



Teaching global English to overseas students

Krzysztof Polok, Akademia Techniczno-Humanistyczna
w Bielsku-Białej, Poland
sworntran@interia.pl

Abstract

Teaching English as a Global Language (EGL) definitely is a challenge. The assertion assumes the introduction into the process of FLE (foreign language education) the forms of FL internalization clearly facilitating the process of teaching English as a global language (instead of assuming that this is only a variant of standardized ELT/ELL). One of the issues worth considering in this instance is the way the concept of teacher language awareness (TLA) introduced by Andrews [2007] can be observed from the perspective of EGL deliverance. The paper discusses the very idea of English as a global language, the reasons and the necessities of its research as well as possible changes to be introduced into the school syllabi when the perspective of teaching a foreign language has been shifted into the one of teaching a functional language. While accepting the currently existing message-production status quo, the paper offers a number of points-to-consider (mostly based on the researches carried out by House [2002] and Knapp [2002]) aimed at helping overseas learners become more productive message producers. Finally, assuming that teaching EGL ought to be different than the standardized forms of teaching EFL, the paper suggests a number of issues (such as the self-centered hypothesis, for example) to be possibly taken into account by any average native/non-native English teacher and, subsequently, included into the comprehensible language teaching plans of which they are the authors.

Key words

EFL, EGL, TLA, PCK, functional language, language teaching syllabus, motivation, subject-matter cognitions, self-centered hypothesis, attitude, belief, Byram's resultative and motivational hypothesis

1. General assumptions

It goes without saying that English has become a world language. It is generally used as the language of world communication and in many situations it is difficult to imagine not using English as a means of transfer of any whatsoever subjectively important piece of knowledge at the nation-above level. Historically, the reasons for the current status quo of the language can be traced in the past, in the whole post-war history of the world development, that is, in the moments the world – due to a number of inventions, such as radio, television and (especially) the Internet – has shrunk into a subjectively and objectively perceived, clearly



visible and cognitively comprehended village (using the famous remark offered by M. McLuhan in: Stearn, 1986, p. 314).

It is in that period of time when the US, one of the victorious allies of the anti-Nazi coalition, has begun to build its economic and political domination in the world; it is also at that period of time when the language used by a great number of American politicians and economists has become one of the most easily recognized elements of help offered to the war-crushed nations and countries. The transmission of the information concerning many of the issues of the economic development and reconstruction of the countries, in case any of them were to be effectively used for the said reconstruction purposes was possible to be carried out in two ways: directly (i.e. by the people who were able to understand the contents of such instructions, so as to later implement them in practice) or indirectly (i.e. by means of having all the issues translated into the vernacular language of the addresses). As the first of the two options clearly appears to be not only far less complicated, but also much (economically) cheaper, it explains many of the reasons for the sudden growth of popularity of the language in the world.

Such a situation resulted in an unprecedented thirst of knowledge; suddenly, people became aware of the fact that the more they know, the better decisions they can take. This growth in human education was paralleled with human understanding of the importance of its correct processing and retrieval in case of possible re-use; the importance of cognition in the process of gaining the necessary knowledge, the salience of the application of various mental activities during human conscious involvement in many decision-making processes appeared to shift human attention on the instruments used during the transfer of information, i.e. the language. It was found out that as what generally matters in the world culture is the quality of the message, the language used during the process of such message transmission should be exact, structurally not very complicated, predominantly to-the-point and able to provide a large margin in the transmission of various types of information.

Miraculously, it suddenly appeared that English might be a language fulfilling such expectations to some extent. It was found out (cf. Stradiotova, 2010; Crystal, 1995) that English is a language which, due to its seemingly not very complicated structure, might be the language duly fulfilling the expectations of many of the proponents of the application of the language to be recognized, as this means of message transmission which both best secures and fulfills the interests of message emitters and receivers. Numerous researches carried out worldwide to discover these qualities of English which might nominate it to be the language



duly exemplifying the interests of the world culture, revealed that the inherent qualities of the language, up to a point, show its structural difference from some other European languages (cf. Thornbury, 2004; Harmer, 2003; Close, 1979) as well as relative simplicity in the production of messages (cf. Crystal, 2002; Hakuta, 1986; Fries, 1973). However, at the same time, it was stressed that English, being an agglutinative language to a large extent (Millward, 1989), requires a totally new approach which has to be developed in any language user in case they would like to apply the language for the purposes of unrestrained message production. Numerous researches carried out showed that the structure of the language is not to be easily mapped upon the structures of many other European (and not only) languages and that one needs to develop a special structural approach to be fully able to adjust their ways of reasoning to the ones expected in English (cf. House, 2006).

In this way, on the one hand, it was confirmed that the inherent structure of the language may be recognized as grammatically-friendly to its users (as it doesn't possess the traditional division into cases and one of its characteristic features is an easy-to-understand construction of a clause and/or a statement); on the other, however, it was also indicated that both the semantic and the pragmatic aspects of the language are largely dependent upon the configuration of words to be found in clauses, sentences or paragraphs. In practice, that meant that potential users of the language have to be aware of the existence of many structurally-dependent linguistic traps, which might overturn the intended meaning because of the inaccurate word order construction of a statement. In this way, the assumption of the relative simplicity of the language was to be questioned (cf. Pinker, 1994) and an approach (based upon the hypothesis of language relativity, offered by Sapir & Whorf, 1956[2002]) that any language has got its ups and downs ought to be generally accepted instead. Such a stance resulted in the appearance of a wish to elaborate (for obvious reasons), as well as to test (both empirically and with evident amount of success), a system of learning English that would be effective enough (one the one hand) and not too time-consuming (on the other).

2. Current approaches to teaching/learning EFL

Following the general estimations, the process of teaching/learning a non-native language has to be based upon a thoroughly elaborated plan where the pupils' exposition onto the live language to be learned by them has to be artfully balanced with the appropriately prepared segments of information of structural/lexical/functional nature. Teachers are generally recommended to



remember about the methods, as well as to possibly elaborate their own understanding of the recommended approaches to the technical processing of – what is called – the teaching business. It is not only Ur (2007), or Harmer (2003), but also many other scholars dealing with linguistic and/or glottodidactic activities try to explain the many problems a FL (English) teacher may face. Information, such as how to effectively deliver a language in the language classroom, how to be able to notice the learners' expectations during a language lesson, or how to manage a language classroom so that the learners become its active participants are definitely of utmost importance to anybody wishing to decently perform the demanding profession of a language teacher. Anthony (1963), as well as Richards and Rogers (1986[2001]), who not only modified the ideas offered by Anthony, but also outlined a different perspective for the very act of FL education made an attempt to stress the (direct and indirect) importance of ordered (and well-organized) teaching/learning process. Kumaravadivelu (2006), in his seminal book on the Post-Method, indicated that FLE was never to be fully limited to and dependent on the prescriptions offered by the existing methods, but that the teaching process ought to fully rest on the teacher's shoulders who had been nominated the sole organizer of the whole process of language deliverance, in this way agreeing for the practices of mixing various language teaching methods if only the final outcome were to be the growth of language competence of the learners. Such suggestions, aiming at the facilitation as well as better (and smoother) organization of the process of FLE were expected to help the learners become not only more involved participants of the language lessons, but also more competent users of the whole message production business. It was found out that the very process of FL (English) education, when squeezed down to the practices based on continual repetition of the structural rules found in a language appears to be inefficient as the learners became competent applicants of the language rules instead of becoming fluent language speakers; likewise, it was also discovered that thoughtless and not always well organized, routine-based work focused on the practice of the skill of speaking resulted in the pupils' "parrotization" (Chomsky in: Lyons, 1978) as, despite their efforts, they still were not able to produce the statements they really wished to.

All these approaches, while not being able to offer a miraculous magic wand giving FL learners a way to fast and easy internalization of the new language, still helped a lot in the scholars' attempts to outline the psychological silhouette of a language learner. It was found out that what really matters in the language learning process is the rate of learners' involvement in the learning activities; in



this way, it was proposed (cf. Harmer, 2003; Andrews, 2007; Ur, 2007; Thornbury, 2008) that the focus was to be put on the learner. What suddenly began to matter was the students' decisions as to what form and type of language, as well as with what rate of involvement they were willing to deal with (cf. Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Robinson, 1991; Basturkmen, 2008; Veselá, 2012). Apart from that, it was also found out that language learners, when poorly motivated, are not always able to produce such a language-promoting attitude that would either never let them forget about the reasons which actually had pushed them towards taking up a decisions to learn the new language, or facilitate the growth of such a voluntary pro-language learning conclusion in them.

The position of a language learner in the moment s/he begins studying (discovering) the new language, suddenly appeared to become a research topic so fascinating and time-consuming that, as a result, many aspects connected with her/his internal (mostly), but also external, attitude and approach were not only revealed, but also evidenced.

While analyzing the mutual position of both the teacher and the learner during a language lesson it was found out that it is mostly the teacher who possesses some amount of the didactic and pedagogical knowledge, possibly useful in the process of FL education; as far as the learners are concerned, it was discovered that there exist at least two different categories of them: the ones that are quite aware of what they want to obtain during the process of FL schooling; and the ones that consider a FL(English) lesson as a lesson, where it is only its contents what differentiate it from other lessons. As it is the teachers who are the 'givers', and the learners who are the 'receivers', if a language lesson were to resemble the process found in an act of communication (where, similarly, a message editor edits it for the purposes of mutual exchange of the information with the message receiver), such a lesson has not only to be well-organized, but also match the expectations subconsciously formed by the learners. In other words, the processes of perlocution, locution and illocution (proposed by Austin, 1962) have to be finely adjusted to the proportions of the classroom presentations. Anything planned to be presented in the classroom (perlocution) has not only to be presented (locution) because of some obvious reasons (illocution), but also in such a way that the learners were, first, able to grasp the sense of this presentation and, second, accept it. This appears to be one of the basic golden rules of mutual classroom cooperation that may count for the language learners' acceptance and/or approval (cf. Feuerstein, 1981).

Additionally, such an approach may expect success in the FL learners' attitude to the lessons they are about to take part in.

The process of attitude shaping of FL (English) learners usually rests upon a number of pretty delicate sensors, many of them deeply ingrained in the learners' sub-consciousness. In dependence on where the process of FL (English) learning takes place (cf. Schumann, 1976), the learners are more or less aware of the necessity of learning the language. If the expositional force of the language is evident, the learners become more aware of the fact they have to learn a foreign language; however, in case such an expositional force weakens, the learners become less aware of their obligations. In this way, following Schumann's estimations (1976, 139), the learners learning a FL (English) in the artificial conditions will be [moderately] weakly exposed to the language they are expected to learn, what means they would have to be additionally motivated by the teacher. As it seems, both the learners' attitude to the learning process and their motivation to decently perform their classroom obligations will become a dependent variable resulting from their understanding of the necessity of knowing the language. The clearer this picture has been formed in the learners' minds, the higher is their level of pro-language motivation; the more aware they are of the fact they should become competent language users, the more positive pro-language attitude has been formed in them.

Byram's (2004) resultative and motivational hypothesis seems to function as a strong evidence to back a supposition that the learners' success is an aggregate of their attitudes and beliefs towards a given FL learning process. Following Byram (2004, p. 53) it is assumed that the learners' success in a foreign language results from their attitude towards "the language, country and people". While explaining this hypothesis, Byram indicates that such a positive attitude has to be effectively shaped in FL learners or else its evident deterioration can be observed. One of the reasons illustrating the negative changes to possibly occur in the FL (English) learners' attitudes is his claim that plenty of course-book exercises are fully devoid of any whatsoever piece of information on the target language (TL) culture. When FL learners are to deal with such structures "(...) bereft of the target language culture", many of them are willing to consider them as similar to mathematical equations. It is in this moment when short-termed attitudes, stemming from a wish to obtain a relatively good grade for the work done prevail and the learners lose the larger perspective of language competence, effectively dimmed by a wish to perform well here and now. It is also worth remarking in this moment that the language expositional potential of such learners has been largely limited to getting in touch with the exercises and



their pro-language perspective was shifted from the one of knowing the language to the one of knowing an element of the language right away.

This is also where the second element of the hypothesis can be seen. It is believed that the learners' attitudes result from their beliefs (which may be short- or long-termed) as to the final success in the process of FL (English) learning. In the case their attitudes can be described as "stable of, motive-like constructs" (Byram, 2004, p. 55) their motivational orientations may be of either instrumental or integrative type. The former orientation invariably indicates the learners' concern of the final grade (and thus becoming professionally skilful, similarly to their achievements in some other school subjects); the latter, however, assumes the existence of the learners' interest in the language, understood as the most evident illustration of the cultures it embodies (Kramsh, 1998, p. 3). In this way, their second orientation must entail the learners' involvement in the process of FL (English) discovery understood as a larger and broader contact with the language learned by them (what actually means the appearance of more language-aware learners).

Ellis (2008, p. 287) claims that FL learners' attitudes are shaped by their beliefs towards the target language speakers and culture, as well as the average importance of the necessity of future TL application in the moment they are expected to use it, still being the inhabitants of their own (i.e. native) culture. An assertion like this one more time illustrates the way a FL (English) attitude is shaped in the learners' minds; additionally, this is where one can learn that it is the learners themselves who are primarily fully responsible for the formation of the internal picture illustrating the relative necessity/importance of the language they are about to learn. But a claim like that must also indicate the position of a person providing the learners with all the language-connected information. This is where the notion of functional language can be placed.

Quite a different issue, although clearly relative to those of the learners' attitudes and of functional language, can be formed by the notion of beliefs. Up to a point, such a stance emerges from possible profits language learners may gain after they have satisfactorily completed certain amount of language-connected work. In case the learners mastered a FL because of their wish to be successfully incorporated into the TL society (functioning on the position of immigrants, for example), the relative strength of such a belief is approximately high and many of such learners are not only willing, but also able to work hard to attain final success (cf. Acton & Walker de Felix, 1995, p. 20-22). Additional information in that matter can be found in a well-known research done by Acton (1979), aiming at the estimation of a perfect second (other) language learner, which proves that



the sociological attitude (shaped by the learners' beliefs) cannot be totally disregarded. While placing the ideal FL learner exactly in the middle between the relative influence of both SL and TL cultures, Acton showed that any of the two prevailing influences may dim the other perspective and, in this way, slow down the process of the learner's growth of a FL potential.

Naturally, the process of growth of one's FL potential can be stimulated (both negatively and positively) in a number of different ways. Thus, the learners' attitude to the very process of language learning ceases to be focused on their growth of the FL competence, having been invariably projected upon the grades received for such work (cf. Lamb, 2004; Sarason & Sarason, 1990; Haraczkiwicz, Manderlink & Sansone, 1984). Additionally, Vallerand and Reid (1984) showed clear interdependence between the grades and the learners' levels of motivation in respect to their level of satisfaction from the grades received by them, stating that the learners' motivation clearly gets down when the grade received approximates their beliefs as to the actual level of competence held by them.

An approach like this is not always accompanied by the one found in teachers; and even if it assists (up to a point, at least) the attitudes revealed by the learners, it is often pretty selective, primarily focusing upon certain points, subjectively assessed as more important. Numerous material consolidations carried out by teachers (mostly the ones who closely follow the course-books) are very often limited to the material covered by the nearest unit and hardly ever cover larger portions of the material. Grolnick and Ryan (1987) explicitly showed that such an approach appears to be detrimental to the all-over process of FL internalization, as it may inform the students that the material learned earlier, after it was positively assessed by the teacher, clearly loses in its relative importance in respect to general positive grade achievement ratio, what results in its forgetting. The results of this research show that the learners' attitude to the language material, as well as their average motivation to its mastering, are evidently shaped by the, often unsaid, teachers' behavior and that too obvious splitting of the material to be delivered to the learners results in evident lowering of their pro-language motivation (and, in this way, slower growth of the FL potential).

3. English as a Lingua Franca (LFE) – the approach and the actual estimations

While making an attempt to grasp the idea of Lingua Franca English (LFE), as well as to fathom the reasons of its growing popularity, one has to look at the whole problem both from the point of view offered by the history of language



development and the movements one is currently able to observe. It is glotto-philosophy which seems to offer an answer concerning the reasons of a language development; it is the current social situation observed in Europe (but not only there) which also explains the necessity of existence of such a language variant as LFE.

By now at least two points seem to be certain. The first one concerns the current status of LFE (cf. Hülmbauer et al., 2008, p. 28); the second one focuses upon the fact that it has to be recognized as a functional language.

Following Polok's research (2013, p. 127) the nature (and the status) of LFE has been defined as exonormatively oriented; it means that LFE, despite the fact the number of LFE users far exceeds the one of 'regular' English producers still cannot be recognized as an independent language, let alone its dialectal forms (just as American English is), but is to be recognized as a societal phenomenon. In order for a language to be defined as a dialectal form, some of the features of endonormative language have to be evidenced (such as, for example, the ability to produce inherent norms of use to be observed in it, in contrast to norm-depending forms of linguistic activity to be observed in case of exonormative orientation). As stated above, so far none of the endonormative activity of LFE in any of the linguistic forms of activity has been observed.

The issue of its functionality is to be tackled with care. First of all, a definition of a functional language has to be analyzed; second, the features of such a language have to be found; and third, right after discovering whether such a label of functional language can be stuck to LFE, it is necessary to find out if this form of language is duly delivered to school pupils. The basis for such a behavior appears to be clear enough; if it is school pupils who are supposed to use a global language for the purposes of international communication, what remains is to find out whether the characteristic features attributed to a functional language are correctly practiced with its future users. In other words, one has to learn whether the pragmatic (mostly) aspects of an act of communication are being paid attention to during lessons as well as whether language teachers, not only know what pragmatic aspects are characteristic for an act of functional communication, but also are able to effectively introduce them to the learners.

While making an attempt to define what a functional language may be, one may apply a less or more complicated definition. Basing upon a simpler one, such 'functional language' may be labelled to be the language applied to perform various linguistic functions, such as producing orders, apologies, requests, promises and so on. But definitely, such a definition turns the learner's attention towards language in general (as any language is predisposed to perform such



functions). It seems, therefore, necessary to focus upon certain linguistic features that can be approached from the point of view of language simplicity, especially when assessed as some flexible instrument used for fast message-production. It is there where a technical definition used in language programming may be of help. Definitely, not getting into the detail, one may define a functional language to be a language allowing for the production of semantically valid messages with the help of the smallest number of possible linguistic instruments. Secondly, the implementation of such instruments ought to match the lowest possible level of generality and abstraction. And third, last but not least, the possible (and easily-learned) operations of semantically valid forms of linguistic processing should be as uncomplicated as possible. It is here where relative simplicity of world languages is to matter. It also seems here where the semantic instruments used for message production in English have to be carefully analyzed from the perspective of the language pragmatic possibilities.

The research carried out by House (2002) offers a couple of conclusions that have to be taken into account at least. The research itself appears to be most extremely educationally salient but, mostly for the purposes of textual scarcity, only a few of the conclusions will be presented here.

The first and, by far, the most important observation is a tendency of following along the “monologic tracks” (i.e. avoidance of interaction) by non-native users of LFE. While taking part in a conversation, the research participants tried to say whatever they wished to inform the other inter-actants about, not revealing any inclination to co-operate. This observation induced House to support and re-formulate the Self-Centered Hypothesis, formed earlier by her (House, 1999), assuming that LFE inter-actants tend to prefer concentrating on their own ideas rather than sharing the solution of the problem with other talk participants. However, this behavior appeared to be shared with a form of “marked solidarity” with all the remaining talk co-actants, always ready to help each other overcome visible verbal difficulties. As it seems, the feature aimed at the discovery of the [local] meaning has been spread onto all the talk participants and the negotiations to fix the actual meaning of the idea have become one of the most salient features of such a form of message exchange¹. What is more, the inter-actants did not make an attempt to apply any preparatory strategies, which are normally observed in acts of turn-taking, such as “*I’m sorry to say so but...*”, or

¹ This, clearly observed, contradictory controversy can be explained on the grounds of argumentative vs. social forms of message presentation. The evident will to help others verbalize a concept clearly enough results from the sociolinguistic rules (such as paying attention to comprehensible presentations of individual statements) rather than the inter-actants’ flexibility about the clarification of the global notions. In this respect talk co-actants still preferred pursuing their own ways of argumentation.



even "*I must say that...*". Instead, the very content of the message was produced, with an effort to make as clear as possible that the co-actant agrees (or disagrees) with the opinion just heard. Such an approach means that the generally elaborated conversational "rules of elegance" have been recognized as redundant and removed by them. What remained is the crude main body of the message without any whatsoever additional verbal ornaments.

Another evident feature found by House while analyzing LFE talks was the "Let-It-Pass Principle", that is the visible co-actants' behavior of being not fully interested in the final verbalization of a concept in the moment they were able to grasp it skin-deep. This evidently face-saving activity (in the sense of Goffman, 1967, p. 5) may result from the talk participants' will to concentrate on some more important, in their opinion, issues such as letting the talk go or optimistically hoping that the issue, albeit not clearly presented, will somehow be encoded by the other talk participants and accepted by them as understood. This form of verbal behavior appeared to be applied so often by the talk participants that it has to be recognized as one of the characteristic features of LFE. Such a form of behavior lets the talk participants omit various possible misunderstandings based on culture-related differences, as well as accept evident differences in meaning that may result from native-culture item/concept verbalizations. Additionally, this procedure indicates that LFE talk participants tend to concentrate on these language features which appear to be far more important to them, i.e. the transfer of the general meaning of a concept rather than focusing over some required form of verbal correctness.

Finally, the issues of assumed culture relevance have to be recognized. Despite the claim that any language is to be recognized as culture-oriented, no such attempts have been discovered in the talks of the research participants. What could have been found out were their attempts to be understood despite all possibly amounting problems. The co-actants primarily tended to concentrate upon the production of the expressions illustrating their threads of thought as clearly as possible (in case of a failure they could usually count on their partners' help), thus making an attempt to apply mostly these expressions of which they hoped to be recognized as unmistakable message carriers by other talk participants. Such an approach may indicate that it is the learners' monitor (i.e. these expressions that have been duly internalized by them) that orders them to select only such [more popular] phrases which have been expected to be known by other talk participants.

The whole process of talk has been constructed in a special way; the talk participants tend to focus upon more commonly used expressions, not paying too



much attention to their actual grammatical shapes, while concentrating upon the aspects of meaning transfer first of all. In this way, the very process of making use of the meaning-transferring language has been squeezed down to the application of the most necessary linguistic elements, such as the production of the most popular phrases of which the talk participants were fully aware. Their care concerning the production of the message contents was limited to these elements which might (up to a point) secure not committing a mistake when selecting the phrases illustrating their threads of thought.

4. The practice of teaching/learning contemporary English as a functional language

The research descriptions presented above allow us to indicate possible forms of educational behavior in respect of teaching/learning a FL. At the same time it is possible to abolish certain myths so far existing in the process of FL teaching. Assuming that LFE is this form of English language course participants expect to receive the issue of the language functionality has to prevail. It is these segments of the language which have to be paid attention to first of all. In this way, it is not the aspects of the language culture roots, nor even these concerning correctness of the language grammatical constructions which have to be focused upon first of all, but the ones focusing upon the production of meaning. The issues of language pragmatics, so far effectively hidden behind the demands of careful teaching of the grammatical constructs, appear to be the most salient ones for the LFE users. Apart from that, teaching the so-called literary language seems to be a relatively less relevant. Using the taxonomy used by Cummins (2001, p. 43), what LFE users need first of all are BICS, not CALP. In other words, having approximately mastered BICS (i.e. being able to make use of a number of generally commonly used English expressions/phrases), LFE users are able to produce their messages at the level recognized as appropriately meaningful by most of non-native message receivers.

Such an approach means that the insertions found in CEFR urgently need their more exact definitions. Not every English teacher remembers what has been hidden under the CEFR indications and even if they know that each of the respective letters indicates a language level of competence of their learners, the descriptions of what has to be attained by them when participating in the process of language discovery does not seem to be very clear. In most cases the learners are requested to concentrate upon the grammatical problems, whereas a hope that they will discover the pragmatic aspects of the process of communication to be observed in English themselves remains a form of unsaid wishful thinking. In



case one wanted to deliver so-called functional language to the learners, one should focus upon these linguistic elements which duly indicate their functionality in the pragmatically-assessed process of message production. In other words, one should be able to recognize the communicative (i.e. functional) functions of language rather than the structural ones. Requesting the learners to concentrate upon the structural aspects of a language (what seems to be daily practice in many state schools) leaves many of the learners unprepared to face the demands of everyday message production.

As the process of learning anything (language learning included) is based upon the cognitive involvement of a learner in an educational activity, the issues of psychological analysis of such a process must not be overlooked. This is where careful analysis of the theory of subjective and objective self-awareness (cf. Duval & Wicklund, 1972) can be of help. Briefly speaking, humans are not just robots, unable to recognize what they need, but animate creatures ready to assume an approach towards everything they do. From this point of view, they are able to recognize their general needs in the moment they have made up their minds to start doing a planned activity. If they wish to learn a foreign language they would primarily like to discover the final ways of its application (i.e. how to use it for the purposes of meaningful message production). As they are not able to find out how difficult a process it is (this is where their objective self-awareness is at work), they start getting more and more annoyed, as they keep making use of the language still not being able to convince themselves that they can produce their messages the way they would like to (this is where their subjective self-awareness appears). In other words, the more subjectively self-aware they become, the more difficult the process of the language general recognition becomes for them. As the usual process of language learning effected in schools mostly focuses on the recognition of its structural elements, the learners believe that this is the way to their linguistic mastery. Additionally, the process of school language education makes an attempt to introduce many of the CALP aspects to the learners, focusing on the writing-based techniques of language deliverance (in many schools strictly following various language handbooks the learners are requested to write rather than to speak). When one takes into account that the very process of FL education is delivered within a strictly defined amount of time, there is not enough time to let the learners “befriend” themselves with the particular pragmatic techniques observed within the FL language learned by them. In other words, the functional aspects of the language appear to be slightly left loose, with the primary stress to be placed upon the practice of its structural side, the learning of the lexemes included (cf. the research carried out by Long

and Robinson (1998) in that matter). House (2002, 263-4) concludes her seminal paper with the following words: *"The overall aim of the planned [LFE] course is then to heighten students' sensitivity to others' communicative needs and to enable them to formulate their own questions and reply appropriately to questions posed by others, to realize their own communicative intentions in a less superficial manner, and to reach a deeper understanding of others' communicative intentions."* It seems a matter of careful analysis of an average EFL course delivered in many state schools to discover how many of the remarks postulated by her are really introduced during the students' classroom contacts with English; it is also a matter of equally careful analysis to find out how far the activities observed there match the expected levels of language fluency postulated by CEFR.

References

- ACTON, W. R. (1979). Second Language Learning and Perception of Differences in Attitude. In H. D. Brown, (Eds.), *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.
- ACTON, W. R. & WALKER de FELIX, J. (1995). Acculturation and mind. In J. M. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture Bound* (pp. 20 – 32). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- ANDREWS, S. (2007). *Teacher Language Awareness*. Cambridge: CUP
- AUSTIN, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BASTURKMEN, H. (2006). *Ideas and Options in English for Specific Purposes*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- BYRAM, M. (2004). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. London : Routledge
- CLOSE, R. A. (1979). *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*, Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Crystal, D. (2002). *The English Language*. London: Penguin Books
- CRYSTAL, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- CUMMINS. J. (2001). *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society*. Los Angeles, California Association of Bilingual Education, pp. 41 -45.
- DUVAL, S. & WICKLUND, R. (1972), *A Theory of Objective Self-Awareness*, Michigan University: Academic Press;
- ELLIS, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: OUP
- FRIES, C. C. (1973). *The Structure of English*. London: Longman
- GOFFMAN, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face to Face Behavior*, NY: Anchor.
- GROLNICK, W. S. & RYAN, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in Children's Learning: An Experimental and Individual Difference Investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(5), 890 – 898
- HAKUTA, K. (1986). *Mirror of Language. The Debate on Bilingualism*. NY: Basic Book.
- HARACKIEWICZ, J., MANDERLINK, G. & SANSONE, C. (1984). Rewarding Pinball Wizardry: The Effects of Evaluation of Intrinsic Interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 287 – 300



- HARMER, J. (2003). *How to Teach English*. London: Longman
- HOUSE, J. (2002). Developing Pragmatic Competence in English as a Lingua Franca. In K. Knapp & Ch. Meiercord (Eds.), *Lingua Franca Communication*, Wien: Peter Lang
- HUTCHINSON, T. & WATERS, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centered Approach*. Cambridge: CUP.
- HÜLMBAUER, C., BÖHRINGER, H., & SEIDLHOFER, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF) Precursor and partner in intercultural communication. *Syneriges Europe*, 3, 25 – 36.
- KRAMSCH, C. (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LAMB, M. (2004). It Depends on The Students Themselves; Independent Language Learning at an Indonesian State School. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17, 229-245
- LONG, M. & ROBINSON, P. (1998). Focus on Form; Theory, Research and Practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: CUP.
- KUMARAVADIVELU, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching*, Mahbaum, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Publishers.
- MILLWARD, C. (1989). *The Bibliography of the English Language*, Philadelphia: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich College Publishers
- PINKER, S. (1994). *The Language Instinct; How the Mind Creates Language*. London: William Morrow & Co.
- POLOK, K. (2013). Teaching (Lingua Franca) English. In Tabačková, Z. (Ed.), *Cudzie jazyky a kultúry v škole 10*, Nitra: PF UKF
- ROBINSON, P. (1991). *ESP Today: A Practitioner's Guide*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- SARASON, I. G. & SARASON, B. R. (1990). Text Anxiety. In H. Leitenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Social and Evaluation Anxiety* (pp. 475 – 493), New York: Plenum Press.
- SCHUMANN J. H. (1976). Second Language Acquisition; The Pidginization Process. *Language Learning*, 26(2), 391 – 408.
- STRADIOTOVA, E. (2010). Hodnotenie, testovanie a typy testov. *Fórum cudzích jazykov*, 2(2), 63-70.
- THORNBURY, S. (2004). *About Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- UR, P. (2007). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
- VALLERAND, R. J. & REID, G. (1984). On the Casual Effects of Perceived Competence and Task Feedback on Intrinsic Interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 94–102.
- VESELÁ, K. et al. (2012). *Teaching ESP in New Environments*. Nitra : ASPA.

Contact

Krzysztof Polok, PhD
ul. Zacisza 698
43-384 Jaworze, Poland
sworntran@interia.pl