CORE
Metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
Provided by OTHES

universität wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

“The Role of English as a Lingua Franca in European Multilingualism. Perceptions of Exchange Students”

Band 1 von 1 Bänden

Verfasserin

Annamária Tóth

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2010

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:	A 343
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:	Anglistik und Amerikanistik
Betreuerin:	Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Seidlhofer

To my mother and father,
with love and gratitude

Acknowledgements

Without the help and support of some people, it would have been impossible for me to write this thesis.

My supervisor Barbara Seidlhofer has not only been an inspiration because she made me aware of English as a lingua franca (ELF) as a fascinating area of reasearch. She has given me invaluable intellectual guidance and shown patience for my constant questions, doubts and, in the last month, desperate e-mails sent back and forth between Paris and Vienna. I will not forget her help in participating in the LINEE conference in Dubrovnik and her support in combining my new study field in European Affairs with my old field of English and American Studies.

I also owe special thanks for my friends and colleagues who have been listening patiently to all my “Diplomarbeit” problems and have provided linguistic and non-linguistic insights and ideas. Their use of ELF has been a constant inspiration, even though they often did not know that my linguist mind was (and is) taking notes of their use of and statements about English. My thanks go to all of them, but especially to Johnny Unger for his advice on qualitative interviews, Anna Fundárek, Julia Gundacker, Claudio Schekulin, and Tanja Wimmer for volunteering to 'try out' my interviews, and to Marie Czuray, Susanna Kappl, Daniel Spichtinger, and Nadine Zeiss for proof-reading parts of my thesis.

Moreover, this thesis could not have been written if my respondents had not volunteered to participate in my research. While I cannot mention them by their names, I would nevertheless like to stress the special help of S1 and S14, who have contacted several of their friends and organised meetings to make my interviews advance faster.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my mother for having helped me with correcting this thesis and with the paperwork needed to hand it in. I am more than grateful to my mother and father for having encouraged and supported me in my study and life choices. My parents have not only shown me the importance of science (books and, of course, history) but they have also given my siblings and me a wonderful family.

Table of contents

1 INTRODUCTION..... 1

2 ENGLISH AS A EUROPEAN LINGUA FRANCA.....4

2.1 English in different parts of Europe..... 4
2.2 Language in Europe 5
2.2.1 The language policy of the European Union. United in Diversity?.....6
2.2.2 European language ideologies. Standard languages and nationalism.....12
2.2.3 The role of ELF in European multilingualism..... 18

3 ERASMUS STUDENTS, ELF, AND COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE. 19

3.1 The Erasmus programme.....19
3.2 United in Erasmus?..... 21
3.3 Communities of Practice..... 26

4 THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS..... 29

4.1 Investigating language attitudes..... 29
4.2 Reconsidering language and language knowledge in the European context..... 32
4.3 Applying ELF.....38
4.3.1 The multicultural nature of ELF interactions..... 38
4.3.2 Attitudes to ELF. Previous research..... 41

5 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....47

5.1 Qualitative data collection.....49
5.1.1 Qualitative interviews and focus groups. General remarks.....49
5.1.2 Interview guideline..... 51
5.1.3 Sampling..... 52
5.1.4 Conducting the interviews..... 53
5.2 Qualitative content analysis.....54
5.2.1 Transcription.....54
5.2.2 Coding and memoing..... 55
5.3 The participants..... 56

6 RESULTS..... 60

6.1 General attitudes to ELF..... 60
6.1.1 ELF as a 'deficient' communicative tool..... 61
6.1.2 ELF as an 'efficient' communicative tool..... 64
6.1.2.1 Direct reference to ELF as an 'efficient' communicative tool.....64
6.1.2.2 Indirect reference to ELF as an 'efficient' communicative tool.....68
6.1.3 Language use in the Erasmus community.....71
6.2 Native speaker norms and Standard English in an international context 81
6.2.1 The native speaker as a teacher of Standard English.....81
6.2.2 The model is not necessarily the goal..... 91

6.2.2.1 Keeping an accent....91
6.2.2.2 Being a successful language user....94
6.2.3 The role of native speakers in an international context....97
6.2.3.1 ENS as a source of misunderstandings....97
6.2.3.2 The native speakers as an isolated group....100
6.2.4 The absence of the native speaker?....103
6.3 Perceptions of the EU's linguistic situation....105
6.3.1 English vs. other languages....105
6.3.1.1 English as the international language....105
6.3.1.2 The local languages....108
6.3.2 ELF as the language of Erasmus....114
6.3.3 ELF as the language of European integration....118

7 IMPLICATIONS AND OUTLOOK....120
7.1 Summary....120
7.2 Implications....122
7.3 Outlook....126

8 CONCLUSION....127

9 REFERENCES....129

10 APPENDIX....138
10.1 Interview guideline....138
10.2 Questionnaire for participants....140
10.3 Questionnaire results....142
10.4 VOICE transcription conventions and my modifications for this thesis....144
10.4.1 VOICE spelling conventions....144
10.4.2 VOICE mark-up conventions....148
10.4.3 My modifications for this thesis....157

11 DEUTSCHE ZUSAMMENFASSUNG....159

Index of Tables

TABLE 1: CODING (EXAMPLE).....47

TABLE 2: LANGUAGE CLASS ATTENDANCE.....97

Abbreviations

AmE	American English
BrE	British English
CS	code-switching
CofP(s)	Community(ies) of Practice
DG	Directorate General (of the European Commission)
EC	European Commission
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
ELT	English language teaching
EM	European multilingualism
ENL	English as a native language
ENS(s)	English native speaker(s)
EU	European Union
GA	General American
LP	language policy
NS(s)	native speaker(s)
NNS(s)	non-native speaker(s)
RP	Received Pronunciation
StdE	Standard English

Abstract

This thesis deals with the role of English as a lingua franca (ELF) in a multilingual and 'united' Europe. Based on semi-structured interviews with 16 current or former exchange students, it focuses on three aspects: (1) general perceptions to ELF and its multicultural nature; (2) the role of English native speakers and their norms in an international context; and (3) what the first two points mean for the European Union's (EU) linguistic landscape and how the participants perceive this landscape. In order to sketch the historical and socio-cultural background of the research, I start by outlining the function of English as a European lingua franca. Then, I go on to an analysis of the EU's multilingualism policy and point out some of its contradictions. My main argument is that the EU's policy is not efficient because it fails to address the problematic core of its language issues. This is the question how a common sphere of European interaction can be established if there is no attempt whatsoever to find a common means of communication on the official level. By contrast, my analysis shows that on the non-official level and even in the daily work life of the EU institutions, English has become the *de facto* lingua franca. A second line of argument focuses on the creative and multilingual nature of ELF interactions and adopts a view of language and language knowledge as dynamic and fluid. A good example for this phenomenon is communication in ELF, where the interactants' languages influence the mode of communication. Based on these two lines of argument, my analysis of the interviews leads to the following results: first, overt attitudes to ELF tended to be negative but the participants are confident and successful users of ELF. The negative attitudes have to be set in the context of standard language ideologies, where languages are strictly connected to nations and where, as a consequence, it is hard to accept that a language, in this case English, can be disembodied from its native speakers. Second, despite this context, some participants point out that native speaker proficiency is not their ultimate goal in learning English. Rather, they focus on communicative efficiency and see native English as a model but not a target. Some even point out that it is sometimes harder to understand natives than non-natives, which means that ultimately, native speakers will have to adjust their language use to the international communicative situation, i.e. they will also have to become proficient ELF users. Finally, as for the EU's linguistic situation, it seems clear from my investigation that ELF is perceived as the EU's lingua franca. Its position has to be seen within European multilingualism (EM), where it acts as a bridge-builder in international communication, but does not threaten local language diversity.

1 Introduction

This thesis deals with the role of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)[1] in a multilingual and ever more integrated Europe.[2] On the one hand, it summarises the historical background of language in Europe and defines ELF as a multilingual means of communication. On the other hand, it analyses semi-structured interviews, in which sixteen former or current exchange students have participated (ch. 6). The interviews focused on three main areas: first, the attitudes and perceptions of these students to ELF; second, differences between the native and the non-native communicative situation and the role of English native speakers (ENSs) in an international context; and finally, on possible implications for the European Union's (EU) linguistic situation and linguistic policy (LP). The perceptions and attitudes of these students are a good example of social and linguistic processes currently at work all over the EU.

This thesis is set in a very specific context: an EU of twenty-seven member states at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century. Over the past century, English has become a global means of communication that is used not only as a native language, but also as a lingua franca, i.e. as a communicative tool between speakers of different mother tongues. Indeed, there are more non-native speakers (NNSs) of English than there are native speakers (NSs). Crystal (2003:67-69), talks about around 1.180 million second and foreign language speakers, who have 'reasonable competence' in English, compared to around 329 million first language speakers. Not only do NNSs by far surpass the number of NSs, they also use English increasingly in interaction among one another and not only to communicate with NSs. In these contexts, English is appropriated creatively for the communicative purposes of NNSs.

This development has led to a debate about the ownership of English and scholars have claimed that English does not only belong to its native speakers any more. The earliest example of this argument is Widdowson (1994) who claims that

> [h]ow English develops in the world is no business whatever of native speakers in

[1] ELF is one of many uses of the English language. This is why, throughout this thesis, I will use *ELF* when referring to this specific use of the English language, but *English* when referring to the language in general. In this case, the use of *English* does not necessarily equal *English as a native language* (ENL).

[2] Europe, in this thesis, will be used to refer to the EU-27. However, it usually also refers to the European continent as a whole. In these cases, the difference in use will be marked.

> England, the United States, or anywhere else. They have no say in the matter, no right to intervene or pass judgement. (Widdowson 1994:385)

Thus English is not an international language with a fixed set of norms and rules, but that it is used in various contexts for different purposes (Widdowson 2003:50).

There are also more critical voices connected to the spread of English. One of the most prominent theories falling into this category is linguistic imperialism (Phillipson 1992). Theories of linguistic imperialism would assert that "the spread of English represents a culturally imperialistic project, which necessarily imparts English language culture to its second language learners" (Brutt-Griffler 2002:). They see NNSs of English as passive victims rather than as active subjects who own the language and appropriate it (Brutt-Griffler 2002, Wright 2005:168). For linguistic imperialists, these speakers participate in a hegemonic relationship as defined by Gramsci and "those who do not accept that they are exploited [are seen] as dupes" (Wright 2005:168).

My arguments are based on another assumption, namely that the global spread of English and its unprecedented use as a lingua franca has in a way detached the language from its native speakers, who no longer act as its sole owners. This implies that the spread of English is not an imposition, as proponents of linguistic imperialism claim. Rather, the non-native users of English are active agents and influence the development of the language. Brutt-Griffler (2002:12, 107) uses the term *macroacquisition* to describe the acquisition and subsequent appropriation of English as a second language by entire communities. Thus NNSs have their own way of using English, which is different in its structural and pragmatic use from NS English. English would not simply diminish if the NS countries lost their important role in world politics and the global economy. Indeed,

> English may have gained so much ground outside circles associated with or dominated by its native speakers, that it may be rooted as a lingua franca no matter what actually happens to the native speaker society. (Wright 2005:155-156).

Set in this context, the thesis will first outline the status quo of ELF in Europe (ch. 2.1). I will then go on to give an overview of the EU's policy of multilingualism (ch. 2.2.1) and set it in a more specific historical context of European ideologies on language (ch. 2.2.2). These ideologies see languages as separate units and often use them as the means of expression for nationalist movements. To contrast this theory with more recent

considerations of language, I will move on to a view of language as a fluid entity. In this view, language competence is the ability to use the linguistic repertoire creatively (ch. 4.2). This view is also what lies at the core of ELF, which will be defined as a multilingual mode of communication (ch. 4.3.1). These two perspectives on language will be present in the analysis of my results. While I will argue that the second view is more appropriate in the present context, I will also show how the first position dominates.

The third chapter has two goals. On the one hand, it introduces the Erasmus exchange programme, in which around two million European students have participated so far. The focus will be set on showing the increasing mobility that is characteristic of today's Europe. The main argument will be that mobility has indeed become part of the identities of many young Europeans at the beginning of the 21st century. On the other hand, the third chapter will also introduce the theory of communities of practice (CofP), which can be applied to Erasmus communities because of the temporary nature of their encounters, their similar backgrounds (they are students on exchange), their use of ELF and their shared activities (Wenger 1998).

The next chapter (ch. 4) addresses some theoretical issues. It has to be seen in contrast to and as a complement of chapter 2. It stands in contrast to the second chapter because of its point of view on language as a creative means of communication (ch. 4.2). It is a complement of chapter 2 because this view of language interacts with language ideologies in the formation of language attitudes: while overt attitudes may coincide with ideologies, attitudes on a covert level may contradict them as I will illustrate later on in the analysis of my results.

Chapter 5 addresses some methodological issues. It will deal with how I conducted my research and why I have chosen this methodology. In other words, I will consider basic issues about semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and qualitative content analysis.

Chapter 6 describes my results. It is divided into three main parts according to the three main research questions. First, it deals with general attitudes to ELF, both positive (ch. 6.1.2) and negative (ch. 6.1.1), and with ELF as a multilingual tool of communication in the Erasmus community (ch. 6.1.3). The second part deals with native speaker norms in an international context. The results presented in this chapter have implications for the role NSs play in international contexts. For example, NSs might have to adjust their

ways of communicating in these situations (chs. 6.2.3, 6.2.4). Finally, ch. 6.3 shows results pertaining to some aspects of the EU's linguistic situation. It deals, first, with English in relation to other languages (6.3.1) and then adopts a broader view of ELF as the language of both educational (6.3.2) and socio-political (ch. 6.3.3) international exchange.

The results are summarised in the following chapter, which also deals with implications and gives an outlook on future research (ch. 7). Together with the concluding chapter (ch. 8), it sees the role of ELF as a mediator in a multilingual EU. It includes ELF in European multilingualism and sees it is as one of many means to manage a linguistically diverse and mobile EU.

2 English as a European Lingua Franca

2.1 English in different parts of Europe

It is hard to draw an overall picture of English in different parts of Europe; however, it can be said that English has recently won the status of the most widely spoken, understood, and learnt language of the EU. The best way to illustrate this is by looking at how widely English is taught as a foreign language at school. The Eurydice report "Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe 2008" (Eurydice 2009) provides facts and figures for such an analysis.[3] In accordance with the Barcelona Council's decisions in 2002[4], most member states teach at least two foreign languages at school, but the range of languages offered is not very diverse. In fact, "[p]upils […] essentially opt for learning more widely used languages" (op.cit.:11) by far the most prominent of which is English (op.cit.:12). English is learned by at least 90 per cent of the students in the majority of the member states. It is thus the most widely learned foreign language in all countries except Belgium and Luxembourg. Adding to that, it is also compulsory in thirteen countries (op.cit.:12, 69). This trend is true for both primary and secondary

[3] The Eurydice network provides information and analyses of the education systems of altogether 31 countries. It includes the member states of the EU, EEA countries (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway), and Turkey. These are the countries who participate in the EU's Lifelong Learning Programme. The main goal of the network is to "*To provide those responsible for education systems and policies in Europe with European-level analyses and information which will assist them in their decision making.*" (Eurydice 2010, emphasis in original.)

[4] The Council of Ministers set a new target for language learning in 2002. This target is to educate EU citizens in two foreign languages apart from their mother tongues. (EC 2008a)

education; in the former, numbers of English learners are on the rise (op.cit.:69). In most countries, German and French rank second, and in some others Russian and Spanish are also taught. These languages make up another 5 per cent of the curricula, whereas the remaining 5 per cent are 'other' languages. (op.cit.:11, 12, 62). In other words, English dominates primary and secondary education.

English is not restricted to the primary and secondary stages of education. Universities are increasingly offering programmes that are at least partly in English (Seidlhofer 2010b). English in its lingua franca use is the language of research ranging from the Humanities to the Hard Sciences (Ammon 2000). This, of course, is also connected to the Bologna process, the main goal of which is to integrate higher education systems (European Commission (EC) 2010f).

ELF is also widely established in the media, especially as the language of the youth (Berns et al. 2007) and of advertisements (Kupper 2007, Spitzmüller 2007). Of course, there are differences between countries: the Scandinavian countries, for example, take the first place as far as the use and knowledge of English is concerned, while Mediterranean countries such as Italy are further down on the list (Görlach 2002, 2003). Nonetheless, the general claim that Europeans are “in the presence of English” (Berns et al. 2007) is true for every country.

Despite this widespread use and presence of English in Europe, there has been no official attempt so far by the EU to acknowledge the important role of the language (Seidlhofer 2010b). As I will show in the following chapters, there is a big discrepancy between the EU policy of multilingualism and language ideologies on the one hand and actual linguistic practices on the other hand.

2.2 Language in Europe

The EU's slogan *United in Diversity* is the basic principle on which the policy of multilingualism is built.[5] According to the principle of diversity, the main goal of the EU LP is the establishment and enhancement of multilingualism throughout Europe.

[5] The European Commission (EC) does not have any power to enforce its LP in individual member states. However, it can – and does – support certain programmes and projects based on its directives (e.g. programmes directed at language learning and linguistic projects such as LINEE [Languages in a Network of European Excellence] or DYLAN [Language Dynamics and Management of Diversity], the European Year of Languages in 2001, the Action Plan from 2004 to 2006). (Schjerve-Rindler 2006/07) As a result, the EU policy of multilingualism is applied in practically all member states (van Els 2005: 271-272).

This does not only include the protection of regional and minority languages, but refers also to education for children and adults (e.g. language learning and teaching to immigrants). The EU LP is part of the decisions taken at the Barcelona Council (2002) and the Lisbon Strategy (2000)[6], according to which a knowledge-based economy and society should be established. Applied to the area of language, this includes trilingual citizens: every citizen should speak or understand at least two languages apart from their mother tongue. These languages should be, according to the EC, a language of wider communication and another "language of the heart", i.e. an instrumental and an authentic language (EC 2009b, Gal 2010).

In what follows, I will point out some discrepancies in the EU policy of multilingualism that I find relevant for my thesis. My main argument will be that this policy does not really address problematic issues at the core of the EU's linguistic situation. As I shall discuss in more detail later on, a case in point is the recommendation to learn a language of wider communication without any specification which language this should be. I will also try to show that a multilingual policy can hardly be efficient unless it tries to find a means to establish the unity that acts as a bridge between regional diversity.

2.2.1 The language policy of the European Union. United in Diversity?

Maybe the only multilingual transnational organisation worldwide, the EU is proud of its support of multilingualism and, above all, the protection of regional minorities and their languages. The EU has expressed its respect for and promotion of linguistic diversity in several documents, most importantly in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the Union, which all member states (except Poland and the United Kingdom) must respect. The Charter states that no-one should be discriminated against based on their language (Title III, Art. 81). Furthermore, it claims that every citizen may address the institutions of the EU in one of the twenty-three official languages and may get an answer in the same language (Title V, Art. 101, §4)[7], and that "[t]he Union shall respect

[6] During the Council meeting in Lisbon (2000), the EU ministers launched the so-called Lisbon strategy. Its main goal is to establish the EU's role as the strongest player in the global market. It is based on three pillars: one for economy (the transition to a competitive knowledge-based economy), a social pillar (investments in education and training and in fighting unemployment), and an environmental pillar (added at the 2001 Göteburg Council, this pillar holds that economic growth must not do damage to natural resources). (EC 2010g)

[7] Two things should be noted here. On the one hand, nobody should be discriminated against based on

cultural, religious and linguistic diversity" (Title III, Art. 22). (EU 2000) In other words, the policy is based on a strong commitment to establish and promote multilingualism and this commitment is anchored in important founding documents of the EU.

As for the official level, one or several official languages of the EU member states are also official and working languages in all bodies of the European Union, as established by the Treaty of Rome (Regulation No. 1, 1958). From an organisation with six official and working languages, the EU has grown to a uniquely multilingual transnational organisation with 23 official languages. This does not mean that 23 languages are used on a daily basis in the EU bodies. Practice has restricted the working languages to English, German, and French. English dominates (followed by French and German) within the bodies of the EU except for the European Court of Justice, the main language of which has traditionally been, and remained, French. As I have shown in ch. 2.1, English dominates also as far as language learning and use in the member states themselves are concerned (Fontenelle 1999:121, van Els 2005:269).

The (theoretical) equality of the individual languages has nonetheless been reaffirmed repeatedly. For example, the mission statement of the Directorate General (DG) for Education and Culture, to which the subtopic Multilingualism belongs, underlines this commitment:

> The European Commission fosters and promotes language learning at all levels in order to empower citizens to make full use of the opportunities created by the European project. At the same time it promotes multilingualism to preserve linguistic diversity in Europe and as a link to other cultures. This is achieved mainly via the Lifelong Learning Programme and by means of policy instruments, such as the Communication adopted in September 2008 entitled "Multilingualism an asset for Europe and a shared commitment". The European Commission also seeks to raise awareness of the importance of language skills for a healthy European economy and for social cohesion. Its comprehensive policy approach seeks to involve all Commission departments as well as the Member States. In addition to organising conferences, seminars, and information campaigns it commissions studies and monitors policy developments and their implementation. (EC 2009a)

This mission statement outlines two of the three pillars that the EU LP is built on. First, it aims at encouraging and promoting language learning with the goal of strengthening linguistic diversity. Second, it focuses on multilingualism as an economic resource.

their mother tongue. On the other hand, citizens may address the EU institutions in the official languages, not their mother tongue. This, of course, excludes in a way speakers of minority and regional languages, not to mention immigrants who have already become EU citizens.

Finally, and not explicitly mentioned in the mission statement, multilingualism should not be an elite process but social integration should be enhanced by the respect of linguistic diversity (EC 2008a). The importance of these pillars is reinforced again and again in many EC publications and statements (cf. Vlaeminck 2003).

The policy document mentioned in this quote, "Multilingualism. An asset for Europe and a shared commitment" (EC 2009b) provides a good overview of the three core topics that EU LP is concerned with today. Drawing on documents such as the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, and the Barcelona strategy set out in 2002 (EC 2008c), this resolution points out that "linguistic and cultural diversity have a significant impact on the daily life of citizens" (EC 2009b:2). Therefore, EU citizens should learn "a diverse range of language skills", so that they can "derive full economic, social and cultural benefit from freedom of movement within the Union and from the Union's relations with third countries" (ibid). Furthermore, multilingualism is also seen as a measure "to prevent the emergence of possible conflicts […] between the different linguistic communities within the Member States" (ibid). In other words, multilingualism is not only part of cultural diversity and an important skill for a successful participation in the integrated community, but also enhances European economic integration and aims at ensuring peace and freedom on the European continent.

Furthermore, the EC refers to multilingualism as "a rewarding challenge", and sees language strictly related to culture and identity:

> Languages are one of the key features of cultural identity. The European Union's motto "Unity in diversity" is a reflection of the multilingualism which lies at the heart of the EU. The European Union has always considered its many languages as an asset, rather than as a burden. While committed to political and economic integration among its Member States, the EU actively promotes the freedom of its citizens to speak and write their own language. (EC 2008a)

As the mission statement mentions, another area of EU LP are projects funded by the EU. The Commission has supported projects to enhance multilingualism for a long time, such as the European Year of Languages (2001). This project put an emphasis on life-long language learning and on the importance of foreign language competence. Moreover, the so-called Action Plan (2004 to 2006) aimed at the efficient

implementation of multilingualism in the form of funded programmes at the secondary education level. The action plan also focused on establishing common norms for foreign language competence in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Schjerve-Rindler 2006/07). 2008 was the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue. Other long-term programmes focus on education and training and include early language teaching (e.g. the new programme Piccolingo, EC 2010c), secondary education (Comenius), higher education (Erasmus), and adult and professional education (Grundtvig). (EC 2008a)

In sum, we can see a repeated insistence on the positive aspects of multilingualism, its importance in everyday life, and the equality of all languages. However, in practice, some languages seem to be 'more equal' than others as I will try to show by the following example. Similar to the documents mentioned above, the *Framework Strategy for Multilingualism* (EC 2005), one of the key documents of EU LP, sets out three core areas of focus, one of them being access for citizens to "EU legislation, procedures and information in their own language" (EC 2005:3).[8] As a mother tongue speaker of a small language (Hungarian), I was interested in how many documents I could actually access on the web page of the DG for Education & Culture, when selecting the section on multilingualism.

The main page opened with a Hungarian side bar and hot topics in English. The first topic, an article on linguistic diversity in South Africa (EC 2010a), had just been posted on the Friday (28 May 2010) before my search (30 May 2010). Therefore, I assumed that it would be translated later on. The next headline on the importance of language skills on the job market, posted a week earlier (EC 2010b) was also only available in English, similar to the third and last headline (10 May 2010), an introduction to the new Piccolingo programme focusing on early language teaching (EC 2010c). Next, I tried to use the EU's second and third biggest languages, namely German and French, but I was always redirected to the English headlines. In other words, I could not access the latest news provided by the EC in my mother tongue or a 'big' language other than English.

Later on, I tried to access the "Important Documents" section and was lead to a site saying "This site is only available in English! Click here to access" (EC 2009c). When I

[8] To this, we can add the articles from the Charter mentioned above (Title III, Art. 81; Title V, Art. 101 § 4), which ensure that no citizen should be discriminated against because of their language and that the citizens can address the institutions in their mother tongue and get a reply in that language.

accessed the next page, I found that only those policy documents were available in Hungarian that have been drafted after Hungary's accession (2004). Even after that year, I could not access all the documents in Hungarian and some of them were only to be found on other web pages (such as a link to the European Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms from 2000).

Finally, I selected the press releases area on multilingualism, another feature providing citizens with the latest news. 28 notes were released between 11 February and 30 May 2010, all of which were available in English. Almost half of them (12) were available in English only, thirteen in French and German (N.B. the same thirteen documents), and half of them – interestingly – in Greek. As a monolingual journalist of my mother tongue, I could have accessed only around a third (9) of the press releases.

In summary, I could read the areas explaining the language policy as such (posted in 2008, i.e. two years earlier) in Hungarian, but even here, not everything was available in this language. I could not find out what was actually happening and how the EU was promoting multilingualism on a day to day basis. However, I could access everything in English. These two facts stand in contrast to what the *Framework Strategy* and other policy documents say, namely the absolute equality of all official languages and the availability of information in all of them. Would it, then, not be more efficient for the EC (and the EU) to recommend its citizens to know English at least passively in order to be able to understand the latest news, which is the case anyhow?

This discrepancy, with official statements on the one hand claiming absolute equality of all languages, and with reality proving to be different on the other hand, creates a situation in which the EU has a *linguistic* deficit in not addressing complex but important issues at the heart of the language problem (Castiglione 2007, Seidlhofer 2010b). One of these issues is illustrated above: how should the EC reach the citizens if there is no time or if there are not enough resources for translation?

Pointing out this discrepancy does not imply that the policy of multilingualism should be abandoned because linguistic diversity is indeed at the core of Europe. For instance, citizens should be able to use their mother tongue in addressing the EU and get an answer in their language as a basic linguistic right. However, the EU's policy of multilingualism is, as present, not *efficient*. In what follows, I will try to (1) exemplify my argument and (2) give a possible explanation as to why this is the case. This will be

followed (3) by my own case study on Erasmus students, which exemplifies actual language use on the international level in the EU (ch. 6). In all three cases, I will come to the conclusion that ELF has already been established as or is one of the possible solutions to managing multilingualism.

First, in order to illustrate why the EU LP is not efficient, let us consider the following. The resolution by the European Parliament cited above (EC 2009b: "Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment") holds that "linguistic diversity constitutes a major cultural asset" in the EU. Therefore, "it would be wrong for the European Union to restrict itself to a single main language" (EC 2009b:3). While I agree with the claim that the EU should not go for a 'one language for all' policy, I believe that this sentence needs to be contextualised. On the regional level, the policy directives should protect the language(s) spoken. In many other contexts, such as a formal meeting of EU officials, or an international gathering of students, it may be pragmatically more efficient to agree on one language.

However, this is exactly the point that the directives do not take into account. In contrast, it is argued that

> multilingualism is essential for effective communication and represents a means of facilitating comprehension between individuals and hence acceptance of diversity and of minorities (EC 2009c:4-5).

Therefore, EU citizens should learn "other EU languages, one of which should be the language of a neighbouring country and another an international 'lingua franca'" (EC 2009c:5). I agree that an awareness of the multilingual nature of European society may lead to an acceptance and respect of diversity. Similarly, the advice to learn neighbouring languages may also be practical in daily life (e.g. an Austrian launching business in Hungary may profit more from knowing Hungarian than, let us say, Spanish).[9] I doubt, however, that multilingualism as such may be beneficial in an international situation of communication. For example, let us imagine a situation in which a Slovak and a Dane meet. The Slovak has learned Polish as a neighbouring language and Spanish as a lingua franca, while the Dane has learned Swedish and English. The situation in which they meet is very multilingual but I cannot see how they

[9] For a similar argument see Lüdi (2002) or Weber (2005). It is interesting to note that this document advises citizens to learn languages of third countries only after European languages. However, just as it might be practical for a Viennese person to learn Czech or Slovak, it may be even more practical to learn Turkish, a 'third country language' in order to communicate with local immigrants.

could communicate efficiently.

In order to circumvent such a situation, it would be more efficient to advise citizens to learn one language, and the best candidate would be English. In this way, citizens could communicate in international (European) situations. Giving such advice would not mean any big changes to the EU's linguistic landscape as English has become a *de facto* lingua franca of Europe (cf. e.g. Berns et al. 2007, de Swaan 2007, Seidlhofer 2003, 2007, 2010b, Seidlhofer et al. 2006). Nevertheless, the special status of English in the EU context is not taken into account in these directives (Seidlhofer et al. 2006, Seidlhofer 2010a, 2010b). English, according to official policy, is just like any other foreign language despite its dominant use as a lingua franca on all levels of society. Why this seems to be so is the focus of the following chapter (ch. 2.2.2). The main reason seems to be that it is hard to 'disembody' language from its nation in the present state of language ideologies, i.e. that English is very often seen as the sole property of its NSs.

In conclusion, there seems to be no pragmatic and efficient attempt by the EU to find a solution to its Tower of Babel. While official documents claim that diversity as such can provide unity, I believe that in some contexts, there is a need for something more pragmatic, such as an effective means of communication.[10] Diversity only cannot provide unity in European integration: there is a need *in some contexts* for a unifying element. This element is *de facto* ELF (Wright 2009:96). In other words, while the EU's slogans show diversity, practice on the supranational level and in international encounters actually moves towards unity. Despite the EU's official insistence on the equality of languages in all situations, practice very often shows the above cited message: “This site is only available in English! Click here to access.”

2.2.2 European language ideologies. Standard languages and nationalism

I have argued in the previous chapters (chs. 2.1 and 2.2.1) that there is a discrepancy

[10] Cf. Gal (2006) for an argument of how linguistic diversity and shared practices can provide unity as well. Gal argues that there is not a need for one single language to create a European public. Giving the example of quite similar practices in the media throughout Europe, she shows that unity can also be established in linguistic diversity. While agreeing with her argument, my claim here focuses on international settings, such as the Erasmus students' community that I will analyse later on, or the official EU level, which I have just dealt with.

between linguistic practice on the one hand and official attitudes / policies on the other hand as far as language in the EU context is concerned. Linguistic practice on the supranational level is moving towards unity by increasingly converging towards the use of ELF, whereas the official level has so far shown itself reluctant to provide any efficient means to deal with this situation (Seidlhofer 2003, 2010b). It has thus failed to address controversial issues at the heart of the EU's linguistic challenge (Castiglione 2007).

Having outlined this ambiguity, I will now explain at least partly why this is the case. I will argue that language has long been connected to nationalism and thus, on the international level, to political power. Given this context, nation-states have shown themselves especially reluctant to make an official commitment to any kind of cultural or linguistic integration. They have feared not only to lose their lingua-cultural sovereignty, but also their political power. Languages in the EU are still strictly tied to the individual member states. In the present language policy, they are in competition for whose language should be the most powerful. In a personal communication, an EC official pointed out to me that it was indeed for political reasons that the *de facto* lingua franca of Europe, English, has not yet been acknowledged officially. He explained that the adoption of English as the official lingua franca of the EU would create a huge uproar, as most member states (and especially the 'big' countries France and Germany) would see this as an attempt to create an Anglophone hegemony. Also, people would interpret such a recommendation as an imposition, whereas they choose English anyway if there is no recommendation. Had I asked this EC official in an official discussion, he ended, he would not have given me the same explanation. In other words, at least on the official level, nationalist ideals still trump effective communication. Apart from Esperanto, there has not been any attempt to adopt a lingua franca. It is considered better not to address the question at all and let things happen as they do. The same explanation is give7n by Wright (2000):

> Any proposal of effective policies to aid communication between the citizens of its constituent parts, such as the adoption of a *lingua franca,* would surely cause a ferocious nationalist backlash, similar to but much greater than the reactions to the proposed single currency. Thus discussion would be possibly counter productive for integration and this would account for integrationists' reluctance to address the problem of plurilingualism honestly. They may feel, given the intra-European discord any attempt to plan for a community of communication would cause, that it is better to let the issue resolve itself in an unplanned way. (Wright 2000:121)

> The choice of one nation's language to be the official *lingua franca* for the whole would certainly bruise national sensibilities. A *lingua franca*, particularly if it were to be English, would be perceived as a threat, carrying with it the distinct possibility of undermining other languages and cultures. Anglicisation might worry many Europeans as much – if not more – than the democratic deficit caused by the lack of a European community of communication. (op.cit.:130)

This explanation is exemplified also in Sherman et al. (2009). Addressing the issue of a unifying language of Europe, the participants in WP4 of the LINEE project explained that the adoption of ELF was happening spontaneously. They accepted this event as it was a bottom-up process:

> In most of the students' answers there was the prevalence of the opinion that, due to the increasing mobility amongst EU citizens, English is becoming a lingua franca. Several participants agreed that this is a spontaneous event, i.e. it happens without the imposition of any (supra)national language policy measures. The participants expressed a positive or neutral attitude with respect to this "naturally occurring" expansion of the English language, and *at the same time they said they were against the artificial top-down imposition of an European lingua franca*." (Sherman et al. 2009:15; emphasis added)

These arguments mean, then, that it may be extremely controversial in the European context to make a proposal to adopt ELF or to recommend its acquisition officially. While English is the *de facto* lingua franca, it is hardly possible to recognise this situation *de iure*. The discrepancies created by this ambiguous and controversial lingua-political situation as well as their roots in European nationalism have been pointed out repeatedly (e.g. Edwards 1985, Joseph 2004). While I cannot give a detailed account of the intricacies between language and nationalism, as it would fill yet another thesis (or more), I will outline work by Seidlhofer (2010a, b) and Wright (2000, 2005, esp. 2009) because they deal specifically with ELF in the European context. I will also refer to Gal (2006, 2010) because she makes a highly interesting comparison to the linguistic situation of the late Habsburg Empire, and because her comparison is indeed useful when trying to find solutions for the present situation.

As I have already pointed out, the discrepancies arising from the claim to guarantee multilingualism at all costs and under all circumstances can be explained with reference to European history and the century-long connection between language and nationalism. As individual national languages have been connected to the political power of their states, the EU has to support all national languages equally in a union of equal partners. European states have to overcome a long history of rivalries between single nations,

which have often also been carried out in the field of language. Nationalist movements such as French or German nationalism are just some examples but the same aspect has also been increasingly relevant in nationalist conflicts in Central-Eastern Europe or the Balkans (Wright 2000:63, 121 and 2005:ch. 3, esp. 65-7, ch. 8.3).

Importantly, European politicians (and Europeans in general) have difficulties reconciling old notions of nationalism with new, emerging notions of an integrated Europe in which the nationstate does not play the same role anymore. This point is crucial and illustrates well that Europe is at a transitory stage: while old ideas are present, new ideas are emerging. They are very often in conflict with well-established notions not only on the level of language, but on other levels, such as economy, as well. Citizens very often still identify themselves primarily with their nation-states, while at the same time the European level is developing, and regions are of increasing importance (Seidlhofer 2010b, Wright 2009:100). In addition, official discourse about integration praises overcoming national difficulties, but this does not seem to apply to the language question, where there is an insistence on diversity. Insisting on diversity without a unifying element on the cultural level, however, hinders plans to create a community of communication on the supranational and transnational levels (Wright 2009:100-101 and 2005; cf. ch. 2.2.1).

Another important phenomenon is colonialism and imperialism (Wright 2009:102-104). Parallel to processes of nation formation, there have also been several efforts of globalisation by European nations, such as the spread of Christianity (starting in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), the ideas of the Enlightenment (C18), or transnational capitalism and the establishment of colonial empires (C17 to C19). Wright argues that these processes also influence present language ideologies as they were connected to spreading not only political or economic ideas but also languages.

> It is likely that Europeans' experience and/or memory of these various imperialist projects will also frame their attitude to language use and spread. Significantly, in all of these projects there has been an element of top-down language imposition, with the centre requiring the periphery (or at least some on the periphery) to accommodate linguistically. (Wright 2009:104)

Wright argues that the spread of imperialism and connected language policies are so much present in the minds of Europeans that they create great resistance to an official adoption of ELF. These memories also enhance hegemonic analyses of the linguistic

situation in Europe such as arguments by Phillipson (e.g. 2003, 2007, 2008). Less radical positions also claim that English is spreading from the centre and benefits the centre (e.g. van Parijs 2004, 2007).[11]

In a similar vein, but with a different focus, Gal's work addresses standard language ideologies (2006) and compares today's linguistic policies to those of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of the nineteenth century (2010). Gal (2010) argues that the move from a mono- to a multilingual regime has not led to changes in the ideas on what language actually does in social life. European cultural values have not moved to multilingualism, but there is rather a "top-down regime of multilingual standardisation" (Gal 2010). On the one hand, increasing migration, the revival of minorities, and the spread of an international language are in conflict with the integrity of the national languages. On the other hand, the solutions offered still focus on the national language ideology. The solution is seen in "standardising diversity" (Gal 2010) as standards are seen as authentic and authoritative (Gal 2006:166). A standard has a certain

> universality that comes from supposedly being the property of all citizens, unbiased because it is no one's in particular, and hence represents a socially neutral, supposedly anonymous voice. (Gal 2006:166)

However, the standard is always a construction and an abstraction from reality. This may be best exemplified by Chambers' (2009) argument:

> Codification perpetuates the linguistic standard. The accumulation of dictionaries, grammars, usage guides, orthoepies, readers, and spellers forms an educational base for preparing future generations of standard-bearers. It also forms a bedrock of authorized language in the event of linguistic challenges. Enshrining the standard dialect in print inhibits change as far as possible, although that is never very far. Because change is irrepressible, orthographies become ever more inaccurate reflections of speech, dictionaries become repositories of archaisms, and usage guides become edicts of ritualized grammar. As the most faithful reflection of the codified language, the standard dialect preserves some features that have disappeared from other dialects if they had them in the first place. (Chambers 2009:267)

The same ambiguity between the standard and actual language use is pointed out by Milroy (1999. He argues that standard languages are canonical and legitimised because of their codification. Furthermore, they

> exist at their highest level of abstraction in standardised forms, and these abstract

[11] See Lichtkoppler (2007) for a criticism of both Phillipson's argument of linguistic imperialism and Van Parijs' argument of linguistic justice.

> objects are, in principle, uniform states. Yet, apparently paradoxically, all languages [...] are observed to be variable within themselves and not uniform at all, and they are also in a continuous state of change. (Milroy 1999:17)

In other words, standard languages are idealisations and simplifications of reality. In standard language cultures (e.g. English, French, or German), the standard variety is constructed as superordinate to other varieties and is promoted in society by different means, such as education and literacy in the standard (Milroy 1999:18).

While the support of multilingualism seems to work against the notion of the standard, Gal (2006) points out that this is not the case in the EU discourse on language diversity. "The emphasis on linguistic diversity is deceptive" because the languages mentioned in the policy documents have to "conform to standardising" and have to be "named languages with unified, codified norms of correctness" (Gal 2006:167).[12] In the context of the EU's multilingual policy, standardisation includes the creation trilingual speakers who have an instrumental, practical language for business interactions and another "authentic and freely chosen language of the heart" (2010), reflecting, again, universality and authenticity.[13]

In today's linguistic situation the relevance of such a dichotomy might be questionable. Gal illustrates this with the linguistic situation of the late Habsburg Empire, where "many alternate visions of language and identity" (Gal 2010) coexisted, and where language was not always tied to nationhood, the idea that eventually survived the Empire. Gal describes one of these points of view, which was replaced by the monolingual idea later on, as "polyglot nationalism or modernity" (op.cit.). She gives the example of the Hungarian linguist Hunfalvy, who "rejected the special position of the mother tongue" and who "did not see any connection between the national language and the national *Geist*" (op.cit.). But also on the local, non-scientific level, "many people practised this view" (op.cit.), for example in the establishment of child exchange or *gyerekcsere.* In child exchange, children as young as five years old until secondary school pupils were sent to families to learn their language. Gal explains that "multilingualism was seen as something valuable and children were proud of their

[12] This point is also emphasised by van Els (2005), who argues that accepting the national languages of member states as official languages of the EU is a reduction *per se* as it excludes regional and minority languages as well as immigrant languages.

[13] Note that this policy sees the 'average' EU citizen as monolingual. It seems to neglect speakers of, let us say, Basque and Castilian in Spain, or a child of a Turkish immigrant to the Netherlands, who grow up with two languages from their early childhood on.

language skills, but the types of linguistic skills differed" (2010; cf. ch. 2.2.3). Sometimes, the skills included literacy. In other cases, people only knew some registers. Hence a secondary pupil's skills differed from that of the child sent off to a farm but in both cases, they took pride in their language skills. The reasons to learn these languages were not clearly instrumental or authentic, but both. Many people, such as Hunfalvy, were tied to both Hungarian and German, and did not see this as a conflict. Others, such as priests, had to learn local minority languages to reach their believers.

In other words, people learned languages without giving up the mother tongue and without necessarily sticking to a standard. This type of language knowledge is the core of polyglot modernity. Instead of sticking to monolingualism connected to the main ideas of nineteenth-century nationalism, Gal (2010) concludes, these alternate visions should also be taken into consideration today. Maybe they reflect the linguistic situation of an integrated and increasingly mobile Europe more appropriately than multilingual standardisation.

In conclusion, language and nationalism are tightly linked in the European context. This chapter has argued that linking supposedly homogeneous languages as unifying factors to nations creates an ambiguous situation. On the one hand, it is a simplification of a diverse reality. In fact, there is no such thing as a monolingual member state of the EU. On the other hand, this point of view stands in contrast with attempts to deepen European integration and to give more significance to the supranational and regional levels than to the national one. Finally, this chapter is also important as it forms a socio-historical basis for the remaining part of my thesis. Indeed, the influence of standard language ideologies as well as links between language and nationalism, in other words, the European historical and political context, can be found in the answers given by the participants in my own research.

2.2.3 The role of ELF in European multilingualism

So far, I have outlined the discrepancies inherent in the EU's policy of multilingualism, arguing that it fails to recognise and acknowledge the de facto role of ELF in European multilingualism (chs. 2.1 and 2.2). I have also attempted to explain why this is so (ch. 2.2.2), and will continue to do so from a more linguistic perspective in ch. 4. Before doing so, I would like to conclude the socio-historical part of my thesis on language in

Europe by establishing the role of ELF in European multilingualism, and then deal with the closer context of my research, namely student exchange and mobility.

As I have shown in the previous chapters (chs. 2.2.1 and 2.2.2), there is a tension between the promotion of European multilingualism on the one hand and ELF as a unifying language on the other hand (Seidlhofer et al. 2006). This tension lies in the fact that in the present state of affairs and ideas about the roles of languages, the move is towards diversity, not unity. Seidlhofer et al. also point out the "dilemma" of promoting many languages and at the same time one language for all.

> This state of affairs thus looks like an irresolvable dilemma: In order to have a sense of community, a common language is needed, but having a common language is seen as a threat to European multilingualism. How can one promote a common language for the community while supporting equal rights for all community languages at the same time? (2006:24)

Thus, in Wright's (2000, 2005, 2009) terms, it is hard to imagine a community of communication such as the EU without a language in which this communication should work.

It is indeed a dilemma how to find an answer to this question but my case study will show that it might be possible. I see the role of ELF in the promotion of inter-cultural communication in multilingual situations that are happening on an everyday basis in the EU. In many cases, such as most of the Erasmus communities, the bodies of the EU, international conferences, and so forth, ELF is the unity in a very diverse framework. As I will show in the remaining part of my thesis, taking Erasmus students as an example, ELF is facilitating communication between interactants who only engage in temporary relations and whose stay in a country is only temporary as well. By playing this role, ELF is enhancing integration and the creation of a European awareness, while not infringing on European multilingualism.

3 Erasmus students, ELF, and Communities of Practice

3.1 The Erasmus programme

The EC funds different education and training programmes which focus on exchange, as

in the form of the Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus Programmes. Launched more than twenty years ago, the European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) includes a three- to twelve-month stay at a partner university. More than 1.5 million students have already participated in the programme. This number should be doubled by 2012 as an ambitious goal of the Life Long Learning Programme (EC 2007b). Erasmus also provides a programme for staff mobility for higher education employees. Erasmus Mundus includes European master programmes in which students study at two or more different institutions and usually graduate with a double diploma.

Financial backing for Erasmus is provided by the Member States as well as the Commission, which has recently announced a fourfold increase of the 2009 to 2013 budget of the Erasmus Mundus programme. The budget was raised to € 950 million (EC 2009d). These exchanges, together with other programmes such as Leonardo and Socrates, are important in order to establish a European awareness among students and integrate university systems into a common area of European higher education. They also tie in with linguistic policies and are part of the Bologna process.[14]

Erasmus thus "enables students at higher education institutions to spend an integrated period of study […] in another participating country" (EC 2010e). The Erasmus programme aims, first, to promote educational, linguistic, and cultural awareness. Second, its goal is to reinforce inter-institutional co-operation between universities in order to enrich their educational environments. Finally, the programme wants "[t]o contribute to the development of a pool of well-qualified, open-minded and internationally experienced young people as future professionals" (op.cit.).

In other words, the main goal is to form a new generation of linguistically diverse, culturally open-minded economic workforce. This is why language acquisition is supported actively (at least in theory, as many universities offer courses in English and participants may not need to learn the local language at all; cf. ch. 6.3.2). If participants do not have sufficient language skills in the language of the receiving member state, they may attend intensive courses offered by the programme for free. (EC 2009d).

In the academic year 2006/07, 153.396 students from universities in the twenty-seven member states and Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, and Turkey took part in the

[14] As for secondary educational exchange, the Comenius programme provides a wide range of opportunities. Furthermore, the Eurydice network supervises and analyses European secondary education systems on a regular basis (EC 2007).

programme. Numbers are growing as two years later (2008/09), there were 198.568 Erasmus students recorded. The largest states were leading as far as absolute numbers are concerned in 2006/07 as well as 2008/09. While Spain was the largest host country, receiving 27.500 students, most outgoing students were German, with 23.700 students leaving Germany in 2006/07. France ranked second after Spain with around 23.000 incoming and 20.000 outgoing students, but by 2008/09, it ranked first, with 28.283 outgoing students. It was followed by Germany (27.894 outgoing students) and Spain (27.405 outgoing students). (EC 2008b, 2010d.) However, relative numbers show that Luxembourg, Liechtenstein and Austria are on the lead with 15.5, 3.01 and 1.89 per cent respectively of the whole student population on exchange in the academic year 2008/09 (this should be compared to the EU average of 0.92 per cent).

Thus, absolute numbers of exchange students seem to be quite high, but relative numbers per year are quite low. Nonetheless, numbers are growing and going on an exchange (within and outside Europe) has become a valuable add-on to the study curriculum (King & Ruiz Gelices 2003:232).[15] Indeed, for many students, 'exchange' has become synonymous with 'Erasmus'. This is why I have decided to use the terms Erasmus / exchange / international student synonymously, unless marked differently. Erasmus is known to practically every European student, even if they have not participated in an exchange. Sometimes, they even use *Erasmus* to refer to exchange outside Europe although Erasmus programmes are limited to the EU member states and some other European countries. In sum, since the great success of the movie *L'Auberge espagnole* at the latest, Erasmus has become part of the everyday vocabulary of European students.

3.2 United in Erasmus?

Ever since its launch in 1987, the Erasmus programme has been seen as a prime promoter of European identity. By staying in a different country for a longer period of time, the argument goes, students widen their mental horizons, get to know the host country's language and culture, and may also become more European as a result of mobility. (King & Ruiz Gelices 2003, Fernández 2005, Sigalas 2009:2-6.) Indeed,

[15] King & Ruiz Gelices (2003: 232) add that in 1996, 1.6 million students from the tertiary level went on exchange world-wide. Half of these students were studying in Europe, slightly more than a third in North America, and 7 per cent in Australia. In other words, Europe is taking the lead as far as university exchange and mobility is concerned.

fostering mobility as a promoter of European identity is a key issue in EU politics, not only on the level of education (e.g. the Erasmus, Leonardo, Socrates, Comenius, and Grundtvig programmes) but also on the economic level (one of the basic principles of the EU is the free movement of goods, capital, services, and people). The former Commissioner for Education, Culture and Youth, Jan Figel, underlines the importance of Erasmus as the promoter of a European identity.

> ERASMUS has developed beyond just being an educational programme. It gives many European university students the chance of living for the first time in a foreign country, and it has reached the status of a social and cultural phenomenon. It is an excellent example of what coordinated European action in the field of education can achieve and it embodies the belief that concerted European action has a larger added value than the sum of excellent independent initiatives. (EC 2007b)[16]

In other words, Erasmus is not only an enrichment on the academic, but also on the personal and community level. This is not a new phenomenon. Sigalas (2009:8) points out that the cultural aspect has always been at the core of Erasmus exchanges and quotes the Council Decision of 1987 which established the programme:

> The objectives of the ERASMUS programme shall be as follows: (i) to achieve a significant increase in the number of students […] spending an integrated period of study in another Member State, in order that the Community may draw upon an adequate pool of manpower with first hand experience of economic and social aspects of other Member States [...]; (iv) to strengthen the interaction between citizens in different Member States with a view to consolidating the concept of a People's Europe; (v) to ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experience of intra-Community cooperation, thereby creating the basis upon which intensified cooperation in the economic and social sectors can develop at the Community level. (Council, 1987:21- 22, qtd. in Sigalas 2009:8).

Hence staying in another country and getting to know its culture will eventually enhance economic development. Moreover, it encourages the acceptance of "the concept of a People's Europe" and promotes the formation of "intra-Community cooperation", that is, a European identity built on the exchange experience.

While the connection between the exchange term and identity formation seems to be a widely accepted view, Sigalas (2009) cautions to equal the Erasmus term with the strengthening of a European identity. His quantitative study uses bivariate analysis in

[16] Sigalas (2009:8) quotes EC president José Manuel Barroso, who said the same: "ERASMUS has developed beyond just being an educational programme. It gives many European university students the chance for living for the first time in a foreign country, and it has reached the status of a social and cultural phenomenon" (Europa Press Releases 2006).

order to test whether the exchange year has a positive impact on European identity formation (op.cit.:10). His results do not prove this hypothesis. The students in his longitudinal survey have improved their foreign language skills (op.cit.:12) but there is "no evidence that the ERASMUS experience leads students to adopt a European self-identity" (op.cit.:14). Nonetheless, the Erasmus students are more likely to see themselves as primarily or exclusively European than the sedentary control group.

Changes in awareness of being European seem to be related to the host country. The respondents in this survey consisted of British outgoing students going to continental Europe on the one hand and continental Europeans coming to English universities on the other hand. In the first group, respondents report a stronger attachment to Europe after the exchange term and discover commonalities among Europeans (op.cit.:15-16). In contrast, the students going to the rather Eurosceptic UK even indicate that their pride in being European has declined over their exchange (op.cit.:16). In sum, the respondents learn about their host countries and improve their language skills but do not strengthen their European identity to a statistically significant extent (op.cit.:19).

However, as Sigalas points out himself, it is extremely difficult to talk about 'a' European identity because there is no such concept. And even if there is a concept of European identity, it is not as strong as the national identities of individual member states (op.cit.:2-4). For this reason, Sigalas chose to use the categories used in Eurobarometer surveys, in which respondents have to indicate whether they belong to (1) their own nation; (2) their nation and Europe; (3) Europe and their nation; (4) Europe only (op.cit.:14).

I see these categories as quite problematic, given the difficulties in defining what being European means. These categories are built on a hierarchical opposition between being European or a national citizen and do not take into account regional identities, such as being Basque or from an immigrant background (King & Ruiz-Gelices 2003:247). Even categories (2) and (3) establish a hierarchy as they differentiate between feeling primarily an attachment to Europe or the own nation.[17]

King's and Ruiz-Gelices' (2003) research, however, shows that students who have already been abroad were more positively attuned towards issues of European

[17] An additional factor complicating the issue of European identity is that Europe is a geographical area and not only the political organisation of the EU. A person may feel European but not attached to the EU as an institution and as the project of European integration.

integration and identity than students who have not yet been abroad or sedentary students. Based on results from Eurobarometer surveys, King and Ruiz-Gelices (2003:38) also point out that being positive about Europe is generally (but not in the UK) a growing phenomenon that is most common among the youth. Around half of the students in their survey realised that there was a common European cultural sphere during their exchange (op.cit.:240). Attachment to Europe also correlated positively with repeated stays abroad ever since the exchange and where the students stayed at the time of the survey (i.e. at home or abroad) (op.cit.: 241).

Similar to Sigalas (2009), King and Ruiz-Gelices (2003:241) included the Eurobarometer questions on European vs. national identity in their survey. Answers were more positive depending on whether the respondents were mobile or sedentary students. This correlates with Sigalas' results in absolute numbers, but King and Ruiz-Gelices do not indicate anything about statistical significance. They claim that their numbers "indicat[e] the 'Europeanising' impact of the [year abroad]" (2003:242). For example, 16 per cent of the mobile students indicated feeling as nationals only, compared to 21 per cent in the sedentary group. Almost two thirds of the mobile group said that they felt national in the first place and European in the second. This can be compared to 42 per cent among sedentary students.[18]

They therefore conclude that the year abroad has a positive effect on both knowledge about Europe and European identity.[19] At the same time, they explain that it is hard to show a representative picture of identity issues in questionnaire surveys as many different aspects have to be taken into account:

> [T]hese findings are only indicative, and gloss over a number of complexities and alternative outcomes relating to socialisation patterns before and during the YA [year abroad], and the possibility of dual or multiple identities. (op.cit.:246)

Another study carried out by Fernández (2005) in 2000/01 points out the discrepancies

[18] Note the aspect of age. As for feeling as nationals only, UK respondents from the latest Eurobarometer survey made up almost two thirds of all responses. As for the second category, around a quarter indicated that they saw themselves as nationals in the first place, and only then as Europeans (King & Ruiz-Gelices 2003:242).

[19] A slight bias for their results may come from differences in fields of study. The mobile students were studying European Studies and their curriculum included a year abroad. The sedentary students had chosen different fields of study without an obligatory year abroad. The researchers claim that "[they] have some evidence that reinforces this critical point, and other evidence which counters [this]" (2003 247). Although European Studies students may be 'predisposed' to be more interested in Europe, there was also a difference between those European Studies students who had already been abroad and those who had not yet left their home country (ibid).

of Europe's present state, where old, national(ist) tendencies are often in conflict with the comparably new process of integration. Fernández' research consists of questionnaires with open questions distributed to around 200 students and open interviews with 31 of them. Fernández argues that higher education does indeed have a potential to form a feeling of citizenship in young Europeans. This means that more initiatives should be undertaken to develop citizenship as social practice (op.cit.:66). Citizenship, then, evolves through the interaction of the citizens and through their European experience(s) (cf. ch. 3.3 on CofPs). Mobility and cooperation between educational establishments should encourage this process in which interpersonal contact will eventually result in the formation of European citizenship (op.cit.:60-62).[20] Of course, these things may seem a bit idealistic at first. In spite of this idealism, Fernández argues that mobility as well as technological and educational cooperation are already amongst the positive aspects that students value in the EU. To this, the free movement of people, goods, capital, and services can be added (op.cit.:63-64).

However, there is a discrepancy in the students' views on Europe. On the one hand, they support the idea of a unified Europe and acknowledge its benefits. On the other hand, they are "disillusioned and sceptical about Europe's future" and, more importantly "notoriously uninformed about the EU":

> Young Europeans value the basic ideas of building a united Europe, but they do not really believe that these will become concrete. European institutions seem distant and unknown to young people, who lack the necessary perspective to realise what progress has been made. Yet they are impatient to see results, although they are somewhat indifferent about the initial steps of a construction that does not aim as high as their desires. Their idea of the EU is very vague. […] They admit that their knowledge of the EU is insufficient, and feel little concern for, or involvement in 'building Europe'. (Fernàndez 2005:63)

There seems to be an inherent ambiguity: while young Europeans profit daily from such things as borderless travel, they do not really know about European politics, policies, and other issues. Moreover, they do not identify with the EU as an institution but more with Europe as a geographic and cultural area.[21] Yet, their practices seem to form a kind of emerging awareness; otherwise, they would not be able to list in which way they are profiting from integration. Also, they are generally positive about these developments,

[20] Cf. also King & Ruiz-Gelices, who point out that the initial 10% goal of mobile students per year set by the Commission in 1987 has not been reached yet (2003:233). They thus call for a higher investment and encouragement in this area (op.cit.:246).

[21] Interestingly, S6 from my own research came to the same conclusion in a personal communication.

even though they do not know them in detail and do not identify with the institutional aspects of integration.

Part of these developments is, of course, student mobility. Still, it would be hard to conclude that there is a European identity because of Erasmus. If there is a European identity at all, it is not only because of Erasmus, but also other trends: parallel cultural and historical developments in continental Europe for hundreds of years (which were not always conflict-free) and the process of integration over the past fifty years or so, which has been accelerated by the fall of the iron curtain in 1989 (cf. King & Ruiz-Gelices 2003). Erasmus has played an important role in this process, but things such as the four basic freedoms of the EU have reached many more citizens. Indeed, Erasmus could also be seen as part of these freedoms.

Borderless travel and study mobility may not have contributed to a single European identity so far. Erasmus nonetheless seems to promote a unity in diversity as it has become an integral part of many curricula. European students seem to be, at least partly, 'united in Erasmus'. Mobility is increasing, as the numbers above (ch. 3.1) show. This is a new and unique process on a continent where twenty-five years ago it was cumbersome and extraordinary to go for instance from Hungary to Austria, two countries that had been under common administration a century earlier. Now, the EU is growing closer together than ever before and mobility seems to be an integral part of this new Europe. It could even be seen as one of its constitutive elements. It is not a single European identity in the traditional sense, but rather an awareness of what is happening that may be described as an emerging, mobile and multiple identity.

3.3 Communities of Practice

If the emerging identity that I have dealt with in the previous chapter is mobile and temporary, it also has to be seen on a theoretical background explaining these factors. The theory of Communities of Practice (CofP) may be a useful way to deal with groupings of Erasmus students.

Originally a theory for learning as a form of socialisation, CofPs are defined as “the property of a kind of community created over time by the sustained pursuit of a shared repertoire” (Wenger 1998:45). Three factors are crucial in the creation of the community: “mutual engagement”; “a joint enterprise”; and “a shared repertoire”

(op.cit.:73). In this context, Wenger (op.cit.:47) uses *practice* in order to refer to "doing, but not just doing in and of itself": doing means getting involved in a certain context that is influenced by social and historical factors (cf. Fernández' notion of citizenship, ch. 3.2).

This use of *practice* also means linguistic interaction, and, above all, social interaction between the members of a community. Hülmbauer et al. argue that in this context, "the community is no longer created by a common language variety, but rather the language variety is created by the community" (2008:28). The shared repertoire only evolves because it is needed in a certain context and this context determines in which way it may develop.

This aspect makes CofPs much more fluid and open for negotiation than speech communities. Speech communities are comparably large and stable groupings of (mostly) NSs of a language (Seidlhofer 2006:314). They are thus "a group of speakers who share rules and norms for the use of a language" (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992:464). In contrast, communities of practice "are not permanent communities but ad hoc groupings of speakers" (Klimpfinger 2007:37). They are

> an aggregate of people who *come together* around mutual engagement in an endeavor. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations —in short, practices—emerge in the course of this mutual endeavor. (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992:464, emphasis added)

Thus, CofPs are not determined by territorial factors or by stability; the defining factors focus on negotiation of meaning on the spot and on temporality. While speech communities share the same mother tongue, CofPs do not do so. They thus have to develop a shared repertoire that "consists of linguistic and other resources which are the agreed result of internal negotiations" (Seidlhofer 2006:314). This is why they are well suited to deal with groups of Erasmus students, who use ELF as their shared linguistic repertoire.

These negotiated features can be found frequently in ELF conversations (Lichtkoppler 2007:61, Pölzl 2005:6), but this does not mean that being an ELF user equals being the member of a single ELF CofP. Ehrenreich cautions us against using the theory for "ELF speakers in general" and argues that it "unfolds its analytical potential when applied to particular CofPs in which it is used for communication" (2009:130-131). ELF researchers thus focus on a sociolinguistic perspective in the formation of CofPs, such

as the meaning that ELF acquires in various communities. As Ehrenreich says,

> [the aim of ELF research] is to explore contextual conditions of use as well as to identify processes of socialization and learning which shape the members' emerging sociolinguistic competence, i.e. their knowledge about what constitutes "appropriate" English within their community. (Ehrenreich 2009:131)

What is 'appropriate' may vary from community to community, but there seems to be a general trend in ELF CofPs, namely a declining reliance on NS norms. Seidlhofer claims that ELF CofPs may define appropriateness quite differently from ENL speech communities:

> And indeed here one has to accept that it is likely to be appropriate in many, if not most contexts in which English is currently used, **not** to fully conform to native speaker conventions. This is because these native speaker conventions derive from quite different, local communities of users and are replete with in-group markers of shared sociocultural identity, conditions that just do not obtain in the same way in ELF situations. (2006:315-316; emphasis in original.)

As for the specific case of Erasmus-ELF CofPs, Kalocsai (2009) argues that this theoretical framework can be seen as "a model where ELF speakers learn, while at the same time constructing identities in relation to the community" (2009:26). The CofP framework does not only provide an analysis of language use, but also of how members socialise in the Erasmus community, of how they become members and negotiate their membership. Members in the Erasmus-ELF CofP learn not only socially, but also linguistically. They learn how to participate in the group both on the level of practice as behaviour and practice as language use. Kalocsai's analysis of the Erasmus-ELF CofP in Szeged, based on in-depth research and indeed participation in the community focuses on what role ELF and other languages play in the members' socialisation in their established communities. Moreover, Kalocsai bases her research on situated learning theory, which sees language socialisation as "a practice in its own right" (2009:29). This is connected to CofPs as "[i]t involves the individuals participating in the activities of social communities and constructing identities in relation to these communities" (ibid). Thus her data, together with the work done by her and her colleagues for the LINEE project, can serve as a basis of comparison for my own research even though it is based on wider and more detailed fieldwork.

In sum, as far as the ELF CofP of Erasmus students is concerned, it is a group of young people who meet on their exchange term (their common enterprise in Wenger's terms),

use ELF and other linguistic resources for their communicative purposes and develop common practices (i.e. they have a shared repertoire). The rules and habits in their communities as well as their language use are created on the spot through mutual engagement by all participants. Their groupings are temporary as they are limited by the duration of the programme (i.e. three to nine months). There are also several CofPs on the exchange term and participants move in and out of them, but in general, they belong to the Erasmus / international group as separated from local students. This does not, of course, exclude participation in local communities, but represents the common experiences of a majority of the students.

4 Theoretical considerations

This chapter has several goals. On the one hand, it gives a short overview on some problematic issues in the study of language attitudes (ch. 4.1). On the other hand, it completes and stands in contrast to chapter 2 as it reconsiders perceptions of language and language use in a more fluid and dynamic framework (ch. 4.2). These three factors (language ideologies, attitudes and actual language use) are in constant interaction and thus have to be considered in my analysis. For example, overt attitudes of my respondents are, as I will show in the discussion of my results, often influenced by the ideologies presented in chapter 2. At the same time, their creative use of ELF as a multilingual means of communication and more covert attitudes to it show an awareness of the fluidity and creative potential inherent in language, which are, however, often neglected in the ideologies outlined above. Thus the goals of this chapter can be summarised as theoretical considerations necessary for an analysis of my interviews, which are set in a specific socio-historical context.

4.1 Investigating language attitudes

The topic of investigating language attitudes is the first theoretical point that needs to be considered in the analysis of my research. As I have claimed above, (European) language ideologies and other extra-linguistic factors influence attitudes often to a greater extent than the actual creative nature of language use (ch. 4.2), an example of which are ELF interactions (ch. 4.3). Therefore I see the concepts of language ideologies (ch. 2.2.2), language attitudes, and folk linguistics as interrelated and

sometimes overlapping fields of study although the heading of the present chapter refers to language attitudes only.

First, the study of language ideologies can be defined as the enquiry of

> how the beliefs and theories that speakers have about different forms of language help them to rationalise and relate highly complex social systems, such as access to power, and what social processes sustain those beliefs. (Meyerhoff 2006:55)

Second, language attitudes can be seen as

> [t]he study of what people think about different linguistic varieties and how those perceptions about language relate to perceptions or attitudes about different users of language. (Meyerhoff 2006:292)

Therefore, I would see language ideologies as a more general concept than language attitudes. Moreover, language ideologies seem to result from socially sustained language attitudes. At the same time, language ideologies also influence the attitudes people might have about speakers of certain varieties. For example, the attitudes to ELF are often negative in the first place, and this can be seen in relation to general language ideologies which connect perfection in a language to nativeness. Language attitudes, then, can both be an input and an outcome (Baker 1992:12). In the previous example, attitudes can be seen as an outcome of ideologies. In other examples, they may also predispose an outcome. For instance, Baker (ibid) says that the positive attitudes towards a certain language may influence successful participation in language classes of that language.

Finally, both language attitudes and ideologies are examined in folk linguistic studies which look "at non-linguists' beliefs and perceptions about language and language use" (Meyerhoff 2009:66) such as accents, dialect boundaries, and so on. These perceptions may represent a linguistic reality, but in other cases, they may not do so. What folk linguistics is concerned with is not so much whether the perceptions of speakers are correct or incorrect, but what their social meaning is (op.cit.:67). Often, different perceptions of language emerge without actual empirical evidence and this may be seen as "a very strong indicator of the crucial role language plays in reflecting and constituting different social identities" (op.cit.:69). It also means that language is "central […] to the formation and maintenance of social and personal identities" (ibid, cf. Garrett, Coupland & Williams 2003:13-14).

Having established the interrelations between language attitudes, ideologies, and folk linguistics, I will now address some implications drawn in attitude research even though a detailed overview on language attitude research would not fit into the framework of this thesis. The first issue is related to the aspect of prestige. Prestige is typically understood in terms of overt prestige, that is, the generally recognised, 'better', or positively valued ways of speaking in social communities. For example, as I will show in chapter 6, StdE is generally considered as the prestige variety when it comes to different Englishes as far as overt prestige is concerned. There is also a 'hidden' aspect of prestige. Chambers explains the presence and prevalence of non-standard forms in all languages by the covert prestige attributed to them (2009: 234-238, 268). This means that there is a 'hidden' type of positive value often attached to non-standard forms and expressions used by certain sub-groups. Members of such sub-groups may place much higher value on the use of certain non-standard forms as markers of social identity. Examples for this sort of prestige are abundant, such as gay slang, the language of rap music, or the slang expressions used by schoolchildren (Meyerhoff 2006:63-65). Hence, attitudes, too, can be both covert and overt and the covert attitudes may go in quite a different direction than the overt ones.

This leads to the second, interrelated, issue. In contrast to actual behaviour or outer appearance (e.g. height or weight), attitudes cannot be observed but must be inferred to a certain extent (Baker 1992:10-11; Garrett, Coupland & Williams 2003:2). Attitudes are “self descriptions or self perceptions” (Baker 1992:11). This means that they may not directly refer to reality but are rather an interpretation of it. The researcher relies on the participants' honesty in interpreting their attitudes because of the fact that attitudes are not directly observable. As for covert attitudes, they can only (and not always) be discovered when analysing the given data in detail (cf. ch. 6.1.2, esp. 6.1.2.2). In other words,

> [i]n attitude measurement, formal statements are made reflecting the cognitive component of attitudes. These may only reflect surface evaluations. Doubt has to be expressed whether deep-seated, private feelings, especially when incongruent with preferred public statements, are truly elicited in attitude measurement. […] Overtly stated attitudes may hide covert beliefs. Defence mechanisms and social desirability response sets tend to come inbetween stated and more secret attitudes. (Baker 1992:12-13)

This does not mean, however, that participants simply do not tell the truth if they refer

to something in a certain way and if their way of referring to this topic diverges from reality. Indeed, the relation between perception and reality may be asymmetric as I have noted above when talking about folk linguistics (Meyerhoff 2006:75-79). The interesting aspect is to discover how overt perceptions and actual language use interact. While I will focus on overt perceptions, I will also take an approach to language attitudes that is referred to as the "societal treatment approach" by Garrett, Coupland and Williams (2003:15). The main focus of this approach is "gaining insights into the relative status and stereotypical associations of language varieties" (ibid) through a content analysis of how languages or language varieties are treated.

In sum, I will focus on overt attitudes of the participants but will try to underline covert aspects wherever possible. Similarly, I will focus on what they perceive as their English performance, and not what they actually do on a formal level during their conversations. This does not mean that dealing with the differences between perception and performance would not be worth analysing. On the contrary, such an analysis would enrich the present study. However, it would also make the study longer, and hence it would also go beyond the quite specific scope of analysis. It is thus for clearly practical reasons that I decided not to analyse these differences in detail. I will nonetheless point out some ambiguities between perception and performance whenever feasible.

In conclusion, the first important thing to be kept in mind in my analysis is the difference between covert and overt attitudes as well as the interrelations between language attitudes and ideologies that are present in the specific socio-historical context I am dealing with. This is not to mean that the ideologies will determine eventual attitudes but they certainly exert influence on them and thus cannot be neglected. So far, I have established these interrelations but there is a third issue I consider important for my analysis. This is the aspect of actual language use and language knowledge in general, which will be the topic of the following chapter.

4.2 Reconsidering language and language knowledge in the European context

Chapter 2 dealt with European language ideologies. These ideologies often have more to do with politics and socio-historical developments than with linguistic research and they usually represent what most laypeople believe about language. For example,

underlying the view that sees languages as part and parcel of nations is the theoretical assumption that languages are clearly defined homogeneous units. From a linguistic perspective, this is a simplification as languages as such are always heterogeneous and fluid entities. Nevertheless, not only laypeople but even linguists themselves often cling to this opinion.

In order to show the diverse and fluid nature of languages, I will now move on to a short outline of different views on language, language knowledge, and multilingualism. I will briefly introduce two different models to explain multilingualism, namely Cook's notion of multicompetence (Cook 1992) and Herdina and Jessner's Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner 2002). Then, I will briefly consider other arguments which criticise the assumption that languages are separate units and define language knowledge as a creative process sometimes referred to as “languaging” (Phipps 2007, Widdowson 2010). These considerations will be followed by a definition of ELF which will be seen as an example of these processes 'in action' (ch. 4.3).

Earlier views on multilingualism considered bi- or multilingual individuals as speakers with two (or more) separate languages. These views have been repeatedly challenged and indeed proved to be wrong by various scholars. In this chapter, I will present briefly some attempts at explaining multilingualism from a different perspective, namely that the multilingual mind does not equal the addition of languages as separate entities. The first point of view is provided by Cook's notion of multicompetence. Multicompetence is “the compound state of a mind with two grammars” (Cook 1991:112, qtd. in Cook 1992:557) and it “covers the total language knowledge of a person who knows more than one language” (Cook 1999:190). Cook defines the start of multicompetence as the stage where “there is language knowledge of an L2 that is not simply assimilated by the L1, such as lexical borrowing” (Cook 1992:557). He underlines that multicompetence is a process, rather than a fixed point that can be attained (op.cit.:581) and gives several pieces of evidence for multicompetence as a different state of mind from the monolingual brain (op.cit.:566-577). Cook claims that multicompetent speakers do not only differ from monolinguals in their knowledge of their L1, but also in that of their L2 (op.cit.:560-2). Multicompetent speakers also show higher metalinguistic awareness. This leads him to the conclusion that the multicompetent mind is not simply an addition of two linguistic systems, but something new and independent (op.cit.:563). L2 speakers

should not be regarded as deficient native speakers but rather as autonomous learners and users of the language in question. Similarly, L2 users should not be measured with reference to monolingual NSs but their different knowledge of both their L1 and L2 should be taken into account. (Cook 1999:191)

Thus in Cook's terms, multicompetence describes language knowledge in the multilingual brain and its effects on actual performance. Hall et al. (2006) reconsider this notion and see it as social practice rather than the accumulation of two different language systems. They justify their argument by pointing to the inherently social nature of language in general. For them, multicompetence sees the multilingual mind as different from the monolingual one even though this theory moves away from the long-established monolingual bias. In other words, "[research on multicompetence] has failed to use the findings on multilinguals' language knowledge to reconsider some primary theoretical assumptions framing these efforts" (op.cit.:225). For example, the theory of multicompetentce holds that the multicompetent mind is compound but it still assumes that there are two different grammars that the speakers appropriate (ibid). As a consequence, Hall et al. argue, there is "a qualitative distinction between multicompetence and monocompetence" (ibid) with multicompetence being defined as "dynamic and variable" and monocompetence as "stable and finite" (op.cit.:224). Rejecting this view, Hall et al. opt for "a usage-based view of language knowledge", in which language knowledge emerges through performance (op.cit.:228). They see language knowledge as social interaction and negotiation. In their view, multilingual communication is not necessarily different structurally from monolingual communication. Language knowledge is dynamic and creative as such and not only in multilinguals, as often claimed by previous research on multicompetence. Hall et al. therefore call for a theory

> seeing language knowledge as an inherently dynamic set of patterns of use which, in turn, is subject to a variety of stabilizing influences that are tied to the constancy of individuals' everyday lived experiences, and more generally, to more encompassing societal norms that value stability. (Hall et al. 2006:229)

The reason why multilinguals may be more efficient multicompetent speakers is that they usually have a more diverse range of social experience, but this does not mean that monolinguals cannot be multicompetent (op.cit.:230) because "*all* language knowledge is socially contingent and dynamic no matter how many language codes one has access

to" (op.cit.:229, emphasis in original). As knowing language is work in progress constructed in social interaction, there is no "homogeneous monolingual native speaker" (op.cit.:230).

Hall et al.'s argument that multilinguals and monolinguals may have the same cognitive 'foundations' for language knowledge is reminiscent of Herdina and Jessner's dynamic model of multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner 2002). They view language competence as knowledge of the language system as well as how to use the language. They also disagree with Cook for making a difference between monocompetence and multicompetence: they argue that "multilingual proficiency is not reducible to monolingual competence" but they still see "multilingual proficiency as derivable from individual language competence" (Herdina & Jessner 2002:57). Multilingualism would have to be seen in a completely separate cognitive process if it was clearly divided from monolingual language competence. Herdina and Jessner argue that their model of language competence is a

> synthetic approach to multilingualism: the language systems involved are seen as a unity, whilst being able to specify the functions of the respective components within this model. (2002:58)

In this model, then, the multilingual's languages are neither completely separate, nor completely united systems. Rather, the two systems are in constant interaction. (Herdina & Jessner 2002:150) This can be seen in contrast to Cook's multicompetence (1992, 1999) as the unification of two systems. In Herdina and Jessner's dynamic model, language competence is not a fixed process but it "should be seen as neither an absolute nor invariable state, but as an attainable goal, both for native (!) and non-native speakers" (2002:75). This, again, draws our attention to the fact that NSs are not necessarily the ultimate reference as far as 'correctness' is concerned. It also points to another fact, namely the fluidity of language knowledge and therefore leads me to my next point, namely creative views of language knowledge and use.

The arguments of the scholars I will consider in what follows are similar to the rather psycho-linguistic approaches of Cook (1992, 1999) and Herdina and Jessner (2002) insofar as they arrive at similar results even though they consider language from a sociolinguistic and applied linguistic point of view. Their argument focuses on the dynamic nature of language use. A case in point is Widdowson (2003, 2010). In his

1994 paper on the ownership of English (republished with modifications in Widdowson 2003), Widdowson talks specifically about the global status of English and introduces his notion of the "virtual" language (2003:48), but his conclusions are also applicable to language in general.[22] He claims that NNSs use English for their own communicative purposes in many situations where NSs are not even involved and therefore do not provide the norms. Their strategies of using language, inventing new forms and thus creatively playing with English, is a way

> to exploit the resources of the language to produce a novel combination, not allowable by the conventional code, but nevertheless a latent possibility which is *virtual* in the language though not actually encoded. (Widdowson 2003:48)

In a paper presented at the closing conference of the LINEE project, Widdowson (2010) argues that the definition of multilingualism in most of the EU documents is problematic as it implies that languages are separate units, which are, one by one, added to a speakers' repertoire. In his own words, *"multi* or *pluri* imply the quantitative accumulation of different languages as discrete and self-enclosed entities" (ibid). He calls this process "monolingual multilingualism", a concept that was also referred to as "multiple monolingualism" at the same conference. Whichever concept is chosen to refer to this phenomenon, the core argument in the authors cited in the previous section (Cook 1992, 1999; Hall et al. 2006; Herdina & Jessner 2002) and Widdowson (2003, 2010) is very similar: language as such is creative; its creative potential is limitless and developed in social practice. It is problematic to define competence in a language by reference to an ideal and homogeneous native speaker who does not actually exist.

Rejecting the view of the native speaker as the ultimate model as "highly questionable", Widdowson (2010) also disagrees with the notion of learning a language as a complete act and opts for language learning as a process (cf. Herdina & Jessner above). The truly plurilingual speaker – referred to as a "communicative expert" by Hall et al. (2006:231) – draws on a wide range of linguistic resources and is "capable of languaging or lingualising", that is, of using their plurilingual repertoire to the highest extent for their purposes of communication. In another context, namely of tourism studies, Phipps (2006:12) uses the term *languaging* to describe the way in which tourists engage in

[22] Indeed, many findings about English / ELF are not specific to this area, but a very good illustration of general processes in language use and development as such. In other words, the diverse nature of ELF interactions is not special in the sense that it is not found in any other types of language use. It is special, however, because NNSs from very different backgrounds are using the language creatively and on a global scale, which is not the case with any other language to the same extent.

interactions when they are on holidays and when they only have a very limited vocabulary. Her definition of languaging

> emerged […] out of the process of struggling to find a way of articulating the full, embodied and engaged interaction with the world that comes when we put the languages we are learning into action. […] '*Languagers*', for us, are those people, we may even term them '*agents*' or '*language activists*', who engage with the world-in-action, who move in the world in a way that allows the risk of stepping out of one's habitual ways of speaking and attempt to develop different, more relational ways of interacting with the people and phenomena that one encounters in everyday life. 'Languagers' use the ways in which they perceive the world to develop new dispositions for poetic action in another language and they are engaged in developing these dispositions so that they become habitual, durable. Languaging, then, is an act of dwelling. (Phipps 2006:12, emphasis added)

Another definition of languaging is given by Jørgensen: "language users employ whatever linguistic features are at their disposal with the intention of achieving their communicative aims" (2008:169). In a similar vein, Lüdi (2006, 2010) talks about the plurilingual repertoire, which he sees as a "linguistic toolbox" (2010) from which speakers take out tools according to their needs.[23] Summed up, in these views, "language is thus performed rather than projected" (Widdowson 2010); it develops in social interaction and is not a predefined and codified entity (cf. Gal's (2010) argument in ch. 2.2.2).

In conclusion, I have pointed out at the beginning of ch. 4 that I see an interaction between three factors: (1) language ideologies as presented in ch. 2; (2) language use and language knowledge as presented here; and (3) language attitudes. I will now move on to describe a field of research where these considerations are particularly present, namely research done on ELF. I will show, first, that ELF is a prime example of multilingual languaging (ch. 4.3.1), and second, introduce some pieces of research which have already dealt with attitudes to ELF (4.3.2).

[23] Indeed, recognising the dynamic and heterogeneous nature of language knowledge opens up for many other possibilities apart from ELF to manage multilingualism, such as receptive multilingualism (cf. e.g. Ten Thije 2007 for more details).

4.3 Applying ELF

4.3.1 The multicultural nature of ELF interactions

On the homepage of the Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE), ELF is defined as

> an additionally acquired language system which serves as a common means of communication for speakers of different first languages.
>
> ELF is currently the most common use of English world-wide. Millions of speakers from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds use ELF on a daily basis, routinely and successfully, in their professional, academic and personal lives. (VOICE 2010)

ELF shares many goals and theoretical perspectives with the World Englishes paradigm (Seidlhofer 2005, Cogo 2008), but unlike many other English varieties, such as Indian English, it is not a second language for most of its speakers.[24] Similarly, ELF does not have any mother tongue speakers, but is rather "additionally acquired" and used as a tool to manage intercultural communication (cf. above). The fact that ELF is mostly used between NNSs of English does not mean that NSs are excluded from ELF communication (Hülmbauer, Böhringer & Seidlhofer 2008:27, Seidlhofer 2004:211). By contrast,

> ELF is […] defined *functionally* by its use in intercultural communication rather than *formally* by its reference to native-speaker norms. The crucial point is that speakers of whatever L1 can appropriate ELF for their own purposes without over-deference to native-speaker norms. (Hülmbauer, Böhringer, & Seidlhofer 2008:27, emphasis in original)

Similarly, the fact that ELF is used only as a means of communication does not mean that it is a neutral and culture-free tool. While this view is proposed in some definitions of ELF (House 2002, 2003, Lüdi 2002), in the point of view I am using here, ELF is not culture-free. ELF is a language of communication but at the same time, it can be seen as fulfilling functions of identity (cf. ch. 6.3.2) and it carries the culture and language of its speakers (Klimpfinger 2005, Pölzl 2005). In this way, it can become part of the international identity of its speakers.

[24] In Kachru's terms of the three circles of English, ELF would be contextualised in the Expanding Circle (Kachru 1992). However, in some European countries ELF has taken over so many functions that it could also be characterised as ESL. As this example shows, it is hard to categorise ELF according to the Kachruvian circles as its functions are neither exclusively those as in an Expanding Circle country nor exclusively those of an Outer Circle country. (Seidlhofer 2007:141)

> [ELF speakers'] linguistic behaviour thus seems to go well beyond using ELF as a transactional tool (cf. House 2003:560) towards using it as a means for expressing identity . [...]
>
> As all use of language constitutes an act of identity to some extent […], it seems likely that the ELF users develop their own markers of identity (be they a common 'European' or 'international' nature or more individual ones which are created online, depending on the community of practice they are emerging in). (Hülmbauer 2007:19)

Therefore, ELF is multicultural rather than culture-free (Pölzl 2005: 42) or, as Meierkord puts it, "both a linguistic masala and a language 'stripped bare' of its cultural roots" (2002: 128).

Another important feature is the situationality and multilingual nature of ELF interactions, which focuses on function, rather than form (e.g. Cogo 2008, Cogo and Dewey 2006, Firth 2009, Hülmbauer 2007, Lesznyák 2002) and hybridity, rather than uniformity (e.g. Firth 2009:161-163). This linguistic and interactional hybridity originates from a high variability that characterises these interactions. Variability, again, results from the application of "complex pragmatic strategies to help [interactants] negotiate their variable form" (Firth 2009:163). Therefore, "ELF […] cannot be characterized outside interactions and speakers in specific social settings" (ibid). Similarly, it is hard to describe ELF competence in traditional terms because it depends on the "mastery of strategies for the accomplishment of accommodation of diverse practices and modes of meaning" (ibid). In other words, in ELF interactions it is more important to be efficient than correct, i.e. to know how to use the linguistic repertoire creatively rather than correctly. To achieve efficiency, speakers in ELF conversations negotiate meaning cooperatively and accommodate to each other's cultural backgrounds to a great extent (Cogo & Dewey 2006:68-70).

As a consequence, the lingua-cultural backgrounds of the speakers are present and visible in many instances, such as code-switching or translations of expressions from their L1s (see e.g. Klimpfinger 2005, 2007, Pitzl 2009). The speakers' diverse background influences and determines what ELF actually looks like:

> [I]t is the immediate environment of ELF, namely its multilingual context, which is a crucial factor of influence. […] ELF, by implication, is a phenomenon arising from and within a multilingual framework. (Hülmbauer 2007:15)

ELF communication is also characterised by convergence, which is "used as a means

for indicating solidarity, but also for enhancing mutual intelligibility" (Hülmbauer 2007:16). By ways of this strategy, "the speakers co-create a common ELF repertoire which ensures mutual understanding and establishes the possibility for both speakers to participate actively in the interaction" (Hülmbauer 2007:17, cf. also Canagarajah 2007). House refers to this "negotiability, variability in terms of speaker proficiency, and openness to an integration of forms of other languages" as the "most important ingredients of a lingua franca" (2003:557) in general and ELF in particular.[25]

In ELF communicative contexts, the lesser importance of correctness also means that NS norms are not as relevant as in ENL contexts. The importance lies on communication strategies other than nativeness, which often leads to a communicative situation where ENSs are at a disadvantage because they do not possess the competence required for these situations (Hülmbauer, Böhringer & Seidlhofer. 2008: 25, 27; cf. chs. 6.2.3 and 6.2.4).

As a consequence to these claims (accommodation, negotiation of meaning, non-relevance of NS norms), ELF speakers are not learners but active users of the language (Hülmbauer, Böhringer & Seidlhofer 2008: 28, Firth 1996: 241 ctd. in Lesznyák 2002: 164). Björkman brings together both the argument focusing on function and the argument of ELF speakers as users: "ELF users are not 'learners' of English, but 'speakers' of it. They simply need a tool to get the work done, since in such contexts it is content that counts rather than form" (2008: 35).

Considering these arguments and the theories presented in the previous section, my conclusion is that ELF communication is an example of multicompetence and languaging (ch. 4.2) in use. ELF speakers usually acquire English as an additional language, are thus plurilingual speakers, and can consequently draw on their diverse repertoire (Lichtkoppler 2007:67). ELF speakers are confident *languagers* (Widdowson 2010, Phipps 2007) rather than deficient EFL learners. Their language use is new because of its extent (indeed, it is happening on a day to day basis globally and in many different domains) and characteristic of a "process of internationalisation and destandardization" in EIL (Seidlhofer 2004:212).

[25] Note that this does not mean that ELF interactions are always consensual and conflict free. Indeed, as in many other forms of interaction, there are misunderstandings and there is divergence in ELF communication. (Knapp 2002) The important point is, however, that ELF communication is generally characterised by a high readiness for co-operation and quite a few numbers of misunderstandings, which are either 'left aside' (let-it-pass principle) or re-negotiated (cf. e.g. Lesynyàk 2002, House 2002 and the authors ctd. above).

4.3.2 Attitudes to ELF. Previous research

As my thesis deals with attitudes to ELF, I will outline several attitude studies on this topic that have already been conducted. The studies I have encountered so far deal with secondary and tertiary students' attitudes to ELF (Adolphs 2005, Cogo forthcoming, Kalocsai 2010, Peckham et al. 2009, Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2003, Spichtinger 2000, Timmis 2002, Zeiss 2010), but they also address professionals (Mollin 2006) and English teachers (Grau 2005, Jenkins 2007). Summed up, respondents in these attitude studies mainly come from the domain of education. Although the studies are diverse in their research foci, one overarching factor emerges from all of them, namely a discrepancy in the results. This discrepancy, again, can be seen in two points. On the one hand, perceptions on the spread and presence of English recognise its role as a lingua franca. On the other hand, the international language English is tied to its native speakers and the NSs are the ultimate models in learning English. As I will point out later, my own results only confirm this aspect.

First, Mollin's (2006) *Euro English: Assessing Variety Status* is the first book-length study trying to assess whether there is a particularly European variety of English; in other words, a non-native English variety in mainland Europe that is different from NS varieties. For this purpose, she uses Kachru's framework of ESL formation and divides her study into three parts. Mollin thus looks at “function, form and attitude” (2006:2) of Euro-English. Mollin seems to misunderstand or neglect the claims of ELF researchers in several aspects. First, ELF research focuses on oral communication in diverse contexts. Mollin's research is based on official English use in the formal EU context and on forum discussions related to the same context, thus, on a domain-specific aspect of written language (Modiano 2007:529). Second, in the attitude part of her book, she uses a questionnaire with 'typical' ELF sentences and asks respondents whether these sentences are acceptable. Her questionnaire does not specify in which context the sentences should be acceptable. The instructions tell respondents to read the sentences “and indicate whether they are acceptable English” (Mollin 2006:208). At no part of the questionnaire is it specified that it deals with NNS-NNS communication, and not with communication between NSs, or that the sentences are taken from an oral context. The questionnaire reflects the 'correct' NS paradigm, which does not allow for independent NNS features.

Adding to this, ELF is not a generally accepted variety of English similar to other NS varieties (e.g. Seidlhofer 2001, 2005, Mauranen & Ranta 2009).[26] Even though NNSs use ELF in their communication, researchers frequently underline that the NS ideology is still dominant in the minds of many NNSs and NSs alike, and that English language teaching (ELT) has not yet adapted to the fact that most of the communication in English is happening between NNSs. Indeed, as Jenkins (2007:89-90) points out, for the time being, most NNSs remain convinced that their English is not 'correct' unless it is as close as possible to NS standards. Jenkins (2000:1) also points out how surprising it is that ELT, apart from business English, has not yet adapted to the growing demand after efficient international communication.

Second, Timmis (2002) inquires about teachers' and students' attitudes to conform to NS norms. He shows "that those students who aspire to native-speaker spoken norms have an idealized notion of what these norms are" (Timmis 2002:148). In contrast, teachers seem to be more inclined to move away from NS norms.

In contrast to the two previous studies (Mollin 2006, Timmis 2002), the studies of Jenkins (2007) and Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2003) are based on previous discussions and readings on ELF and may therefore provide more revealing insights. On the one hand, Jenkins' (2007) *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity* outlines misconceptions about ELF, and presents two studies on ELF attitudes, a qualitative study based on discussions among students and professionals, and a more quantitative study on ELF accents. The results of her first study show practically all arguments brought up for and against ELF and should therefore be discussed here (Jenkins 2007:28). On the negative side of the argument, respondents claim that ELF would lead to a lowering of standards, and ultimately to a deterioration of the English language. Similarly, allowing for non-standard, non-native pronunciation will lead to fragmentation, and students will sound unnatural if their pronunciation is not native-like. Also, native English is seen as more intelligible and clearer than non-native English. On the positive side, supporters of the ELF argument claim that 'correct' English does not exist, that "ELF will be a relief to learners and teachers" (ibid) and that having an accent is part of the speaker's identity that they should not lose.

On the other hand, Seidlhofer and Widdowson's (2003) study is based on student essays

[26] See also Promodromou 2007 and Saraceni 2008 for similar misunderstandings and Jenkins 2007b and Cogo 2008 respectively for replies as well as clarifications.

written by prospective English teachers studying at the English Department of the University of Vienna. The students had read House (2002) and had to write an essay reflecting on ideas brought forward in that paper. The students had been educated to comply with NS forms and for many of them, House's paper was their first encounter with ELF theories and the assumption that NS norms may not always be the most appropriate for international communication. Seidlhofer and Widdowson argue that

> [t]he students [...] clearly react very favourably to the idea that learning English does not have to be a matter of confinement of linguistic correctness or to cultural conventions of use. (2003:121)

They cite one of the respondents, who claimed "I'm talking English but I am still an Austrian. I speak English but not yours!" Another student pointed out that it was a "relief" to her to know that "I will be an ELF teacher, an expression which does not point to a deficiency right from the start!" (Seidlhofer & Widdowson 2003:119).

They also mention that students show concern whether stripping English off its original cultural context will not also strip it off its ability to express wittiness, or the speakers' personalities (ibid). It is true that ELF is deculturalized from its NSs but I would not claim that it is completely depersonalised or deculturalized (cf. ch. 4.3.1). In contrast, my results will point to another direction (ch. 6). A citation in Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2003:122) supports this argument: one of the respondents described in her essay that culture is reflected in the speech of interactants; she claimed that during her stay in England, she made many international acquaintances and that to her, European NNSs used English differently from for instance Asian NNSs, reflecting their cultures in their speech.[27] (cf. e.g. studies by Hülmbauer 2007, Klimpfinger 2005, 2007, Pitzl 2009).

Three further studies are linked closer to my own research project as they deal with students' attitudes to ELF. First, Adolphs (2005) looks at the attitudes of international students to native speaker English during a year at a British university. She claims that their view of 'native' English becomes increasingly fragmented in her longitudinal study because the students develop an awareness of the purpose of English in international communication (namely "the ability to understand and to be understood", op.cit.:130) as they are in a way isolated in their international students community and confronted with

[27] This goes against e.g. House's (2003) argument that ELF is only a means of communication and thus an instrument void of culture.

the fact that the 'native' speakers do not necessarily conform to 'standard' English for the first time.

Second, Zeiss (2010) is a quantitative study on European students' attitudes towards ELF. An analysis of altogether 250 on-line questionnaires, this study addresses several thematic areas, namely the participants' own perceptions on whether they are learners or users of English, opinions about linguistic imperialism, attitudes to pronunciation and grammatical features, and, finally, idiomaticity in language use. As her questionnaires show, many external factors influence attitudes to ELF, such as language ideologies and emotional aspects, that is, extralinguistic features. While her findings show that standard language ideology is strongly present in her respondents' minds, the students are also considerably tolerant as far as their interlocutors' speech is concerned. She claims that the students' lack of knowledge about what correct forms are results in linguistic insecurity and an orientation towards NS models even though they are not clear (cf. Timmis 2002). This ambiguous situation is not only represented in her study, as she points out with reference to Jenkins (2007) and Adolphs (2005) and can indeed be seen as an overall feature resulting from attitude studies to ELF. Zeiss concludes with an optimistic outlook. She claims that an awareness of ELF is emerging, which is maybe best illustrated by the fact that most of her respondents identified themselves as both users and learners of English. She also points to the need to change the present ideology on English equalling ENL in order to have a more appropriate description of Europe's linguistic landscape (Zeiss 2010:114).

Third, the most relevant studies for my purposes were conducted at the University of Szeged and the Charles University Prague and deal with Erasmus students' attitudes to their use of ELF as well as the use of ELF and its implications for EM. As my study partly replicates these studies, I will describe their findings in more detail and come back to them frequently when discussing my results (ch. 6).

Looking at three different kinds of data (semi-structured interviews with Erasmus students, with students, teachers and administrators at the secondary school level, and internet fora on English in Europe), Peckham et al. (2009, forthcoming,[28] cf. also Francheschini 2009, Sherman et al. 2009) see ELF within the framework of European multilingualism. Their data come from work done for WP7a of the LINEE project,

[28] I am very grateful to Donald W. Peckham and his research team at the University of Szeged for sharing a draft copy of their article with me.

"Learning, use and perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca communication in European contexts".[29] Far from seeing ELF as a threat to other languages, they point out that it is a means to facilitate communication and enhance integration into the local CofP(s) of Erasmus students. It is used for the communicative purposes of multicompetent speakers in linguistically diverse situations and adapted to this context. The Erasmus students acquire multicompetence as a form of social practice (cf. Hall et al. 2006).

In the Erasmus CofPs, ELF is the primary means of communication but not the only one. Speakers use diverse strategies to signal their identity, build interpersonal relations and enhance mutual intelligibility (Francheschini 2009, Kalocsai 2009, Peckham et al. 2009, forthcoming). One of these strategies is code-switching (CS), which is used not only in switches from the L1 but also from other languages (Francheschini 2009:11, Kalocsai 2009, Sherman et al. 2009:11-12, cf. ch. 6.1.3).

As for the role of ELF communication as such and attitudes to it, the researchers claim that ambiguous results emerge. Generally, students agree on the usefulness of English and point out that competence levels vary from one country to another (Cogo 2010, Francheschini 2009, Peckham et al. 2009, forthcoming). They only rarely evaluate ELF-communication negatively and "[a]sked about corrections between NNS, the most common comment was that this does not happen" (Francheschini 2009:13). At the same time, references are made to different accents, which are accepted for NSs but not for NNSs. The reason for this is that accents are often seen as part of the identity of the ENSs but as a failure to learn the language properly on the part of NNSs (ibid). However, yet some other students are proud of keeping their accent and thus being able to show their L1 identities in ELF conversations (Peckham et al. forthcoming). In sum, there is a recognition that English in the world today is not just another foreign language, but has acquired a different status, while at the same time the general idea is that of ELF equalling EFL (Cogo 2010).

The same ambiguity can be seen when it comes to NS norms. NSs are seen as the owners of Standard English (StdE), just as for instance Czech speakers are the owners of the Czech standard (Francheschini 2009:14, Cogo 2010, cf. ch. 6.2.1). StdE is seen as

[29] Here, I will be drawing on the work conducted in WP7a in general as well as on specific results of interviews with Erasmus students in Szeged and Prague. The main reason for this is that the LINEE WP research results do not name the results of every university one by one but rather summarise them.

a model to be taught in schools, but not so much as goal that everyone can achieve (Cogo 2010, forthcoming, Peckham et a. 2009:4, forthcoming). As reasons for this, respondents name the fact that after a certain age, it is not possible to reach NS accents any more. More importantly, ELF speakers recognise that for their communicative purposes, i.e. NNS-NNS communication, it is more important to be communicatively effective than correct. In other words, "ELF has to do with general communicative skills (fluency and confidence), which are seen as more important than correctness" (Francheschini 2009:15, cf. also Jenkins et al. 2010:9).

Because of this, NSs do not always find a place in the Erasmus communities. Their way of speaking is perceived as different and sometimes more difficult because of divergences in "speed, accent and vocabulary" (Peckham et al. 2009:5). This is not the only obstacle in their integration into the Erasmus CofP. Erasmus students often develop their own code, "their own variety of English with unconventional vocabulary, phrases and grammar" (ibid). This "new ELF repertoire" is sometimes referred to as "Erasmus English" (Kalocsai 2009:31, cf. also 32-35). NSs often do not adapt to this way of using English and thus fail to become part of the international community. As a consequence, the respondents claim that NSs should adapt to the international situations in which they are engaged and should learn to communicate with NNSs (Peckham et al. 2009:5, forthcoming, cf. ch. 6.2.3.1).

All in all, the main results of the attitudes towards ELF show that the Erasmus CofP is "a multilingual community of English users" (Peckham 2009:5). As ELF is a multilingual means of communication, it "might mitigate the possible negative effects of the spread of English on multilingualism" (ibid). This does not mean that ELF is always the perfect solution. Indeed, students in this research point out that sometimes it is "unfair" (Jenkins et al. 2010) towards other languages that English is used. Moreover, it is difficult to integrate into local, non-English, communities as the locals tend to use English with the foreign students. This makes it cumbersome to learn the local language. Therefore, the learning and teaching of 'other' languages should be supported (Kalocsai 2009, Peckham et al. 2009, forthcoming).

Moreover, as Peckham points out, ELF challenges linguistic theory in many ways because it "promises to play an important role in defining what it means to be an English speaker in multilingual contexts" (2009:5). As these studies show,

> successful participants in English conversations with multilingual individuals are not necessarily those whose native language is English, but those who can adjust their language to the needs of their co-participants and the actual context. (Kalocsai 2009:42)

In sum, the pieces of research I have presented here focus on the area of ELT (students and/or teachers of English). Research on attitudes to ELF outside the 'professional' ELF community is only emerging, but has already shown interesting results (e.g. Zeiss 2010, results from LINEE WP 7a). The results generally show a growing awareness of the international use and change of English, but the accepted norm still remains the one provided by ENSs. Despite the comparable lack of awareness on ELF, over the past decade scholarly interest has shown that it is a vibrant field of research the results of which are hard to summarise in just a few pages.

5 Methodological considerations

My study draws on one data source: semi-structured interviews with Erasmus / exchange students. The interview data were collected from 16 students who were either former Erasmus students (11) or current internationals studying in Vienna (2), where all the interviews were conducted. Three students were internationals studying in Vienna and had been on exchange during their studies.

The main reason for choosing these participants was that they had used ELF during their exchange. At this point, a short note needs to be made on my use of the terms Erasmus / international / exchange students. As I have pointed out above (ch. 3.1), the uses of these terms overlap quite frequently. For example, Erasmus students usually 'belong' to the international office of the university, where they participate in different programmes (e.g. as mentioned by S5, S6, S15 and S16 in their respective interviews). When they take part in these programmes, they do not only meet Erasmus students, but exchange students in general.

Moreover, as I have argued, 'Erasmus' is often used interchangeably with 'exchange'. For instance, when I asked S14, who lives in a quite international residence, whether there were Erasmus students in his residence who had been to a non-English-speaking country, he said that he himself as well as two other colleagues of him had done so. However, he then specified that his exchange to Finland had been organised by Campus Europeae, the European University Foundation, and only included prospective teachers.

As for his colleagues, one of them was constantly studying in Vienna but had participated in Erasmus (S7), while the other (S13) went on exchange to Israel.

The reason why I still included these speakers in my research was that they fulfilled all of the the important criteria of my research. As NNSs of English, they had decided to go abroad to study, they were 20 to 26 years old, and they had chosen an expanding circle country. In this country, they had only attended courses offered in English, apart from optional language classes in the local language. In other words, their scholarship was not funded by Erasmus, but apart from that, they fulfilled all criteria. Adding to this, they have all socialised with 'real' Erasmus students, either on their exchange or at home, as many of them were living in a residence with Erasmus students.

Having clarified these issues, I can now move on to a more detailed description of the project. After a presentation of the research questions, I will deal with methodological considerations concerning qualitative data analysis.

First, as for the research questions of the study, the semi-structured interviews originally included five groups of questions but were later reduced to the following three:

1) What do these speakers think about ELF and its multicultural nature?
2) What differences do they see in their communicative situations as opposed to NS communicative situations? What do they think about the role of the NS and NS norms in the ELF communicative situation?
3) What do their attitudes mean for the EU's linguistic situation? What role does ELF play in the context of EU multilingualism?

The research questions thus focused on three areas: first, attitudes to ELF in general and its diverse realisations in particular (ch. 6.1); second, the role of the NS in an international context (ch. 6.2); and third, perceptions of the European linguistic situation (ch. 6.3). As the Erasmus students in these interviews all had been or are currently members of local ELF CofPs, they can be seen as a suitable group to talk about these questions. Not only have they experienced ELF in use for a longer period of time (usually around half a year), but they have also personally profited from mobility and have had an international experience.

Although the students were chosen according to criteria paralleling the features of ELF conversations, they were not given any prompt text or explanations in the first place

about ELF. The only explanation they were given was that my research focused on English as spoken between NNSs. I also explained that I will not look at formal features, but rather at how, why, with whom, and when they used English. I made this decision because my focus was on finding out if and how far they were aware that their English was different and if they assigned a certain label to it.

This, of course, had pros and cons. On the one hand, my results show what is the state of the art. Not many laypeople have yet heard about ELF. Even if they have done so, they very often treat English as any other foreign language and their English use as EFL. On the other hand, after the interviews I sometimes explained to the participants in more detail what ELF was about and what my research focused on. Many reactions, then, were positive ("Well, that's what we were doing") and S11 for example even said that NSs should adjust their speech to international situations. This means, then, that a prompt text, such as Jenkins and Seidlhofer (2001) used in Cogo (forthcoming) could have led the discussions in a direction focusing more on ELF as such.

All in all, however, quite a few indirect and direct references to the nature of ELF interactions can be found in my data. Therefore, I will be able to show in the following that an awareness of the multifaceted nature of ELF interactions is present, but not always accompanied with positive overt attitudes.

5.1 Qualitative data collection

In this chapter, I will explain my reasons for choosing focus groups as a method of data collection and analysis. This will include a description of how I collected, categorised, and analysed the data. I will also present the participants' background with a focus on highlighting their mobility throughout Europe.

5.1.1 Qualitative interviews and focus groups. General remarks

Qualitative data collection and analysis are often overlapping processes because of "the flexible and emergent nature of the qualitative research process" (Dörnyei 2009:124). In contrast to quantitative data, qualitative data can often be very long, diverse, and, to put it colloquially, messy. Analysing such a big body of data may involve a lot of work and is less standardized or systematic than quantitative analysis. In other words, qualitative

research is usually “fluid and open-ended” (op.cit.:125).

This is also true for my own data compiled of qualitative interviews conducted in groups of two to three people. Although my groups were very small, I deal with them as focus group interviews because they share a basic characteristic: as a result to the participants' interaction, meaning gets constructed on the spot and the participants may lead the discussion in different ways.

The second reason why the groups are so small, sometimes only consisting of two people, is quite blunt. I initially planned to conduct only interviews with groups of three but organising groups of three turned out to be more complicated than I thought. In interview 4, the third participant did not arrive on time to the interview (indeed, the interview had arrived at its conclusion when she called to say that she would arrive in around twenty minutes). In interview 6, a similar thing happened, as the third participant preferred to watch soccer when the date of the interview was fixed after several attempts of doing so.

Despite the initial difficulties, I decided to choose and stayed with this form of data collection for several reasons. In qualitative interviews, the interviewer is the listener, while the interviewee(s) answer and explain (Warren 2001:83). The role of the interviewer is that of an outsider who acts as a guiding moderator, but does not get involved too much into the discussion. Therefore, the respondents construct meaning in interaction and the discussion may go in unintended, but interesting and enriching directions. (Dörnyei 2009:146, Unger 2009:71)

Critics of group interviews sometimes take this as a weak point and say that this kind of interview cannot be guided appropriately. They also point out that some participants may dominate the discussion, whereas others may say things that they find socially more acceptable because other people are present (Morgan 2001:51). As for the first criticism, it is the role of the moderator to counteract these trends (Unger 2009:71). As for the second criticism, that participants may not be always saying what they think, this is just as true for individual interviews as it is for focus group discussions. All in all, it is true that different people say different things when they are alone and in groups or that people tend to dominate discussions. This is a 'normal' characteristic of human conversations and it does not make group research invalid (Morgan 2001:151).

In sum, group interviews may be a good way to analyse the creation of meqning in

interaction. Although the role of the moderator is important to guide the discussion, the participants can discuss among each other and their arguments may evolve almost naturally (of course, the research context means that the conversation will not be completely 'natural').

5.1.2 Interview guideline

Having decided to choose qualitative interviews as a method of data collection, I compiled my questions focusing on five broad topics (cf. interview guideline in the appendix, ch. 10.1): (1) domains of ELF use; (2) advantages and disadvantages of ELF as a means of communication; (3) ELF vs. other languages; (4) NNS-NNS communication in ELF; and (5) NS norms and standard English in an international context. I roughly compiled three sub-questions to each area and tried to include as many content questions as possible. Patton (2002, ctd. in Dörnyei 2009:137-138) argues that this is a good strategy because it allows the participants to give examples from their own experience. This means that

> on any given topic, it is possible to ask any of six main types of question focusing on: (a) experiences and behaviours, (b) opinions and values, (c) feelings, (d) knowledge, (e) sensory information (i.e. what someone has seen, heard, tasted, smelled etc. […]), and (f) background or demographic information. (Dörnyei 2009:137-138)

Having formulated a first draft of my questions, I asked some friends and acquaintances of mine, linguists and non-linguists alike, to go through the interview with me. They not only answered my questions but also provided valuable feedback on how to reformulate and add questions to my study. I owe special thanks to Claudio Schekulin, who came across Kalocsai (2009) and sent me the article without knowing that I had chosen her and her colleagues' joint study as a point of comparison. As the guiding questions to Kalocsai's interviews are attached to her article (Kalocsai 2009:45-46), I could 'adjust' my own questions in order to have a good basis of comparison. Most importantly, I decided to include her grand tour question, which would help the participants to get introduced to the topic and get relaxed (Dörnyei 2009:137, Johnson & Weller 2001:497). However, later on, some of the participants pointed out that the question (What did you particularly like about being an Erasmus / exchange student?) was too broad for them and they could not really respond anything to it. It was also not always

necessary to ask the grand tour question as the discussion sometimes started with quite different topics and then ran smoothly into the actual interview.

Having an interview guideline was necessary for several reasons. First, I felt that a structured interview with prepared and fixed questions would be like a questionnaire read out to the participants. This method would have been adequate if I had had detailed previous knowledge about Erasmus CofPs and had chosen to collect answers on specific topics (Dörnyei 2009:135). I rather wanted to get insights into the everyday experiences of these students and into their perceptions of their own language use. Therefore, a more open format was necessary.

However, an unstructured interview would have been too open because I still wanted to guide the interview into a certain direction. Unstructured interviews are led completely by the participants and comparisons between different groups are therefore quite difficult (Dörnyei 2009:135-136). In other words, "[t]o make comparisons across people and to summarize the results in a meaningful way, the researcher must ask all informants the same questions" (Johnson & Weller 2001:499). This strategy would nonetheless not exclude 'derivations' from the topic. Indeed, in almost every interview, different 'main themes' came up. For example, in interview 6, a focus was set on accommodation to the interlocutor, while in interview 2 there was quite a long discussion on language as a means of communication vs. language as a means of identification.

These issues directed me to follow the semi-structured interview format, which is a kind of middle way between the structured and the unstructured interview. While I prepared an interview guideline with specific questions, the format as such was open-ended. I also encouraged the participants to give everyday examples, reflect openly on what they were saying, and I did not prevent them from bringing up new topics and discussing them. I explained that the questions were only there as a guidance but that the goal was to develop a discussion in which they exchange their opinions and elaborate on them (Dörnyei 2009:136, Warren 2001:86-87).

5.1.3 Sampling

The next step was to decide on which sampling strategy to use. I tried to collect participants who would form a group that would meet the following criteria:

participation in an exchange programme, preferably Erasmus; a minimal stay abroad of three months and in a NNS country; age range from twenty to twenty-six; and, finally, the exclusion of 'expert' students, i.e. students of English or languages in general. This is a criterion sample (Dörnyei 2009:127-128). I asked participants to recruit other volunteers who would take part in the research, a strategy referred to as snowball or chain sampling (op.cit.:129, Warren 2001:87).

As I have explained above, not all participants meet the criteria strictly as three of them have not taken part in Erasmus as such. In addition, S14 is a prospective teacher of English, but has not dealt with ELF in detail yet during his studies. These two features, however, do not mean that I took whoever was available (convenience sampling, Dörnyei 2009:129) because these participants nonetheless meet all other criteria and have socialised with Erasmus students. Also, I selected the participants according to quite specific criteria, whilst convenience samples usually take broader criteria like gender, age, or social class into account (Johnson & Weller 2001:496).

5.1.4 Conducting the interviews

The final decision to make before conducting the interviews was where they should take place. I decided not to make the interviews too formal as this may be 'uncomfortable' for the participants (Unger 2009:74). Therefore, I either provided drinks and refreshments in my own flat (interview 2), in the participants' residence (interviews 3, 5) or arranged a meeting in a café or bar (interviews 1, 4, and 6). Holding the interview in a bar was only troublesome in interview 4, where many side noises (and, especially, loud music) made the transcription of the data difficult.

As for the interviews as such, the participants were first given a short questionnaire (cf. appendix, ch. 10.2), in which they had to indicate some personal data and in which I gave a short introduction to my research.The detailed results of this questionnaire are given in the appendix (ch. 10.3). This introductory note helped explaining the reason and purpose of the interview. I repeated this purpose again after the participants had filled out the questionnaire and focused this time on the importance of their participation. This was also useful to give the participants the (right) impression that I was interested in their knowledge and experience (Johnson & Weller 2001:497). I encouraged them to give as many examples from actual events as possible and to

explain their points of view rather than giving 'yes' or 'no' as answers.

This strategy was successful most of the time but of course, sometimes it is not enough to encourage participants to do something. Listening to the interviews while transcribing them also showed that sometimes, it would have been important to ask the participants in more detail about why they think what they think and how they could exemplify it. Of course, these things can only be noticed in retrospect and be corrected in future interviews.

5.2 Qualitative content analysis

Originally a method for quantitative text analysis, content analysis is now linked to qualitative analysis. The main difference between the two is that in a qualitative method, the categories dividing up the data evolve in the course of reading and analysis. (Dörnyei 2009:245). In addition, qualitative analysis can be described as "latent level analysis" (op.cit.:246) as it is more concerned with interpretation than surface meaning. Dörnyei differentiates four steps in the process of qualitative content analysis:

> (a) transcribing the data, (b) pre-coding and coding, (c) growing ideas – memos, vignettes, profiles, and other forms of data display, and (d) interpreting the data and drawing conclusions. (2009:246)

Generally, this is how I preceded in my analysis although points (b) to (d) sometimes overlapped. For example, some memos or vignettes bring up new categories for coding, and the writing of memos does not stop but is sometimes a parallel process even while interpreting the data. As most of the overlaps happened during coding and growing ideas (b and c), I will treat them in a joint sub-chapter.

5.2.1 Transcription

The first analytical step in qualitative research is to transcribe the data and bring them to a coherent textual form. In order to do so, I transcribed each interview in a separate document. In doing so, I relied mainly on the VOICE transcription conventions. As my research focuses on the content of what is said rather than on formal features, I decided to adapt the VOICE transcription conventions 2.1 to my analysis (cf. appendix, ch. 10.4). While I did not change any conventions, I simplified some of the mark-up conventions, but oriented to the spelling system. As for the mark-up conventions, most

of the rules were left out because they were not as relevant for a content-based analysis as they would have been for an analysis based on formal aspects. They are listed in the appendix (ch. 10.4.3), with a remark explaining if they were followed or not.

In addition to the VOICE transcription conventions, I added a mark-up feature to categorise interviews. At the beginning of each extract a slash indicates which interview the extract is from. An example: S2/i1 refers to speaker 2, interview 1. While I do not deal with the interviews in detail but rather with general outcomes, this helps to see how speakers interacted. It also helps to separate interviews from one another during the analysis without having to switch back and forth between the list showing who participated in which interview. Therefore, this strategy helps to compare similarities and differences between individual interviews. This, again, is useful for the purpose of tagging and coding as explained below. The transcription conventions are followed in all longer extracts quoted from the interviews. In shorter quotes included in the text body, I do not use the VOICE conventions and I emphasise words just like quotations from secondary literature: by the use of italics.

A further note has to be made on the transcriptions themselves. As not everything that was said during the interviews concerned the key research questions (e.g. other topics were used instead of the grand tour question or participants started talking about something completely different), these passages were not transcribed. If something irrelevant was deleted within a longer sequence of utterances, this is marked just like deleted passages in quotes, by setting two square brackets divided by three full stops: […]. The transcription is quite detailed (in interview 1, for example, everything was transcribed), but it is still "a *partial transcription* of the sections that seem important" (Dörnyei 2009:249, emphasis in original).

5.2.2 Coding and memoing

As a starting point to coding, I read and re-read the transcripts of the interviews. At each reading, I highlighted parts of the utterances in different colours that referred to a certain question in the interview or were particularly interesting. Parallel to this, I made a separate document in which I listed the categories and their colours, so that the categories and colours I would use at the following reading or for the following interview would not overlap. In addition, I also used the commenting function of my

word processor in order to highlight passages and comment on them (initial coding; Dörnyei 2009:251). It was at this stage, for instance, that coding and memoing overlapped.

Having repeated this strategy several times, I compiled a new document with the different subject headings of categories (second-level coding, Dörnyei 2009:252). In this document, the different codes were connected, and thus formed a hierarchical list which corresponded to the main research questions. The document consisted of a table where the general topic was marked in the heading. This was then followed by two grids: the left grid included one or several extracts from the interviews, while the right grid summed up the main argument in those extracts in key words. As an example, the following table shows one grid from the topic node "the meaning of English":

THE MEANING OF ENGLISH	
S5/i2p1: well without english you don't GET anywhere S4/i2p8: "you just have to" learn it	just necessary

Table 1: Coding (example)

In the left grid, the speaker (S), interview (i) and page (p) numbers are indicated. In this way, it was easier to retrace the context of the extract without resorting to software for qualitative analysis. Computer Aided Qualitative Data Analysis (CAQDAS) would have made the analytical and interpretive process faster and easier but the amount of data used for this study was not as large as to make CAQDAS necessary. (Dörnyei 2009:262-267)

The final step was to interpret the data as such. The results are given in chapter 6, which is preceded by a presentation of the participants (ch. 5.3).

5.3 The participants

Before introducing the participants in this survey, I have to clarify my own relationship to them. As I have already mentioned in the sub-chapter on sampling (ch. 5.1.3), I recruited practically all speakers by asking them if they knew any further possible participants. I had known many of them before their respective interviews, some for more than ten years. This, of course, can be seen as a factor that makes scientific enquiry more difficult, but I do not believe that this is the case. In contrast, knowing

many participants in more detail and being able to discuss many topics related to my thesis outside the actual interviews helped me to understand their experience better. In addition, as a former Erasmus student in Paris (winter term 2007/08) and as an exchange student in Toronto (academic year 2008/09) I share much of what they have seen and done on exchange. The participants usually knew that I had myself been an exchange student. Thus even those speakers who had not met me before could feel more relaxed because we shared the international student experience.

The participants of this research project are sixteen former or current international students (cf. appendix, chs. 10.2 and 10.3 and a less detailed overview in Table 2 below). They are all staying or have stayed for at least three months in a country where English is not an official language and they do not have English as their mother tongue. Apart from one participant (S14), none of them is a student of English and the other participants are also not involved in studying any other languages as language professionals. In other words, almost all participants only use language in their daily life as a tool and not on a meta-level, by doing research in language and linguistics. Therefore, their views on language and language use are most probably not influenced by a deep knowledge of linguistic theories and can be seen as a good representation of folk beliefs about language.

This, however, does not mean that they do not reflect on language or their language use. Indeed, they seem to have a high awareness on why and how they use the languages they know. Although their viewpoints seem to be influenced by standard language ideologies (ch. 2.2.2), this does not mean that they do not have opinions about language or that their viewpoints are simply wrong. On the contrary, they provide an excellent basis for an analysis of the language question in Europe as exemplified in the Erasmus exchange programme (cf. ch. 1 in Niedzielski & Preston 2000).

All participants are between 20 and 26 years old and at least in the third year of their studies (as this is the requirement for participation in an Erasmus exchange). As for their fields of study, they are very diverse, ranging from sociology, political science or business to the teaching profession, media studies and criminology. Nine of the sixteen have German as their mother tongue, all of them know at least one foreign language, and all speakers know English quite well. Before the interviews, the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire and indicate how well they know English on a scale

from 1 = basic and 6 = almost like a native speaker. As I have later on decided not to refer to native speaker skills as a norm and as the scale would have focused on self-perceptions that would need to be contrasted with actual performance, I will not deal with this scale in detail. It should nonetheless be pointed out that all speakers indicated at least level 3 on this scale and the majority (8) thought that they had level 5 in English. Only two speakers (S9/i3[30] and S14/i5, who are interestingly a couple) indicated that they spoke almost like a native speaker.

Finally, the participants came from and went to a wide range of Erasmus countries. S1, S2, and S14 went to Finland. It was in this country that S14/i5 met S9/i3, who had previously been to Austria on exchange. At the time of the interview, she lived with S14/i5 in Austria, where S8/i3 was studying as an exchange student. Similarly, S7/i3, S12/i5 and S13/i5 are studying in Vienna, but they are international students as they come from Croatia[31], Hungary and Bulgaria respectively. Both of them went on exchange, S12 to Belgium and S13 to Israel. Speakers 7 to 9/i3 and 12 to 14/i5 lived in the same residence but had not all been acquainted before the interviews.

Like S12/i5, S15/i6 and S16/i6 went to Belgium. Yet another destination was Denmark, where S3/i1 and S4/i2, two Austrian students know each other from. S5/i2 from Sweden with Polish origins and S6/i2, an Austrian with Polish origins met in the Netherlands, have stayed in contact ever since, and have recently moved back to Amsterdam. Finally, S10/i4 is Austrian and went to Portugal, while his girlfriend S11/i4 is an Italian student doing an English degree in Vienna and spent her exchange in the Netherlands.

These personal data are summarised in the appendix (ch. 10.3) and in the table below. The reason why I still describe the quite confusing list of countries and some relationships between the participants is to show the impact mobility (cf. ch. 3.2) has had on the daily lives of these students: for example, S5/i2 and S6/i2 have similar origins, but grew up in two completely different parts of Europe and met in yet another part, the Netherlands. S14/i5 is German, studies in Austria, has lived in England and Ireland, and met S9/i3 in Finland. In other words, these students represent a new generation for whom mobility is just part of life. They go from one country to another and usually, the variety they use during these short-term stays, their friendships and

[30] The speakers are marked consecutively depending on who took the first turn. The interviewer is always marked as S0.

[31] S7 is the only student who is not an EU citizen. Nonetheless, she was included in the interviews because of Croatia's proximity to the EU and its candidate country status.

relationships, is ELF.

Speaker	**age**	**mother tongue**	**foreign language**	**exchange / international student in...**
1 (/i1)	25	German (D)	Swedish, French	Finland, fall 2007/08[32]
2(/i1)	22	German	Italian, French	
3(/i1)	22	German	Danish	Denmark, Aug. 2009- Jan. 2010
4 (/i2)	26	German	French, Spanish	Denmark (summer 2006, fall 2009/10), Canada (summer 2008)
5 (/i2)	25	Swedish	Polish	The Netherlands, fall 2009/10
6 (/i2)	23	German, Polish	Spanish	
7 (/i3)	20	Croatian	German	Austria (degree)
8 (/i3)	20	Hungarian	German	Austria (summer 2010)
9 (/i3)	24	Finnish	Swedish, Spanish	Austria (summer 2008)
10 (/i4)	25	German	Italian	Portugal (fall 2008/09)
11 (/i4)	26	Italian	German	The Netherlands (fall 2008/09), Austria (degree)
12 (/i5)	23	Hungarian	German, Spanish	Belgium (summer 2009), Austria (degree)
13 (/i5)	25	Bulgarian	German, Russian, Italian	Israel (fall 2008/09), Austria (degree)
14 (/i5)	25	German (D)	French, Finnish	Ireland (2007/08), Finland (2008/09)
15 (/i6)	22	German, Spanish	French	Belgium (summer 2008)
16 (/i6)	24	German	French, Spanish	

Table 2: The participants: questionnaire results

All in all, I have so far established both the historical and theoretical background of my research and considered theoretical and methodological difficulties. In this chapter, I have introduced the backgrounds of the participants. Therefore, I can now move on to

[32] Cells are merged wherever they apply to several participants.

an analysis of my results.

6 Results

The aim of this chapter is to present an overview of topics that came up in my interviews. If a word had to be given to describe the interviews, it would be *ambiguity*. *Ambiguity*, notwithstanding, has quite a broad and vague semantic meaning. The reason why I would still assign it to the interviews is because there seems to be a tension between the actual use of English as a lingua franca on the one hand and ideas about English as ENL on the other hand. In the discussions I have followed, statements jump from acknowledging the European and global role of ELF and recognising that it is different from ENL to marking it as deficient EFL and almost blindly referring to the standard ENL. While the students recognise that they use English efficiently for various purposes, they also describe their own use of English as simple, basic, and bad.

I will nevertheless try to separate different thematic fields and deal, first, with general, positive and negative, attitudes to ELF (ch. 6.1). I will then go on to an analysis of the role ENSs play in an international context (ch. 6.2). Trying to connect my results to the European language situation, I will then analyse English in connection with other languages (ch. 6.3.1). Finally, I will consider what these connections may mean for future developments as well as language policy (chs. 6.3.2 and 6.3.3). My analysis will thus start with ELF, set it in contrast with ENL norms, and conclude with a more general outlook.

6.1 General attitudes to ELF

When asked about 'their' English, students display, often at the same time, positive and negative opinions. While marking the English they use negatively, they report communicative success, efficiency, and the inherent diversity in ELF communication. This is why I will first deal with ELF as a “deficient” communicative tool (in the eyes of the respondents) and then with ELF as an “efficient” communicative tool. As I will show later on, the ambiguities between the two poles cannot be explained simply by linguistic insecurity (most of the students I interviewed described themselves and acted as confident users of English), but need to be contextualised within a European framework of standard language ideology and ENS norms.

6.1.1 ELF as a 'deficient' communicative tool

The inherent ambiguities in the answers given by the focus groups make it hard to divide them into only negative or positive. I will nonetheless try to do so, but it is necessary to point out at first that my respondents showed an awareness of their English being different from ENL, and still appropriate to their purposes. This may be best exemplified by their reactions when I asked them to participate in my survey. Usually, they pointed out that they were the best example for my purposes because they always used English in their international groups.

However, this awareness is accompanied by a negative view on their own English. The respondents were eager to participate in the interviews because they knew that their use of English was different and specific to their circumstances. Despite using it all the time at university and with their friends, they usually refer jokingly to all the 'mistakes' they make and their 'bad English'. Generally, the participants say that their English is simple and that very often, the Erasmus students have to converge on a more basic level because this is where their levels of competence meet. This is what S15 and S16 point out in the following extract:

Extract 1. Going back to the basics

S15/i6: the thing is you go back to the basics
S16: yeah yeah
S15: you try- you er automatically try to speak like the person you're TALKING to or you- i do and if you're talking to the spanish (.) or er ITALIAN for me it was more the italian people? in english you actually talk some kind of baby english? =
S16: = yeah er cheese is goo::::d @@@
S15: and you don't make an effort to to NOT to have a:n ACCENT but you actually talk in THEIR accent? =
S16: = yeah =
S15: = and that's really bad because i noticed when i'm drunk i start to talk <spanish accent> spanish english you know? </spanish accent> and that's really bad i mean

S15 points out one of the basic features of ELF conversations, namely accommodation to the interlocutor. She connects this accommodation, however, to a loss of competence and claims that the result is “some kind of baby English”, i.e. a simplified version of (Std)E. S16 agrees, jokes, and gives the example of describing good food, in this case cheese, talking in an exaggerated way and with incorrect grammar. This is followed by S15's claim that in NNS contexts, speakers do not necessarily pay attention to correctness, in this case on the level of pronunciation, but just talk and put on each others' accents to make the conversation run more smoothly. She describes this as

“really bad” and complains that she sometimes has the feeling that she talks with a Spanish accent (it should be noted, however, that S15 grew up bilingually with German and Spanish).

Similarly, S13 points out in the following extract that accommodation, especially on the level of pronunciation, is an uncontrolled process and results in simplification.

Extract 2. Accommodate automatically

S13/i5: for for me it's- automatically i- i KNOW it's happening but i can't control it? i- i- i- stick to a very rudimentary ugly form and i i also my pronunc- =

S0: = really? =

S13: = yeah and also my pronunciation goes down yeah? just so that it makes me m you know so i can get the message across

Again, S13 refers a common process in ELF conversations: accommodating to the interlocutor's level in order to “get the message across”. He does this automatically and it actually enhances communication but nonetheless, he thinks that it is negative. A similar point of view can be found in another interview, even though the participants in this interview (4) were very open to ELF and maybe most aware of it.

Extract 3. Ridiculous English

S10/i4: i think i

S11: <@> have ridiculous english </@>

S10: <@> ridiculous english </@> strong german accent or eastern students eastern english speakers never use articles because they don't HAVE them in their languages

S10 and S11 connect S10's “ridiculous English” to having a strong accent. They also describe other speakers' English as characterised by their L1: as S10 explains, Eastern students do not use articles because they do not have them in their languages. So, having a “ridiculous English” is connected to keeping an accent or having lexico-grammatical features from the L1. The result of these influences is seen as something confusing and, as in the following extract, “terrible”.

Extract 4. Mixing

S16/i6: but actually we mixed it all up er now that I think about US talking ENGLISH? i- they- i REALLY mixed it all up and i really talked most of the time to people who are NOT fluent in english? and and i just REALISE now that we used TERRIBLE english

S15: = yeah yeah =

S16: = COMPARED to how I talk to (natives) so even if WE would talk in english we would use a better er er er nicer and CLEANER english

S15: in antwerp not

As S16 points out, the English used by Erasmus students is a mix of all L1s present in the conversation, resulting in “terrible English” compared to NS standards. Erasmus ELF (the English the two speakers were using on their exchange in Antwerp) is thus set in contrast to ENL, which is considered as “better”, “nicer”, and, most of all, “cleaner”

English.

For a NNS with high competence in English, getting used to the 'low' level of these conversations can be seen as annoying. As S12 and S13 argue in the following extract, many ELF speakers do not have the same level and this can be tiresome for the interlocutor.

Extract 5. Bad English

S12/i5: i mean it's always terrible to talk to them they are always searching for words their grammar is terrible you really have to figure out what he wanted to say. tenses forget it.
S13: @@
S0: so do you- you don't understand them because their english is so bad
S12: you understand them 'cause i'm a foreigner too so i can imagine what he wanted to say but still it's not fun
S0: but do you think that a native speaker would NOT understand them?
S12: he would do hard
S0: <@> if he tried very hard he would </@>
S12: yeah most probably he would understand them but still it's simply (.) BAD

S12 reacts almost angrily to the fact that many exchange students do not speak 'good' English. He points out that they have problems with vocabulary and with grammatical correctness such as the appropriate use of the English tenses.[33] Interestingly, S12 also points out that he actually understands the way less competent speakers talk because he is “a foreigner too”. He shares a similar repertoire with these speakers and can understand them more easily than natives, who would have to make a greater effort to understand them. In other words, the interlocutors' “terrible” English does not necessarily infringe on successful communication, but it is not correct according to NS standards. The same point is made by S13 above when he argues that he lowers his level of English “so I can get the message across” (Extract 2. “Accommodate automatically”).

Summed up, the negative attitudes are accompanied by an awareness of accommodation processes that lead to communicative success. The different factors leading to these negative reactions are perceptions of grammar or pronunciation mistakes, going back to basic structures, putting on the interlocutor's accent, code-switching and the influence of the L1 on the levels of pronunciation, grammar, and lexis. While the accommodation strategies used lead to communicative success, they do not comply to NS norms and therefore, they are seen as bad, simple, and less eloquent than ENL.

[33] Looking at S12's speech would lead to similar results despite his fluency but I am not dealing here with the differences between self-perception and performance; I am focusing on overt perceptions on ELF use in general.

6.1.2 ELF as an 'efficient' communicative tool

6.1.2.1 Direct reference to ELF as an 'efficient' communicative tool

The inherent ambiguities in ELF attitudes can also be seen in the negative opinions themselves. ELF may be negative, but it is nonetheless often seen as good enough for the communicative purpose which the participants want to achieve and therefore also has positive effects. For example, S10 points out right after the above quote (Extract 3. "Ridiculous English") that he actually does not really care about having an accent and that he can still get the message across.

Extract 6. "I don't have a problem with it"

S10/i4: i think er although many people had to get used to my german english in the end i don't have a problem with it maybe it's ridiculous but yeah (that's it)

In other words, the English S10 is using is "ridiculous" according to NS norms but in the contexts he needs it, it is not a deficient, but rather an efficient form of communication. After some time, the interlocutors get used to his way of speaking and communication runs smoothly. At another point, the speakers in this interview underline that they only had to get used to the accents and after that, they did not have any difficulties. By using ELF in their daily interactions, the students realise that communication is more about efficiency than correctness and that they will also learn how to get more proficient and efficient by using the language.

Extract 7. Just do it

S0/i2: = what like- what you said that it's kind o- that you realise that you make misTAKES (.) but at the same time it's (.) oKAY? (..)
S2: <1> ah that's something </1>
S3: <1> <un> xx <un> doing isn't? </1>
S0: sorry?
S3: LEARNING by doing
S0: a:h okay
S1: o:r doing and not learning anything but just <2> doing </2>
S2: <2> @@ @@@@ </2>
S0: yeah
S2: it doesn't matter if i speak so or somebody else but you =
S3: = yeah =
S2: underSTAND each other (.) (the rest is) doesn't matter
S3: just about the mistakes (.) i think you LEARN a lot from the others (.) so: i'm really proud- not proud but erm i'm really glad that (there) were so many italians and spanish people because i get really CONfident?

In this extract, S3 says that the way Erasmus students talk is like "learning by doing" but S1 corrects him and says that it is "doing and not learning anything". Realising that

correctness is not so important, the students get more confident in their language use and do not care anymore about grammaticality or nativeness. Using English with other, sometimes less proficient, speakers, adds to this confidence: by speaking English to them, the speakers realise that they can actually do it and thus get more confident. However, as S1 points out, this is "doing and not learning anything" because the English they end up with is incorrect according to NS norms. Indeed, my respondents often point out that they did not get any *better* in English but only more *fluent*. As S3 points out in Extract 7. "Just do it", the speakers get more confident in their language use by applying the language daily. They even go as far as to say that this would not have been the case had they been in a NS country, though yet others point out that it was only because of NSs that they got better. At this point, I will look at the argument that it was during the Erasmus term (and because of NNSs) that the speakers got more confident.

Extract 8. Getting confident

S1/i1: honestly i must admit i learned a few vocabulary i did not know before but no in general i would say i did not improve. i even got worse.
S0: really?
S1: yes.
S0: in in which way?
S1: because because as we said it was the first time you did not look for the grammar anymore =
S0: = okay =
S1: you did not look for the pronunciation. so you just started talking? and you realised okay he understands so: i just go on talking my german english and going on and going on and so you just (.)
S0: yeah
S1: did not think about it anymore =
S0: = yeah =
S1: = and you switched more into a german english
S3: but you would (stay) more confident
S1: yeah that's true. of course. of course you get confident to the language you use

Here, S1 argues that he did not learn much during his term abroad apart from some new words. He connects this to the fact that he focused on communicative efficiency and not correctness. S3 does not agree and points out that his English must have become better in a way because he got more confident, a fact to which S1 agrees. In other words, S3 connects confidence in English to an actual improvement but this is not the case for S1. However, when the discussion turns back to improving English at the end of the interview, S1 acknowledges that he learned something when using ELF.

Extract 9. Improving everyday English

S1/i1: this all-day language english of course i improved (.) and i think this is the english you really need in your life. how often do i need academic english? (yeah) nearly never so (that) was really good. and as he said (.) if you talk to other erasmus students especially from spain or

italy or <7> france you really get confident </7> and you say okay i'm better so why don't i speak english? and then you START talking in english (.) a:nd i think in england it's really much more difficult. i you have to do with- with the native speakers and you realise they're all better than i am. how should i start? what am i supposed to say? they always will hear i'm not from here

S3: <7> @ @ @ @ </7>
S0: mhm
S1: so i think it's much easier to learn it on a first time on erasmus to get confident
S0: okay
S1: to realise if you start talking in english they understand what you WANT to say =
S3: = yeah yeah =
S1: = and that's the GOOD- the most important thing

Only by using English in the lingua franca context does S1's realisation come that it is possible to get the message across even if the message is not grammatically correct. S1 explains that his "all-day language English" did improve during his exchange and that this is the kind of English he actually needs, not academic (or standard) English.[34] He also points out that talking to other students who have a lower level of proficiency enhances the process of getting more confident and fluent in English. Thus, gaining confidence may even be facilitated by the fact that the interlocutors are NNSs of English and that they share the same situation with the speakers: they also use ELF actively for the first time and learn how to exploit its communicative potential. This, after all, "is the most important thing".

Another factor that makes this experience easier is the fact that English is different. Although it is not an explicit and recurring theme in the interviews, S10 and S11 address the aspect that English has a special position as an international language. In Extract 10. "English is different (1)", S11 talks about the difference between efficiency and correctness.

Extract 10. English is different (1)

S11/i4: i think that this is more for english not that {much} for other languages because if you speak italian incorrect in italy then after you- you are- you feel stupid but english everyone is inventing his own english and so

While it might be important in other languages to be correct, it is not the case with English because it has become an international language that is appropriated by all of its speakers, not only natives. Even if speakers make mistakes in English, they do not have

[34] Note, however, that opinions on this diverge. While S1, S2, S12, and S13 are business students and have had most of their classes in English, others have not. Indeed, S6, S15 and S16 have started to deal with English texts and have actually studied in English, be it writing academic essays or preparing readings for class, during their exchange. Thus, this aspect seems to depend on when and where students familiarise themselves with academic English. The business students did not improve their academic English as much as the others because they had already learned it (S12 and S13 have even attended Business English classes), while others (especially S15 and S16) point out that this was one of the greatest benefits of going on Erasmus.

to “feel stupid” because it is used so widely. However, if they do so for instance in Italian, it leads to embarrassment because it is important to comply to NS norms as the language is not international. Thus, as a consequence of internationalisation, demands of English proficiency have changed.

Extract 11. English is different (2)

S10/i4: even not that. maybe it's a different thing in this case because (it is) the biggest language in the world is not chinese or english but bad english
S0: @@ <@> that's true </@> @@
S11: yeah (that's good)
S10: maybe it is a bigger DANger for english than for other languages because
[…]
S11: it's not a danger but if you want to make a language international (.) than you cannot (using) it
S0: yeah 'cause that's what happens then @@
S11: (also i don't know) if it's european english or for all the laws they don't use the english the native native speaker english but there is really a european english so it's
S10: yeah there is even in wikipedia i remember there is simple english

Here, again, positive and negative attitudes overlap because ELF is described as “bad English” and “simple English” but the efficiency of international communication in ELF is not neglected. S10 explains that English is different because it is *the* global language. Importantly, S11 even says that appropriation is a normal process in internationalisation and that different uses of English lead to different Englishes, in this example the English used in the EU institutions. She seems to be completely aware of the fact that English is used in many different situations and this language spread is normal to her. S10 points out that the biggest language in the world is “bad English”, i.e. NNS English, which, compared to NS standards, is deficient. In other words, ELF is mostly seen as EFL although the speakers recognise the spread of English and its appropriation by NNS as a natural process.

ELF is therefore an efficient tool of communication because the students can use it for their communicative purposes. While they recognise that the English they use is different and refer to it as worse than ENL, they also seem to show confidence about their way of speaking. For example, S9/i3 points out that “I don't think there's anything WRONG with it?” and S11/i4 argues that it is “nice” to have accents, while S14/i2 claims that

Extract 12. Like accents

S14/i5: to me to me it doesn't matter if they have an accent or not i mean as long as they have enough vocabulary to interact to me- i actually think- i actually LIKE accents

Thus, as long as communication runs smoothly, it does not matter how correct the speakers talk. ELF can be – and is – an efficient and appropriate tool of communication

for these students. This goes in line with Kalocsai's (2009) argument that Erasmus students are often surprised about the efficiency of their way of talking. The following quote from her interviews expresses a German student's surprise at how well the interaction actually works.

> (…) nobody knows (the / maybe) the rules and often we are listening some words and then we try to express them other way and for my example my, my grammar is ( ) but I think everybody understands what I want to say, and it's the same with all the other Erasmus students. Everybody use the the grammar of his own language and put it, puts it into English, and it works ((laughs)), somehow it works. No(h)? (Kalocsai 2009:33)

This quote is similar to what S11 says in Extract 10. “English is different (1)” and Extract 11. “English is different (2)”: the appropriation of ELF in different situations is a natural process. It also reflects what my participants have said about efficiency vs. correctness: although the utterances in Erasmus ELF conversations may not always be correct, they are communicatively successful (cf. Extract 7. “Just do it” to Extract 9. “Improving everyday English”). Moreover, just like S10 (Extract 6. “I don't have a problem with it”), this German speaker explains that her co-students understand her despite her bad grammar; in the end, conversation runs smoothly.

6.1.2.2 Indirect reference to ELF as an 'efficient' communicative tool

A more indirect reference to ELF being an efficient tool of communication is made in what I would refer to the naturalness of ELF, or as Berns et al. (2007) describe it, the fact that the Erasmus students are “in the presence of English”. For the participants, English is often not like any other foreign language; they know that they have to know it and they use it comfortably, without even thinking about why and how they are actually using English. Generally, they use English very often, no matter if on exchange or at home. They simply accept the fact that “without English you don't *get* anywhere” (S5/i2) and that “you just have to” learn it (S4/i2) and do not seem to have a problem with that.

As for the use of English at home, the answers range from “full time” and “well whenever it is necessary” (S12/i5) to “at least three days a week” (S16/i5). How natural the use of English becomes is illustrated in the following extract.

Extract 13. Using English at home

S1/i1: yeah i i work for a company where english is the official official company language?
S0: okay?
S1: so of course it is a world-wide operating company so i get all the all the letters all the (.) all the instructions always in english a:nd then i have to translate them for the austrian company more or less or at least to explain not translating word by word but <13> explaining </13> what is it? so i work with it every day then i play <un> x x </un> in an international rugby club where the official language IS english as well so: there all the instructions are in english
S0: <13> mhm </13>
S0: mhm
S2: yeah but you just USE it <14> you know </14>
S1: <14> (all day long) </14> yeah but i use it every day and half of my courses at university are in english more or less <15> so: </15>
S2: <15> i don't </15> even remember if a course i did is in english or not <un> x x </un>
S0: mhm
S2: it's just yeah
S0: mhm
S2: i mean it's bad if i have to write the exam because then i'm like in the vocabulary
S0: mhm
S2: but that's just <@> it </@> doesn't matter
S0: <L1de> ja </L1de> so you're actually- yeah- but you actually all said that you use english basically almost every day.
S3: yes
S2: yeah
S0: yeah
S1: yeah, five times a week <16> <@> on the weekends i try just not to think about <17> english </17> </16>
S3: <16> @@@@@@@@ </16>
S2: <17> why </17> because then you watch TV sitcoms
S0-4: <18> @@@@ </18>
S0: <18> <@> IN english </@> so:: yeah </18>

S1 opens this extract by explaining that he has to use English at his work in an international company. His task is actually to translate or explain English texts for his German co-workers. He also plays rugby regularly, and as the club is international, they also use English in their training sessions. He then goes on to explain that half of his courses in Business Administration are in English and S2 adds that she usually does not remember whether she studied for an exam in English or German. English is just part of studying economics and the same is pointed out in interview 5, where S12 and S13 are students of the Vienna University of Economics. Ironically, S1 concludes by saying that on the weekends, he tries to switch off English completely, but his girlfriend S2 reminds him jokingly that his weekend pastime is watching American sitcoms in their original version. Summed up, without even noticing, S1 is using English all the time, at work, at university, and in his private life (it might seem that in his private life he is only using it passively but he also used to have an English-speaking flatmate in his shared flat).

There is a comment at the beginning of Extract 13. “Using English at home” that does not quite seem to fit in. S2's comment that S1 only *uses* English refers to the previous

discussion on whether English is just a tool or whether it is more important. For S2 (and, in another interview S4/i2) English is only a tool that she needs to communicate with some people; for the other participants the very fact that it is a tool makes it more important. While S2 and S4 seem to agree with House (2003) that ELF is only a neutral tool, the other speakers believe that the tool can never be completely neutral and as they use it for their own purposes, it becomes their personal means of communication. All students use ELF as a means for international communication but it is only a language of communication for some, while for others, it becomes part of their daily life and also a language of identification. However, what crystallises in the interviews (especially 1 and 2), no matter if English is seen as a language of communication or a language of identification or both, is that it is used successfully and efficiently by all speakers as their primary means of communication in international settings. The general tendency is best illustrated by S12's statement:

Extract 14. "It's quite the same"

S0/i5: so do you only use english in your studies or in private too?
S12: well in private too imagine this dorm we just talk in english actually we don't really care about talking german or english it's quite the same

Talking English or German in his residence, where there are several internationals, is "quite the same" for S12, an L1 speaker of Hungarian. Many of his classes are in English, he reads English on the internet, and uses the language even in private life; in other words, English is just part of his everyday life.

The same applies even stronger on the participants' exchange terms, where they use(d) English "always twenty-four seven" (S5/i2). How often they use(d) English is also shown by the fact that it was extremely hard to get any details about their frequency of English use. Most of the replies looked like in interview 3.

Extract 15. Using English every day for everything

S7/i3: every day
S0: every day
S8: every day same here
S0: and in which situations?
S7: everything

Thus English is just a natural ingredient of the exchange term; indeed, it is so obvious to use English that there is nothing much to explain about it. The same problem arose when I asked for situations where English was an advantage. English was an advantage for the participants almost all the time. Actually, the only examples where English was a

disadvantage that were brought up were in talking with NSs or NNSs with native-like competence because they were talking too fast or using too much vocabulary unknown by the participants (cf. ch. 6.2.3.1). Interestingly, with local authorities, English was usually (but not always) also enough, even though in some situations it would have been better to speak the local language (cf. ch. 6.3.1.2). All in all, it is again S12's comment that is the best summary of the responses:

Extract 16. The biggest advantage is to have English

S0/i5: can you think of erm also of a situation where you used english during your studies as an exchange student and it was actually GOOD to speak english? any kind of- any real life situation (.) where it was good to BE there and HAVE english

S12: well i think if i understand the question right e:r it's not really- it's not really a question at all so it was the biggest advantage of having english because ALL the courses were in english so we attended english courses

S0: so it was just NEcessary to know it

S12: it was really necessary

SX-12: yes

S13: yeah

S14: exactly

S0: but it wasn't necessary to know any other language

SX-12: no

I included my prompt question in Extract 16. “The biggest advantage is to have English” because it is also a good illustration of how long I usually had to explain to make the participants understand what I actually meant. Here, S12 is not really sure if he understood my question right and thinks that “it's not really a question at all” because having and using English can only be advantageous in an international setting. The participants repeatedly point out that it was the only language they had and that they did not have much of a choice as far as other languages were concerned (cf. ch. 6.3.1). For these students, English is not something special; it is something that is necessary for international encounters, for their studies, for their personal life, and for their later careers. While their views differ on what English means to them and how well they want to know it, they all agree either spontaneously or in answering to questions that they usually use English as a lingua franca in international settings and that it is an efficient communicative tool in these situations.

6.1.3 Language use in the Erasmus community

In most of the interviews, the peculiarity of ELF is referred to implicitly. The respondents seem to be completely aware of the fact that their lingua franca use of English is different, but efficient, even though, as I have argued above, they see it as

deficient EFL most of the time. That the respondents know different features of ELF communication shows that they are (maybe unconsciously but nonetheless) aware of their language use. For example, the interviewees repeatedly address two aspects of ELF usage: accommodation and negotiation of meaning on the one hand and code-switching on the other hand. Of course, these aspects are often intertwined, which may be best illustrated by the following example.

Extract 17. Hail storms

S10/i4: (could be.) i think the biggest problem is the vocabulary. you have much less vocabulary and the and if i don't know a word i say it maybe in german maybe they under- understand it and

S0: so you would use =

S10: = i don't have an example

S11: er i remember when i was in the netherlands i say to you when it was <L1it> grandinare {to hail} </L1it> there is coming the ice from the sky and then they say to me it was (what?)

S10: hail

S11: yeah hail so we- and MANY times i didn't know a word and i say thunder or

S0: so you try to find something that is what you MEAN

S10: (yeah)

S11: i think that was the problem for the dutch they have known this word and then i watched them WHAT? @@

S0: okay yeah yeah yeah yeah

S10: i think this is the best- it's a good example (if you say hail) i wouldn't understand it but if a slovenian says there comes ice from the sky

S0: yeah yeah yeah okay true (.) and would you e:rm would you then sometimes also use the german word?

S10: er if i have the impression that it is an international word i simply don't know it i just say how to say it in english

S0: cause sometimes when i don't know a word i just describe it and i say we say it like that

S10: yeah i think that works more often than to say it in english. you make a mistake maybe or something

In the beginning of the extract, S10 points out that the greatest difficulties he has usually concern unknown vocabulary. He does not find any examples but S11 remembers an episode when she was telling him about a hail storm. In order to describe this event where she did not understand the English word *hail*, she resorts to code-switching in her L1, Italian, and uses the verb *grandinare*. Thus, she refers to the situation where she did not know the word by switching again; in other words, she refers to a strategy to find the right word by the use of another strategy serving the same purpose. She actually resorts to a common feature of ELF talk, namely asking an interlocutor who knows her L1 for help (cf. e.g. Kalocsai 2009:32). In the situation she refers to, the Dutch speakers, whose English was in a way too 'good', used *hail* but then they had to describe to her what was happening: “there is ice coming from the sky”. In this way, S11 learned from her Dutch interlocutors. Thus the Dutch speakers acted as experts in the ELF CofP and as teachers, but the learning process happened through collaboration and a joint

explanation of meaning. Learning, in this sense, is a form of collaboration between ELF speakers and shows that they are not deficient, but autonomous users of the language: they can learn from one another (Kalocsai & Peckham 2010, Francheschini 2009). In this case, S11 does not only refer to a process of negotiating meaning familiar to her from her Erasmus term, but is also using code-switching as another strategy while referring to the first one. In both cases, learning is incidental: it happens as a side-effect of meaning-making and rapport-building between the participants (Kalocsai & Peckham 2010). At the same time, the very strategy of code-switching shows how the speakers adapt their plurilingual repertoire to their own needs (Hülmbauer 2007, Klimpfinger 2007) and thus illustrates the inherent diversity in ELF communication.

The speakers then go on to explain in more detail what they do when they do not find the right word: they either use expressions from their L1, ask their interlocutors for help, or just describe what they mean, as S10 and S11 do in this situation. Interestingly, S10 points out that these strategies are often more efficient than using the ENL term: by using the ENL term, speakers may make a mistake and thus will not be understood by their interlocutors. He refers to a process that can be compared to what Seidlhofer describes as unilateral idiomaticity (Jenkins, Modiano & Seidlhofer 2001:16, Seidlhofer & Widdowson 2007). Unilateral idiomaticity is the process whereby a phrase or idiom is used that is too native-like and thus leads to misunderstandings. In order to circumvent a similar outcome, S10 prefers using a term that is maybe not native-like but describes the communicative purpose just as well.

Similar features in the negotiation of meaning are underlined by S15 and S16 in the following section.

Extract 18. Explaining and code-switching

S15/i6: <1> well you try to explain </1> it somehow else or you describe the words

S16: exactly or you speak the language THEY speak or use a language that is e:r more similar so if i talked to italian and i could not find the right WORD and i could find the vocabulary in SPANISH i would say e:r the SPANISH word and see if he can get e:r to a common sense there

S15: or how do you call this?

While S15 refers to the joint negotiation of meaning in Extract 18. “Explaining and code-switching”, S16 points out that there is also the possibility of code-switching and using the potential inherent in receptive multilingualism to achieve understanding (cf. e.g. ten Thije 2007). In particular, she would use Spanish words with Italians because their languages are so similar. This kind of mixing becomes especially important when

there are Southern Europeans present, mostly Spanish students, who are mentioned in every single interview (!) as a very closed group with a much worse competence than other nationalities; followed by the French and Italians.

Extract 19. Mixing

S16/i6: and in the community there was basically ALWAYS somebody who spoke spanish and even if my spanish is not good i can at least understand it so so: with hands and feet and so the spanish were in their crowd and they didn't NEED it for their social life because they just sticked with their OWN people

S0: so so could you say that the english you USED was never like PURE english?

S15: it was MOST of the time so

S16: but not with some people who were fluent in english as well but most of the time <1> NOT </1>

S15: <1> most of the time </1>

S15: with [name 12] she is half french half scottish of course her english is rea:lly good but even with her we would mix<2> dutch </2>AND french words =

S16: <2> that's true and </2>

S16: = and german sometimes =

S15: = and german yeah but it was never PURE english <3> conversation </3> like the people coming from great britain or the <4> states </4>

S16: <3> yeah that's true </3>

S16: <4> especially </4> as we were always together so we ALWAYS also communicated in german

Just before Extract 19. "Mixing" starts, S15 explains that the Spanish people she and S16 met in Antwerp were attending English classes while the other students had their survival courses in Flemish. Because of their closed groups they did not use English enough and they failed many classes. However, there were always some Spanish students who socialised with the other internationals (S5/i2 refers to them as "outgoing" Spanish students) and there were always some other Spanish students at parties or other Erasmus events. In these cases, the students communicated by using hands and feet or their knowledge of Spanish and other similar languages. In other words, if English was not enough, they resorted to other languages.

This is not only true for situations with less competent speakers. S15 refers to a friend who was a French-English bilingual. Even with her, they used to mix English with Dutch and French. Thus, their English was never "pure" but always different from ENL. When S15 and S16 were together, they also used English or mixed it with German, sometimes arriving at some sort of *Denglish*, as they explain later on. At another point, S15 and S16 refer to their way of using English as a mixture of different languages.

Extract 20. "We talked a mixture Dutch, English, Spanish, and French"

S16/i6: yeah we talked a mixture dutch english spanish and french because with the spanish you could obviously not talk english because they would not understand you so: you MIX the stuff and especially some bel- because we wanted to learn <LNnl> flandern {flemish} </LNnl> we wanted to learn erm of course dutch yeah so: <1> erm </1> flemish yeah so the words which

we knew in a regular sentence we used all the time but yeah
S15: <1> flemish </1>

As S16 points out here, ELF is inherently multilingual; it is a mixture of different languages that the speakers in the communicative situation are familiar with. In order to speak to the Spanish, for instance, mixing is obligatory; but because S15 and S16 were in the Flemish part of Belgium, they used some words and phrases from the local language and gave their ELF a local touch. Kalocsai arrives at similar results when she argues that "participants learn that they may further collaborate by switching to a particular language routinely" (2009:32, cf. also 36). Her participants, too, "typically switch to Hungarian" in some phrases, such as saying thank you, apologies, toasts, or greetings (op.cit: 32).

In interview 1, S1 also claims that he tried to use other languages while speaking English. In particular, he explains that he sometimes tried to create a mix between French and German with French students. In these mixed conversations, he would try to speak as much French as possible, while the French students would try to reply in German as much as they could.

Extract 21. Mixing German and French

S1/i1: so i just said from time to time i try to to to: talk french with the french <13> or </13> or to try to improve my spanish =
S0: <13> okay. </13> =okay=
S1: = until i realised okay it <@> (won't) work </@> =
S2: =@@ <14> @@@@@@ </14>
S1: <14> so: i stopped it <@> because THEN the spanish </@> realised OH you speak spanish so <15> just </15> go ahead talking spanish to (me)
S0: <15> okay </15>
S1: but with the french it was very nice because all of them they had to learn german at school <16> so they </16> they said okay you cannot speak french but you try so we try a:nswer you in german
S0: <16> ah okay? </16> okay.
S1: erm that was very nice.
S0: okay <17> so </17> so you would speak french and they would an <18> swer </18> in german
S1: <17> so </17> <18> answer </18> <L1de> ja </L1de>
S0: a::h okay.
S1: or i would TRY to speak in french
S0: okay. and they would TRY to answer in german
S1: <@> exactly yeah</@>

S1 finds this strategy, quite successful with his French friends, "nice" because the speakers show a kind of solidarity as they all try to speak the other's language. Kalocsai refers to this strategy as a means to signal "belonging to the group of multicultural speakers" (2009:36) as the students can use and practice the languages they have

previously learnt but in which their competence is not as high as in English. Code-switching becomes a way of signalling identity, and makes ELF talk different from ENL. While in my interviews, it was a German student who pointed out this strategy explicitly, Kalocsai mentions a French student who says almost the same:

> There are some Erasmus students that try to speak French with me. They are proud to say they know some French words, and it's the same for me when I try to speak German. (Kalocsai 2009:36)

While the speakers quoted above (Extract 19. "Mixing" to Extract 21. "Mixing German and French") refer most explicitly to their mixing in English, they are not the only ones to do so. In the following extract, S12 points out that English was not always enough to express what he wanted to say and therefore, he mixed with another language, in this case Spanish.

Extract 22. Dirty words

S12/i5: well i spoke a bit of german with the other germans and also some spanish with the spanish students but my spanish isn't is not good so just very basic level some dirty words or so
S0: @@ <@> 'cause they don't exist in english or what? </@>
S12: indeed they exist but in spanish you can do it like a more sophisticated way 'cause english don't have a LOT of dirty words

In Extract 22. "Dirty words", S12 points out that English does not have enough swear words. Therefore, he sometimes preferred using Spanish, although his Spanish was not as good as his English. In other words, when English was not enough, he tried to choose other words from his repertoire that would fit his communicative purpose. In this way he played with language as such and profited fully from his linguistic resources at hand.

The multilingual nature of ELF also becomes clear when it acts as a bridge-builder between other languages. A case in point are language classes. In interviews 1 and 3, the respondents point out that they use(d) English in their language classes if they do (did) not understand something not only among each other but also in talking to the teacher.

Extract 23. Learn other languages in and through ELF (1)

S3/i1: (to) explain it to them and that's the interesting part if you talk to your (..) fo- for instance to your left neighbour in german and then at the right <5> there's </5> a bulgarian or spanish girl? you you switch and then you have to translate or you have to explain <6> (the meaning) </6> in english sometimes (you) mixing up the languages but you you still practising- you still practice it too isn't it?
S1: <5> mhm </5>
S1: <6> mhm </6>
S2: <L1de> ja? {yes} </L1de> actually yes
S0: so would you kind of give extra lessons to those who were not from a germanic language?
S3: of course you had =
S0: = yeah
S3: yeah because <7> it's </7>

S0: <7> 'cause </7> you underSTOOD and they didn't.
S3: especially if you're from vienna
S0: yeah
S3: sometimes if you use- speak swedish or danish it's easier if you just do it in some kind of a viennese dialect?
S0: <@> really? </@>
S3: yes yes it's quite <@> quite </@> easy to understand
S0: do they say <L1de> oida {old buddy} </L1de>?
S3: they don't say <L1de> oida {old buddy} </L1de> <8> but they say </8> <LNdk> vaertshus {pub} </LNdk> which is <L1de> wirtshaus {pub} </L1de>
S0: <8> @@ @@ @ </8>
S0: a:::h <9> okay mhm </9>
S3: <9> <un> xx xxx x </un> </9> but (i would say) the language course is one of the situations where you (.) practice a LOT
S0: okay (.) so you actually practice not only ENGlish but =
S3: = yes =
S0: = any language you use- you would practice it =
S3: = sure =
S0: IN the language <10> course </10>
S3: <10> because </10> you have to explain it in (.) in (a) language which is not your mother tongue

This extract is preceded by S3's question to S1 and S2 how they learned Swedish in their language classes. He says that the language classes were a great opportunity for him to get better in English because he would often explain things from Danish (the local language he learned in Copenhagen) to his classmates who did not speak any language from the same language family. Even if the languages got “mixed up”, he “learned a lot” because he had to reflect on and explain linguistic features of one language in another language. Thus, at the same time, he used his receptive multilingualism, drawing parallels between German and Danish, practised English as the bridge builder between his NNS colleagues and himself, and taught them Danish. He argues that it was much easier for him to understand some words such as *vaertshus* 'pub', which is *Wirtshaus* in German, and he could therefore help his friends. The language classes were multilingual and the students there did not only learn the local language, but also English, and, maybe bits and pieces from other languages. The same process is mentioned by the speakers in interview 3.

Extract 24. Learn other languages in and through ELF (2)

S8/i3: it's easier to learn actually
S0: you think so?
S7: definitely. (.) i think english is basic of every language. when you are able to speak english it's easier to learn ano- another language =
S8: = for example german =
S7: = it's definitely that way […] if you're able to speak english you're also able to compare that grammar for example with me? when i sp- when i learn english er when i learn german i'm able to comp- to compare <LNde> grammatik {grammar} </LNde> where german with english and croatian. so if i'm able to speak english that's like advantage to learn another foreign language. i think so. […] everybody use english but it's not like everybody use french or spanish it's not so

S0: so they can explain if you don't like- let's say you learn german? erm so the teacher could actually unde- explain something in english if you don't understand it in <1> german or? </1>
S7: <1> yeah for </1> example when i'm in my german lessons she: er we don't understand every word she's always going to say er explanation in english? not in spanish o:r japanese but in english because it's international LANguage
S8: yeah and the <2> erasmus is also with english yeah </2>
S7: <2> and she suppose that every person </2> is able to speak english so that's the reason why she (say) explanation in english

At the very beginning of Extract 24."Learn other languages in and through ELF (2)", S7 replies to my question as to why English is the international language by arguing that it is easier to learn English than other languages. She goes on to explain that knowing English can be helpful in learning other languages: as many people know English, they can compare it with the other languages they learn, just as they can with their L1, in her case Croatian. They have a common point of reference, which is, at the same time, also the tool which they use to talk about parallels or differences between languages. Although this may be true for any language, the difference with English is that many people speak it, much more people than, for instance, French or Spanish. To my question whether English is used in her German classes, S7 says that the teacher sometimes explains German in English because it is the language everyone understands. S8 agrees by saying that the main language of the Erasmus programme is English, probably pointing to the fact that Erasmus students use English among each other for the same reasons (cf. ch. 6.3.2).

The examples in this chapter (Extract 17. "Hail storms" to Extract 24. "Learn other languages in and through ELF (2)") go in line with the argument in Peckham et al. (2009, forthcoming): using ELF can help in learning of other languages and give Erasmus students the possibility to integrate into a community with which they would not be able to communicate. Thus, ELF acts as a bridge-builder within multilingualism rather than as a threat to multilingualism.

> English enables Erasmus students to communicate within a group of students with many different mother tongues. Consequently, they do not only learn some of their host country's language, but also some of their fellow students' languages, as the statement of [an] interviewee illustrates:
>
> *"People tell their words to others, the words in their language and, and it is one of the topics of conversation always that 'how is it in your language?' 'how is it in your', and you, you already learn the new, new words and new things."* (Peckham et al. 2009:4, emphasis in original)

In other words, ELF acts as a cultural negotiator between Erasmus students and helps

them to get to know other languages, thus broadening their linguistic repertoire while learning from one another. As English is understood by everyone, it helps the students to enter the Erasmus CofP. In the research conducted by Peckham et al. (forthcoming), the CofPs consist only of newcomers, who have to negotiate their own local norms and practices jointly. These new rules are negotiated in ELF, which is appropriated to local practices and needs, turns into a diverse means of communication, and therefore also becomes a signal of group membership. As Peckham et al. (ibid) point out, the students are fully aware of their new code and use it confidently in their communicative situations.

In this process of using ELF as the language of the Erasmus CofP, the participants, consciously and unconsciously, make use of their joint multilingual repertoires, and use the virtual possibilities of language as such for their own purposes (Widdowson 2003:48). Thus, they "[recognise] each other's linguistic skills as a valuable resource" (Kalocsai 2009:33) and negotiate meaning as appropriate to their CofP. As I have shown above, this process is connected to a move from focusing on correctness to focusing on efficiency and "on the communicative and rapport building functions of language" (ibid). In this way, the students create a repertoire which is unique to their community. In using multilingual and multicultural ELF all the time, it becomes part of talking like and being an Erasmus student. This point is made by Kalocsai when she argues that

> through their involvement in the Erasmus students' community of practice, the participants realize that they can use multiple languages as a realization of their ELF identity, if they so wish. They may emphasize different aspects of their ELF identity at any single moment during the conversation, and they do so with pride. They expect their NS peers to respect their ELF identities and adjust their language to their specific needs. (2009: 37)

While I can agree with all these claims, I cannot fully support the argument that the students are also proud of their English, as their opinions are very often accompanied by negative opinions. The respondents in my interviews do not seem to take pride in their way of using English, but rather accept it as it is. Whether this is connected to the fact that the interviews were done in retrospect and not on spot remains an open question. Nevertheless, S11 pointed out to me after her interview that ENS should learn to talk like ELF speakers and she also mentioned the appropriation of English by NNSs (Extract 10. "English is different (1)" and Extract 11. "English is different (2)"). Also, the participants generally agreed with me in follow-up discussions on claims about the

multilingual nature of ELF, even though they did not address it themselves. This might be a sign that they are aware of what is happening when they use English as a lingua franca, but as for my results, it does not show that they take pride in it.

Considering the reflections of my respondents on their multilingual ELF use nonetheless leads me to supporting the claim that Erasmus students do not live in CofPs dominated by English but rather in a very multilingual and multicultural environment. In this environment, English is used as a lingua franca, i.e. a common means of communication adjusted to its multifaceted context of use.

In conclusion, I believe that there is a common, general tendency in these results even though they are not completely generalisable. Kalocsai's (2009) and Peckham et al.'s (2009, forthcoming) research focused on Erasmus CofPs in Szeged and Prague, while my respondents spent their Erasmus exchanges in Portugal, Belgium, Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Austria. And yet, the processes they refer to are very similar to what researchers in Szeged and Prague have shown. Indeed, I would go as far as to say that there are parallel tendencies in these Erasmus CofPs that are not bound to certain places or points of time but are characteristic of Erasmus students' ELF use as such. The actual realisations may be varying depending on the context, but the underlying processes seem to be very similar. My argument can be compared to what Canagarajah (2007) and Seidlhofer (2006) refer to as virtual communities, i.e. communities that are not bound to a certain place but are established, for example, on the World Wide Web.

I have shown so far that the Erasmus communities, as communities which use ELF as their communicative tool, seem to develop their own ways of using English appropriately for their purposes. As I have also shown, in these situation, efficiency is more important than correctness and adherence to native English norms. However, ENSs are often also Erasmus students, participate in these communities, and their norms are taught as the model to follow in language classes. The next chapter will deal with the interrelations of these factors.

6.2 Native speaker norms and Standard English in an international context

6.2.1 The native speaker as a teacher of Standard English

The analysis of my interviews shows that, for my respondents, one of the main roles of NSs is that of teachers of English. They are often seen as language experts, as guardians and the sole owners of the language (Widdowson 1994, 2003), and as the role models to follow. While language in use always gets adapted to its contexts and thus changes constantly, standard ideology, connected to a monolingual ideal, dictates a fixed set of norms, a prescribed and codified standard (Cogo forthcoming, Gal 2006, Widdowson 2003). The participants in my research thus find themselves in a paradoxical situation: on the one hand, they are influenced by standard ideologies and a strong monolingual bias, whereas in their everyday life they are using a plurilingual mode of communication in appropriating ELF for their communicative purposes. Generally, standard ideologies and the belief in the knowledge of the Chomskyan ideal 'native speaker-listener' are stronger than the awareness of how the participants develop communicative competence in Hymes' (1971) terms. Even though NNSs use English confidently and successfully in ELF contexts, the norm providers for them still remain the NSs (Cogo forthcoming).

Therefore, if NS are present on the exchange term, some students see them as models and teachers of English. Simply by being NSs, they are seen as perfect teachers of English and as language experts. In the following extract, S4 talks about the fact that members of the Erasmus CofPs sometimes use words in different ways than NS. For instance, she used the word *cover* to refer to *blanket* but other NNSs understood perfectly what she meant. Her use of *cover* was only a problem when NSs were present and until a NS pointed out to her the difference between the two words. S5 and S6, however, reply that they learned much more from NSs than NNSs because the NSs correct the NNSs when they make mistakes.

Extract 25. Cover vs. blanket

S5/i2: yeah 'cause it's easier to say what you wanna say and the and the they understand it more easy wha-what you wanna say if you if you don't KNOW exactly wha:- e:r how to put it

S4: i think it's the other way round?

S5: yeah? (.)

S4: i have more misunderstandings with native speakers than i do with internationals (.) because you you kind of like get your OWN english with the other internationals?

S5: o:kay okay okay
S4: so: i think <un> x x </un> you also get to learn to be more FLEXible in english that you EVEN underSTAND somebody although he or she is using a completely different word all the time? i think the natives are sometimes not that flexible that they just realise okay (.) even like (.) i don't know for year i said instead of blanket COver. (.) and i was just Using it like this you know that was the word for me @
S5: yeah yeah yeah
S4: and i just realise that if you use all the time the wrong word (.) the other (.) like from- with other people who are not speaking english as a native language they're more flexible in this like okay it's not the perfect word but we still underSTAND it. natives are like <imitating> what are you TALKing about? </imitating> @@
S5: yeah yeah yeah no i <un> xx </un> but yeah I thought it was way better to speak to natives =
S6: = yeah me too =
S5: = because if y- if if you said any- said a word and you used it with an internatio =
S4: = it's because you're that WELL in english =
S5: a:r @@@@
S4: no you do not SAY cover instead of blanket
S5: no i don't <@> but there were so- </@> some words and if THEY don't understand they're like what do you MEAN? and then i have to explain what i MEAN and my english evolves
S6: yeah and they CORrect you if you say something WRONG
S5: yeah they do it <1> <un> xxx </un> </1>
S6: <1> and a (non-native) speaker doesn't DO that </1>
S5: 'cause they understand pretty much what you MEAN but they <2> don't know how to COrrect it </2> but the native speaker will correct you right away
S6: <2> yeah yeah yeah </2>
S6: yeah i felt like i improved the most when i was talking to:
S0: to natives
S6: and i liked listening to them 'cause they- of course they use other words and other vocabulary and (.) you can actually LEARN something from that

In the beginning of Extract 25. “Cover vs. blanket”, S4 points out that it is much easier to talk to NNSs because they are more “flexible” than NSs (cf. ch. 6.2.3.1). Even if the speakers use a word incorrectly, their interlocutors understand the meaning from the context and accept the 'wrong' use. Her example is the difference between *cover* and *blanket.* She used the semantically more general term *cover* to refer to 'blanket'. While NNSs just figured that she meant *blanket* and accepted her use of *cover*, she expresses the NS' perplexity (“what are you *talking* about?”) at her use of this word. S5 agrees with her on the point that NNSs are more flexible but he thinks that only NSs can be teachers of English because they correct the NNSs. The NNSs, for him, just do not know any better; they do not know the right word. Therefore, they cannot correct the speaker or teach them anything. S6 also agrees with this and explains that she improved most when she was talking to NSs for the same reason. She “likes” listening to NSs and picking up words and phrases they use in order to sound more proficient, which, to her, equals more native-like. At a later point in the interview, S6 also expresses her wish to go to the United States for some time to improve her (very proficient) English further, whereas S5's best friend during his exchange was an US-American student. In sum, both

S5 and S6 have a very high level of English, almost native-like competence, and also express their endeavour to be as good as ENSs.

Of course, NSs are also seen as teachers in their own country. Very often, going to a NS country is seen as the best way to get better in English (cf. S6's claim above that she wants to spend some time in the US). Many participants point out that they got more comfortable and confident or even more fluent in English, but not more correct, which would have been the case had they gone to a NS country (cf. ch. 6.1.2.2).

Extract 26. Going abroad to a NS country (1)

S16/i6: LEARN I don't think we LEARNED english <4> there no </4>

S15: <4> but you </4> but like- it's more like to get more- to get more comfortable with the language

S16: because you use it EVERY single day but AS you are an erasmus and you('re) er yeah most of the time surrounded by people who are NOT as good in english or english is always a foreign language to them? so: you do NOT improve it as if i would have been in england or really i would have improved my english

When S16 says that she did not learn any English, S15 immediately corrects her by saying that the Erasmus term is useful to get more comfortable in using the language on a daily basis. Although S16 agrees with this, she points out that being surrounded by NNSs also means that it is harder to advance in English because the 'right' teachers of English are the NSs. It has to be pointed out, however, that S16 went to an English-German bilingual school and that English is practically like a second language to her. She explains in the beginning of the interview that she does not have any problems whatsoever using English or German and still, she seems to feel the need to improve and be more native-like.

The reliance on NSs may not be so strong all the time, though. S14 for instance did his civil service in England and then studied for a year in Ireland. He explains that those two years helped him much more in improving his English than going later on to Finland on an Erasmus term. However, he also acknowledges the fact that by using the language, he also got better and more comfortable and that he just does not know how much he would have improved had he only gone to Finland.

Extract 27. Going abroad to a NS country (2)

S14/i5: i mean if you go abroad to an english speaking country you certainly i think i mean from my experience ireland i er there was a huge leap and then again in england it was a it was a huge leap for me er and what i've learned

S0: but not in finland?

S14: i don't know i mean from IREland i went straight away to finland so it's it's kind of difficult but i think that if you USE english kind of on a regular basis which is what i DID in finland? i think yes it did improve as well but NOT the the this kind of leap

So, S14 focuses more on practising the language than only on going to a NS country. Nevertheless, he thinks that going to England or Ireland was a "huge leap" compared to his previous level, while his stay in Finland would only help him to get more fluent. There is a slight preference for NS countries in his point of view, but not a strong one. Interestingly, S14 is a student of English, but his opinions and his reliance on NS norms are less strong than for other students. Moreover, he is the only participant who has actually been to a NS country to study or to work there for a longer period of time and his experience seems to have shown him that just by using English (i.e. his stay in Finland), it is also possible to get better (cf. Adolphs 2005).

In sum, especially the respondents who are interested in improving their English and also explain at some point that they would like to go to a NS country or had close contact with ENSs (e.g. ENS friends either abroad or at home) see the NSs as teachers, the notable exception being S14, the only speaker who has had actual experience in NS countries. The students think that they can learn from the NSs and profit from being on exchange with NSs, while they believe that they do not get better with NNSs. In other words, NSs teach them correctness, but talking to NNSs they learn how to be communicatively efficient. As the norm, however, is the NS and the standard, they prefer to be like NSs. At the same time they say that the NS is not always the ultimate point of reference. Answers fluctuate back and forth between acknowledging the authority of the NS and challenging it. The following statement summarises the reliance on NSs, which seems to be the dominant perspective.

Extract 28. "I LOVED to be with Natives"

S3/i1: and i would say as you've mentioned before there is a big difference if you (.) that i would say is a really important point- that was a really important point (.) e:r if you if you're in touch with natives like australia or ireland or the states then you practice a lot because you LEARN so much how they USE the words how they- not just new vocabulary when you use a word when you don't use it like differences ah (.) you can't you can't see you can't look up in a dictionary when you use this word? you just see it and you use it in a situation? and if you are in a situation with natives then it's a big benefit =

S0: = mhm =

S3: = a really great benefit.

S0: but you did have like you kind of

S3: i stayed in touch with- i LOVED to be with natives i went them for a three-day-trip or something

S3 explains in Extract 28. "I LOVED to be with Natives" how important it is to talk to NSs and to try to imitate them not only on the level of pronunciation but also on the level of lexis. He also points out that there are some expressions that are very hard to learn from a dictionary and that NSs will point out the differences to the NNSs. All in

all, it is “a big benefit” to talk to and learn from ENSs, which is not the case with NNSs, as the following extract shows.

Extract 29. “There was still a difference between her and the natives”

S3/i2: <5> we (have) (.) we have </5> we have one girl from er slovakia and i was really impressed by her english because she: she spent one year in california o:r utah or whatever (.) e:rm but there was still a difference between her and the natives so (.) erm e:r i would say the biggest benefit was to talk to the natives?

At the beginning of his utterance, S3 points out that he met a Slovak girl on his exchange who, having spent some time in the US, was almost native-like in her English use. Although he was “really impressed” by her use of English, he does not see her as a model. Instead, his model and teacher is the NS. The proficient NNS is not a goal to be achieved or a good teacher to learn from. S3 seems to rely completely on what NSs say about English and sees them as the only language experts. In a similar vein, speaking with a NS is sometimes considered as a gain, whereas speaking with a NNS is considered as a loss.

Extract 30. Making an effort

S15: you make an effort

S16: you make an effort first of all? you feel (ve-ve::ry) uncomfortable if you're NOT express er if you don't find the- you feel somehow- if i can't find the right term and i talk to my ENGLISH friend i always say how do you say that? i i want him to to learn me new STUFF i WANT to improve my english and i do NOT want to use basic words because i know tha:t tha:t it's actually NOT exactly what i want to say and i REALLY want to to get the point i really want to erm put an EFFORT to it so you make an effort when it comes to pronunciation AND when it comes to vocabulary but if you talk to somebody who is AS bad as you are or even even WORSE the:n a:h your english- you automatically don't care about it if you use the right grammar if you pronounce something WRONG

S15: exactly and and especially you make an effort with your accent

S16: yeah

S15: you try to =

S16: = yeah =

S15: = you try to speak PROPER english and not to no to like whatever =

S16: = GERMAN english =

S15: = <ipa> slɒbi{sloppy} </ipa> english

S15 and S16 agree that talking to NNSs is a loss because efficiency and not correctness or adherence to NS norms comes first in the NNS-NNS communicative situation. S16 argues that she pays much more attention to grammar, pronunciation, and the correct use of words when talking to a NS and that she also asks the NS for help if she does not know a word. In a NNS-NNS situation, she would describe this word, or maybe use it in another language, but most probably she would not find the right English word to express her thoughts.

The fact that it is sometimes hard to find the right word to express thoughts in a foreign

language is also brought up in interview 2 (cf. e.g. Extract 25. “Cover vs. blanket”). The participants claim that NSs of any language can always find the right word. This seems to me to be more connected to the ideology that a NS knows everything than to reality. Of course, a speaker often has a wider repertoire in their L1 than in their other languages, but the repertoire can never be complete. The same speakers who claimed that it is hard to find foreign language words and that in these situations (only) NSs can help, use code-switching into English frequently (and maybe unconsciously) when talking German to me and not finding the right word to express what they want to say.[35] Expressing the right nuances seems to be connected to knowing how to exploit the linguistic repertoire creatively and not to having the knowledge of an ideal NS in a language.

Coming back to Extract 30. “Making an effort”, the speakers underline the importance of communicative efficiency in the ELF situation and recognise implicitly that this way of communication can be successful. They nevertheless prefer to ask a NS for help, to ask them to find the 'right' word. The connotations they actually express about a strategy relying on the creative exploitation of the linguistic repertoire are negative: speakers do not make the same effort to sound correct or use the right words as with NSs. Therefore, their English deteriorates. Native-like or StdE is the 'correct' way of talking and in order to talk like this, there is a need for NS teachers.

One aspect should, however, be added at this point. Most of the time, the speakers express their wish to have NS models, but what they often think of are ideal speakers of Std British English (BrE) and Std American English (AmE), or at least speakers who have a neutral accent. Therefore, what they want to learn is only a model; hardly any NS actually talks Received Pronunciation (RP) or General American (GA).[36] In other words, it is very hard to define who the right NS teacher is, as the following extracts will show.

Extract 31. “It's still native but it's something else”

S0/i5: but it's still n- like (.) or good german or saying that in english like i don't know if you go to scotland and then you speak scottish english it's STILL native?
S13: <4> mhm </4>
S12: <4> it's still native </4> but it's something else
S0: but which one- so which one (.) should you then learn at the english lesson? at school.
S12: the high level (in every language)

[35] This, again, poses interesting questions for investigation, just as the case marked in footnote 33. Perception and performance seem to diverge here, and perception seems to be influenced stronger by NS and standard ideologies than what is actually happening.

[36] Timmis (2002) study shows a similar insecurity. He argues that many students want to have a 'correct' grammar without really knowing what this is.

S12 explains to my question whether dialects of any language, or, in this case, Scottish English should be taught, that it is “still native but it's something else”. It is something else because it is not StdE, not “the high level” and should therefore not be taught at school. Only a dialect of the widely accepted standard, Scottish English cannot make it to the list of possible candidates on the school curricula. It is connected with difficulties in comprehension and divergence from the universal standard. The next extract, from a slightly later point in the same interview, confirms this assumption:

Extract 32. GA or RP

S13/i5: american english there is at least TEN different kinds =
S0: = yeah yeah yeah =
S13: so (.) either i don't know you use the <spel> c n n </spel> type of language or o- or or or the <spel> b b c </spel>
S12: the <spel> b b c </spel>
S0: so it's still kind of erm general standard that you should then learn
S13: yeah
S0: NOT the american english from the southern states
S13: no:: no no no

As S13 rightly says, there is no one single AmE variety. Instead of teaching any kind of English, he says that the accents that are broadcast on CNN and BBC (GA and RP) should be taught at school because they are StdE varieties. Anything else, like the English spoken in the American South or Scottish English in Extract 33. “It's still native but it's something else”, should not be considered in ELT. Similarly, when talking about Australians, S15 points out that it is very hard to understand them

Extract 33. “You don't see them as ENS”

S15/i6: because they actually they speak such an english that we didn't- you don't see them as english native speakers?

Australian English is so far away from the standard for S15 that it is almost not an ENL variety. For her, it is too different and diverges from the generally accepted British English (BrE) and AmE accents.

Nevertheless, this does not always mean that only speakers of the standard should be taken as teachers. Indeed, reliance on the NS is often so strong that it is still better to take a dialect speaker as a teacher than a proficient NNS. In the following passage, S16 explains that NSs are always the better teachers even if they do not speak StdE.

Extract 34. “Take the Natives”

S16/i6: yeah i think it's important to first of all that there is a good english that you teach at school and maybe you can also point out that there are many different- especially the- i realised in third grade or something that there are just different spellings when it comes to english and and english english and britain english and american english erm at that point you HAVE to decide-

at one point the school has to decide which one will you go for you know so there is a point where you have to decide but even if you go to the to the point where you say so the spelling is british or american english you can comPARE those two and expressions and with the: ACCENT i think it's also- a NEUTRAL accent is the best bu:t erm if you have the possibility that locals or that native would TEACH your class it doesn't matter if they have a accent because the natives will also be better than e:r than the locals which just studied english. so i think a NEUTRAL english in general would be better but if there ARE natives available take the natives because it's it's it's much better

Summed up, S16's argument shows that the NS is usually seen as more authentic than a NNS teacher. Just by being a NS it is possible to be a good and reliable teacher of English. She says in the beginning of the passage that a neutral accent would be the most appropriate for ELT. Schools (or teachers) should decide which standard dialect they adopt for teaching – BrE or AmE – and this is especially important for spelling conventions. Differences between individual dialects should be pointed out (as the speakers in this interview explain later on, on the level of pronunciation as well as on the level of lexis), but the teacher should try to speak StdE, which is seen as neutral. This goes exactly in line with Gal's (2006, 2010) argument that the standard is usually seen as neutral, universal, and thus better than any regional or social varieties. In this view, the standard is the unmarked variety, whilst the other varieties are marked by categories of class, gender, or region and thus not neutral.

S16 concludes, as I have shown above, by saying that a NS will always be better than a NNS teacher. If there is a choice between a NNS teacher who speaks StdE and a NS who speaks another variety, the NS should be chosen because they are always "much better" as they provide 'authentic' English. The fact that English is mostly used in international settings between NNSs is not taken into account. In most cases, EIL and ELF are still compared to ENL standards and generally seen as EFL.

However, the previous argument that not all varieties of English are 'good' enough goes hand in hand with the explicit or implicit claim that NNS speakers with a high level of proficiency *can* also be teachers. For example, S12 and S13 agree in the following passage that the level of proficiency lowers in many ELF situations where speakers with less native-like competence are present.[37]

Extract 35. A high command of English

S13: i would i would say it's actually e:r a i would say that this is something actually holding him DOWN if you don't have the right surrounding even if you're all non-native speakers i would

[37] This means, then, that S3's claim that he "*loved* to be with natives" (Extract 28.) and his preference of NSs as models over NNSs (Extract 29.) does not ipmly that NNSs cannot be teachers at all. Maybe even S3 would confirm that proficient NNSs can be teachers but his point is that the ultimate models, i.e. the models that the proficient NNS teachers also orient themselves to, are the NSs.

say it's extremely important to talk with people who are- people with a high- higher command of english
S12: of course of course =
S13: = because this really (.) pushes you in- you gain (now) on the other hand if you talk to people who have only basic english (.) then you you
S12: you won't advance
S13: no you on the contrary you go down =
S12: = you go down
S0: but high command you don't necessarily mean natives <1> but j- </1>
S13: <1> no </1> not at all not at all

The speakers are discussing whether it is better for a NNS to learn from a NS or a NNS. S12 has just pointed out that it is harder for speakers with lower competence to understand NSs because they talk much faster. To my question whether it was better to learn from NNSs, the speakers replied that it was easier to understand them, but maybe not good to make progress in English. In the above passage, S13 explains that this may even be negative because it is always important to talk to people who have a “higher command of English”. Having 'models' who are more proficient is a motivation for the speakers themselves to make an effort and to get better. Similar points are made in other interviews as well, such as Extract 30. “Making an effort”, where S15 and S16 claim, however, that they make more of an effort when talking to ENSs. Importantly, in this extract, high command does not equal nativeness; anyone can have a high command of English, no matter if they are NSs or NNSs. The speakers in this interview also have a clearer assumption of what the standard is and why it is important socially. They are very conscious about talking in the right way and having the right appearance as this is crucial in the world of business. It could be this acknowledgement that also leads them to understand that nativeness does not equal standard speech; they also complain at other passages of the interview about Viennese English and dialect speakers of languages other than English.

So far, I have shown in this chapter how far the reliance on standard language ideologies and the NS as the only reliable teacher of English go. Cogo (forthcoming) has similar results in her focus groups of 16 ENL teenagers. In her research, the participants, divided up into linguists, non-linguists, and mixed groups depending on whether they had specialisations in languages or not, were given a prompt text by from the *Guardian Weekly* (Jenkins & Seidlhofer 2001). This text specified the contexts of ELF use and some basic features of ELF. Having read the article, the participants were asked to discuss it in focus groups. Although presenting the NS perspective, Cogo's research seems to underline my results. Her participants, too, see competence in a

language as the knowledge of a set of rules which are in a way naturally given to NSs. These rules are fixed in time and given their codification, they can be referred to as 'English', 'French', 'German', or whatever language, thus reflecting an ideal of a monolingual speaker. NNSs, in contrast, are seen as deficient learners whose endeavours to be just like the monolingual NSs are a tiresome and long road to *almost* native-like perfection. If ELF is accepted as a common way of communicating in mainland Europe, this is connected with a perception of it as EFL, as less correct than ENL, and a reduced version of the standard. Thus what is seen as correct is compared to standard grammar rules and to NS use of English.

In Cogo's research, this difference between ENL and ELF (EFL) is connected to a process of otherisation and differentiation: the participants refer to themselves as the guardians of the language and to ELF speakers as 'the others'. Even though the participants in my interviews were NNSs, the same process can be found at the other end of the spectrum: the participants in my research see themselves as 'the others', as those who have to comply with the NS norms. This happens most possibly as a result to the influence of standard language ideologies that are not only connected to English but to language in general. Presented as the invariable, correct, authentic, universal, and neutral points of reference, StdE and ENSs are set in contrast with the 'bad' English the Erasmus students use among themselves. Many students claim that they want to learn the 'real' English used by NSs. This, however, seems to exclude any approach of teaching and learning a more 'realistic' English (Seidlhofer 2003b) appropriate to their use in international contexts, where the focus is not reliance on NS models, but knowing how to use the language in a multilingual and multicultural situation.

Hence I could not agree more with Cogo's (forthcoming), Jenkins' (2007) and others' (e.g. Zeiss 2010) conclusions based on their attitude studies that a change in mindsets is necessary. The most common use of English, namely its use as an international lingua franca, has detached it from its NSs. Notwithstanding, talk about ELF is still linked to the NSs just as with any other language. English, however, is not like any other language, given its deterritorialization. It has to be addressed with different means. The ideal of standard languages and their connection to nations is, as I have shown, an idealisation in Europe generally, but even more so in the case of English. Nonetheless, ENSs remain the teachers of English in the eyes of the participants in my research, just

as standard German speakers are seen as guardians of the German language.

However, these positions can be relativised when looking at the results presented in the next chapter. Indeed, as I will show, being good or competent in English is not always equaled to being just like a NS.

6.2.2 The model is not necessarily the goal

6.2.2.1 Keeping an accent

Even though the participants see NSs as models and teachers, they also think that it is not absolutely necessary to be just like a NS to be a competent speaker of English. In other words, the NS is the model, but not necessarily the ultimate goal in learning English.

Extract 36. Just make yourself understood

S0: yeah okay so d-do you think that it's actually important to TALK like a native speaker?
S5: well not TALK like a native speaker just so they understand you
S0: okay? but like would you try to: to imitate them? like their way of speaking?
S5: yeah i think you do that automatically
S4: not consciously <un> x </un> that you do that
S5: no no no
S4: you just start to copy them

For S5, knowing English cannot be equaled to talking just like a NS. However, he says that NSs are automatically the models which he wants to follow. Most probably, this is connected to the assumption that NSs speak the 'right' English. It is important to be an efficient user of the language and communicative success is connected to imitating NSs. As the discussion goes on, S4 argues, in agreement with the other speakers, that she cannot understand why anyone should not worry about keeping their accent and not try to imitate NSs. In the other interviews, apart from S12 and S13, however, there seems to be an agreement that fluency is more important than nativeness. The answers range from no interest in sounding like a NS, to not yet trying to do so and to claiming that it is just not that important.

Extract 37. “It doesn't make any difference”

S0/i3: yeah. so do you- when you talk do you try to SOUND like a native speaker? or like?
S9: i don't know (.) not really
S0: yeah not really. and WHY? or why not?
S9: it doesn't make any difference? no i don't think so?
S0: okay? do you think- do you think it's it's- why wouldn't make a erm a difference ? wha- you know when you learn a language usually people try to sound like a native speaker or not? erm that's what I would assume.

S9: in finland for example when you're learning the finnish language it's so different from (.) the english one so: i don't know when you are in school everybody is making fun of the (.) english one because everybody are trying to learn it the finnish way
S0: a:h okay?
S9: that's why a lot of finnish politicians and er i don't know ski jumpers have a really really bad english […]
S0: so they are making fun of people who try to sound like REAL english speakers?
S9: yeah i guess some are like that i don't know then it's just at some point it just comes with <spel> t v </spel> and when you have to actually use it

To S9, "it doesn't make any difference" if she tries to talk like a NS or not. Proficiency comes automatically with regular language use. Interestingly, S9 says that in Finland, it may be counterproductive to imitate NSs completely. Keeping an accent is an identity issue: those who try to be more native-like are sometimes even made fun of because most of the people try "to learn it the Finnish way". Generally, S9 seems to be a confident ELF user and also shows at another point that she likes different accents (cf. ch. 6.1.2.1).

Another example is S11's explanation, who even goes a step further when she demonstrates that she does not need to have native-like competence because she hardly ever actually gets to talk to ENSs.

Extract 38. No need to talk like a NS
S0/i4: do you think that it's actually important to TALK like a native speaker?
S11: hm no
S0: why not?
S11: because i don't live in england or in america so is- i think the people would understand me less
S0: okay?
S11: if i speak perfectly so it would not be useful
S10: i would find it arrogant from an american or an english to to WANT from me- to require me to to speak native english okay anyway i would never be able but it would be strange from them to require it er i speak it well enough to communicate with all of them but

S11 replies to the question whether it is important to talk like NSs with a clear "no": it would be counterproductive for her because the people she actually talks to (NNSs of English) would understand her less. There is just no need for her to speak "perfectly" because, as she seems to realise, other factors are more important in the situations in which she uses English. S10 adds to this that it would be "arrogant" from NSs, who are usually monolingual, to demand that NNSs speak perfect English. (Adding to that, he doubts that this would be possible.) It would not be bad to speak "perfectly" but there is no real need for any of the speakers to do so.

In a similar vein, S1 feels that there is no need to hide his accent when he is talking to other NNSs; he even thinks that for some less competent speakers it would be

uncomfortable or embarrassing if he spoke much better than they do, i.e. if he did not try to adjust his English to the ELF situation.

Extract 39. Don't hide the accent

S1/i1: no for me it's? if i talk to non-natives i just don't try to hide that i'm german i don't even try to pretend talking english without any german dialect {accent} but as SOON as you talk to a native you just want to show (.) i CAN do better (than to) speak with non-natives (.) so: to me it's not really more difficult it's just- yeah because yeah i don't want the other ones to feel not comfortable <correcting stress> comfortable </correcting stress> if i talk too good english. that was the problem WE realised when we were there

S1 can show his identity as a German speaker fully when he is talking to NNSs, while in discussions with NSs he tries to adjust his language to their level. His point here is indirectly that the importance lies on knowing how to use the language repertoire: in a situation with ENSs, it may be more appropriate to adjust to them, but in an ELF situation, it may be more appropriate to show his own identity as a German speaker of an international means of communication. Apart from that, some speakers may be shy and insecure about their English level and therefore, nativeness may be counterproductive.

Of course, even though keeping an accent or not may be irrelevant, there needs to be some kind of model to stick to in order to make intercomprehension easier.

Extract 40. The importance of a model

S16/i6: i LIKE it but i realise that e:rm it is of no IMPORTANCE because i can use the best erm english ACCENT but people who are more FLUENT and have more VOCABULARY can ANYHOW express them-m-mselves more correctly than I do but i DO think if you have a very HARD accent it's very difficult for for for the NATIVES but also because everybody('s school) tries to speak the accent of the ACTUAL language erm so you understand somebody much- it's it- if for example french people speak ENGLISH i always thought the speak FRENCH because they pronounce it the the same way as if they would speak FRENCH so when i was really tired i was like is she talking french now? or is she talking ENGLISH so it's very difficult to actually underSTAND it if you do not erm TAKE the accent of the language and it's not only in english it's also in dutch it's also in french if i would (were) in france and speak french with a a different RHYTHM er also the RHYTHM you know also in spanish there is a different rhythm so i think to actually understand it it's quite difficult

S0: yeah so you should actually just TRY to have it as a model <4> even </4> if it's not exactly the same

S16: <4> yeah </4>

S15: well you should try to have it as a model and of course but STILL it's always- you always adapt it to the people you talk to i could really say- i notice it more and more that when i talk with a (.) american guy i speak with a

S16: american accent

For S16, communicative competence is often more relevant than having a native-like accent: having the right vocabulary in order to express one's thoughts is more important than being correct according to a standard ideal. But this does not mean that there should be no standard model; indeed, there is a need for a model that outlines the

prosody and general pronunciation patterns of the language. For example, if a French speaker has a strong accent, understanding them may be tiresome for NSs and NNSs alike. Interestingly, S16 first mentions that a strong accent is difficult to understand for NSs and only then does she add that it is complicated for other speakers as well. There seems to be an underlying assumption that NNSs understand the diverse accents better than NSs but that the NS standards should be taken as a point of measurement.

S15 sums up her friend's argument by commenting, like S1 in Extract 39. “Don't hide the accent”, that the importance lies on finding the right level and accommodating to the interlocutor's English. Stressing this point repeatedly in the interview, S15/i6 concludes that “I think that's the general outcome from this interview”.

6.2.2.2 Being a successful language user

The examples given so far have focused on aspects of pronunciation, but many statements also show that nativeness is not the most important goal as far as using the language successfully is concerned. Although there is no general agreement on this point of view, the tendency seems to be that it is much harder (and less important) to reach a native-like accent than native-like competence and comprehensibility. While the speakers usually connect a good language user to high proficiency according to NS standards, the underlying factors in their opinions seem to focus on knowing how to use English appropriately in certain contexts. For example, S15 and S16 have both had working experience in diplomacy and argue that good users of English know how to apply the vocabulary of the world of diplomacy in this specific context.

Extract 41. Pronunciation vs. efficiency

S15/i6: even if you have a german accent you can have the vocabulary and everything from the the native speakers

S16: yeah

S0: which one do you think is more important

S16: I think it's more important to actually HAVE the vocabulary because there's so many languages that are so different to english er especially for example the french or the russian or the whatever and even THOUGH they have a weird accent if they know the WORDS they can exACTLY express what they WANT to say and they can say it in a correct way which is much more important than to pronounce it the right way it's not to PUT something the wrong way because you don't know the words

S15: i've experienced that during my internship at the [organisation 1] because english is well actually they have official- officially they have five working languages but english is the language which is used in informal meetings and even it's- even if it's an informal meeting it's very important which word you USE and especially russians they have a very strong accent but they speak PERFECT english =

S16: = yeah =

S15: = er grammatically and (.) vocabulary wise because for them (well) in diplomacy EVERY

WORD is important to say BUT or AND it makes such a huge difference
S0: okay you have to be exact
S15: you have to be REALLY exact and that's why the- they speak even the khazak who have a horrible accent but they =
S16: = KNOW what to say =
S15: = know exactly which word to use so that's

Even though the speakers connect proficiency to native-like competence what they describe is communicative competence: for instance, Russian or French speakers, according to S16, "have a weird accent" but they know what they want to say and how to express it. I would not conclude from this argument that the speakers have an awareness of the importance of strategies such as languaging. They rather seem to understand that different ways of using language are important in different contexts. In the world of diplomacy, the importance lies on saying *and* or *but* at the right time. But as S1 says, with NNSs he prefers to keep and show his identity as a German speaker, whereas with natives, he tries to adjust to their rules. This is best summed up by S14/i5 but also by the other participants in the same interview when they talk about the relevance of correctness in the business world.

Extract 42. What purpose is English used for?
S14/i5: then you have to make the difference between sounding like a native speaker and using the same vocabulary so there is a difference i mean between pronunciation and language in use
[…]
S14: i think because it's easier to read and listen to something than to interact so it's more likely that you're going to read (.) er i mean that's maybe cultural acquire- maybe vocabulary and language than to: interact i would say so for that reason i think it can be more easily achieved
S0: so you can be really good in a in a in english but still have an accent
S14: mhm i mean also for some (.) JOBS there are more important things so if you are translating (.) if you're <pvc> dolmetsching </pvc>
SX: <soft> <pvc> DOL <4> metsching? {interpreting}</pvc> </4> </soft>
S14: <4> you know it depends </4> it's kind of similar to what kind of knowledge you need (.)

First, S14 mentions the difference between a native-like pronunciation and communicative competence. Then, he also shows that passive language competence is easier to achieve than knowing a language actively; at another point, he also points out that many people are better in writing than in interacting. Finally, he also shows that the context of use determines how proficient a speaker has to be. An interpreter, for instance, may need other forms of language competence than someone working in another field.

As S14 is a future English teacher, it is hardly surprising that he is aware of these differences but his statement is only the best one to summarise different points of view. His colleagues S12 and S13 had a similar awareness, just like other speakers such as

S15 and S16. Therefore, I can conclude that an awareness of different uses for different purposes of the English language can be found in many cases. However, this awareness is usually not connected to acknowledging the autonomy of NNSs when it comes to using English for their purposes as a lingua franca.

The notable exceptions to relying completely on ENSs were S9 and, to a much greater extent, S10 and S11. It is in S10's and S11's interview that ELF is almost literally addressed: for S11, there is no need to talk like NSs (Extract 38. "No need to talk like a NS"). The discussion on which variety of English should be taught at school embraces an ELF perspective to a greater extent than in the other interviews, where opinions ranged from teaching British or American English, a neutral variety, or the variety the students liked more to ENL in general.

Extract 43. ENSs as a model

S0/i4: but you SHOULD teach english like the natives use it (.)
S10: yeah i think we study the camb- oxford english it is called?
[…]
S10: the target should be speak like someone from oxford maybe the accent (isn't) there but the target should be a perfect grammar and er and a particular variety of english but er we should also make it clear to the pupils that er they probably will not be able to speak it that perfectly and that the importance should be on other things (than) to study grammar grammar grammar but to communicate and also the grammar would be better after that (.) but as i said before it is not that important to speak a perfect english but the target should be
S0: mhm yeah the target should be like that yeah yeah yeah
S10: yes

For S10, RP, or what he refers to as "Oxford English" is the most neutral way of speaking and he prefers it as a model because the UK is closer to Europe than the US (the same is noted by S1/i1 and S15/i6). Similarly, S1 points out that BrE should be taken as a norm and "you just learn it but that doesn't mean that you really adopt it" (S1/i1). Even though StdE should be taken as a model in ELT, S10 would set the focus on communication, i.e. language in use, rather than grammar teaching. Earlier in the interview, he complains, just like many other participants, that the focus has always set on grammar in his language classes and not on language in use.[38] The students, then, have to be prepared in the English class to the reality of their English use, where "it is not that important to speak a perfect English" but where the focus is set on communicative efficiency.

In conclusion, my results are quite similar to research done in Prague and Szeged. The

[38] Indeed, there is an abundance of data in my interviews on what students want from ELT and what they criticise about the present state of teaching English at school. However, as this aspect was not a focus in my research, I decided not to deal with it in detail.

secondary students in this research were asked to rate NS accents and "they considered the native speakers' accent as a model" (Peckham et al. 2009:4), thus taking NSs as a point of reference. At the same time, they thought that the model was not necessarily achievable and their goal was "to achieve the competence of a speaker with a high, but understandable level of non-native English" (ibid).

6.2.3 The role of native speakers in an international context

6.2.3.1 ENS as a source of misunderstandings

NS are sometimes seen as the source of misunderstandings or at least as not participating in the international community, where the English used is different from what they are used to. While some participants thus think that it is better or easier to talk to NSs because they act as teachers, others have difficulties understanding NSs because of their talking speed, use of vocabulary, and pronunciation (cf. Peckham et al. 2009:5). The following extract precedes Extract 17. "Hail storms" immediately.

Extract 44. It is more difficult to talk to NS

S0/i4: okay so yeah when you talk to internationals it's not very important to sound like and get everything right the grammar and and
S10: would be nice but er it was never necessary
S0: yeah yeah i can understand that
S10: (and and the point is that) other NON-native speakers understand it MUCH easier than english native speakers
S0: oh really?
S10: (yeah) they have- other native speakers have MORE- have to be really- i don't know there is one word and describe it first and this happens without even thinking what the word could be it's easier to communicate with {non-native speakers}
S0: and when you talk to: erm is it the same when native speakers talk to YOU? like do you understand them- is is there any difference to non-native speakers?
S10: <un> x xx </un>
S11: yeah i don't understand native speaker really well
S0: yeah and why do you think it's like that? (.)
S11: it's their mother tongue they speak it perfectly and they speak it fast? they use <pvc> vocables {vocabulary} </pvc> that i absolutely don't know and (.) and they <un> xx x </un> the non-native speaker
S0: so do the non-natives i don't know do they co-operate more with you or why why- or is it just that they don't speak as well? or? (.)
S10: (could be.) i think the biggest problem is the vocabulary. you have much less vocabulary and the and if i don't know a word i say it maybe in german maybe they under- understand it and

For S10, it "would be nice" to get the grammar and pronunciation right when talking to internationals, but "it was never necessary".[39] There were no ENSs on his exchange

[39] Cf. S16 in Extract 40. "The importance of a model" saying that she "likes" not having an accent but

term, but his general experience has shown that NNSs have less difficulties understanding him and that this is true the other way round as well. With NNSs, he can always resort to different strategies to find meaning, such as describing what he wants to say, while the NSs usually have a much wider vocabulary (cf. S4/i2 in Extract 25. "Cover vs. blanket"). S11 explains that NSs speak English fast and use different words, a factor that S10 sees as "the biggest problem". As I have already noted, after the interview S11 even pointed out to me that the NSs should adapt their way of speaking to how internationals interact. This means, then, that NSs usually do not pay attention to whether they are in an international or a native setting. Therefore, they often do not participate fully in the international situation and are excluded from the Erasmus CofP, as I will show in what follows. The same observation is made in the research on the Erasmus CofP in Szeged.

> Both interviews and the analysis of Internet forums suggest that native speakers of English should learn (and be taught) to speak in a manner that is understood by non-native speakers. (Peckham et al. 2009:5)

The participants that Kalocsai interviewed and talked to causally also

> often referred to the NS members as a source of communication problems, not due to differences in proficiency but due to the NS not necessarily communicating well in these contexts. (2009:34)

Kalocsai's analysis shows that those ENS Erasmus students who do not cooperate and adjust their English to the international setting usually do not become members of the international Erasmus CofP(s) (ibid). Often, this process is strengthened by an unwillingness on the part of the NS to integrate into the community and

> [the NNSs] argue that due to their [the NSs'] lack of interest in community membership they purposefully segregate themselves, and maintain difference between their own language use and that of the NNSs'. (ibid, cf. ch. 6.2.3.2)

In other words, the unwillingness to integrate is not only reflected at a social level (e.g. not going to Erasmus parties) but also at a linguistic one (i.e. not accommodating their speech to the ELF situation).

Similar results are found in ELF research in general. The question about the role of NSs in a context where they are outnumbered by NNSs is a recurrent theme in ELF research as well (e.g. Jenkins 2007, Seidlhofer 2005b, Wright 2009).

---

that it is "of no importance"

> Even among scholars dealing with international developments, there has not been much readiness so far to accept ELF concepts such as the detachment of English from its NSs. In other words, ELF appears not to be seen in a positive light by large numbers of NSs and NNSs alike, including members of the expanding circle themselves, who for various reasons continue to support the traditional orientation to English in international contexts. (Jenkins 2007:7-8)

An example of such criticism is Trudgill (2005), who recognises that there are more non-native speakers of English, but still holds that the major part of communication and the provision of norms is carried out by NSs. NSs, after all, use English more frequently than NNSs, practically for all their communications. In contrast, NNSs only use it if necessary as they also have (an) other language(s) at their disposal. Trudgill also wonders whether there is ownership of a language at all and argues that "even if native speakers do not 'own' English, there is an important sense in which it stems from them, especially historically resides in them" (2005:78 qtd. in Jenkins 2007: 8). NSs, then, are the sole guardians of English because the language naturally stems from them (cf. my conclusions in ch. 6.2.1). Therefore, Trudgill does not see why NS should adapt to international encounters; after all, it is *their* language that is 'borrowed' for international communication and therefore they should be the only norm providers (Jenkins 2007:8).

Another point of criticism comes from Quirk (ctd. in Jenkins 2007 and in Seidlhofer 2005b), who holds that expanding circle speakers are EFL speakers. Therefore, standardness is a primary concern for them when they learn English. This is why only StdE should be taught for those who learn it as a foreign language (Jenkins 2007:11, Seidlhofer 2005b). These arguments, of course, are in contrast to those put forward by ELF researchers: that ELF is not a threat to ENL varieties, but rather developing independently from them. NSs may need to adjust their speech in international communication situations, where they are not the majority anymore, but rather a small minority (Jenkins 2007:11, Seidlhofer 2003b:11, Seidlhofer 2004:229).

Coming back to my results, they exemplify similar tendencies as the position of renowned linguists such as Trudgill and Quirk. Apart from being the teachers of English and a source of misunderstandings, NSs are often also an isolated group within the whole Erasmus community. I will now go on to deal with this aspect in more detail and I will conclude the chapter on the role of NS in an international context by showing that very often, NS are not present in international contexts. If they are present at all, their roles within the international community are not more vital than of any other member.

6.2.3.2 The native speakers as an isolated group

When ENSs are present on the exchange term, they often seem to form their own communities isolated from the other international students. This is not only mentioned in Kalocsai (2009:34) but also at different points in my interviews. I will try to explain why this is so in the following, but at first I want to outline the relative surprise the participants experienced regarding this phenomenon.

Extract 45. "We weren't so much in touch with English native speakers"

S15/i6: actually we weren't so much in touch with english native speakers because they were mostly americans we had- in our house we had- we got northern ireland a:nd two american girls and we actually didn't like them that was the reason and the other native speakers actually KEPT with the english native speakers were like a little ghetto of native speakers =

S16: = mhm that's true =

S15: = we had a guy from CANADA also living in our house or there were canadians? americans? and one girl from northern ireland and one scottish guy there were VERY little english people

S16: and APPARENTLY no apparently after at the very end I realised that there was a BIG american community of economic students who were THERE but they actually did the same as the: as the: SPANISH do they CROWD and they they STICK to each other =

S15: = mmm = {bidding for a turn}

S16: = and when i was- because we didn't even realise that they EXIST you know but afterwards it was like yeah they did and when i was in in in BRUSSELS for the internship it was the SAME that actually when i started to speak- because there were many students who did their masters there and actually as an intern i i i GOT to know those people obviously and there was also a HUGE community of ENGLISH natives so the english natives no matter if they are from american or england at that point erm also gather and stick to each other and it seems as if the EUROPEAN also stick together because it was like =

S15: = because what i just REMEMBER which is really absurd our NEIGHBOURS our room neighbours they were two <2> australian SISTERS

S16: <2> <shouting> that TRUE it's TRUE </shouting> </2> @@@@ how could I forget about them?

S15 starts this extract by saying that S16 and she did not have many ENS friends because they did not like most of the NSs who lived in their residence. More than that, the NSs were so isolated and apparently did not participate in the same events as the other international students that S16 did not even realise that there was a big American community in Antwerp. She made the same experience during an internship in the Belgian capital: the ENSs had their own communities there as well. So, on the one hand, there was an ENS grouping and on the other hand, there was an ELF grouping of continental Europeans (cf. Extract 46. "Different lifestyles" below). Interestingly, S15 suddenly remembers that their own neighbours were from Australia (ironically, the Australians mentioned in Extract 33. "You don't see them as ENS") but they had hardly any contact with them and at first did not even remember that they had been there.

In sum, there seems to be a "we" group of continental Europeans and a "they" group of

ENSs.[40] Three reasons are given when the issue is dealt with in the interviews: a different lifestyle, a different way of using English, and aspects of character.

First, S15 and S16/i6 connect the NSs' isolation to their being different from mainland Europeans. This argument seems to be crucial to me as it implies that, as I have just argued, there are at least two different communities: the ENL community and the ELF community within the bigger group of exchange students. The following extract exemplifies this point of view.

Extract 46. Different lifestyles

S16/i6: = and i also think that the continental europeans are more CLOSE to each other so we feel much more like a FAMILY with the spanish? and the french? as if we do with the english maybe or the north american people because er because the the: the: the general approach to LIFE of the americans is different to the european because we grew up with alcohol and cigarettes and it's BASIC stuff like that o:r when you have basic conversations that they are like okay you were REALLY allowed to that with fifteen? and i'm like yeah i mean that's normal in europe you have your freedom you fight for them so i think it's also because they- the society in especially the states is DIFFERENT to the european society (.) so they are much more excited about being on erasmus being able to DRINK and it's about DIFferent stuff than it is actually for us europeans being in a different european country i think it's also THAT approach which

S15: and it's like- I don't know GENERAL (.) lifestyle

S16: yeah

S15: is different for us

S16: VERY different

In Extract 46. “Different lifestyles”, S16 refers to continental Europeans a “family”: she feels much more connected to the French or the Spanish than to the Anglo-Saxons. In the case of the Americans for instance, coming to Europe means experiencing some kind of freedom as they can drink alcohol and smoke cigarettes, things that are just normal for anyone from Europe. Generally, American society, according to S16, is different from European society and this also leads to diverging interests and goals on their exchange. For the Europeans, the exchange is an opportunity to get to know another country, whereas for the Americans, their exchange is about experimenting for the first time with drinking, smoking and enjoying similar freedoms that they do not have back home. Summed up, their “general lifestyle” is different from continental Europeans, thus leading to an isolation based on diverging interests.

Second, just before Extract 46. “Different lifestyles”, S15 mentions the difference between ENL and ELF as an isolating factor. The diverging uses of English are also named as a reason in interview 2.

Extract 47. Different levels of English

[40] Cf. Cogo's (forthcoming) argument on otherisation, ch. 6.2.1.

S6/i2: but i've also noticed that the NATIVES stick together like english natives
S0: a:h okay?
S6: like there was i got to know people from new zealand and THEY stick together with british people and americans so: (.) i don't know
S0: and WHY would they they- like don't they like you your english? or don't they like (.) i don't know […]
S5: i think they feel more comfortable and for them it's not like the spanish people? the spanish people are not speaking english a:nd th- the english or like american people they're like like trouble like talking have a discussion their english level with people that are not natives
S0: so they are too good <2> and the spanish are too bad </2>
S5: <2> yeah yeah yeah </2> and the rest of us are in the middle @
S6: yeah yeah yeah […]
S4: it must be WEIRD when everybody tries to speak your language
S5: yeah […]
S4: it's like that's wrong that's wrong that's WRONG AH
{all speakers laugh} […]
S6: yeah because they can use like SLANG and vocabulary that a non-native would not KNOW

On S5's and S6's exchange in Amsterdam, there were NSs from very different parts of the world and they often gathered in one group. In a previous discussion, S6 had pointed out to me that she thought there was a linguistic divide between ENL and ELF users. The ENSs used a different English and did not socialise that much with the lingua franca users of the language. This is why I automatically reply to her by asking whether they did not like 'international' English. S5 then responds that they feel more comfortable in their own group, like the Spanish students, who are bad in English. For the NSs, the opposite is true: their English is too good compared to other speakers.[41] S4 agrees to this argument and adds that it must be "weird" if "everybody tries to speak your language". Importantly, she uses the phrase *tries to speak* and not simply the active verb *speaks.* In this way, she establishes a hierarchy between those who can speak the language properly (ENSs) and those who cannot (NNSs). She also underlines the divergence between the levels of proficiency and the uses of English. Finally, S6 connects the NSs' isolation to the fact that they have a bigger range of vocabulary at their disposal and that they can use colloquial ("slang") expressions the NNSs do not know. Thus, the NSs are seen as much higher above the level of (deficient) Spanish speakers, and the important argument is that "the rest of us are in the middle" where they meet and form an international community based on proficient ELF use.

Third, the aspect of character is intrinsically connected to this argument. The interview goes on in the following way immediately after Extract 47.

Extract 48. A question of character

S5/i2: but it's the same er with the- those people. if they're outgoing they don't wanna be with their

[41] This, again, ties in with results in chs. 6.1.1 and 6.2.1. The NSs are the 'good' English speakers, while the NNSs have 'bad' competence.

> peers so much they're like be with europeans or whatever to learn different cultures but (.) but the NOT so outgoing ones they are like (stay) mostly with their own people

For S5, the important factor is character: if a person is open-minded and wants to make new experiences, they will socialise more with the continental Europeans. Of course, it is much easier for ENSs to stick in their own group and not to adjust their own way of speaking to the ELF situation. But, just as with the Spanish who are open-minded and join the more proficient group of English speakers, the ENSs who want to make new experiences also make the effort to accommodate to the ELF CofPs of Erasmus students. This goes in line with Kalocsai's argument mentioned in ch. 6.2.3.1. The NSs who were not part of the Erasmus group in her research maintained this difference also on the linguistic level.

In sum, then, the division between the ENL and the ELF group seems to be founded on three criteria: first, on diverging interests and lifestyles; second, on diverging ways of English use; and finally, on the issue of character. These factors are intertwined: for example, an American who sees Europe as a prime opportunity to party and get drunk legally will not have much interest in integrating into the ELF community, unless they also want to make international encounters on a regular basis.

This does not mean that there is no mixing between the two groups, but the general tendency seems to go in two ways: ENL vs. ELF. Of course, there will be speakers who socialise in communities of practice from the ENL and the ELF group. There will also be members who will not (e.g. in the interviews, the majority of the Spanish exchange students). The important factor in these CofP formations for this thesis is that they are not only based on socio-cultural or personal factors but also on linguistic issues, namely the use of English as an L1 in contrast to the use of English as an L_n and as a lingua franca.

6.2.4 The absence of the native speaker?

Given the NSs' isolation from the rest of the international community, often they are absent from it altogether. Furthermore, often the majority of the exchange students are NNSs. For instance, S1 and S2 mention that there was only one (Australian) NS in their community of fifty-two exchange students. In interview 3, the same is the case: S7, 8, and 9 practically do not have contact with NSs during their studies in Austria. Similarly,

S10 and S11 did not meet any ENSs in Portugal and the Netherlands, which also led them to the realisation that they did (and do) not need English for native-like but for international communication. If , then, NSs often simply are not present in the international situation, or even if they are present, only as a minority, the question comes up as to what role they play in these situations. This is what I have tried to analyse in this chapter so far.

First, I have shown that standard language ideologies based on the monolingual native speaker of English still trump the adoption of an ideal that goes more towards what I have shown in the chapters on languaging, multicompetence, and the diverse nature of ELF interactions (chs. 4.3 and 6.1.3). Second, I have dealt with aspects that relativise the dominance of the NS in a way: the participants in my research seem to value communicative competence over correctness and native-like proficiency on the level of pronunciation. At the same time, they connect communicative competence with a high level of proficiency according to NS standards. These chapters have shown the dominance of the NSs as the norm providers in any kind of communicative situation. They therefore stand in contrast to this chapter (ch. 6.2.3), where I have shown that very often, NSs cause communication problems, are in isolated groups, or are simply absent from the community of exchange students.

At first sight, these two poles do not seem to be connected at all: on the one hand, there is a reliance on NS norms, but on the other hand, there is an irrelevance of such norms which is sometimes even recognised by the speakers themselves. The participants seem to find a solution to this tension by saying that the NS norms should be the models, not the goals. At the same time, the way they refer to their own English as compared to the 'correct' version ENSs are using proves that they do not embrace any kind of norm apart from the one provided by standard ideologies. This, then, would mean that the NS is not absent. Indeed, even when they are absent, their norms seem to be dominating the ELF situation.

In this chapter, I have also shown that some participants do not see native-like English as very important for them because they realise that they use English in different situations. Similarly, my analysis of the data in ch. 6.1.3 has demonstrated an awareness of processes in ELF communication and a confident (though often unconscious) use of these strategies to express identity or, simply, to achieve the purpose of interaction. The

overt attitudes of participants seem to orient towards NS norms, but their covert attitudes seem to show an emerging trend towards a realisation that there is something else than ENL.

So, the NS is still seen as a norm provider but this norm is sometimes also questioned and not always accepted as the only possibility. It is hard to make predictions towards the future, but I would argue that the importance of the NS in international settings is declining slightly. In other words, the NS is not absent yet and even in future, they may be present but their role as the sole norm provider is on the decline. Even now, the NS is often only just like any other member of the community. Many different Englishes meet in the international situation and the result is clearly not ENL, but rather ELF: a plurilingual, international means of communication that is appropriated by NNSs (and ENSs integrating into the international setting) for their own communicative purposes, or, as S16 puts it:

Extract 49. A "mixture of everything"

S16: it's so difficult because you always have so much INPUT that you have so different accents that you you get your little OWN weird british i don't know mixture of everything of british american spanish and german and whatever

6.3 Perceptions of the EU's linguistic situation

6.3.1 English vs. other languages

6.3.1.1 English as the *international language*

If we compare the status of English to that of other languages, it will usually take the win. This statement seems to be generally acknowledged, no matter if we consider arguments looking at this trend negatively (e.g. linguistic imperialism, Phillipson 1992 a.o.) or neutrally and rather positively (e.g. Brutt-Griffler 2002; de Swaan 2004; Fontenelle 1999; House 2003; Hülmbauer, Böhringer & Seidlhofer 2008; Seidlhofer, Breiteneder & Pitzl 2006).

The reason for this trend is often explained with an instrumental motivation to study English (e.g. van Parijs 2004, de Swaan 2007): as English is most likely to be the language that others speak and understand, people will choose to learn English more often than, let us say, Rumanian. In other words, English has a higher communicative

value (Q-value) or a higher value on the linguistic market. People will choose to learn English because the reason to learn a foreign language is to be able to reach as many individuals as possible (de Swaan 2007: Appendices 2 & 3). Although this may not be the only reason for the 'dominance' of English, it is the prime reason that came up in my interviews.

The participants acknowledge the status of English as the language of globalisation. For some, this means that English should be the first foreign language learnt at school. In interview 2, for example, S5 argues that English should be "the first foreign language" and the participants even consider teaching English form kindergarten on.

Extract 50. Learn English in kindergarten

S5/i2: yeah the first foreign language yeah yeah i think so

S4: i think you raise your children really bilingual or you really do the second language much later because it's- i've just heard that kids get really confused if it's not done properly- the bilingual. (.) because everybody is like so: raise them bilingual? and i mean it's a good thing but also it can really mess

S6: but i think it would be fine if kids speak like english in kindergarten <un> xx </un> and their mother tongue at home and just english at school or

S4: i think it will GO like this anyway

In the discussion preceding this extract, the participants talk about differences between the Austrian and Swedish education systems. S5 thinks that "they should do it like in Sweden" (e.g. not dub movies, teach English from an early age on, etc.) and S6 agrees with him. She points out that it may be quite hard to find a movie in Austria screened in the English original and that the availability of English in Austria is quite "poor". The two speakers agree that English should be learned as early as possible. When S4 fears that a bilingual system may "confuse" children, S6, raised bilingually, disagrees and thinks that the children would still be able to speak their mother tongue at home or outside English classes. S4 then actually agrees that the teaching of English will only grow in future.

This means that children should be prepared for English from an early age on because of its Q-value and importance on the linguistic market. This explanation was also given in discussions on why English should be taught as well as in discussions why English was used as an important language on the Erasmus term. The second aspect will be dealt with later (ch. 6.3.2), but generally English is referred to as the language of international communication.

Extract 51. English as an international language

S0/i3: ok let's ask it differently why SHOULD we t- learn english? (..)

S9: that's a good question
S7: i think english is one language which you can go in EVERY country and you er you are able to feel at home.
S8: for example the web pages are in english also and you can also do something and the: (.) songs and everything for example advertisements and you can understand (if you can speak english)
S0: yeah what do you think? why would you?
S9: well (..) i don't know […] well i think it is necessary to have a common language in for example in scientific surroundings and for some reason english is the one that has stuck already (.) and i think it's quite helpful that you actually do all the research or the research papers and stuff in one language and everybody are able to use that?

In this extract, the reasons of why to learn English clearly refer to its Q-value: it is an international language, web pages are often written in English, just like popular music or advertisements. S9 adds that English is the language of scientific communication because it is "necessary to have a common language" in order to make scientific exchange more efficient. More than that, having English makes scientific communication in a way more democratic because everybody can use it to access publications. In other words, English has the broadest communicative range and as a consequence, it is "quite helpful" to use it as a means of communication.

This does not mean that English should be the first language for everyone. For example, S11 thinks that English instruction should be made more efficient and maybe provide the basis for deepening English knowledge later on.

Extract 52. "You learn it after some time anyways"
S11/i4: yeah (.) no no i (.) i think it would be important to communicate that the school give the possibility maybe to to make it deeper but i studied many years english i think five years at school and learned three words of english and i'm not sure if my professor was able to speak english and so yeah why. so you learn it after some time anyways

S11 complains about the quality of English instruction in Italy and concludes that it would be better not to teach English at school at all and learn it after school. Some turns later, she specifies her argument.

Extract 53. "It's not so important to learn it in school"
S11/i4: but when i say that it's not so- i think it's not so important to learn it in school. it would be better at least in italy to change the system and say it's mandatory to do a year abroad between fifteen and nineteen and this would be much more useful than to sit two hours a week and hear someone that is drawing something and the present continuous is what

Here, S11 explains that English teaching in Italy is so bad that it would be more efficient to simply spend a year abroad and learn it there. The interesting thing is that she does not explicitly connect this year abroad to any NS country in particular, but only points out that this would be more efficient than listening to someone explain the present continuous twice a week or reading Shakespeare in Italian, as she mentions

earlier in the interview. S10 addresses the first issue, namely learning English on a stay abroad as well at an earlier point. He says that most of his friends used English on their Erasmus exchange and that they usually socialised with internationals. For him, English is unique in this respect.

Extract 54. Studying vs. knowing a language other than English

S10/i4: if i think a little bit i think i know no-one at least in our age who KNOWS a language who really KNOWS it from studying it. everyone who speaks another language than english knows it because he has been there or he has a girlfriend in this country or something (.) french i (studied) another ten years here

S0: yeah so then you actually learned to speak english actually IN portugal and not not in the english classes

S10: well okay

S0: well maybe it's a bit hard to say it like that

S10: english is maybe another case because you really have to learn it much and you are not as you can <un> xx </un> life no more

S11: i think i started to learn a little bit english just with him because before i (.) yeah i was not really able i had to think really much for a phrase or (.) yeah i guess there and then

English, again, is different from other languages. S10's friends all learned to communicate in other languages outside the classroom. Usually this meant that they spent some time in that country or that they had a personal motivation to learn the language. The same is true for his personal experience, as he learned Italian only when he met S11. In the beginning of their relationship, however, they spoke English together. S11 points out that it was at that point that she really started speaking English. The exact reason why English is a special case is actually unintelligible on the recording. I assume that S10 used an expression like “it is not as if you cannot use/learn it in your life anymore” but this is only an assumption on which it is hard to base any further analysis. However, what does become clear in this interview is S10's belief that English can be learnt, or at least improved, during a stay abroad, even if the stay is not in an ENS country. This, again, points to its widespread use as the language of international communication.

6.3.1.2 The local languages

Quite a different aspect in which it becomes clear that English takes the win is learning other languages, especially the local languages of the host country. Table 3 illustrates which speakers attended language classes during their stay.

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	S16
A	X	X	X				X*	X*	X	X				X		

D				X	X										X	X
NA						X					X	X	X			
A = attended; D = dropped; NA = not attended																

Table 3: Language class attendance

Altogether slightly more than half of the participants attended language classes. S7 and S8 are marked with an asterisk as they were attending classes when they were interviewed but it is not sure whether they dropped them later on or not. As S7 and S8 wanted to improve their German, I assume that they continued attending them. Nonetheless, they were mainly using English in their everyday lives and for their classes.

As for the other students, S1, S2, and S14 had to take the classes as part of their exchange. S1 and S2 would have preferred to learn Finnish in Helsinki, but they had to take Swedish classes as students of the Swedish university.

S9 pointed out that she attended a German class for one semester but did not learn more than the basics. This is interesting because the students in general seem to have a higher competence in the local languages than they acknowledge. For example, S9 and S4 say that they learned hardly any German and Danish respectively. When I enquired in more detail, however, I found out that they can read and understand the language quite well. They preferred using English because they felt more confident in using this language and because it was easier (cf. ch. 7.3 below).

S3 and S14 were the only students who said confidently that they learned the local language to a certain extent, and S14 continues doing so as his girlfriend S9 is from Finland. S3, too, still continues to learn and use Danish as much as possible.

Finally, S10 attended Portuguese classes because they were easier than all the other classes, some of which he had failed. He needed the Portuguese classes to get enough ECTS credits not to repay his scholarship. Despite this fact, he enjoyed studying Portuguese and said that instead of really revising for his other exams he did "international communication".

As for the other students, they dropped the language classes after some time because they realised that they only spoke English everywhere and that it was enough. In the case of S15 and S16, the reason was even more simple:

Extract 55. Dropping language classes

S15: for me it would have because i stopped going to the dutch classes because it was SUNNY outside my BIKE broke down and it was (.) forty-five minutes away and er i had actually started to go with the bike and actually enJOYED the ride (.) so and it was always on WEDNESDAYS and wednesdays were the big erasmus parties =

S16: = @@@@ =

S15: = so that was another reason i STOPPED going there because it took me one and a half hours to go back home =

S16: = and you couldn't get DRUNK =

S15: = yeah apart from that the class started at nine yeah and i was at home at half past ten or eleven and- yeah so- but ACTUALLY I really wanted to learn dutch and i picked this second class because i i thought okay i'm going to another country and actually i LIKE the language

S15 would have wanted to learn Dutch on her exchange and in the beginning of the extract she explains that it would have made a difference if she had stayed another term in Antwerp. She even took a second language class apart from the pre-semester crash-course, but when the weather got better and the Erasmus parties started, she preferred to stay at home rather than bike half an hour to the language class, which would have deprived her of the pre-party drinking sessions.

The reasons for S5 to drop his class were quite similar: he realised that the language courses were a good place to socialise even though he did not learn much. In addition, he found out that he did not need any other language than English. Apart from some problems when registering at the police station, which were resolved in English, he did not have any communicative difficulties even though he did not learn Dutch.

As for the participants who did not attend language classes at all (S6, S11, S12, S13), they did not even consider doing so because it was not necessary. S12 for instance pointed out that he had only chosen his host university because of the good level of English classes and that even the shopkeeper in the supermarket understood his English.[42]

All in all, the picture seems to go for English only. However, as I have shown in the previous chapters (esp. ch. 6.1.3), this is not the case. As S10 says, the situation would be quite different if the participants had decided to live in their host countries for a longer period of time.

Extract 56. "It would be enough but in a strange way"

S10/i4: it would be enough but in a strange way. i would not LIKE er i would HATE it e:r i'm sure i could survive without problems (.) at least in lisbon far away maybe not but er

S0: but in lisbon it would be fine

S10: but i would not want it

[42] Note that S10 said the same for Lisbon and S16 for Antwerp.

As S10 explains, he could survive only using English in Lisbon for a longer period of time but he would feel like a stranger. He simply would not want to feel like this. This seems to be true for the other students too. For example, S15 repeatedly expresses her regret about not having learned more Dutch. S6 mentions that it is possible to get along with the locals in English but sometimes it would be better to know Dutch, not because of misunderstandings or communicative difficulties but because it helps feeling closer to the local community. The participants also regret that they could not really use what they had learnt in their language classes as the locals usually switched to English when they started talking to them. Only the very ambitious ones, like S14 , still stuck to the local language and did not choose the easier option.

In other words, the participants in my interviews recognise the role of ELF as the prime means of international communication as a truism. But they also know that ELF is not always enough. As S10 puts it, ELF will not replace local languages and cultures.

Extract 57. ELF is not enough

S10/i4: yeah anyway if you want to learn a culture better if you're interested in something you have to ALways study that language

S10's argument is also supported by the discussion in interview 2 on the global role of English.

Extract 58. English is everywhere

S0/i2: is it is it is english more important than other languages?
S5: yeah i think so 'cause you can get along with english EVERYwhere
S6: yeah
[…]
S0: so english is like then definitely the most important.
S6: it is.
S4: if they would have started with a different language then it would have been a different language <1> but they didn't start with a different language </1>
S5: <1> but it's (.) kind of too late @@ </1>
{all speakers laugh}
[…]
S6: but there is more people speaking chinese like mandarin
S5: yeah but they're IN china. english is everywhere
S6: yeah yeah yeah it is
[…]
S0: yeah yeah and one day we're all gonna speak english i guess
S5: sweet
S0: @@@@@@ <@> or not </@>
S6: no:
S0: do you think that's gonna happen?
S6: mh mh
S4: <1> we will all speak it but we will still have our languages </1>
S5: <1> yeah why not everyone's just </1> more and more people are speaking english
S0: but do you =
S6: = but it's not gonna =
S4: = but it's not (.) like

S6: substitute
S5: no no no no no (.) no of course not. but MORE people will speak it
S4: yeah and better and better

In the beginning of Extract 58. “English is everywhere”, I summarise the previous discussion by saying that English is the most important language. The speakers agree and S4 points out that this is not because of any inherent characteristic of the English language, but rather due to extralinguistic processes. S5 confirms her argument and remarks jokingly that it is “too late” to change the situation now. Shortly afterwards, the discussion goes on with S6's statement that there are actually more mother tongue speakers of Chinese / Mandarin than of English. To this, S5 counters, again jokingly but correctly, that “they are in China” whereas English can be found all over the globe. In interview 5, S13 also argues that the significance of Chinese is growing because of China's position in the global market but S14 counters that the role of English is more widely established than the role of Chinese.

In interview 2, the discussion goes on with my remark that English will be spoken by everyone in future. The speakers disagree: S4 adds that in future, many people will know English but this will not mean that their L1s will get lost. In her view, then, English will be an additional language for everyone. This position will not be in conflict with “our languages”. It is not going to “substitute” other languages but more and more people will speak it and their English will be “better and better”.

Thus the dominance of English does not remain unquestioned. In addition, my results do not mean that no Erasmus student learns and uses the local languages at all. For example, S15 and S16 mentioned a friend of theirs who stayed a whole year in Antwerp and who learned Dutch quite well. S15 talks about a student who went to France and did not have any courses in English (which has also been my own experience), and yet another student, who attended classes offered in English in Spain and still learned the local language during his year. As I have shown, even the students who dropped or did not attend language classes learned some bits and pieces of the local languages.

Hence learning the local language also seems to depend on the host country and how long the Erasmus term lasted (one or two semesters respectively). In the 'small' or 'anglophile' countries the students are usually welcome by the international student network which organises programmes for them. As they have common interests, they stay in an “Erasmus bubble” (S4/i2). There is no real need for them to invest very much

time in learning the local language well. This is illustrated in the next extracts, where S16 complains about this process.

Extract 59. You only "learn a different language when you are forced to use it"

S16/i6: I HATE that i mean those people really IMPROVED (to) LEARN a different language when you are FORCED to use it? if the belgian people had not talked so much ENGLISH to us? we WOULD have been forced to use a bit more of DUTCH you know

S16: no but it's true because everyb- if you are FORCED if you are not HELPED by the university and if you HAVE to do your administrative stuff in the LOCAL language and nobody DOES understand english and nobody is WILLING to understand english? you- in the FIRST week when it starts you use the local language and you get much more INTERESTED into the local language and you notice that it's NECESSARY to surVIVE but for US it was from the very first moment we realised we ACtually do not NEED dutch we learn it if we WANT to learn it but it's not that you NEED it to communicate

S16's first statement is her reaction to S15's anecdote about her friend who improved his Spanish quite well while staying in Spain. The discussion then switches to France, where students are also often forced to speak the local language. This is helpful for learning or improving the language and use it on a daily basis. Although the locals in the other countries want to help, be polite, and make the conversation easier by using English, their strategy also hinders the exchange students from practicing the local language.

In her second statement, S16 argues that it is simply easier to use English because everyone understands it. She explains that there is not enough motivation to learn other languages: the language classes after the crash-course were late in the evening, the locals knew enough English to communicate, and within the international community, the language most widely used was English anyways.

All in all, for the participants English is the biggest language in the world. English is preferred over other, especially smaller languages, as many people understand and speak it. In its function as a lingua franca, English is a cross-cultural bridge-builder. This position does not seem to be in conflict with language diversity: while confirming the role of English, the participants do not express any concern about loosing "their" languages.

Their reasons for learning English, just as any other language, are often instrumental. For example, S16 explains in her interview that she would have preferred to go to Spain and improve her Spanish. In Belgium, she did not put much effort into learning Dutch as it is not a language that she needs for her CV. While S15/i6 holds that she would have needed another term in Belgium, S16/i6 says she could have learned more but "not on

Erasmus" and because she did not have the motivation to do so. Similarly, S12/i5 says that it "didn't make no sense for my studies" to learn Dutch. S11, who went to the Netherlands, claims that "no one is so interested in Dutch" because during her exchange, there were practically only internationals. Even S4/i2, who tried to learn Danish, holds that students may go to Denmark "because you want to improve your English". Even those students who are interested in the beginning in learning and practising the local language often do not find enough opportunities to do so.

My results are supported by work done in Szeged and Prague. In these studies, participants "feel that one has to acquire at least some knowledge of the local languages, too" (Peckham et al. 2009:5). Kalocsai (2009:37-38) points out that the majority of the students invest time in learning the language, but have hardly any opportunities to practice them. As in my interviews, the locals often want to be polite and switch to English or they want to practice their own foreign language skills. Peckham et al. dealt with the problematic situation where the local language should be learnt in five months of language classes in more detail, and conclude that the students were generally open to learning the local languages. Given the situation that I outlined above, the majority could not really do so successfully. Therefore,

> these attitudes must be met with resources and opportunities to actually learn these languages. If there are not sufficient opportunities to learn further languages, there is the risk that speakers of English rely solely on their English skills. (Peckham et al. 2009:5)

This also means an active 'advertising' for smaller languages, in order to give the students sufficient motivation to learn them and not just a handful of 'big' languages.

6.3.2 ELF as the language of Erasmus

The previous chapters have focused on English as an international language and its relation to other languages. The recognition of English as the language of internationalisation is connected to a view of English as the language of exchange. For the students that I have interviewed, English is the language of Erasmus. This is the case because of many different factors.

First, the use of English is generally considered more efficient than the use of any other language. As S13/i5 says, English is the "lowest common denominator". Given its

higher Q-value (cf. ch. 6.3.1), these students know that they can reach more people if they use English. Another aspect of efficiency is that it saves time: trying to speak the local language would take longer and the speakers would have to make a greater effort (S4/i2). Other languages would always exclude someone present in the ELF communicative situation where participants come from diverse linguistic backgrounds.[43] This is illustrated in the following extracts.

Extract 60. "When a foreigner came everybody switched to English"

S1/i1: ALways when a foreigner came everybody switched to english =
S0: = yeah
S1: just we saw =
S2: = yeah we tried i mean
S1: we SWITCHED somebody answered in german we said er look <8> there's </8> another one who doesn't understand so let's switch so we talked more or less all the time english

So, there seems to be a kind of unwritten law to switch to English when people are present who do not know the language spoken by the majority of the group, in this case German. This is not only considered as more efficient but the use of English is a question of politeness, as the following extract shows.

Extract 61. English is practical and polite

S3/i1: but i preferred speaking in in ENGLISH to internationals and to:: even when you're erm heaps of austrians around <un> xx </un> you can't yeah you CAN'T really- it would be impolite if you if you talk(ed) to you your FRIENDS in german while Others are listening and they don't understand it so: i think it's practical on the- first of all and then second it's polite.

Similarly, in interview 2, S4 argues that using English is a question of politeness. It is considered as rude not to switch to English when someone who does not know any other languages joins a group. As S4 explains, it is often uncomfortable to speak English to Germans but it is the logical solution in a big group of people, where it would be impolite to stick to German just because it is 'weird' for the German speakers. In the following extract, S12 expresses his embarrassment about the fact that not all students respect this rule of politeness (but, in this case, with French speakers).

Extract 62. Not using English is rude

S12/i5: the Others were embarrassed 'cause they don't understand a shit about what they're talking- they were talking. i really hated it actually and there was a group we had to do group work or something and they just start talking french or spanish with two or three others and i'm just sitting and listening and the heck what are they talking about? you know?

S12 refers to an episode in which he had to prepare group work with French students. Their English was not very good and as it was easier for them to talk French, they just

[43] In interview 1, S1 and S2 explain that this fact was used by some students to exclude others. On their exchange, there was a German student who did not like a Polish girl. Whenever she joined the group, he automatically switched to German "just to show her she's not welcome" (S1/i1).

did so. Hence they excluded all speakers of other languages, among them S12, who can 'only' speak English, German, Hungarian, and some Spanish. This brought him into an annoying situation as he felt excluded and did not know how to react.

The third reason why English is the language of these Erasmus students is related to the participants' perceived language competence in other languages. Many participants claim that their skills in other languages are not sufficient and that they are not confident in those languages (cf. chs. 6.3.1.2 and 7.3). For example, to my question whether she preferred using English to any other language, S2/i2 replied "yes of course" and added laughingly that this was the case "because it was the only language what we could use". So, apart from a practical decision, she concludes "no I don't have the choice", just as S8/i4 says that "I can use only English". Similarly, S11/i5 says that German would "not really [be] an alternative" to her even though she is studying in Austria. In the same interview, S10 explains that the Slovene students in Lisbon spoke quite good German and that they sometimes spoke German together. However, he "always spoke slightly better English then they German" and therefore "it was just easier that way".

All in all, then, the reasons why English is the language of Erasmus for these students is because it is enough to use English for the majority of their communicative purposes. However, as I have shown in ch. 6.1.3 "Language use in the Erasmus community", this is a specific use of English, namely English used as a lingua franca. In these contexts, ENS norms are rarely followed and mixing languages explicitly or implicitly (e.g. translating idioms, Pitzl 2009; or playing with the language, Kalocsai 2010) is a common phenomenon. Moreover, as the participants in my interviews pointed out, they speak English most of the time, but not all of the time. If they have friends, for instance, who speak the same L1, they will use this language in private.

The most convincing example for the overwhelming use of ELF is that all participants answered "yes" to my question "Do you think that this way of talking is part of the Erasmus/international experience?". No matter if the students saw ELF as deficient, simple, or bad, they all agreed that English was the language of Erasmus. The following extracts illustrate this point.

Extract 63. "This IS being an Erasmus student"

S1/i1: yes (.) this is not part of it but this IS being an erasmus <16> student </16>
S0: <16> a:h okay </16>

SX-3: ye:ah
S0: this is the reSULT
S1: yeah this is just <17> being an erasmus </17> student=
S0: <17> @ @@ </17>
S2: =not only erasmus for every international group. i had (a) <18> language </18> course in italian- italy=
SX-3: <18> yeah </18>
S0: =okay
S2: a:nd <L1de> ja {yes} </L1de> it was (.) the same.

For S1, using ELF is not only part of Erasmus: it is what defines Erasmus. For S2, this applies to "every international group" such as her language class in Italy. She also adds later on that the "problem" with this is that it is "simple" English but she nonetheless sees English as the international language. Another statement supporting this argument comes from interview 2.

Extract 64. "Just jump into that"

S5/i2: I think it's part of the <un> x x </un> experience thing
S0: <@> okay? </@>
S5: 'cause if you go on erasmus and only like speak like swedish or spanish people only hang out with spanish people
S0: yeah?
S5: you- is like a long vacation with some people from your country
S6: yeah with friends or something
S5: the big thing is to meet people from around the WORLD talk english? like have troubles communicate and like overcome that barrier and stuff like that so I think it's a very big part yeah.
S0: and erm how do you overcome that barrier?
S5: by talking
S0: by talking?
S5: by talking yeah yeah like by having problems and trying to solve them
S6: just JUMP into that
S5: yeah because then if you express yourself in english o:r then the other person can't understand you you have to do something to make yourself understood (to make it) work? and english is the easiest way because everyone kind of knows it

Again, English is seen as the international language and as part of being an international student in another country. Although there are some communicative difficulties in the beginning, S5 expresses the function of English as a lingua franca by saying that "the big thing is to meet people from around the world and talk English". English is used in basically every international situation and thus becomes part of going abroad because it "is the easiest way". In the following extract, S8 and S9 talk about different aspects of the use of English.

Extract 65. Different aspects of English use

S8: yes because for example all of my classmates they all speaks er speak english and not german so i think it's very important. and maybe in the streets people also can speak english so mh i think mh it's really important and it's part of part of living in a- living abroad and- definitely
S0: so usually in english you could reach- you can reach like more people? maybe?
S8: yes definitely

S0: okay okay okay okay what about you?
S9: well i think it depends in what COUNTry you go to. if you go to latin america nobody is going to speak any english probably you have to speak spanish or it's not the same situation here but if you go to be an exchange student in EUrope i think english is quite strong

For S8, ELF is part of Erasmus because most of the people she knows speak English. She can also use English with the locals. For S9, it depends on the host country how much English is spoken. While in Latin American countries, Spanish will be used more often, she believes that in Europe "English is quite strong". Quite similarly, S12/i5 holds that "you got no other chance" than talking English and S14 replies to him that English is "THE exchange language" in Europe. S16/i6, too, says that "it's the international language everybody is supposed to know" and that "it's the language in which the world communicates".

In sum, this means that my participants all associate English with internationalisation, going abroad, and talking to people from different backgrounds. As I have already argued, they see English as a 'natural' ingredient of mobility and use it confidently for their communicative purposes. In some interviews, English was seen in the context of European integration and described as the language of an integrated Europe, which will be the topic of the following chapter.

6.3.3 ELF as the language of European integration

The role of ELF in an integrated Europe emerged as a topic in interviews 4 and 5 even though it was not included explicitly in the interview guideline. First, in interview 5, S12 and S13 point to the interrelations between business and the promotion of English. S13 argues that both on a global and a European level, the role of English will be determined by the influence that the two major English-speaking countries, the UK and the US, will play. This is why he also mentions the increasing importance of Chinese. S14 counters that the role of English will not only be determined by economic factors, just like its spread has also involved political processes. He sees the future of English in Europe as the first foreign language no matter which role ENSs will play.

Extract 66. The future of English in Europe
S14/i5: but i DO think in europe it's going to be for the next- i mean it's not going to change
S0: but what if what if kind of for the <spel> e u </spel> what if the <spel> u k </spel> and ireland LEFT?
S14: still <1> i don't think it would make a difference </1> because ALL- you have all the education systems are so much into english it would be too much of an effort to actually change that or in thirty years it would be really difficult to change it
S0: <1> would it still be english? </1>

S12: and as well look at the science the language of the science is <2> english </2> ALL the papers ALL the publications are in english and they won't CHANGE 'cause all the scientists speak english
S14: <2> exactly </2>

According to S14, the position of English in Europe is so well established that it is not connected to the role ENS countries such as the UK or Ireland play within the Union. When he explains that English is taught very widely, S12, who has previously argued that "English is driven by the business", agrees and adds that English is also the lingua franca of science. In other words, English is detached from its NSs in many of its uses. Later on, I suggest that it is hard for scientists to publish internationally without any English knowledge. S14's responds that it does "not just [mean] staying within your country; you're like twenty years behind". Thus knowing English also implies being up-to-date and it is clearly an advantage.

As for interview 4, S10 saw English as the lingua franca that is needed in order to make inter-European communication successful.

Extract 67. "If Europe wants to grow together everyone has to study English"
S10/i4: if europe wants to grow together everyone has to study english that's the only possibility whether we want it or not. europe can integrate very well if- sorry- also italy spain studies everyone a good english
S0: you mean you have to have a language to integrate in?
S10: yeah
S0: okay
S10: but there are many countries that think that THEIR language is more important but that's not true even not for france- even not for french looses its importance completely and they will also have to study english it will not be the chinese everybody has to study english now
S0: do you think should we still learn also other languages?
S10: of course but the most important that you should (try at least) is english

This extract is the continuation of Extract 52. "You learn it after some time anyways". S10 concludes that English will play an increasingly important role in Europe as it will be the language of European integration. Even the notoriously 'bad English' countries France, Italy, and Spain will have to do their best to speak English. Without a language of the common European sphere, S10 does not believe that integration can be truly successful. Importantly, this does not exclude learning other languages. In S10's view, anyone can learn other languages if they want to, but English is "the most important". As the interview goes on, S10 explains that the level of English does not necessarily have to be very high.

Extract 68. Everyone has to learn English
S10/i4: simple (primitive) english should be applied at least in europe for everyone […] not only countries which WANT to do so like holland and scandinavia

S10's statement that everyone should have a basic knowledge of English and not only in those countries that are well known for their 'good' English instruction could be seen as a first step to conceptualising ELF. As many others in ch. 6.1.1 “ELF as a 'deficient' communicative tool”, he describes the English that everyone should learn as “simple”. At the same time, this also means that he does not see ENL as the ultimate norm in an integrated Europe. He believes that the importance lies on successful communication between Europeans from different backgrounds, even if this English is “simple”.

At yet another point of the interview, the question of languages other than English comes up one more time. Again, S10 does not see English as a danger for other languages.

Extract 69. English is not a danger for other languages

S10/i4: yeah it will be necessary to study english there are few people who think that it could be a danger for their home language (.) for the big languages it's sure not and even not for the little i think

So, the 'dominance' of English is not a threat to language diversity. This argument is similar to what the participants in interview 2 (Extract 58. “English is everywhere”) say: “we will still have our languages”. In other words, the participants generally do not see the role of ELF as a danger. They rather recognise that ELF is necessary to form a community of communication. They focus on efficiency and the fact that ELF is the smallest common denominator both in their choice of English as the language of the Erasmus community and in talking about English as an international language. They do not see ELF as a threat, but rather as a practical solution to communicate successfully on the international level.

7 Implications and outlook

7.1 Summary

This thesis has dealt with the role of ELF on the civic level of the EU. More specifically, it has seen ELF in the framework of European multilingualism and has analysed which role it plays in this context. As an illustration, it has analysed the perceptions of former and current exchange students from Europe (the EU member states and Croatia). It has dealt with three main research questions: first, general attitudes to ELF; second, perceptions on the role of ENSs in international contexts; and

third, what participants think about the role of English as a language of globalisation and increased Europeanisation.

On the one hand, the focus was on outlining the context in which ELF is situated in Europe both on the level of politics and ideologies about language. The second chapter, “English as a European Lingua Franca” has given an overview of the EU policy of multilingualism. It has also introduced the topic of language ideologies in Europe and has argued that language has been closely linked to nationalism and the idea of a codified standard language in the European context. These theories are an important background to the results presented in the sixth chapter. Indeed, the second and sixth chapter are strongly interrelated because the perceptions and attitudes of today's Europeans are influenced (strongly but not exclusively) by the same ideologies as the EU's multilingual policy.

In the fourth chapter, I have argued that language ideologies and actual language use interact constantly in the formation of language attitudes. This chapter has shown that reality is very often different from generally accepted ideas about language. In contrast to the ideas presented in ch. 2.2, I have introduced in chapter 4.2 the ideas of multicompetence, a dynamic view on multilingualism, and languaging, which see language competence as a creative and social process.

As for my own results (ch. 6), the attitudes of the participants in my survey go in two directions. On the one hand, the students see their use of English as deficient because it does not correspond to the norms provided in the codified version of the language (ch. 6.1.1). As NSs are seen as the sole owners of English in this perspective, ELF usage of the language cannot be but deficient. On the other hand, a more covert level shows that the participants are languaging when using English for their communicative purposes (chs. 6.1.2, 6.1.3). They report that mixing languages in ELF is successful, that the way they use English is indeed multilingual, and that they develop their own English, which is often easier to understand than the NS version (chs. 6.1.3, 6.2.3.1). In addition, they also see this way of using ELF as part of their identity as Erasmus students (ch. 6.3.2).

Concerning the second research question on the role of NSs in international contexts, the dominant view is that of the NS as the ultimate and best teacher of English (ch.6.2.1). This does not mean that NNSs cannot be teachers of English, but they cannot replace the NSs. English is treated just like any other language and its global role is not

taken into account as far as acquisition and use of the language are concerned.

Nonetheless, there seems to be an emerging recognition that ENS norms are not necessarily the most appropriate in an international context (ch. 6.2.2). NSs are often seen as model, but not as the goal at all costs. They also often form their own small communities in the local exchange student groups that the participants have lived in for half a year (ch. 6.2.3.2). ENSs are not absent from the international context, but they can be part of it if they learn to use and understand ELF in these contexts (ch. 6.2.4).

Third, English is seen as the language of mobility and internationalisation both on the European and the global level (chs. 6.3.1.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3). There is a hierarchical relationship between English and other languages (ch. 6.3.1.2), in which English is used much more frequently and confidently than any other foreign language. This, however, does not mean that English takes it all. Indeed, the participants have repeatedly pointed out that local language diversity is not likely to vanish because speakers are connected strongly to their L1s. ELF is seen as a means of international communication, while other languages do not lose their value and communicative potential at the local level.

7.2 Implications

My survey includes the perceptions of sixteen exchange students. These perceptions cannot be taken as empirical evidence for making general conclusions. They nonetheless seem to confirm my own personal experience and results from other studies. The interesting point is that the participants come from and have gone to different regions in Europe. Despite this diversity, they reported very similar stories and their statements could sometimes almost literally be compared to opinions in the Prague and Szeged studies. There seems to be an underlying process on the level of how languages interact during the exchange experience. This does not seem to be connected to any specific place, but rather to the experience of mobility and internationality in Europe as such. This is not only an extremely challenging point of departure for further studies (cf. ch. 7.3), but allows me to draw some implications based on chapter 2 “English as a European Lingua Franca” and the results presented in chapter 6.

A very basic point in listing my implications is that ELF does not equal ENL. The English addressed explicitly or implicitly in EU documents as well as in most of my interviews is ENL/EFL but it is ELF that is a mediator in a multilingual Europe. It is

crucial to make this distinction in any kind of attempt of trying to integrate ELF in the European framework. Indeed, ELF fulfils very different functions from ENL or even EFL (Seidlhofer et al. 2006:8).

Of course, recognising the role of ELF as the European lingua franca and recommending it as the lingua franca to be learnt by all Europeans means a numeral reduction of languages. This is true if we consider languages as separate and countable units, as is the case in the present EU LP. However, in every ELF communicative situation several languages are present (the speakers' mother tongues, other languages that they may know, and English) and all these influence the way ELF is used.

So, I agree that this situation reduces the absolute number of languages spoken in big groups on an international level but I do not see the position of ELF in Europe as a threat to multilingualism. Indeed, "[i]t does not follow from the growing hegemony of English in Europe and beyond, that English will or should be the only language used" (De Swaan 2007:8-9). Far from that, ELF can act as a bridge-builder between member states on the EU level and enhance multiculturalism. To give a practical example from my own experience: if I meet my French friends, I will of course talk French to them. If I go on holidays to Hungary with my Austrian and French friends, I will use ELF with them and Hungarian with the locals. However, if my Austrian friends share a tent and are just about to build it, they will not use ELF to plan this process, but their L1 (Austrian) German. Then, this group of internationals may develop their own repertoire. For example, my French friend may notice that my Austrian friend and I sometimes use *Schnucki* ('sweety') to address each other. She may then ask (using ELF) what it means and come to use it with her French boyfriend back home. That is to say, she would learn a German word in English and use it in French. Erasmus students could name many other similar appropriations of words. This is multilingual languaging in practice and happens on a daily basis among European youth.

This means that today, as in the future, ELF has to be seen within European multilingualism and not outside it. It is one of the options to establish communication in a linguistically diverse area, but of course not the only one and not the single best solution. ELF could also open up for a more diverse range of other languages to be learnt. At present, there is a hierarchical relationship between languages depending on their Q-value. If the EU is to support 'true' multilingualism (whatever 'true'

multilingualism might be), it should give the necessary promotion to small languages and counteract the process of European multilingualism meaning “English + German / French / Spanish” and maybe “Russian + Italian”.

First, policy planners as well as teachers have to acknowledge the status that ELF has and the role that it plays throughout the EU. This may include the recommendation (*not* the obligation) to learn and actively use ELF. Recommending ELF does not mean that the benefits of multilingualism will not be cherished and that measures enhancing various forms of multilingualism or the learning of other languages should not be enhanced. I have argued above that these options should be promoted, while at the same time accepting the role of ELF. For example, there is no use in statements such as “multilingualism is essential for effective communication” and in claiming that every EU citizen can access information on the EU's institutions in their own language if in fact they cannot. The resources should rather be spent on projects focusing on receptive multilingualism, language awareness and creative language use, language classes for Erasmus students, advertising small languages, or supporting local language diversity. Moreover, local diversity is not likely to 'vanish' as most Europeans (and the participants here as an example) are strongly attached to their own languages.

Another implication goes even further than that. An important aspect for EU LP is the reconsideration of the policy “MT + >2”. The importance of foreign language knowledge cannot be denied, but it would be more important to educate citizens to be independent and confident “communicative experts” to use Hall et al.'s (2006) or “language activists” to use Phipps' (2006) terms. Trying to convince every citizen to gain active or passive competence in two languages apart from their mother tongue will not make the EU more diverse. While I argued that more promotion of small languages is needed, sometimes another question should be asked: What kind of language knowledge do EU citizens need? Some citizens may simply not need two foreign languages, but one which they can use appropriately. The Erasmus students in my survey, for instance, needed English for their temporary stays in countries most of the time and they learned the local languages out of personal interest. To put it in van Els' terms,

> [the EU's] argumentation misses the core of the problem: that it is in the interest both of the EU as a whole and of its citizens not that there should be as much foreign language knowledge as possible but that *individual citizens should have*

> *the knowledge of foreign languages that they need as individuals*. This is a matter of the communicative competence of the citizens themselves, of their mobility and their capacity for mutual understanding. (van Els 2005:73, emphasis added)

In other words, the goal to educate trilingual citizens is not appropriate in every context and for every citizen. As I have mentioned, for my Erasmus students, ELF was enough. While not claiming that it should be abandoned, the "MT + >2" policy should not be presented as the perfect solution to find a means to manage EM. Rather, it should be connected with other strategies, such as the recommendation to learn ELF, and awareness-raising that success in ELF does not depend on approximating NS proficiency. At the same time, it is necessary to give incentives to learn and use a broader range of other languages. Also, alternative strategies, such as receptive multilingualism in border regions, should be supported. This would be closer to Gal's (2010) use of the term 'polyglot modernity', where language knowledge and competence is defined in more flexible terms.

In conclusion, it is hard to say what the best solution would be in finding a means to manage EM. What is important though, as Wright argues, is that policy makers react to processes of internationalisation in general and the *de facto* adoption of ELF as the European lingua franca in particular:

> It also seems sensible that policy-makers should work with what is happening and not try to block it. A lingua franca allows contact and exchange across borders and permits the circulation of knowledge. A single lingua franca does this more effectively than a number of different languages shared by different constellations of groups. A lingua franca is of general benefit to Europeans. An intelligent policy approach would be to minimise disadvantage in the developing situation and to apply redistributive policies to iron out the inequalities caused by the development of a community of communication in this form. (2009:114)

Wright thus advocates what my own research has illustrated: that the best candidate for the role of a European lingua franca is English. The Erasmus students choose ELF because it is the smallest common denominator in their interactions. Their situation is only one example of many occurring on a daily basis in Europe. ELF is not an exclusive but only a partial solution and has to be supplemented with other strategies to manage multilingualism. This is also why ELF is an element of, and not a danger to, multilingualism.

7.3 Outlook

The present thesis leaves open many questions and therefore provides input for further research. At this point, I would outline three possible areas.

First of all, this thesis is one of the few pieces of research on how ELF is used in Erasmus communities (e.g. Kalocsai 2009, research conducted for LINEE; parts of the VOICE corpus are recorded in Erasmus settings) even though they are a prime place for ELF interactions. Connected to this type of research, the application of a CofP perspective is useful, as I have shown above and as Kalocsai and her colleagues have done in their research. However, what is missing in my own thesis is the presence in the CofP. My results are based on reflections of students and not on participant observation in the CofPs the interviewees were part of. As to my knowledge, the research done in Szeged and Prague is the only attempt at analysing empirically how ELF is actually used in Erasmus CofPs. They can provide interesting and challenging constellations of CofPs and enrich ELF research in general.

Second, connected to my first point, my thesis has shown that the participants who have had an international experience use ELF confidently and several times a week, if not even daily, even after their exchange. They live “in the presence of English” (Berns et al. 2007). Their attitudes to the position of English in Europe in general and in their lives in particular may provide interesting starting points for research and maybe even point to future developments as they are the 'next generation'. While this thesis has addressed attitudes to ELF and to the presence of English, it has not dealt in detail with differences between perception and actual production. A comparison of these two levels may be a starting point for further research.

Finally, another aspect open for analysis is the relation between English and other languages. As I have shown in this thesis, the participants very often only have basic knowledge in the local languages of their exchange for various reasons. One of them is linguistic insecurity: they are afraid that they could make mistakes, take too much time for explaining something, and so on. Therefore, they switch to English. The intriguing question is: why is this the case? Of course, many students have a better knowledge of English. At the same time, many of them go on exchange also to learn a foreign language. This is why they should do anything possible to use the local language, even if it is cumbersome in the beginning to do so. English might be 'easier', but I believe that

there may be another reason to the preference of English/ELF. It seems to be 'allowed' to make mistakes in English, as S11/i4 (Extract 10. “English is different (1)”) mentions in my interviews. Looking for the reasons why this is so could not be answered in this thesis but may be a stimulating research question at another point. Moreover, foreign language teaching should in general be reoriented to a perspective where it is 'allowed' to make mistakes. In other words, foreign language teaching (and learning) would benefit from a rethinking along the lines of languaging and a dynamic view of multilingualism. This would be a first step to promote the 'other' languages and to free the speakers of their insecurity to use the local languages and not only English because it is easier.

8 Conclusion

My thesis started with the EU's policy of multilingualism and European language ideologies. While these ideologies are still strongly present and influence any analysis of language in Europe, I believe to have shown that actual language use in ELF settings, a daily practice all around the EU and specifically in Erasmus settings, goes more in the direction of multicompetence and languaging. ELF is a prime example of multicompetence in use: its users are constantly languaging. Hence their language use represents the mobile and often temporary nature of their encounters. This, of course, does not mean that ELF cannot be more than a neutral tool for communication. As English is used increasingly for the international encounters of many especially young Europeans, it becomes part of their lives (cf. Gundacker 2010).

ELF is already the lingua franca that the European community needs for communication (cf. Wright 2000). Its role is most clearly illustrated when looking at international encounters. These could be business meetings or EU hearings on the official level. At the non-official level, these encounters happen at tourist spots, at international parties, and on student exchange. All these situations have one aspect in common: mobility.

Mobility is part of European integration and internationalisation in general. Increasing mobility also results in a need for a means of communication to use on exchange, holidays, and so on. This means is ELF in the EU member states. As I have argued in ch. 3.2, it could even be seen as part of a new European identity at least for some people. All in all, the best way to summarise this situation is to quote my participants:

“If Europe wants to grow together, everyone has to study English” (S10/i4, Extract 67.) but “we will still have our languages” (S4/i2, Extract 58.).

9 References

Adolphs, Svenja. 2005. “A longitudinal view of attitudes towards 'native speaker' English”. In Gnutzmann, Claus; Intemann, Frauke (eds.). *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 119-131.

Ammon, Ulrich. 2000. “Towards more fairness in international English. Linguistic Rights of non-native speakers?”. In Phillipson, Robert (ed.). *Rights to language. Equity, power, and education.* Mahwah, New Jersey, and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 111-116.

Anderman, Gunila; Rogers, Margaret (eds.). 2005. *In and out of English. For Better, For Worse?.* Clevedon, Buffalo and Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, Colin. 1992. *Attitudes and language.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Berns, Margie; de Boot, Kees; Hasebrink, Uwe. (eds.). 2007. *In the presence of English. Media and European youth.* New York: Springer.

Björkman, Beyza. 2008. “'So where we are?' Spoken lingua franca English at a technical university in Sweden”. *English Today* 94 (2), 35-41.

Brutt-Griffler, Janina. 2002. *World English. A Study of its Development.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, Suresh A. 2007. “The Ecology of global English”. *International multilingual research journal* 1 (2), 89-100.

Castiglione, Dario. 2007. “Introduction. Negotiating language regimes”. In Castiglione, Dario; Longman, Chris (eds.). *The language question in Europe and diverse societies. Political, legal and social perspectives.* Oxford: Hard Publishing, 1-14.

Chambers, Jack. K. 2009. *Sociolinguistic Theory. Linguistic variation and its social significance.* Revised ed. Oxford et al.: Blackwell.

Cogo, Alessia. 2008. “English as a Lingua Franca. Form follows function”. *English Today* 95 (3), 58-61.

Cogo, Alessia. 2010. “Youthful perceptions of ELF”. Paper presented at New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe, Dubrovnik, 11 to 15 April 2010.

Cogo, Alessia; Dewey, Martin. 2006. “Efficiency in ELF communication. From pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation”. *Nordic Journal of English Studies.* http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/65/69 (26 February 2010).

Cook, Vivian J. 1991. “The poverty of the stimulus argument and multicompetence”. *Second Language Research* 7 (2), 103-117.

Cook, Vivian J. 1992. “Evidence for multicompetence”. *Language Learning* 42 (4), 557-591.

Cook, Vivian. 1999. “Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching”. *TESOL Quarterly* 33:2, 185-209.

Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a Global Language.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.

de Swaan, Abram. 2004. "Endangered languages, sociolinguistics, and linguistic sentimentalism". *European Review* 12 (4), 567-580. http://www.deswaan.com/engels/from_our_archives/Endlan.htm (23 June 2010).

de Swaan, Abram. 2007. "The language Predicament of the EU since the enlargements". *Sociolinguistica* 21, 1-21.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2009. *Research methods in Applied Linguistics.* 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP.

Eckert, Penelope; McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 1992. "Think practically and look locally. Language and gender as community-based practice". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21, 461-490.

Edwards, John. 1985. *Language, society and identity.* Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell.

Europa Press Releases. 2006. "Erasmus @ 20. The Commission launches the celebrations for the anniversary of its flagship programme". IP/06/1698, 7 December.

European Commission. 2005. "A new framework strategy for multilingualism". http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/com596_en.pdf (1 June 2010).

European Commission. 2007a. "The Bologna Process: Towards the European Higher Education Area". http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna_en. html (29 March 2009).

European Commission. 2007b. "Erasmus. Success stories". http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/erasmus/success-stories_en.pdf (4 August 2010).

European Commission. 2008a. "At a glance". http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/at-a-glance/doc1458_en.htm (30 May 2010).

European Commission. 2008b. "Erasmus – Statistics". http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/llp/erasmus/stat_en.html. (29 March 2009).

European Commission. 2008c. "EU Language Policy". http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/eu-language-policy/index-en.htm (26 March 2009).

European Commission. 2009a. "Who we are – our mission". http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/who-we-are/doc1454_en.htm (30 May 2010).

European Commission. 2009b. "Multilingualism. An asset for Europe and a shared commitment". http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.dopubRef=-//EP//TEXT +TA+ P6-TA-2009-0162+0+DOC+XML+V0//en (31 May 2010).

European Commission. 2009c. "Európai Bizottság – Dokumentumok". [European Commission – Documents.] http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/key_docs/doc3413_hu.htm (31 May 2010).

European Commission. 2009d. "Funding". http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/eu-programmes/index_en.htm (26 March 2009).

European Commission. 2009e. "Expanding Horizons in Higher Education". http://ec.europa.eu/news/culture/090216_1_en.htm (29 March 2009).

European Commission. 2010a. "Football... feverpitch... and loving the language(s)!".

http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/news/news4031_en.htm (30 May 2010).

European Commission. 2010b. "New skills for new jobs". http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/news/news4028_en.htm (30 May 2010).

European Commission. 2010c. "Piccolingo – Support across Europe for early language learning". http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/news/news3995_en.htm (30 May 2010).

European Commission. 2010d. "Erasmus – statistics". http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/doc920_en.htm (31 July 2010).

European Commission. 2010e. "Erasmus Student Mobility for Studies". http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/doc892_en.htm (31 July 2010).

European Commission. 2010f. "The Bologna Process. Towards the European Higher Education Area". http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc1290_en.htm (22 August 2010).

European Commission. 2010g. "Glossary. Lisbon Strategy". http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/lisbon_strategy_en.htm (22 August 2010).

European Union. 2000. "Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union". http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf (29 March 2009).

Eurydice. 2009. "Key data on teaching languages in Europe 2008". http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/ education/eurydice/key_data_en.php (27 June 2010).

Eurydice. 2010. "About Eurydice". http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/about_eurydice_en.php (26 August 2010).

Fernández, Óscar. 2005. "Towards European citizenship through higher education?". *European Journal of education* 40: 1, 58-68.

Firth, Alan. 1996. "The discursive accomplishment of normality. On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis". *Journal of Pragmatics* 26, 237–59, qtd. in Lesznyák 2002.

Firth, Alan. 2009. "The lingua franca factor". *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6 (2), 147-170.

Fontenelle, Thierry. 1999. "English and multilingualism in the EU". *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 47: (2), 120-132.

Francheschini, Rita (supervisor). 2009. "Thematic area C. Multilingualism and education. Research report". http://linee.info/downloads/ (6 July 2010).

Gal, Susan. 2006. "Contradictions of standard language in Europe. Implications for the study of practices and publics". *Social Anthropology* 14 (2), 163-181.

Gal, Susan. 2010. "Linguistic regimes and European diversity". Plenary lecture at New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe, Dubrovnik, 11 to 15 April 2010.

Garrett, Peter; Coupland, Nikolas; Williams, Angie. 2003. *Investigating language attitudes. Social meanings of dialect, ethinicity and performance.* Llandybïe: Dinefwr Press.

Görlach, Manfred (ed.). 2002. *English in Europe*. Oxford: OUP.

Görlach, Manfred. 2003. *English Words Abroad.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Grau, Maike. 2005. “English as a global language – What do future teachers have to say?”. In Gnutzmann, Claus; Intemann, Frauke (eds.). *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 261-274.

Gundacker, Julia. 2010. *English as a lingua franca between couples. Motivations and limitations.* Berlin: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

Hall, Joan Kelly; Cheng, An; Carlson, Matthew T. 2006. “Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of language knowledge”. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (2), 220-240.

Herdina, Philip; Jessner, Ulrike. 2002. *A dynamic model of multilingualism. Perspectives of change in Psycholinguistics.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

House, Juliane. 2002. “Developing pragmatic competence in English as a Lingua Franca”. In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua franca communication.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter, 245-267.

House, Juliane. 2003. “English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism?”. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7 (4), 556-578.

Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2007. “'You moved, aren't?' The relationship between lexicogrammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness in English as a lingua franca”. *Views* 16 (2), 3-36.

Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2010a. “A matter of reception. English as a *lingua franca* as plurilingual speaker-hearer language”. Paper presented at New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe, Dubrovnik, 11 to 15 April 2010.

Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2010b. “Trespassing recommended. A DYLAN perspective on plurilingual borderland in and through ELF”. Paper presented at New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe, Dubrovnik, 11 to 15 April 2010.

Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2010c. “The virutal and the plurilingual in ELF”. Paper presented at ELF³. Third International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca, Vienna, 22 to 25 May 2010.

Hülmbauer, Cornelia; Böhringer, Heike; Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2008. “Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF). Precursor and partner in intercultural communication”. *Synergies Europe* 3: 25-36.

Hymes, Dell. 1986 (1971). “On communicative competence.” In Pride, John (ed.). *Sociolinguistics. Selected readings*. London: Penguin Books, 269-293.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language.* Oxford: OUP.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007a. *English as a Lingua Franca. Attitude and Identity.* Oxford: OUP.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007b. “The author replies”. *TESOL Quarterly* 41, 414-415.

Jenkins, Jennifer; Modiano, Marko; Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. “Euro-English. Perspectives on an emerging variety on the mainland from Europe, from commentators in Sweden, Austria and England”. *English Today* 68: 13-19.

Jenkins, Jennifer; Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. “Bringing Europe's lingua franca into the classroom.” *The Guardian Weekly* 19 April 2001. http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2001/apr/19/languages.highereducation1

(18 July 2010).

Jenkins, Jennifer; Cogo, Alessia; Kalocsai, Karolina; Peckham, Donald W.; Sherman, Tamah; Sieglova, Dagmar. 2010. "How non-native speakers of English communicate effectively" *LINEE News* 1/2010, 9.

Johnson, Jeffrey C.; Weller, Susan C. 2001. "Elicitation techniques for interviewing". In Gubrium, Jaber F.; Holstein, James A. (eds.). *Handbook of interview research. Context and method.* Thousand Oaks, Sage, 491-514.

Jørgensen, Normann J. 2008. "Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5: 3, 161-176.

Joseph, John Earl. 2004. *Language and identity. National, ethnic, religious.* Basingstoke: Palgrava Macmillan.

Kachru, Braj B. (ed.). 1992. *The other tongue. English across cultures.* 2nd ed. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kalocsai, Karolina. 2009. "Erasmus exchange students. A behind-the-scenes view into an ELF community of practice". *Apples – Journal of Applied Linguistics Series* 3 (1), 25-49. http://apples.jyu.fi (6 July 2010).

Kalocsai, Karolina; Peckham, Donald W. 2010. "Learning through collaboration in ELF. Use and perceptions". Paper presented at New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe, Dubrovnik, 11 to 15 April 2010.

King, Russell; Ruiz-Gelices, Enric. 2003. "International student mobility and the European 'Year Abroad'. Effects on European identity and subsequent migration behaviour". *International Journal of Population Geography* 9, 229-252.

Klimpfinger, Theresa. 2005. "The role of speakers' first and other languages in English as a lingua franca talk". Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Vienna.

Klimpfinger, Theresa. 2007. "'Mind you, sometimes you have to mix'. The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca". *Views* 16 (2), 36-61.

Kupper, Sabine. 2007. *Anglizismen in deutschen Werbeanzeigen: Eine empirische Studie zur stilistischen und ökonomischen Motivation von Anglizismen.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Lesznyák, Ágnes. 2002. "From chaos to the smallest common denominator. Topic management in English lingua franca communication". In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua franca communication.* Frankfurt am Main et al.: Peter Lang, 163-194.

Lichtkoppler, Julia. 2007. "Language policy and use in the EU. The case of English". Unpublished MA thesis, University of Vienna.

Lüdi, Georges. 2002. "Braucht Europa eine Lingua Franca?". *Basler Schriften zur europäischen Integration* 60: 7-29.

Lüdi, Georges. 2006. "De la compétence linguistique au répertoire plurilingue." *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée* 84, 173-189.

Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca. Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Meierkord, Christiane. 2002. "'Language stripped bare' or 'linguistic masala'? Culture in lingua

franca conversation". In Meierkord, Christiane; Knapp, Karlfried (eds.). *Lingua franca communication.* Frankfurt am Main et al.: Niemeyer, 109-133.

Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2006. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Milroy, James. 1999. "The consequences of standardisation in descriptive linguistics". In Bex, Tony; Watts, Richard J. (eds.). *Standard English. The widening debate.* London: Routledge, 16-39.

Modiano, Marko. 2007. "Euro-English from a 'deficit lingustics' perspective?". Review article on Mollin 2006. *World Englishes* 26: 525-533.

Mollin, Sandra. 2006. *Euro English. Assessing Variety Status.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Morgan, David L. 2001. "Focus group interviewing". In Gubrium, Jaber F.; Holstein, James A. (eds.). *Handbook of interview research. Context and method.* Thousand Oaks, Sage, 141-160.

Niedzielski, Nancy A.; Preston, Dennis R. 2000. *Folk linguistics*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Patton, M. Q. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage. Ctd. in Dörnyei (2009: 137-138).

Peckham, Donald W. 2009. "Comment by the Work Package Leader". *LINEE News* 2/2010, 5.

Peckham, Donald W.; Kalocsai, Karolina; Kovács, Emőke; Sherman, Tamah. 2009. "English as a Lingua Franca can promote learning of other languages". *LINEE News* 2/2010, 4-5.

Peckham, Donald W.; Kalocsai, Karolina; Kovács, Emőke; Sherman, Tamah. Forthcoming. "English and multilingualism, or English only in a multilingual Europe?". Draft copy to appear in Werlen, Iwar (ed.). *Linguistic diversity in the European Union. First findings of LINEE.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: OUP.

Phillipson, Robert. 2003. *English-only Europe? Challenging language policy.* London: Routledge.

Phillipson, Robert. 2007. "English, no longer a foreign language in Europe?". In Cummins, Jim; Davison, Chris (eds.). *International Handbook of English Language Teaching.* New York, Springer, 123-136.

Phillipson, Robert. 2008. "*Lingua franca* or *lingua frankensteinia*? English in European integration and globalisation". *World Englishes* 27 (2), 250-267.

Phipps, Alison. 2006. *Learning the arts of linguistic survival. Languaging, tourism, life.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pitzl, Marie-Luise. 2009. "'We should not wake up any dogs': Idiom and metaphor in ELF". In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 298-322.

Pölzl, Ulrike. 2005. "Exploring the third space. Negotiating culture in English as a lingua franca". Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Vienna.

Promodromou, Luke. 2007. “A Reader responds to J. Jenkins' 'Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca'”. *TESOL Quarterly* 41, 409-413.

Saraceni, Mario. 2008. “English as a lingua franca. Between form and function”. *English today* 94 (2), 20-26.

Schjerve-Rindler, Roswitha. 2006/07. “Französisch als nationale und internationale Sprache”. Notes based on a lecture course held at the University of Vienna. Winter term 2006/07.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. “Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca”. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11 (2), 133-158.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2003a. “English for Europe, or European English?”. In Ahrens, Rüdiger. *Europäische Sprachenpolitik. European Language Policy.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 123-138.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2003b. “A concept of 'international English' and related issues. From 'real English' to 'realistic English'?”. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2004. “Research perspectives on teaching English as a Lingua Franca”. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005a. “English as a lingua franca”. *ELF Journal* 59 (4), 339-340.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005b. “Standard future or half-baked quackery? Descriptive and pedagogic bearings on the globalisation of English”. In: Gnutzmann, Claus; Intemann, Frauke (eds.). *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 159-173.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2007. “Common property. English as a lingua franca in Europe”. In Cummins, Jim; Davison, Chris (eds.). *International handbook of English language teaching. Part 1.* New York: Springer, 137-154.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2008. “Anglo-Saxon and Other Attitudes”. Notes based on a practical course held at the University of Vienna, summer term 2008.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2010a. “Multilingual communities in contact. Conceptual implications and linguistic consequences”. Paper presented at New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe, Dubrovnik, 11 to 15 April 2010.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2010b. “Lingua Franca English – the European context”. in Kirkpatrick, Andy (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes.* London*:* Routledge, 355-371.

Seidlhofer, Barbara; Breiteneder, Angelika; Pitzl, Marie-Luise. 2006. “English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for Applied Linguistics”. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26, 3-34.

Seidlhofer, Barbara; Widdowson, Henry G. 2003. “House work and student work. A study in cross-cultural understanding”. *Übersetzen, Interkulturelle Kommunikation, Spracherwerb und Sprachvermittlung—das Leben mit mehreren Sprachen. Festschrift für Juliane House zum 60. Geburtstag. Zeitschrift für interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht.* 8: 115-127. http://www.ualberta.ca/~german/ejournal/ Seidlhofer&Widdowson.pdf (12

March 2009).

Sherman, Tamah; Bozić, Senka; Studer, Patrick; Jenkins, Jennifer. 2009. "Position paper on European level". http://linee.info/downloads (6 July 2010).

Spichtinger, Daniel. 2000. "The spread of English and its appropriation". Unpublished MA thesis, University of Vienna.

Spitzmüller, Jürgen. 2007. "Staking the Claims of Identity: Purism, Linguistics and the Media in Post-1990 Germany". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11 (2), 261-285.

Thije, Jan D. ten (ed.). 2007. *Receptive multilingualism. Linguistic analyses, language policies and didactic concepts.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Timmis, Ivor. 2002. "Native speaker norms and international English: a classroom view". *ELT Journal* 56, 240-249.

Trudgill, Peter. 2005. "Native-speaker segmental phonological models and the ELF core". In Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, Katarzyna; Przedlacka, Joanna (eds.). *English Pronunciation Models: A Changing Scene.* Peter Lang, 77-100.

van Els, Theo. 2005. "Multilingualism in the European Union". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15 (3), 263-281.

van Parijs, Philippe. 2004. "Europe's linguistic challenge". *European Journal of Sociology* 45 (1), 113-154.

van Parijs, Philippe. 2007. "Tackling the Anglophones' free ride. Fair linguistic cooperation with a global lingua franca". In Carli, Augusto; Ammon, Ulrich (eds.). *Linguistic inequality in the scientific community today.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 72-86.

Vlaeminck, Sylvia. 2003. "A European strategy for linguistic diversity and language learning". In Ahrens, Rüdiger (ed.). *Europäische Sprachenpolitik. European language policy.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 33-43.

VOICE. 2010. "English as a lingua franca. FAQ." http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/faq#elf (29 June 2010).

Warren, Carol A. B. 2001. "Qualitative interviewing." In Gubrium, Jaber F.; Holstein, James A. (eds.). *Handbook of interview research. Context and method.* Thousand Oaks, Sage, 83-103.

Widdowson, Henry G. 1994. "The ownership of English". *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 377-89.

Widdowson, Henry G. 2003. *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching.* Oxford: OUP.

Widdowson, Henry G. 2010. "Terms and conditions of inquiry". Paper presented at New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe, Dubrovnik, 11 to 15 April 2010.

Weber, Peter J. 2005. "Vom Nutzen oder Unnutzen eine Sprache zu sprechen – die Relativität der Sprachökonomie". In: Ammon, Ulrich; Mattheier, Klaus J.; Nelde, Peter H. (eds.). *Wirtschaft und Sprache. Sociolinguistica* 19, 155 – 167.

Zeiss, Nadine. 2010. "English as a European lingua franca. Changing attitudes in an inter-connected world". Unpublished MA thesis, University of Vienna. http://othes.univie.ac.at/8578/ (17 June 2010). Published as:

Zeiss, Nadine. 2010. *English as a European lingua franca. Changing attitudes in an interconnected world.* Berlin: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

10 Appendix

10.1 Interview guideline

Research project: the perceptions and attitudes of ELF speakers concerning the multicultural nature of their communicative situations and the norms of NS in such situations. Criteria for "eligibility": participation in an Erasmus/exchange term/international degree as a NNS in a European (preferably EU) NNS country for at least three months (= minimal Erasmus period), not a student of English, age 20-25 (max. +/- 2 years).

Research Questions:

- What do these speakers think about the ELF and its multicultural nature?
- What differences do they see in their communicative situations as opposed to NS communicative situations? What do they think about the role of the NS and NS norms in the ELF communicative situation?
- What do their attitudes mean for the EU's linguistic situation? What role does ELF play in the context of EU multilingualism?

Thematic fields:

- the nature & function of ELF communicative situations
- interaction between NNS-NNS vs. NNS-NS
- NS norms

Sub-topics:

1. ELF as a means of communication (domains)
2. ELF as a means of communication (advantages and disadvantages)
3. ELF vs. other languages
4. NNS-NNS communication in ELF
5. NS norms and standard English in an international context

Information about the participant – Questionnaire

- How old are you?
- What is your mother tongue?
- Do you speak any foreign languages? To what degree? (from 1 to 6)
- What are you studying?
- Have you participated in an Erasmus or similar kind of exchange programme?
- Where, when, for how long?

"Warm up": grand tour question

- What did you like most/least about being an Erasmus/exchange student?
- What has been difficult?
- What has been surprising?

1- ELF as a means of communication (domains)

ALWAYS ASK FOR REASONS AND EXAMPLES

- What role does English play in your life in general?
- How often do you use English in daily life?
- What situations do you usually use English in?

- In which situations did you use English during your studies abroad?

2- ELF as a means of communication (advantages and disadvantages)

ALWAYS ASK FOR REASONS AND EXAMPLES

- During your exchange, did you prefer the use of English as compared to other languages?
- Can you think of a situation where using English was an advantage?
- Can you think of a situation where using English was a disadvantage?

3- ELF vs. other languages

ALWAYS ASK FOR REASONS AND EXAMPLES

- Did you use English with the locals in [country/city]? Was English enough to manage daily life?
- What language(s) apart from English did you use in [country/city]?
- Did you learn the host country's language?
- (Do you think your or any speakers' first language influences their English use? If so, does it influence communication?)[44]
- (What language(s) do you think someone from Austria should learn? Is it important to be multilingual?)

4- NNS-NNS communication in ELF

ALWAYS ASK FOR REASONS AND EXAMPLES

- If you remember the way you talk(ed) as an international student, what do you think were (are) the differences to the English you learned at school?
- Has your perception of English changed ever since you left school? In general, do you think your use of English has changed over your exchange/studies? How?
- Do you think this way of talking is part of the Erasmus/international experience? What do you like about it? What do you dislike about it?
- (What kinds of accents did (do) you (not) like? Did (Do) you prefer talking to any special NNS nationality?)

5- NS norms and Standard English in an international/EU context

ALWAYS ASK FOR REASONS AND EXAMPLES

- How do you feel when you are talking to a NS compared to talking to a NNS? Are there any differences? If so, what?
- Why is it (not) important to try to talk like a NS?
  - Is it possible to sound just like a NS?
  - Is it possible to communicate just as effectively as a NS?
- Which variety of English do you feel is most appropriate for a European NNS? / Which variety of English should Europeans learn?

[44] Questions in brackets were optional, i.e. only asked when the other questions did not provide enough information.

10.2 Questionnaire for participants

Dear participant,
thank you for taking part in my interview. As a Linguistics student at the University of Vienna, I am currently writing my final thesis. It focuses on the role of English as the language of Erasmus and/or international students who are not native speakers of the language. I am dealing with questions such as how Erasmus students use the language and what their general perception and attitudes towards the language are. I am also addressing the question of the role of English in a multilingual Europe.
Our interview will consist of two parts. First, I would like to ask you to fill in this short questionnaire. Second, I will ask you some questions about your studies abroad and this part will be recorded. Please note that indicating your name only serves for me to connect the two parts when I am analysing the data. Your name or any other names you mention will not be used in my thesis. The findings of the interview will be exclusively used for my diploma thesis and all your answers will be handled confidentially and anonymously.
Thank you very much for your participation!

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this short questionnaire is to get some general information about your background quickly. As you will see, the questions concern your age, mother tongue, foreign language knowledge, field of study, and stays abroad.

- What is your first name?
- How old are you?
- What is (are) your mother tongue(s)?
- Do you speak any foreign languages?
    - If yes, which?
    - To what degree? (Between 1 = basic, 6 = almost like a native speaker)

    1 2 3 4 5 6

- What are you studying?
- Have you participated in an Erasmus or similar kind of exchange programme or have you done an international degree?
    - Where?
    - When (from... to...)?

10.3 Questionnaire results

Speaker	age	mother tongue	foreign language	level of English	field of study	exchange / international student in...
1 (/i1)	25	German (D)	Swedish, French	5	Business Administration	Finland, fall 2007/08[45]
2(/i1)	22	German	Italian, French	4	Business Administration, Art History	
3(/i1)	22	German	Danish	IELTS 7.5	Psychology, Political Science	Denmark, Aug. 2009- Jan. 2010
4 (/i2)	26	German	French, Spanish	4	Sociology, Communication Studies	Denmark (summer 2006, fall 2009/10), Canada (summer 2008)
5 (/i2)	25	Swedish	Polish	5	Criminology	The Netherlands, fall 2009/10
6 (/i2)	23	German, Polish	Spanish	5	Media Studies	
7 (/i3)	20	Croatian	German	5	Architecture	Austria (degree)
8 (/i3)	20	Hungarian	German	4	Tourism	Austria (summer 2010)
9 (/i3)	24	Finnish	Swedish, Spanish	6	Economics	Austria (summer 2008)
10 (/i4)	25	German	Italian	3	International Business Administration	Portugal (fall 2008/09)
11 (/i4)	26	Italian	German	3	Biotechnology	The Netherlands (fall 2008/09), Austria (degree)
12 (/i5)	23	Hungarian	German, Spanish	5	Investment Banking & Foreign Trade	Belgium (summer 2009), Austria (degree)
13 (/i5)	25	Bulgarian	German, Russian,	5	International Business	Israel (fall 2008/09), Austria

[45] Cells are merged wherever they apply to several participants.

			Italian		Administration	(degree)
14 (/i5)	25	German (D)	French, Finnish	6	English & History (teacher)	Ireland (2007/08), Finland (2008/09)
15 (/i6)	22	German, Spanish	French	4-5	Political Science, History	Belgium (summer 2008)
16 (/i6)	24	German	French, Spanish	5-6	Law, Political Science	

10.4 VOICE transcription conventions and my modifications for this thesis

The VOICE transcription conventions can be found and retrieved as a PDF at http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/transcription_general_information (last access 25 August 2010).

10.4.1 VOICE spelling conventions

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS [2.1]

Spelling conventions

The **VOICE Transcription Conventions** are protected by copyright. Duplication or distribution to any third party of all or any part of the material is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your personal research use in electronic or print form. Permission for any other use must be obtained from VOICE. Authorship must be acknowledged in all cases.

VOICE
Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English

Spelling conventions

Version 2.1 June 2007

1. CHARACTERS	
a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z	Only alphabetic **Roman characters** are used in the transcript. No diacritics, umlauts or non-roman characters are permitted in the running text.
2. DECAPITALIZATION	
Example: S8: so you really can <@> control my **e**nglish </@>	**No capital letters** are used except for marking emphasis (cf. mark-up conventions).
3. BRITISH SPELLING	
British spelling	British English spelling is used to represent naturally occurring ELF speech. The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (**OALD**), **7th edition**, is used as the primary source of reference. If an entry gives more than one spelling variant of a word, the first variant is chosen. If there are two separate entries for British and American spelling, the British entry is selected.
4. SPELLING EXCEPTIONS	
cent**er**, theat**er** behavi**or**, col**or**, fav**or**, lab**or**, neighb**or** defen**se**, offen**se** dis**k** progra**m** travel (-l-: trave**l**ed, trave**l**er, trave**l**ing)	The 12 words listed on the left **and all their derivatives** are spelled according to American English conventions (e.g. colors, colorful, colored, to color, favorite, favorable, to favor, in favor of, etc.).
Example: S2: we are NOT quite sure if it will REALLY be (.) privati**z**ed next year	In addition, **all words** which can be spelled using either an *-is* or an ***-iz*** morpheme are spelled with ***-iz*** (e.g. to emphasize, organizations, realization, recognized, etc.).
5. NON-ENGLISH WORDS	
Example: S1: <L1de> wieso **oe**sterreich? {why austria} </L1de> Example: S3: <LNfr> c'est ferme? {is it closed}	Non-English words are rendered in the standard variant of the original language (i.e. no non-standard dialect). The roman alphabet is always used, also in the case of languages like Arabic or Japanese. **No umlauts** (e.g. NOT österreich), **no diacritics**

</LNfr>	(e.g. NOT fermé) and **no non-roman characters** are permitted.
6. FULL REPRESENTATION OF WORDS	
Example: S7: the students that (.) decide freely to enter (.) this kind of master knows (.) for example that **he** can (.) at the end achieve (.) sixty credits	Although words may not be fully pronounced or may be pronounced with a foreign accent, they are generally represented in standard orthographic form. Explanation: S7 is Italian and pronounces the *he* in *he can* as /ɪ/, swallowing the initial h. Nevertheless, this is regarded as a minor instance of L1 accent and therefore represented in standard orthography (*he*).
7. FULL REPRESENTATION OF NUMBERS, TITLES & ABBREVIATIONS	
oh/zero, two, three, … one hundred, nineteen ten, eighteen twenty-seven, …	Numbers are fully spelled out as whole words. British English hyphenation rules apply.
missis (for *Mrs*), mister, miss, mis (for *Ms*), doctor, professor, …	Titles and terms of address are fully spelled out.
et cetera, saint thomas, okay,…	Forms that are usually abbreviated in writing, but spoken as complete words are fully spelled out.
8. LEXICALIZED REDUCED FORMS	
cos gonna, gotta, wanna	Lexicalized phonological reductions are limited to the four on the left. All other non-standard forms are fully spelled out (e.g. /hæftə/ = *have to*).
9. CONTRACTIONS	
i'm, there're, how's peter, running's fun, … i've, they've, it's got, we'd been, … tom'll be there, he'd go for the first, … we aren't, i won't, he doesn't, … what's it mean, where's she live, how's that sound … let's	Whenever they are uttered, all standard contractions are rendered. This refers to verb contractions with *be* (*am*, *is are*), *have* (*have*, *has*, *had*), *will* and *would* as well as *not*-contractions. Additionally, *'s* is used to represent *does* when reduced and attached to a *wh*-word. It is also used to represent the pronoun *us* in the contracted form *let's*.
10. HYPHENS	
Example: S3: more than thirteen years of experience er working in (.) er (.) design and development (.) er of (1) **real-time** software (.) er for industrial (.) implications	Hyphens are used according to British English hyphenation rules. The OALD, 7th edition, is used as the primary source of reference.

Example: S2: we would allow that within er an international **cooperation** (.)	If an entry gives more than one spelling variant of a word, the first variant is chosen.
11. ACRONYMS	
Example: S10: for the development of joint programmes within the **unica** networks.	Acronyms (i.e. abbreviations spoken as one word) are transcribed like words. They are not highlighted in any way.
12. DISCOURSE MARKERS	
	All discourse markers are represented in orthography as shown below. The lists provided are closed lists. The items in the lists are standardized and may not represent the exact sound patterns of the actual discourse markers uttered.
yes, yeah, yah okay, okey-dokey mhm, hm aha, uhu	Backchannels and positive minimal feedback (closed sound-acknowledgement token) (open sound-acknowledgement token)
no n-n, uh-uh	Negative minimal feedback
er, erm	**Hesitation**/filler
huh	tag-question
yay, yipee, whoohoo, mm:	**Exclamations** joy/enthusiasm
haeh	questioning/doubt/disbelief
a:h, o:h, wow, poah	astonishment/surprise
oops	apology
ooph	exhaustion
ts, pf	disregard/dismissal/contempt
ouch, ow	pain
sh, psh	requesting silence
oh-oh:, u:h	anticipating trouble
ur	disapproval/disgust
oow	pity, disappointment
Example: S3: <L1ja> **he:** </L1ja> Example: SX-m: <L1de> **ach ja {oh yes}** </L1de>	What are clearly L1-specific discourse markers are marked as foreign words. Due to the wide range of these phenomena in different languages, the L1-list is open-ended. A translation is added whenever this is possible.

For a detailed discussion of specific aspects of the transcription conventions cf. Breiteneder, Pitzl, Majewski, Klimpfinger. (2006). "VOICE recording – Methodological challenges in the compilation of a corpus of spoken ELF". *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5/2, 161-188.

10.4.2 VOICE mark-up conventions

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS [2.1]

Mark-up conventionss

The **VOICE Transcription Conventions** are protected by copyright. Duplication or distribution to any third party of all or any part of the material is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your personal research use in electronic or print form. Permission for any other use must be obtained from VOICE. Authorship must be acknowledged in all cases.

VOICE
Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English

Mark-up conventions

Version 2.1 June 2007

1. SPEAKER IDS	
S1: S2: …	Speakers are generally numbered in the order they first speak. The speaker ID is given at the beginning of each turn.
SS:	Utterances assigned to more than one speaker (e.g. an audience), spoken either in unison or staggered, are marked with a collective speaker ID **SS**.
SX:	Utterances that cannot be assigned to a particular speaker are marked **SX**.
SX-f: SX-m:	Utterances that cannot be assigned to a particular speaker, but where the gender can be identified, are marked **SX-f** or **SX-m**.
SX-1: SX-2: …	If it is likely but not certain that a particular speaker produced the utterance in question, this is marked **SX-1**, **SX-2**, etc.
2. INTONATION	
Example: S1: that's what my next er slide**?** does	Words spoken with rising intonation are followed by a question mark "**?**" .
Example: S7: that's point two**.** absolutely yes**.**	Words spoken with falling intonation are followed by a full stop "**.**" .
3. EMPHASIS	
Example: S7: er internationalization is a very IMPORTANT issue Example: S3: toMORrow we have to work on the presentation already	If a speaker gives a syllable, word or phrase particular prominence, this is written in capital letters.
4. PAUSES	
Example: SX-f: because they all give me different **(.)** different **(.)** points of view	Every brief pause in speech (up to a good half second) is marked with a full stop in parentheses.
Example:	Longer pauses are timed to the nearest

S1: aha **(2)** so finally arrival on monday evening is still valid	second and marked with the number of seconds in parentheses, e.g. (1) = 1 second, (3) = 3 seconds
5. OVERLAPS	
Example: S1: it is your best **<1> case </1>** scenario (.) S2: **<1> yeah </1>** S1: okay	Whenever two or more utterances happen at the same time, the overlaps are marked with numbered tags: **<1> </1>**, **<2> </2>**,… Everything that is simultaneous gets the same number. All overlaps are marked in blue.
Example: S9: it it is (.) to identify **some<1>thing** </1> where (.) S3: <1> mhm </1>	All overlaps are approximate and words may be split up if appropriate. In this case, the tag is placed within the split-up word.
6. OTHER-CONTINUATION	
Example: S1: what up till (.) till twelve? S2: **yes=** S1: **=really**. so it's it's quite a lot of time.	Whenever a speaker continues, completes or supports another speaker's turn immediately (i.e. without a pause), this is marked by "=".
7. LENGTHENING	
Example: S1: you can run faster but they have much **mo:re** technique with the ball	Lengthened sounds are marked with a colon "**:**".
Example: S5: personally that's my opinion the: **er::m**	Exceptionally long sounds (i.e. approximating 2 seconds or more) are marked with a double colon "**::**".
8. REPETITION	
Example: S11: e:r i'd like to go t- t- **to to** this type of course	All repetitions of words and phrases (including self-interruptions and false starts) are transcribed.
9. WORD FRAGMENTS	
Example: S6: with a minimum of (.) of **participa-** S1: mhm S6: **-pation** from french universities to say we have er (.) a joint doctorate or a **joi-** joint master	With word fragments, a hyphen marks where a part of the word is missing.
10. LAUGHTER	
Example: S1: in denmark well who knows. **@@** S2: **<@>** yeah **</@>** **@@** that's right	All laughter and laughter-like sounds are transcribed with the **@** symbol, approximating syllable number (e.g. ha ha ha = @@@). Utterances spoken laughingly are put between **<@> </@>**

	tags.
11. UNCERTAIN TRANSCRIPTION	
Example: S3: i've a lot of very **(generous)** friends Example: SX-4: they will do whatever they want because they are a compan**(ies)**	Word fragments, words or phrases which cannot be reliably identified are put in parentheses **( )**.
12. PRONUNCIATION VARIATIONS & COINAGES	
Example: S4: i also: (.) e:r played (.) tennis e:r **<pvc> bices </pvc>** e:r we rent? went?	Striking variations on the levels of phonology, morphology and lexis as well as 'invented' words are marked **<pvc> </pvc>**.
Example: S9: how you were controlling such a thing and how you **<pvc> (avrivate) </pvc>** (it)	What you hear is represented in spelling according to general principles of English orthography. Uncertain transcription is put in parentheses **( )** .
Example: S6: what we try to explain here is the foreign direct investment growth (2) in a certain industry (.) and a certain **<pvc>** compy **{company} </pvc>**	If a corresponding existing word can be identified, this existing word is added between curly brackets **{ }**.
Example: S2: anyway i make you an a total (.) **<pvc>** summamary {summary} **<ipa>** sʌmə'mærɪ **</ipa> </pvc>** of destinations	Particularly when it comes to salient variations on the level of phonology, e.g. sound substitution or addition, a phonetic representation should be added between **<ipa> </ipa>** tags.
13. ONOMATOPOEIC NOISES	
Example: S1: it may be quite HARMLESS and at the end of the day you (.) **<ono>** dəʃ dəʃ dəʃ **</ono>** (.) somebody	When speakers produce noises in order to imitate something instead of using words, these onomatopoeic noises are rendered in IPA symbols between **<ono> </ono>** tags.
14. NON-ENGLISH SPEECH	
Example: S5: **<L1de> bei firmen </L1de>** or wherever	Utterances in a participant's first language (L1) are put between tags indicating the speaker's **L1**.
Example: S7: er this is **<LNde> die seite? (welche) </LNde>** is	Utterances in languages which are neither English nor the speaker's first language are marked **LN** with the language indicated.
Example: S4: it depends in in in **<LQit> roma </LQit>**	Non-English utterances where it cannot be ascertained whether the language is the speaker's first language or a foreign

	language are marked **LQ** with the language indicated.
Example: S2: erm we want to go t- to **<LNvi> xx xxx </LNvi>** island first of all	Unintelligible utterances in a participant's L1, LN or in an LQ are represented by **x's** approximating syllable number.
Example: S4: and now we do the boat trip (1) **<L1xx> xxxxx </L1xx>** S3: mhm	Utterances in a language one cannot recognize are marked **L1xx**, **LNxx** or **LQxx**.
Example: S3: <L1fr> oui un grand carre **{yes like a big square}** </L1fr> (.) i <fast> think it would </fast> be better if we put the tables a <soft> different way </soft>	If possible, translations into English are provided between curly brackets **{ }** immediately after the non-English speech.
15. SPELLING OUT	
Example: S1: and they (3) created some (1) some er (2) JARGON. do you know? the word JARGON? (.) **<spel> j a r- </spel> <spel> j a r g o n? </spel>** jargon	The **<spel> </spel>** tag is used to mark words or abbreviations which are spelled out by the speaker, i.e. words whose constituents are pronounced as individual letters.
16. SPEAKING MODES	
Example: S2: because as i explained before is that we have in the **<fast>** universities of cyprus we have **</fast>** a specific e:rm procedure <fast> </fast> <slow> </slow> <loud> </loud> <soft> </soft> <whispering> </whispering> <sighing> </sighing> <reading> </reading> <reading aloud> </reading aloud> <on phone> </on phone> <imitating> </imitating> <singing> </singing> <yawning> </yawning>	Utterances which are spoken in a particular mode (fast, soft, whispered, read, etc.) and are notably different from the speaker's normal speaking style are marked accordingly. The list of speaking modes is an open one.
17. BREATH	
Example: S1: so it's always **hh** (.) going around (2) yeah	Noticeable breathing in or out is represented by two or three **h's** (hh = relatively short; hhh= relatively long).

18. SPEAKER NOISES	
<coughs> <clears throat> <sniffs> <sneezes> <snorts> <applauds> <smacks lips> <yawns> <whistles> <swallows>	Noises produced by the current speaker are always transcribed. Noises produced by other speakers are only transcribed if they seem relevant (e.g. because they make speech unintelligible or influence the interaction). The list of speaker noises is an open one.
Example: S1: yeah <1> what </1> i think in in doctor levels S7: <1> **<clears throat>** </1>	These noises are transcribed as part of the running text and put between pointed brackets **< >.**
Example: SX-m: but you NEVER KNOW when it's popping up you never kno:w S3: **<coughs (6)>**	If it is deemed important to indicate the length of the noise (e.g. if a coughing fit disrupts the interaction), this is done by adding the number of seconds in parentheses after the descriptor.
19. NON-VERBAL FEEDBACK	
<nods> <shakes head>	Whenever information about it is available, non-verbal feedback is transcribed as part of the running text and put between pointed brackets < >.
Example: S3: but i think if you structure corporate governance appropriately you can have everything (1) S7: <soft> mhm </soft> **<nods (2)>**	If it is deemed important to indicate the length of the non-verbal feedback, this is done by adding the number of seconds in parentheses.
20. ANONYMIZATION	
	A guiding principle of VOICE is sensitivity to the appropriate extent of anonymization. As a general rule, names of people, companies, organizations, institutions, locations, etc. are replaced by aliases and these aliases are put into square brackets **[ ]**. The aliases are numbered consecutively, starting with 1.
Example: S9: that's one of the things (.) that i (1)	Whenever speakers who are involved in the interaction are addressed or referred to, their names are replaced by their respective speaker IDs. A speaker's first name is represented by

just wanted to clear out. (2) **[S13]**? Example: S6: so: (1) ei:ther MYself or mister **[S2/last]** or even boss (.) should be there every year Example: S8: so my name is **[S8]** **[S8/last]** from vienna	the plain speaker ID in square brackets **[S1]**, etc. A speaker's last name is marked **[S1/last]**, etc. If a speaker's full name is pronounced, the two tags are combined to **[S1]** **[S1/last]**, etc.
Example: S2: that division is headed by (1) **[first name3]** **[last name3]** (1)	Names of people who are not part of the ongoing interaction are substituted by **[first name1]**, etc. or **[last name1]**, etc. or a combination of both.
Example: S5: erm she is currently head of marketing (and) with the **[org2]** (1)	Companies and other organizations need to be anonymized as well. Their names are replaced by **[org1]**, etc.
Example: S1: i: i really don't wanna have a: a joint degree e:r with the university of **[place12]** (.)	Names of places, cities, countries, etc. are anonymized when this is deemed relevant in order to protect the speakers' identities and their environment. They are replaced by **[place1]**, etc.
Example: S8: he get the <L1cs> diplom {diploma} </L1cs> of **[name1]** university (.) and french university can give him also the <L1cs> diplom {diploma} </L1cs>	Other names or descriptors may be anonymized by **[name1]**, etc., as in e.g. Charles University.
Example: S3: erm i- in the **[thing1]** is very well explained. so <2> i can </2> pa- <3> er pass you this </3> th- the definitions. S4: <2> aha </2> S4: <3> okay <@> okay </@> </3>	Products or other objects may be anonymized by **[thing1]**, etc.
21. CONTEXTUAL EVENTS	
{mobile rings} {S7 enters room} {S2 points at S5} {S4 starts writing on blackboard} {S4 stops writing on blackboard} {S2 gets up and walks to blackboard (7)} {S3 pours coffee (3)} {SS reading quietly (30)} … Example:	Contextual information is added between curly brackets **{ }** only if it is relevant to the understanding of the interaction or to the interaction as such. If it is deemed important to indicate the length of the event, this can be done by adding the number of seconds in parentheses.

S3: one dollar you get (.) (at) one euro you get one dollar twenty-seven. (.) S4: right. **{S5 gets up to pour some drinks}** S3: right now at this time (3) S1: er page five is the er (4) **{S5 places some cups and glasses on the desk (4)}** S1: i think is the descritip- e:r part of what i have just explained (.)	Explanation: The pause in the conversation occurs because of the contextual event.
22. PARALLEL CONVERSATIONS	
Example: S1: four billion <spel> u s </spel> dollars. (.) S4: quite impressive (.) S1: er **<to S2>** not quite isn't it **</to S2>** (.) i understand some other countries we handle	To indicate that a speaker is addressing not the whole group but one speaker in particular, the stretch of speech is marked with (e.g.) **<to S1> </to S1>**, choosing the speaker ID of the addressee.
Example: S7: i've i've found the people very stressed SS: @@@ S7: that's (.) i don't know how many of you study here but it's VERY important to push the close the door button in that elevator. this is something i've never <3> seen in sweden </3> **{parallel conversation between S1 and S3 starts}** or anywhere else <4> but it's very important to push this button </4> SS: <3> @@@@ </3> SS: <4> @@@@@@@@@ </4> @@ S7: <5> i never even saw this button in another el- elevator </5> SS: <5> @@@@@@@@@@@ </5> **{parallel conversation between S1 and S3 ends}** @@@	Wherever two or more conversational threads emerge which are too difficult to transcribe, as a general rule only the main thread of conversation is transcribed. The threads which are not transcribed are treated like a contextual event and indicated between curly brackets **{ }**.
23. UNINTELLIGIBLE SPEECH	
Example: S4: we **<un> xxx </un>** for the <7> supreme (.) three </7> possibilities S1: <7> next yeah </7>	Unintelligible speech is represented by **x's** approximating syllable number and placed between **<un> </un>** tags.
Example: S7: obviously the the PROCESS will **<un>** x **<ipa>** θeɪŋ **</ipa> </un>** (.) w- w- will (.) will take (.) at least de- decade	If it is possible to make out some of the sounds uttered, a phonetic transcription of the x's is added between **<ipa> </ipa>** tags.
24. TRANSCRIPTION BORDERS	

<**beg** CD1_4_00:35>	The **beg**inning of the transcript is noted by indicating the CD number, the track number and the exact position of the respective track in minutes and seconds.
<**end** CD1_21_01:27>	The **end** of the transcript is noted in the same way.
<end CD1_19_01:27> **(gap 00:06:36) {multiple parallel conversations, hardly intelligible}** <beg CD1_21_02:03>	A **gap** in the **transcription** is indicated in parentheses, including its length in hh:mm:ss. Curly brackets **{ }** are used in order to specify the reasons for or the circumstances of the gap.
<end CD1_24_3:02> **(nrec 00:00:45) {change of minidisk}** <beg CD2_1_00:00>	An **interruption** in the **recording** is indicated in the same way, but abbreviated as "**nrec**" (i.e. non-recorded). The length you indicate will normally be a guess.

In addition to the regular mark-up, transcribers supplement the transcripts with Transcriber's Notes in which they provide additional contextual information and observations about other features of the interaction not accounted for in the transcript.

For a detailed discussion of specific aspects of the transcription conventions cf. Breiteneder, Pitzl, Majewski, Klimpfinger. (2006). "VOICE recording – Methodological challenges in the compilation of a corpus of spoken ELF". *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5/2, 161-188.

10.4.3 My modifications for this thesis

My changes are listed as follows:

1) Speaker IDs: followed.
2) Intonation: followed.
3) Emphasis: followed.
4) Pauses: followed to a certain extent. Pauses were not timed, but marked as brief pauses no matter how long they were. Of course, pauses may be important for the content of the utterance because they may mark, for example, hesitation. However, the length of the pauses may not be as important as marking them as such; therefore, they were only marked but not timed.
5) Overlaps: followed to a certain extent. Passages of overlapping speech were indicated but this was not always the case for discourse markers for the same reason as in 4).
6) Other-continuation: followed.
7) Lengthening: followed.
8) Repetition: followed.
9) Word fragments: followed.
10) Laughter: followed. In addition, general laughter was replaced by {all speakers laugh}.
11) Uncertain transcription: followed.
12) Pronunciation variations & coinages: followed, but variations on the level of phonology were only transcribed if they were considered as very peculiar (i.e. only in a few cases).
13) Onomatopoeic noises: followed.
14) Non-English speech: followed.
15) Spelling out: followed.
16) Speaking mode: followed.
17) Breath: followed.
18) Speaker noises: followed.
19) Non-verbal feedback: followed in a few cases where the field notes indicated such feedback.
20) Anonymization: the speakers' names or other names (of organisations and people) they mentioned were anonymized. However, city or country names were not anonymized because the meaning of sentences often depended on the city or country mentioned.
21) Contextual events: followed in a few cases where the field notes indicated such events.
22) Parallel conversations: not followed (no parallel conversations apart from one

case).

23) Unintelligible speech: partly followed (the unintelligible syllables were not always clearly discernible).

24) Transcription borders: not followed.

11 Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Diese Diplomarbeit beschäftigt sich mit der Rolle des Englischen als Lingua Franca (ELF) im Alltag der Mitgliedsstaaten der Europäischen Union (EU). Genauer gesagt sieht sie ELF im Kontext der europäischen Mehrsprachigkeit und analysiert seine Rolle in diesem Zusammenhang. Als Fallbeispiel werden die Meinungen von derzeitigen und ehemaligen Erasmusstudenten untersucht. Die Diplomarbeit basiert auf drei Forschungsfragen: erstens, auf allgemeinen Meinungen zu ELF; zweitens, auf Beobachtungen zur Rolle der englischen Muttersprachler in internationalen Kontexten; und drittens, auf Aussagen zur Position des Englischen als die Sprache der Globalisierung und Europäisierung.

Einerseits wird ein Fokus auf den Kontext gesetzt, in dem sich ELF in Europa auf politischer und sprachideologischer Ebene situiert. Das zweite Kapitel, „English as a European Lingua Franca" („ELF als europäische Lingua Franca") gibt einen Überblick über die Politik der Mehrsprachigkeit in der EU. Es bietet auch eine Einführung zur Thematik der europäischen Sprachideologien und zeigt auf, dass Sprache im europäischen Kontext seit jeher mit Nationalismus, teilweise auch Kolonialismus, und der Idee eines kodifizierten Standards verbunden ist.

Im Gegensatz dazu zeigt das vierte Kapitel, dass Sprachgebrauch in der Realität oft von diesen allgemein anerkannten Ideen über Sprache abweicht. Im Gegensatz zu den oben genannten Ideologien (Kap. 2.2), geht es im Kapitel 4.2 um die Theorien der Multikompetenz (*multicompetence*) und dem kreativen Gebrauch von Sprache (*languaging*). In diesen Theorien ist Sprache ein sozialer und kreativer Prozess, für den die Anwendung von ELF ein gutes Beispiel ist.

Dieser theoretische Hintergrund wird in den Kapiteln 3, 4 und 5 weiter ausgeführt. Sie beschäftigen sich mit dem Erasmus Austauschprogramm und *Communities of Practice* (praxisbezogene Gemeinschaften von Personen) einerseits und mit methodologischen Fragen der qualitativen Inhaltsanalyse bzw. der soziolinguistischen Einstellungsforschung andererseits.

Meine eigenen Resultate werden im sechsten Kapitel ausgeführt. Sie gehen in zwei Richtungen. Einerseits sehen die befragten Studenten ihren eigenen Englischgebrauch als minderwertig gegenüber dem Englischgebrauch von Muttersprachlern (Kap. 6.1.1).

Da englische Natives als die einzigen Urheber des Englischen angesehen werden, kann der ELF Gebrauch in dieser Ansichtsweise nur minderwertig sein. Andererseits zeigen die Teilnehmer auf einem eher subtilen Niveau, dass sie ELF kreativ für ihre kommunikativen Zwecke anwenden (Kap. 6.1.2, 6.1.3). Sie berichten, dass das Mischen von Sprachen in ELF nicht zu kommunikativen Schwierigkeiten führt, sondern vielmehr erfolgreich ist, dass ihr Englischgebrauch mehrsprachig ist, und dass sie ihre eigene Art und Weise entwickeln, das Englische zu verwenden, die vom muttersprachlichen Gebrauch abweicht und oft auch leichter verständlich ist (Kap. 6.1.3, 6.2.3.1). Außerdem sehen die Teilnehmer den täglichen Gebrauch von ELF als Teil ihrer Identität als Austauschstudenten (Kap. 6.3.2).

Was die zweite Forschungsfrage anbelangt, so ist die dominierende Auffassung über die Rolle der Muttersprachler in internationalen Kontexten die der Lehrer des Englischen (Kap. 6.2.1). Das heißt nicht, dass Nicht-Muttersprachler keine Englischlehrer sein können, aber sie können die Muttersprachler nicht ersetzen. Das Englische wird in diesem Kontext wie jede andere Sprache behandelt und seine globale Rolle wird nicht beachtet, wenn es um das Erlernen und den Gebrauch der Sprache geht. Nichtsdestotrotz scheint es eine langsam aufkommende Auffassung zu geben, in der die Normen der Natives nicht unbedingt als die besten in einem internationalen Kontext angesehen werden (Kap. 6.2.2). Natives werden oft als Modelle, aber nicht unbedingt immer als das ultimative Ziel beim Englischlernen angesehen. Außerdem formen sie oft ihre eigenen kleinen Gruppierungen in den lokalen Gemeinschaften der Austauschstudenten (Kap. 6.2.3.2). Auf die Dauer können Englische Muttersprachler wohl nur ein aktiver Teil der internationalen Gemeinschaft sein, wenn sie lernen, ihren Englischgebrauch an den ELF-Gebrauch anzupassen (Kap. 6.2.4).

Drittens wird das Englische als die internationale Verkehrssprache sowohl auf dem europäischen als auch auf dem globalen Niveau angesehen (Kap. 6.3.1.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3). In diesem Kontext gibt es eine hierarchische Gegenüberstellung zwischen dem Englischen und anderen Sprachen (Kap. 6.3.1.2), wobei Englisch immer öfter und selbstbewusster verwendet wird, als alle anderen Fremdsprachen. Die Teilnehmer in dieser Forschung betonen dennoch, dass lokale Sprachenvielfalt nicht untergehen wird, und dass sie sich stark mit ihren eigenen Erstsprachen identifizieren. ELF wird meist als das Medium der internationalen Kommunikation angesehen, während andere Sprachen

ihren Wert und ihr kommunikatives Potenzial auf lokaler Ebene nicht verlieren.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Information

- Name: **Annamária Tóth**
- Date of birth: **13 August 1986**
- Address: **Hollandstraße 4/801, A-1020 Wien**
- Phone: **+43 681 10 20 84 33**
- E-mail: **a0502226@unet.univie.ac.at**

Education

2010 – **MA European Affairs**, Institut d'Etudes Politiques – Sciences Po Paris

2008 – 2009 **Joint Study** exchange, University of Toronto (September to May)

2007 – 2008 **Erasmus** exchange, Université Paris IV – Paris Sorbonne (September to January)

2005 – **Diplomstudium Anglistik und Amerikanistik** (English and American Studies), University of Vienna (1st exam "1. Diplomprüfung" passed with distinction)

MA thesis: „The Role of English as a Lingua Franca in European Multilingualism. Perceptions of Erasmus Students"

2005 – 2008 Diplomstudium Romanistik (Französisch) (Romance Studies / French), University of Vienna (1st exam "1. Diplomprüfung" passed with distinction)

Scientific Experience

- **Project Member** at the Department of Engliash and American Studies

2008 Research on the contribution of continental Europeans to the multicultural Canadian society and on the cultural exchange between the American South and Central Europe; Bibliography and résumés of primary and secondary literature (March to August)

2009 Organisational cooperation before and after the international colloquium "**Riding/Writing Across Borders**" (October and November)

- **Contribution to Scientific Conferences**:

2010 Graduiertenkonferenz des Nachwuchsforums für Kanadastudien "**Crossroads: Canadian Cultural Intersections**", University of Konstanz; presentation "Official languages and Multiculturalism: The 'Other' Languages"

Professional experience

2006, 2007, 2008 Editorial journalist of the daily paper "Alpbach News" during the conference "European Forum Alpbach" (August each year)

Other Qualifications

- **Languages**: English (C2 / IELTS 8,5), French (C2), Spanish (B1), Italian (A1); mother tongues: Hungarian, German
- **Media Competence Seminar**, Institut für Evangelisation, Vienna (monthly seminars from January to June 2007)