



HÁSKÓLI ÍSLANDS

Hugvísindasvið

English as Lingua Franca at European Universities?

Ritgerð til B.A.-prófs

Edda Ýr Meier

September 2010

Háskóli Íslands

Hugvísindasvið

Enska

English as Lingua Franca in European Universities?

Ritgerð til B.A.-prófs

Edda Ýr Meier

Kt.: 040479-5469

Leiðbeinandi: Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir

September 2010

Abstract

Without question, English is at the center,
and other languages are moving increasingly to the periphery.

(Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley 11)

English has been and still is expanding all over the world and to some extent establishing itself as a Lingua Franca amongst people with other native languages. This essay focuses on the effects of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in Europe, in particular European Universities, as English seems to be gaining popularity with both students and faculties. The paper discusses the pressure of English usage in international communication and examines the term Lingua Franca as such and in connection with English usage among non-natives. Further, it introduces the divided scholars' views on the role of ELF and discusses concerns and problems related to ELF. Lastly, it examines the effects of ELF in Higher Education.

Content

1. Introduction	4
2. Pressure to use English in international communication	5
2.1 Media	5
2.2 International Companies and English	5
2.3 Europe	6
2.4 European Union	6
2.5 Education	7
3. Definition of Lingua Franca	10
3.1 Changed norms	12
3.2 Ownership and Culture	13
4. Use of English among non native speakers	16
4.1 Differentials and Features	16
4.2 Digital Communication	17
4.3 Higher Education	18
5. Problems of ELF	20
5.1 Local languages	20
5.2 Varieties of ELF	21
5.3 Teaching ELF	21
6. ELF at The University Level: Effects	23
6.1 Decline of native language usage and study	24
6.2 Communication problems	25
6.3 Decrease in standards	26
7. Discussion	28
Literature	29

1. Introduction

The English language began to spread throughout the world in the 16th century, when the British Empire started to colonize other countries. During this time the English language served as a means of communication between colonizers and the colonized, as well among the colonized themselves (Canagarajah 197). However, the end of the British Empire, and decolonization in the 1950s, did not impact the spread of English negatively, but circulated the language even more through “globalization marked by new technology, transnational economic and production relationships, and the porous nature of nation state boundaries“ (Canagarajah 197).

Today, “English is everywhere, and we cannot avoid it” (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 3) and the pressure of using this language in different areas in daily life is growing. TV, with English speaking channels like CNN and MTV, commercials with English slogans such as ‘Drive alive’ or ‘Be inspired’, the radio, which plays music with English lyrics, interaction with tourists, which often occur in English, of such kinds is the contact with English for many Europeans. In politics and economy English has become essential and in European secondary schools, English is often being taught as a first foreign language (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 3-4). It is in fact an English-boom, as this language has gone from being “the native language of a relatively small island nation” to “the most widely taught, read, and spoken language that the world has ever known” (Kachru and Nelson, cited in I-Chun 213) in less than a lifetime. Seidlhofer et al. speaks of a good likelihood that the usage of English will grow even further (4). It has become, again, a means of communication between native speakers of other languages and maybe the Lingua Franca of the whole world.

With the extend of English usage these days and predictions of further growth in mind, such as Seidlhofer et al. provides, this paper offers the insight to the main views and concerns of English as a Lingua Franca and discusses the effects of ELF at the university level.

2. Pressure to use English in international communication

Due to emigration, colonization and globalization, the usage of English – whether spoken or written – has and still is increasing throughout the world. Why is that? Myers-Scotton explains its growth with the term “snow-ball effect”: “The more people learn a language, the more useful it becomes, and the more useful it is, the more people want to learn it” (cited in Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 4). Coleman compares the expansion of English with the term “Microsoft effect: once a medium obtains a dominant market share, it becomes less and less practical to opt for another medium, and the dominance is thus enhanced” (Coleman 4). Both explanations propose a direction English is heading and as a result the pressure to learn and use English in international communication in various areas is growing steadily.

2.1 Media

Media, such as television, radio, newspaper and internet, has increasingly integrated the English language in non-native English speaking countries (Breibach 20). Seidlhofer et al. explain that the impact of English in Europe is obvious in such mediums as the internet, advertising, popular youth culture and entertainment (5). In Television, for example, “70-80% of all TV fiction shown on European TV is American” (Bondebjerg, quoted by Phillipson 2007, 123), and even though these are often dubbed, except in the Nordic countries and the Netherlands, the American lifestyle seems to be a „lingua franca of globalization“ (Bondebjerg, quoted by Phillipson 2007, 124). These numbers support Seidlhofer’s et al. statement mentioned before. Furthermore, the internet provides the possibility for people with different mother tongues to interact in English without the need for a translator or a third party (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 5). Thus, individuals who passively or actively use the media are presented with some sort of pressure to use the English language.

2.2 International Companies and English

Due to globalization there is a need for companies to interact with foreign customers or companies. Therefore, there is a need for a common language, today, that language is English. Europe, for example, has internationalized its economics,

thus English has become increasingly important due to this development (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 5). It is logical therefore, to use English as a company language in multinational companies. Also, companies that don't have subsidiaries in English speaking countries often tend to use English as their corporate language (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 5). The reason can be seen in their goal to “downplay their national affiliations and to position themselves as transnational companies” (Truchot, quoted in Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 5).

2.3 Europe

English might not yet be the “universal lingua franca in continental Europe” (Phillipson 2008, 3), but recent developments show its continuous expansion (Phillipson 2008, 3). Especially in Europe, English learning has become very popular and often becomes the first foreign language to learn, instead of, for instance, French, German or Russian (Phillipson 2008, 2). Phillipson (2008, 2) lists key societal domains such as commerce, finance, research, higher education and popular culture as areas, where the English language in Europe is constantly advancing. The growth of English use in Europe in the area of media and business is discussed further in sections 2.1 and 2.2 below. Even though measures by the Council of Europe, an international organization which is working towards European integration, aim to increase the multilingual competence of Europeans, they do not seem to have any influence on the increased usage of English. Conferences at the Council of Europe, for example, are conducted in both English and French but English is used by far more (Phillipson 2008, 3). The same applies to publications from the Council of Europe (Phillipson 2008, 3). Even though the people in Europe are aware of their different cultures and languages, and the European politics try to assure the rights of each and every country and the up keeping of each language, there is increasing pressure to use English in order to “keep up” with the inner and outer skirts of Europe.

2.4 European Union

In Europe, the members of the European Union (EU) have also been recognizing the importance of English in international communication. Since the

establishment of the EU in 1958, when six states – Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands – became the first members, the present number has increased to 27 member states. Aside from being an economic and political union, which tries to ensure equal rights in both of these criteria, the EU also adheres “to the principle equality for speakers of all the official languages of member states” (Wright 93). Phillipson points out, that the Commission website does not seem to mirror these beliefs and values of equal language rights, as “virtually everything is available in English, much in French, and little in other languages” (May 2008, 259). EU texts show incoherence from the initial Multilanguage EU, as most initial drafting of EU texts are now in English: since 1970 the percentage of English has increased from 0% to 72% (see table 1 in: Fiedler 3). Nevertheless, the EU “rejects the idea of a lingua franca” (Wright 93), but as the Commissioner for Multilingualism, Leonard Orban, states, it is financially impossible to translate everything into all official languages of the EU (Fiedler 3). Phillipson (2008, 1) criticizes that provisions on cultural and linguistic rights in the EU are not strong enough. Further, “there has been no development in the formal policy of the EU, which continues to require strict plurilingualism” (Wright 94), which might have led to the further domination of the English language in the EU. English has become an important tool for working within the EU and a country’s representative who lacks or shows weak English skills can be at a disadvantage (Wright 94).

2.5 Education

English is now geographically “the most taught language in virtually all countries” (Eurydice, quoted by Coleman 4) and especially in higher education (HE) English has grown in importance (Phillipson 2008, 4), as publication of academics and researchers in many fields are often required to be either exclusively or at least in addition to the mother tongue presented in English (Phillipson 2007, 124). In addition, Universities are gaining interest in classes taught in English with the goal to attract more international students under such programs as Erasmus and Socrates (Phillipson 2007, 124). This interest stems from the development in Universities in English speaking countries: they are currently immensely popular of foreign students from all over the world, whereas Universities in non-English native speaking countries see

their opportunity in attracting foreign students by including English taught courses (Phillipson 2007, 124).

Since the Bologna Process in 1999, “the formation of a European Higher Education Area” (Phillipson 2008, 4) with presently a total of 45 European states, the pressure to include English in Universities has risen. According to Phillipson, while initially upkeep of languages and cultures of Europe in Universities was seen of utter most importance, the present attitude is reflected in the latest policy statement of 2005, which “appears to conflate internationalization and ‘English-medium higher education’” (2008, 4). At Scandinavian Universities, for example, administrators “are being encouraged to address the language policy implications of English being used more” (Phillipson 2008, 5).

Coleman sees the Bologna Progress as “a response to the international marketization of HE” (3) (Higher Education). HE has changed from institutions to brands, in consequence to change in several areas, such as higher fees, student mobility, and excess of supply over demand (Coleman 3). As “the student has become the customer” (Coleman 3) universities now are in greater competition than ever before. Not only does English attract students from across the world, its international appeal also fascinates domestic students (Coleman 5). In the last fifteen years initially Masters level courses were increasingly taught in English, but lately English medium undergraduate degrees have also shown to be rapidly increasing (Coleman 6). In Germany, for instance, Universities offer entire degree programs in English, for the very reason to attract more students (Coleman 8). Countries whose languages are not spoken widely are even more so interested in offering an alternative to their national language taught courses and are leading the “Englishization process” (Coleman 9).

Even though English does not seem to be entrenched in Southern and Eastern Europe, in some of these countries a first foreign language is already introduced in primary school, in which English is in great lead (Phillipson 2008, 5). The ongoing growth of English in HE has an affect on primary schools, as parents now see the necessity of English - as a social promotion - in their child’s primary and secondary education (Wright 95). Thus, even though the Bologna Progress officially advocates multilingualism and a wide range of language learning from a young age, English is the leading language in primary and secondary schools (Wright 95).

Therefore, schools and universities address the ongoing pressure from parents, students and politics, by intergrading multilingual programs – that is “the national

language and English” (Phillipson 2007, 124) - into the school or university. Reports of language learning indicate that English not only is now the leading foreign language being learned in schools and universities, but also the very reason for the decline of learners in other foreign languages (Wright 95).

3. Definition of Lingua Franca

The kind of pressures that exist in i.e. Europe for using English in international communication is discussed in Chapter 2. The question arises whether it is possible to define English as a Lingua Franca, as English is used widely, such as in Europe. For better understanding a short history and definition of the term Lingua Franca is given in this chapter.

The term Lingua Franca originates from the Italian 'Frankish tongue'. The term 'Franca' stems probably from the Arabs before the crusades, when 'Franks' was the name given to all Europeans. The original Lingua Franca was a mixture of mostly Italian with other Mediterranean and Oriental languages. This mixture of languages resulted in the chance for different speaking nationalities that usually wouldn't be able to converse, to interact with each other in an aspect of commerce and diplomacy (Weekley 850). The Renaissance was the time period of the Lingua Franca, as Italians operated businesses throughout the Ottoman Empire. The first written evidence of the term Lingua Franca in English exists from 1678 (Partridge).

Within the last century, dictionaries (Shorter 1148; Webster's 663) usually first refer to the above explained origin and original language mixture, that is Italian with Mediterranean and Oriental languages. Further explanations include the meaning of lingua franca as a middle tool between different speaking cultures. In Shorter (1148), for example, it is described as "any mixed jargon used for intercourse between people speaking different languages" and "something resembling a common language". Other explanations are more specific on the term of usage of the Lingua Franca, such as Webster's (663) description of Lingua Franca, which includes "common or commercial tongues among peoples of diverse speech". Nevertheless, in most secondary explanations in dictionaries, the speakers do not have the Lingua Franca as native language and is only "used for communication between groups of people who speak different languages but which is not used between members of the same group" (Cambridge). Pickering (219) uses the term "contact language" and cites Mauranen's (cited in Pickering 219) description of a Lingua Franca as "a vehicular language spoken by people who do not share a native language".

Phrases, such as "contact language" are used either as a descriptions or comparison, which usually display the term's user's conception of the term Lingua Franca. Other terms, which can be found are, e.g. universal language, world language,

common language and mixed language. These terms include certain meanings and when confronting with a language, e.g. English, as a Lingua Franca, the conception of what a Lingua Franca represents, seems important. Phillipson argues that “the term lingua franca has so much cultural baggage embedded in it and is open to so many interpretations” (2008, 263).

Since English is presently used in a wide field, such as politics, marketing and education, the image of English as Lingua Franca differs broadly. Where, when and why it is used depicts its image. In its global usage, English has been addressed to in terms such as English as an international language, World Standard English, literate English (Pickering 219). In some countries, such as India, English still promotes an image of “lingua divina” (Chamaar, quoted in Phillipson, may 2008, 250) - a language which knowledge defines whether or not a person belongs to the so called ‘higher society’. Nevertheless, English has come a long way from being the language of the British Empire to being the language of a wide range of a variety of users and scholars.

Presently, English is not only being learned for “external communication purposes and familiarity with the cultural heritage associated with ‘great’ powers” (Phillipson 2007, 123), but Kachru has redefined the use of World English (WE) in his three circle model (Canagarajah 198). Three groups are specified: the *Inner Circle*, the *Outer Circle* and the *Expanding Circle*. Native speakers of English, such as Americans and the British, belong to the *Inner Circle*, as they “claimed ownership and the establishment of norms” (Canagarajah 198). The *Outer Circle* uses English as a second language, “with well established local norms since colonial times” (Canagarajah, 2006, p.198). Into this categorization fall India and Nigeria. The now most recent group belongs to the *Expanding Circle*. Countries like China, Germany and Iceland all have in common that “English was used as a foreign language” (Canagarajah 198). The main criticism towards the WE model, Canagarajah points out the mutual agreement of scholars that it “fails to accommodate the complexity of global English” (198). With this model in mind, English as a Lingua Franca differs from other contact languages, as Pickering formulates it, in “the enormously diverse intra- and international contexts of use and the continual movement of users routinely result in interactions between speakers from all three groups” (220). Native speakers now have often interaction with non-native speakers in everyday communication and the *Outer Circle* and *Expanding Circle* differentiate less and less, as the local demand

of English in the latter group is growing (Canagarajah 199). In the present the possibility of English shifting from a foreign language to a second language is quite realistic, as English is increasingly used in public, professional and private life, and in education (Phillipson 2007, 123).

3.1 Changed norms

Scholars find the *Expanding Circle* users of English not to be as dependent on the inner circle language norms as before believed, but they rather “adopt independent norms to achieve intelligibility” (Canagarajah 199). This conception is addressed directly in an online newspaper called *Abolishing the Borders from Below* (cited in Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 5):

... this use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) *is* a reality. It declares itself independent of the norms of English as a native language (ENL), and the authors who use it are confident that the ELF they use is better suited to express their identity, and more intelligible for their readers than a “better” English.

Many believe that this direction parts from the strict norms of ENL and leads to a new future model of English as a Lingua Franca (Canagarajah 199). Within the last twenty years, proposals for a more ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) guided model have been discussed. David Crystal for instance, sees English as “a family of languages” (cited in Canagarajah 199), and both McArthur and Modiano, offer models “that level the diverse varieties” (Canagarajah 199). Whether the interpretations and description of these conceptions, as McArthur’s “World Standard Auxiliary English” or Crystal’s “World Standard Spoken English”, the main goal maintains the same: defining an ‘up-to-date’ model of the current English as a Lingua Franca. Both supporters and opponents of new norms have argued in the English learner’s and foreign learner user’s best interest. Opponents believe in the consistent usage of a single standard of either British or American English in ELF for intelligibility. Yet, despite the young research in ELF interaction, that is communication among non native speakers (NNS), supporters have been able to argue on their behalf by looking at “aspects of intelligibility in both experimental and real-world settings” (Pickering 219). Considering the estimated number of 1 billion L2 users (Crystal, in Pickering 219),

native speakers (NS) are clearly outnumbered by non-native speakers. Therefore, for many a conversation with a native speaker of English is quite unrealistic in their every day lives (Pickering 219), which questions the purpose of holding on to a form which by the latest studies does not necessarily lead to a better intelligibility. David Crystal predicted in 2004 that it will not take long before British and American English will no longer be the only optional localizations (Canagarajah 199).

3.2 Ownership and Culture

If the English language is no longer seen as mainly a two language variety of British English (BE) and American English (AE), but with ELF as yet another variety, it can be argued that ELF is “deriving from different users using English in different contexts and, as such, assert the same authority and authenticity in their own context” (I-Chun 215). Not everyone agrees with this statement and thus, discussions about the various views on whether only native speakers are entitled to claim ownership of the English language and maintain their grip on its norms are present. Claims such as “World English (WE) belongs to everyone who speaks it, but it is nobody’s mother tongue” (Rajagopalan, cited in I-Chun 215) might be far fetched, as clearly the definition of mother tongue is here not taken in consideration. It does not change the fact that English does not need to be promoted by natives anymore and a much higher percentage of users are non-native speakers than natives. This gives reason enough to questions “the irrelevance of native speakers, their Englishes, and their ownership of English” (I-Chun 214).

Yet another aspect often taken into consideration is the fact that most non-native speakers use English as a middle language to communicate with other non-native speakers (I-Chun 214). The question arises, whether a learner of English, who most likely will only use this language in a non-native setting and with other non-native speakers, will have the need, use or desire to include the cultural heritage of the language, whether that of American or British English. Some argue for that very reason, “it should not come from an inner circle country and should not be taught as an inner circle language” (I-Chun 214). In aspect of what culture should ELF then be taught, or is ELF neutral and egalitarian?

It seems that scholars have the desire to define ELF as a culture-free language, but discussions have lead to changed views on this subject. In Kayman’s view, for

instance, ELF has its own culture (Canagarajah 201). The world seems to get smaller in means of transnational relations, due to the growing usage of new media. Therefore development and definitions of culture is changing as well. Kayman sees the possibility of digital media and technologies of communication shaping ELF's culture: it promotes a new 'lingua divina' - as a gateway to global networks for those who have learned English – and therefore even “infuse English with 'cultures' of their own” (Canagarajah 201).

The danger of culture-neutral English is addressed by Tibor, as he argues that it only serves the interests of dominant institutions and agencies (Canagarajah 201). By eliminating the language's complexities and undermining its substance, it may seem that English has been taken advantage of, as it is simply used in means of “delivering (often commercial) messages in the shortest, most economical way” (Canagarajah 201). Tibor coins this “culture-deprived, neutral English” (Canagarajah 201) as “airport English”. Further, he is concerned about this “Supranational English pervades national languages and inundates them with its expressions and distinct style of communication” (Tibor, cited in Canagarajah 201). Nevertheless, even though his discussion mostly addresses ELF as neutral English, he preconceives it to be “an American genre” (Tibor, cited in Canagarajah 201), as values of pragmatism, economy, and commercialism seem to be influencing the language.

The development of ELF, lead by multinational organizations and software companies, concerns especially linguists, scholars and policy makers. Dor introduces the term “imposed multilingualism” for the agenda of dominant interests (cited in Canagarajah 201):

The forces of economic globalization do not have a vested interest in the global spread of English, they have a short-term interest in turning these languages into commodified tools of communication.

In redirecting imposed multilingualism to negotiated multilingualism, Dor sees a possibility, where, among others, policy makers and scholars are enabled to “make spaces for their own interests through the pluralization of language” (Canagarajah 201).

Whether the influence of natives, multinational companies and media or non-native users of English are contributing to ELF's present style, the English language is changing and so are the conceptions regarding its ownership and culture, due to "the volume of ELF exchanges among non-native speakers" (Wright 104). Both native and non-native speakers of English are now engaged in shaping the languages, though seemingly separately in their own variety of English. The use of ELF among non native speakers is still a relative new and fast growing phenomenon, and as such scholars are taking a great interest in.

4. Use of English among non native speakers

With an estimated number of one billion non native speakers using English as a second language, scholars are not ignoring the wide spread use of English among non native speakers (Seidlhofer 339). As this number increases, the growing interaction among non-native speakers of English is an obvious result, as “only one out of every four users of English in the world is a native speaker” (Seidlhofer 339). It has been observed, that the speech among non native speakers varies from NNS converse with NS. Therefore, the scholar’s field of interest includes the differential of NNS’s conversations with NNS’s vs. NNS’s and NS. Further, new media has been a great contributor of English in Europe, which brought digital communication possibilities. Scholars are interested in the language usage within this field including the use of ELF in Higher Education.

4.1 Differentials and Features

According to Canagaraja, “individuals find ways of accommodating their interests into English in interpersonal relationships and everyday performance” (204). It has been suggested, that conditions among non-native speakers (NNSs) differ from NNS-NS interaction (Pickering 227). This would account for some of the differentials and features of ELF compared to first language English and why “native speakers of English are not necessarily effective communicators in European settings” (Wright 105), as NNS’s language includes modifications and reconstructions (Canagarajah 204). Where do these differentials and features of ELF stem from?

As NNS’s come from different countries, societies and backgrounds, they are confronted with a diverse variety of Englishes within ELF, which Meierkord characterizes as “a variety in constant flux” (cited in Canagarajah 197). Wright describes its characteristic as having “hybrid, flexible communication patterns” (105). In order to facilitate intelligibility they “adopt phonological and grammatical options” (Canagarajah 200), which are not necessarily within the inner circle communities’ norms. NNSs seem to use communication strategies, which are usually not used by NS’s (Pickering 227). One example offers pragmatic strategies, such as rephrasing, repetition and “suspension of expectations regarding norms” (Canagarajah 205). Further, NNS’s have been observed to not concentrate on errors such as of speech or

grammar, which Firth coined as the “‘let it pass’ principle” (cited in Canagarajah 205). Discourse strategies also provide NNS’s help as they “accommodate local variants” (Canagarajah 206). Syntactic strategies include segmentations and regularizations. Segmentations are when the speaker shortens his output into clausal or phrasal segments. Regularization, on the other hand, “involves selection of forms that are explicit” (Canagarajah 206), such as topicalization, where the speaker moves the important information of the message in front of the sentence. According to Seidlhofer et al., adept users of ELF put the message content before grammatical norms which are “built-in redundancy of Standard English grammar” (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 5). Further, Meierkord finds the rules of the native language to coincide with ELF (Canagarajah 200), which yet again points to “a heterogeneous global English speech community, with a heterogeneous English, and different modes of competence” (Canagarajah 197). Nevertheless, NNS’s are able to correspond effectively, often due to effective pragmatic and discourse strategies.

4.2 Digital Communication

E-mailing, chatting and blogging – such digital communication media are presently part of a lot of Europeans’ daily lives. The Internet offers the possibility for cultural diverse individuals to meet and interact with each other. Using the new technology provides communication in a new way as it “straddles orality and literacy” (Canagarajah 210). How does this new communication media affect ELF?

Internet discourses are often characterized by simplifications, such as omission of prepositions, copula or auxiliary verbs (Canagarajah 210). Some feel that this development has a negative influence on the non-native user’s competence in English, as due to its frequent usage of simplifications in new media, L2 speakers might adapt to this ‘incorrect’ version of English. Others interpret the simplifications as a representation of “dialect features, reflecting the pressure to accommodate many diverse group members” (Canagarajah 210). Whether or not this has a destructive influence towards the NNS’s English usage or whether it is simply a matter of cultural diversity, is debatable. On the other hand, it is obvious that many, especially young people, prefer to seek this sort of contact and interact within its frame. Eva Lam (Canagarajah 210) gives such an example: her Chinese-American subject Almon chooses rather to talk online than in the classroom. The reason she gives is that he

feels more comfortable to talk freely in an environment without standard American English enforcement. Further, on the Internet he feels free “to use his own variety of English and negotiate the varieties his multilingual friends bring for communication” (Canagarajah 210). Lam argues that changing the environmental speech norms from a NS speech community to one of an ELF has an encouraging effect on the children (Canagarajah 210). This sort of interaction is purposive communication, as they engage in discussions about their interests and are “motivated to negotiate their linguistic differences” (Canagarajah 210).

Linguistic and cultural differences are part of NNS’s communication. Some Scholars have taken interest in how NNSs deal with these differences. O’Dowd, for example, researched a year-long e-mail exchange between classes in Spain and Britain (Canagarajah 210). Besides spending more time on the message, he found the successful participants also focused on personal matters, such as their differentials of cultures, responded to each others comments and questions and “tended to take the sociopragmatic rules of each other’s language into account” (Canagarajah 210).

4.3 Higher Education

Texts are characterized by its author’s personality, in language and style. How far does a text written in English by a non native speaker in Higher Education reflect its composer? It is known that any kind of text is “mediated by the beliefs, values, and subject positions” (Canagarajah 208) of its writer. Recently textual diversity in academic writing has caught scholars’ attention. Why has evidence of localizations become more prevalent in academic papers of multilingual scholars (Canagarajah 207)? The explanation for the recent motivation for NNS’s of English to publish their work with a ‘touch of their culture’, Canagarajah sees is the high stakes of professional success (208).

With AE and BE as its standard and traditional English for academic writing, NNSs’ have not been allowed any latitude in implementing their personal and culture influenced style into their writing. Some defenders of a personal and cultural diverse ELF style in academic writing see it as “a matter of linguistic human rights” (Canagarajah 208) that NNS’s are entitled to in academic writings and that the norms of the main language for academic communication should not be defined by only one or two communities (Canagarajah 208). Still, how far localization is permitted is

subject of debate and opponents are yet strong in numbers. Even though some scholars are less demanding in oral academic communication regarding to the proper norms of English, they do usually not permit localization in writing (Canagarajah 2008). Barbour argues that “writing lacks the contextual cues and interpersonal resources that oral communication provides to negotiate difference” (Canagarajah 2008) and sees therefore the need for NNS to incorporate assistance from a native-speaking editor for correction of local variations. Nevertheless, academic writings influenced by ELF with its cultural language distinctions have been successfully published by multilingual scholars (Canagaraja 2008).

Multiliteracy is the new label for text constructions that include a mixture of different styles, genres, and codes (Canagarajah 2008). This, so claims Canagarajah, can become a “unique and striking voice in English writing” (2008). Different ways of engaging personal culture into English have been observed. One of such strategies is called ‘transposition’: when authors are struggling to obtain an alternate discourse between cultures, it “creates a ‘thirdness’ that resembles neither language” (Canagarajah 2008-2009). Another strategy is ‘appropriation’, in which local values are adopted by adapting English to the NNS’s native local traditions in “orality based, narratively structured, person-centered discourses” (Canagarajah 2009). Some teachers already encourage their non-native English speaking students to use these methods of writing, at least for their first drafts (Canagarajah 2009). It is to mention though that this is still not very common and it heavily depends on the country, the university and each individual teacher’s view on whether or how far localization is permitted into academic writing.

5. Problems of ELF

Whether English has the potential to be a Lingua Franca or is already recognized as such, some scholars are now looking at both potential and already occurring issues and problems of using English as a Lingua Franca. I-Chun criticizes this late or even not existing outlook into the aspects of language, such as literacy and style, and its social functions, such as self-image and –identity (I-Chun 215).

5.1 Local languages

When postcolonial communities finally reached their independence, decolonization, with aspects such as strengthening local cultures and languages, started to take place. Through globalization though, English grew yet again in importance. Besides the negative emotional aspect, such as English being the reminder of a past colonial time and its oppression, a newly independent country is now presented with a challenge to keep affirming local languages when English is one of “the demands of globalization” (Canagarajah 202). The problem lies within the conflict between decolonization and globalization, as “decolonization focuses on language practices within the nation-state”, but the latter “makes national borders porous and brings in linguistic influences from outside” (Canagarajah 202). The member countries of the European Union are challenged in a similar way. They are promoting multilingualism and the equal right of each culture and language, but nevertheless, English is becoming the face of ‘multilingualism’ (Canagarajah 202). In some respect, English therefore can be “seen as a threat to European multilingualism” (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 24).

However, “a resurgence of linguistic nationalism” (Canagarajah 202) has been noticed in many countries. In the music industry, for example, young performers are taking gaining interest in their local language again. In some countries, as in India and Brazil, Canagaraja sees the reason for resistance of English in some communities, due to the uneven acquisition and spread of English and it “serves the vested interests of the elite” (202). The image of ELF and the states’ concerns towards their local culture and languages, vary between countries and their communities. Nevertheless, the negative impact of ELF on local languages has been recognized by scholars.

5.2 Varieties of ELF

ELF is neither homogeneous, nor used in the same way around the world. ELF varies between different continents, such as African ELF and Asian ELF, different countries such as France and Norway, and within countries, such as north and south German ELF users. ELF depends on the individual nationality and community the speaker is from and it is therefore diverse and heterogeneous (Fiedler 9). One concern of such a great variety of ELF is that it can create an imbalance within conversations amongst NNS's. The contact amongst NNS's can include "different degrees of acceptance or negative orientation" (Fiedler 9). Knapp recorded that "linguistic deficiencies ... were exploited in order to dominate the discussion by those who were more fluent" (cited in Fiedler 9). Thus, even in ELF criteria of fluency modeled on AE or BE define the speaker's advantage or disadvantage in social settings. It seems surprising that with such a great number of ELF speakers outnumbering the native speakers of English, their 'correct' language is still used as a quality measurement, even though clearly more English users are NNSs (Fiedler 9). If NS should consider ELF "to be a variety or at least legitimate form of English and not merely a collection of errors" (Fiedler 9), NNSs first need to accept their English as one. Presently, this is usually not the case (Fiedler 9).

With so many different varieties of English, what should then be recognized as ELF? As AE and BE are seen as two varieties shaped by their speakers, ELF's characteristics should arguably become standardized by its users, which would seem no easy task. I-Chun argues that "codification and standardization" (216) reflects the NNS's usage of English, which would lead to a "qualitatively and quantitatively reduced version of ENL" (216). As such, he offers examples as "'He look very sad ... and inaccurate but intelligible pronunciation, such as 'I think [sɪsk]'" (I-Chun 216). I-Chun remarks that "frequent occurrence of a common error does not constitute a strong case for standardization and popularization" (217). The question of acceptance of ELF aside, clearly more investigation towards its features will have to be made.

5.3 Teaching ELF

The claim that the norms of ELF are fundamentally different from the ones of the native English, whether AE or BE, and ELF itself has its own norms and

characteristics, one concern is directed towards teaching ELF as such. For generations mostly BE has been the world wide standard for teaching English as a second language. Teachers have been trained to teach their students the 'right' English and are mediating "the deficit view, according to which deviations from native speaker norms are considered to be errors rather than variants" (Fiedler 9). The latest development in language learning is teaching children English from a very young age, which has the goal to enable the learners to reach a close to accent free speech of English as adults (Fiedler 9). With that development in mind, it seems rather unlikely that ELF with an own identity and new norms would be preferred against Native like English. Nevertheless, in some countries, as for example India, South Africa and Hong Kong, teachers are now introducing the local language "in many subtle ways to negotiate the desired values, identities, and interests" (Canagarajah 203) of the students. Canagarajah argues that this movement is due to competing policy discourse and scholars are now "challenging the stigmatized status given to mixed varieties of English" (203).

The second problem in ELF teaching involves the practical execution of a new ELF modified syllabus. Some scholars are taking on the challenge to discuss this matter. Jenkins, for example, introduces a revised pronunciation syllabus, what he calls the Lingua Franca Core, and Seidlhofer makes first efforts for a description of English as a lingua franca (I-Chun 216). On the other hand, I-Chun finds that "ELF applied linguists seem to be suggesting that what is needed for comprehension is all that is needed to be produced" and criticizes this concept of ELF teaching (216):

The ELF approach, which suggests that a degree of phonological and grammatical redundancy meant to protect the preciseness and completeness of the message can be rightly omitted as long as intelligibility is being maintained, would appear to contradict and misinterpret the nature of language learning and second language acquisition.

The debate of how ELF can be integrated into the language syllabus follows the question of whether ELF is eligible for the class room teaching at all. The learners of English, whether ELF or NE, have the last word, as it is their choice to make which English they prefer to study.

6. ELF at The University Level: Effects

Never before in history have there been that many students studying at universities (Feast 70). Along with the 21 century came a new definition of Higher Education: “Universities are no longer institutions but brands” and the “student has become the customer” (Coleman 3). Before the start of commercializing of Universities (see chapter 2.4), “academe was afforded a significant degree of insulation from the pressures of society” (Altbach 1), but with the new age of ‘university business’ with students as target clientele, “in a context of competition, English represents a selling point, an inducement” (Truchot 9) for both local and foreign learners. Some define the gaining numbers of courses taught in English a trend, but the constant increase of English during the last twenty years might prove otherwise (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 4). In consideration of the fact that universities have only quite recently changed into more business oriented organizations and therefore integrated English into their programs, the effects of this movement for the institutions, as well as for students and faculty members, are current and ongoing issues.

The rising numbers of Universities teaching in the medium of English is yet another pressure for Higher Education institutions that have not yet included English into their programs. Universities in countries with languages that are not widely spoken are under even more pressure, as the gaining popularity of English at Higher Education levels is increasing. “A survey undertaken in 2004 under the aegis of the European Language Council”, which shows that “countries whose national language is not widely learnt elsewhere lead the Englishization process” (Coleman 9), supports this statement. Further, the danger of gaining the image of being “outdated and backward-looking” (Truchot 9) does not help marketing the education they are promoting. Among other things, “international rankings favor universities that use English as the main language of instruction and research” (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley 12), which provides yet another insight to the pressure of universities to include English taught classes. It seems as if a Higher Education Institution does not want to be at a disadvantage, it has to include English in at least some of the programs. Higher Education Institutions are therefore confronted with the fact, that “Universities that use one of the primary international languages, most often English, dominate the academic community” (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley 11).

English is also gaining of importance in respect of publishing findings and papers; in fact it has become indispensable (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 4). Scholars perceive pressure to publish their work in English, as “the key scientific and academic journals have come to be published in English” (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley 11). With “English-speaking institutions and academic systems” producing the “largest amount of research and influence the knowledge-communication system” (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley 11) it is arguable, that scholars see themselves pressured into publishing their work also, or exclusively in English, as they want their paper to be read by as many as possible. Therefore, “it is probably the case that postgraduate degrees and certificates are most affected” (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley 18) by the pressure to use English. Further, some universities pay more money for papers written in English than in the local language (Brock-Utne 374-5). Brock-Utne compares this to the American philosophy “Publish or perish” (375), which might rather be redefined into ‘Publish in English or perish’. The constantly increasing English usage at universities, adds to the pressure for students and faculty members to use this language in their field of study.

6.1 Decline of native language usage and study

With English as a medium of teaching at many universities, teachers have noticed a decline of native language usage within the subject taught in English, even though they want their “students to be able to communicate about the content of the course not only in English but also” (Brock-Utne 370) in the native language. Even scholars are feeling the difficulty of “finding the right academic expressions” in the native language, “for phenomena we normally describe in English” (Brock-Utne 370). A part of this problem might stem from the fact that more and more books used in universities are being published in English rather than in the target language and that “the only works available in a number of educational fields are in English” (Truchot 10). The use of native expressions or phrases in their field of study, are therefore reduced in response to increasing English publications of both educational material and research papers.

The reduction of other foreign languages being learned at Higher Education Institutions is yet another result of the increasing popularity of English at universities. Since the boom of English, “the other larger European languages like French and

German are hardly learned at all by the younger generation” (Brock-Utne 379) anymore. At the University of Iceland, for instance, students in the German section have declined so drastically, that courses once taught every semester are now sometimes canceled due to lack of participants. Hence, as result of the decline of other foreign language studies, teachers see the need in promoting their target language more (see Brock-Utne 379). Nevertheless, the results of additional advertisement of other language studies at Higher Education Institutions are questionable.

6.2 Communication problems

An argument for English at Higher Education Institutions, both in teaching and scientific communication is, that it ”makes communication easier and quicker” (Altbach 1). Yet, the use of English at university level does not always come with great ease. Sometimes communication difficulties are noticed: “Here the language of instruction was a real barrier to knowledge, preventing students from understanding what the teacher was saying” (Brock-Utne 369). Further, instruction in English can “lead to a reduction in expressiveness among both academic staff and students” (Wilkinson 2). Thus for some the English taught classes can become a problem, especially considered that a “link between English language proficiency and academic success” (Feast 71) is suggested by some scholars. What does this mean for foreign learners, such as exchange students? For one, their English will differ somewhat, but a too often overlooked issue, is the “problem of cultural transferability of concepts” (Brock-Utne 371). Texts might have different meanings to students of different nationalities, as for example texts in history textbooks (Brock-Utne 371). Despite of the difficulties English taught courses cause students and faculty, teachers seem nevertheless to be able to adjust. In a qualitative study, which aim was “to investigate the impact on instructional methods of teaching through English among content teachers” (Wilkinson 2), Wilkinson offers the insight to how teachers can adapt to teaching their subject in English:

In particular, they reported creating more time for student Participation and discussion; ... they made less use of lectures, which in general they considered ineffective; during the lectures they did give, they reduced the density of new information, and made extensive use

of support systems (for example, by providing the slides and specialist terms in advance through electronic learning systems).

(Wilkinson 2-3)

Teaching in English is not always uncomplicated, but it also offers a possibility for a change, as for example the opportunity to alter teaching methods as described above.

6.3 Decrease in standards

Universities have a “strong expectations about the language and genre of academic writing” (Canagarajah 208), but with the expanding of English programs at Higher Education, the risk of lowered standards could occur. As “English medium instruction does seem to lead to a reduction in expressiveness among both academic staff and students” (Wilkinson 2), a logical conclusion would be its direct impact on academic writing. Further, the increase of foreign students at local universities would assume to support this claim. The English knowledge and fluency varies greatly between local students, and especially of foreign students. Brock-Utne, for instance, recognizes the difference between Norwegian and African students:

The Norwegian students, who have never had English as language of instruction, either in secondary school or for their bachelor studies at the university, are normally better both in oral and written English than most of the African students who have had English as a language of instruction for ten and sometimes even 14 years.

(Brock-Utne 370)

Not only do different levels of English complicate or even hinder the maintenance of a consistent and high standard, but also the content in respect of cultural attributes and characteristics. As “academic discourse, like any other discourse, is culturally bound, and translation into English implies more than merely linguistic change” (Coleman 10), some information might be lost in the progress of translating or writing papers in English.

The growing popularity of English taught courses at Universities throughout Europe impact both institutions and individuals, i.e. students and faculty members. Whether this so called 'trend' has a long lasting impact is debatable, but as for the moment, it is, at least to some extent, creating difficulties for involved parties, which cannot be ignored.

7. Discussion

The spread of the English language has occupied scholars worldwide. The advocates of English as a Lingua Franca promote a positive outlook on the effects of ELF and offer many explanations why it will help our modern society in the age of technology. The adversaries, on the other side, are more concerned on the negative influence ELF already has and might have in future. Further, the current discussion about what exactly ELF defines and whether it resembles AE or has its own norms provides strong claims on both sides. Nevertheless, it is clear that English “functions as a lingua franca, enabling people to connect based on common interests and concerns across languages and communities” (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl 5) and as such provides users of English with the tool of communication among NNSs.

The effects of the great and fast spread of English taught courses at many Higher Standard Institutions has only recently started to gain interest with scholars, as it is a relatively new ‘trend’, considering the long history of universities as institutions. With the realization of ELF’s influence on both students and faculty members, scholars have the possibility to either promote a positive or negative picture of ELF at universities. Nevertheless, with the new opportunities that ELF may bring, the negative effects cannot be ignored.

Literature

- Altbach, Philip G. *Higher Education and the WTO: Globalization Run Amok*.
Üniversitat ve Toplum, 2001. Retrieved September 8, 2010.
<http://www.universite-toplum.org/text.php3?id=19>
- Altbach, Philip, Liz Reisberg, and Laura E. Rumbley. *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. A report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education. France, 2009.
Retrieved September 9, 2010.
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001831/183168e.pdf>
- Brock-Utne, Birgit. *Language of instruction and research in Higher Education in Europe: highlights from the current debate in Norway and Sweden*. Springer: International Review of Education 53, 2007. 367-388. Retrieved September 8, 2010. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/95888p6860856912/fulltext.pdf>
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved August 26, 2010. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. *Negotiating the local in English as a Lingua Franca*. Annual Review of Applied Linguistic: 26, 2006. 197-218. Retrieved June 29, 2010, from Research Library. (Document ID: 1455766201).
<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1455766201&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=58117&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Coleman, James A. *English-medium teaching in European higher education*. State-of-the-art article: Language Teaching 39. Cambridge University Press, 2006. 1-14.
- Feast, Vicki. *The Impact of IELTS Scores on Performance at University*. International Education Journal Vol 3, No 4, 2002. Educational Research Conference 2002 Special Issue.

Fiedler, Sabine. *Approaches to fair linguistic communication I*. European Journal of Language Policy, 2(1), 2010. 1-21. Retrieved June 29, 2010, from ProQuest Education Journals. (Document ID: 2033961931).

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=2033961931&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=58117&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

I-Chun, Vicky Kuo. *Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca*. ELT Journal, 60 (3), 2006. 213. Retrieved June 29, 2010, from ProQuest Education Journals. (Document ID: 1069216001).

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1069216001&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=58117&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Partridge, Eric. *Origins; A short etymological dictionary of Modern English*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1966.

Pickering, Lucy. *Current research on intelligibility in English as a Lingua Franca*. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26, 2006. 219-233. Retrieved June 29, 2010, from Research Library. (Document ID: 1455766211).

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1455766211&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=58117&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Phillipson, Robert. *English, no longer a foreign language in Europe?*. International Handbook of English Language Teaching. Eds.: Jim Cummins and Chris Davison. Part I. New York, Springer, 2007. 123-136.

---. *Language policy and education in the European Union*. In press, Encyclopedia of Language and Education (ed. Nancy Hornberger). Volume 1: Language policy and Political Issues in Education (ed. Stephen May). Springer, 2008. 1-8.

---. *Lingua franca or lingua frankensteinia? English in European integration and globalisation*. World Englishes. Blackwell Publisher, May 2008. Vol. 27, Iss. 2. 250-270.

Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Oxford University Press, London. Volume 1, A - M. 1950.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. *English as a lingua franca*. ELT Journal, 59(4), 2005. 339.

Retrieved June 29, 2010, from ProQuest Education Journals. (Document ID: 904011181).

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=904011181&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=58117&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Seidlhofer, Barbara, Angelika Breiteneder, and Marie-Luise Pitzl. *English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: challenges for applied linguistics*. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26, 2006. 3-34. Retrieved June 29, 2010, from Research Library. (Document ID: 1455766121).

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1455766121&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=58117&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Truchot, Claude. *Key aspects of the use of English in Europe*. Council of Europe: Strasbourg, 2002. Retrieved September 9, 2010.

<http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/truchoten.pdf>

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. G. & C. Meriam Company, Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 1979.

Weekley, Ernest. *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*. London, John Murray, Albemarle Street, W. 1921.

Wilkinson, Robert. *The impact of language on teaching content: Views from the content teacher*. Maastricht university Language Centre, Netherlands, 2005.

Wright, Sue. *The elephant in the room: Language issues in the European Union*.

European Journal of Language Policy, 1(2), 2009. 93-119. Retrieved June 29, 2010, from ProQuest Education Journals. (Document ID: 1975937371).

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1975937371&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=58117&RQT=309&VName=PQD>