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MASTER’S EXAMINATION

The aim of the examination:
- to define the level of professional knowledge of a candidate for Master’s degree, the candidate’s preparedness for independent pedagogical activities and research work.

The objectives of the examination: to define the degree to which a student
- knows methodological and theoretical basics of subject didactics, its aims, content, methods, teaching approaches and techniques, etc; is aware of how concrete pedagogical tasks shall be realized in subject teaching; can design pedagogical activities and apply knowledge of methodology in practice (to define a methodological aim of a lesson / activity, to evaluate and choose lesson materials, to assess teacher’s and student’s activities, etc);
- can apply in pedagogical practice the system knowledge of main psychological processes, of particularities and rules of students’ development, of study process organization, classroom management and communication;
- has acquired knowledge of research methods in pedagogy; can solve pedagogical and psychological tasks while teaching a subject and can justify advantages of the chosen method; knows methods of academic text analysis and is able to compose a scientific text independently.

The following competences shall be assessed at the examination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psychological-pedagogical competence</th>
<th>Methodological competence</th>
<th>Research competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination format

Day 1

| Psychological-pedagogical competence (skills) | 25 minutes | Solution of 3 psychological-pedagogical tasks. |
| Methodological competence (skills)           | 25 minutes | Solution of 4 methodological tasks.           |
| Methodological competence (skills )          | 45 minutes | Lesson plan writing.                         |
| Research competence                          | 60 minutes | Writing of a short academic text in an offered academic writing genre |

Day 2

| Methodological and Psychological-pedagogical competence (knowledge) | 95 minutes | 70 questions, a multiple choice test. |

Day 2

| Psychological-pedagogical competence | 25 minutes | Solution of 3 psychological-pedagogical tasks. |
| Methodological competence           | 25 minutes | Solution of 4 methodological tasks.           |
| Methodological competence (skills ) | 45 minutes | Lesson plan writing.                         |
| Research competence                 | 60 minutes | Writing of a short academic text in an offered academic writing genre |

Day 2

| Methodological and Psychological-pedagogical competence (knowledge) | 95 minutes | 70 questions, a multiple choice test. |

Day 2

| Psychological-pedagogical competence | 25 minutes | Solution of 3 psychological-pedagogical tasks. |
| Methodological competence           | 25 minutes | Solution of 4 methodological tasks.           |
| Methodological competence (skills ) | 45 minutes | Lesson plan writing.                         |
| Research competence                 | 60 minutes | Writing of a short academic text in an offered academic writing genre |

Day 2

| Methodological and Psychological-pedagogical competence (knowledge) | 95 minutes | 70 questions, a multiple choice test. |
A candidate for Master’s degree has to acquire knowledge and skills in the following subject areas:

Methods in Subject Areas

**Methodology I**
- Teaching and Learning: Factors, Styles, Methods.
- Teaching English to Young Learners.
- Teaching Pronunciation, Grammar and Vocabulary to YL.
- Teaching Speaking & Listening to YL.
- Teaching Reading and Writing to YL.
- Songs and Storytelling in the Primary Classroom.
- Games and Project Work.
- Lesson Planning and Classroom Management.

**Methodology II**
- Teaching English to Teenagers.
- Classroom Management.
- Lesson Planning.
- Curriculum, Syllabus and Coursebooks.
- Teaching Grammar and Vocabulary.
- Teaching Receptive Skills: Listening and Reading.
- Teaching Productive Skills: Speaking and Writing.
- Correcting Errors, Testing and Assessment.

**Methodology III**
- Classroom Management Issues.
- Listening Skills Development.
- Speaking Skills Development.
- Writing Skills Development.
- Grammar Skills Development.

**Curriculum and Materials Development**
- Educational value systems. The place and role of foreign languages in education.
- Curriculum development. Goals and objectives in foreign language education.
- The Common European Framework of Reference for Modern Languages: Learning, teaching and assessment (CEFR) and the Common Reference Levels.
- Different types of language syllabus. Designing an EFL syllabus.
• Language teaching materials. The European Language Portfolio (ELP).
• The role of coursebooks in foreign language teaching. Evaluating EFL teaching materials.
• Supplementing coursebooks. Designing EFL teaching materials.
• A model of materials development. Designing tasks.

• Academic Writing: Aims, Features and Functions.
• Academic Style.
• Academic Writing Genres.
• Process Writing: Pre-Writing, Writing and Reviewing.
• Quotations, Paraphrasing and Summarising.
• Referencing.

• Tunnutusprotsessid. Psühnika ja teadvus, psühnika funktsioonid. Inimese närvisüsteem. Mäl, mõtlemine, taju ja tähendab. Õpilase mõitlemise, mäl, taju ja tähendab arenguga seotud küsimused; erinevad teooriad ja uurimismeetodid.
• Õppimine ja õpetamine. Õppimise määratlused, õppimisteooriad ning nende rakendused. Õppe ja kasvatuse eesmärgistamine. Õppemedd ja strateegiad. Õpioskused. Õpimisprotsessi olemus, põhimõisted ja mudelid. Õpimisprotsessi kontseptsioonid. Õpimisprotsessi kujundamine ja strateegiad. Õpimisprotsessi klassi ohjamine. Õpkekava, õppimise plaan, selle komponentid ja rakendamise tasandid. Üld- ja valdkonnapädevused, läbipiser teed / üldoskused, nende arengu toetamise võimalused aineõppes / üldõpetuses ja aineüleselt. Hindamine (õppe) kavandamine osana. Õppijat toetav hindamine ja tagasisidestamine.
Psühholoogia ja üldkasavatusteadus

raskuste ja barjääride ületamine.

- **Õpetaja identiteet ja juhtimine**
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**REFERENCES**


**RESEARCH COMPETENCE**

Subtest „METHODOLOGICAL COMPETENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL-PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE (knowledge)“.

TEST TASK SAMPLE

Task duration — 95 minutes. Test consists of 70 tasks.
You have received a test and an answer sheet. Write down your surname on each page of the answer sheet.
Choose the right answer by putting a corresponding letter into the answer sheet. For example:

A B C D (C — correct answer).

If you have made a mistake and would like to correct it, then show it as follows:

A B D (C — mistake, D — correct answer).

If you have changed your choice one more time, do not correct or cross out anything but just enter the final variant of your answer into the additional column.

Do not write anything in the test paper! The answer sheet is the only one to be checked.

Tasks 1–50 (Methodological competence: knowledge)
Choose your answer and mark it in the answer sheet.

(1) Which of the following language teaching methods does not have the development of communicative competence as one of its main aims? Please choose one.

(A) Task-based learning
(B) Audio-lingual method
(C) Content-based language learning
(D) Communicative language teaching

(2) Which of the following techniques is not an example of language practice? Please choose one.

(A) Composing sentences using a substitution table.
(B) Writing a summary of a newspaper article.
(C) Reciting a dialogue learnt by heart from the book.
(D) Writing a postcard using a detailed model.

(3) Which of the following is not part of the reflection stage of a lesson? Please choose one.

(A) Self-assessment of students.
(B) Presentation of new vocabulary.
(C) Students giving feedback to the teacher.
(D) Revision of studied vocabulary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks 51–70 (Psychological-pedagogical competence: knowledge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Määratlege ja märkige ära millises tunnetussüsteemis on sönastatud järgmised väljendid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51) Kui ma vaatan tulevikku, siis see tundub mulle ähmane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) visuaalses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) kinesteetilises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52) Saša muutub kurdiks, kui mina räägin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) visuaalses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) kinesteetilises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53) Maša on ärevil enne järjekordset ettekannet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) visuaalses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) kinesteetilises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) Miski ütleb mulle, et ma eksin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) visuaalses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) kinesteetilises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valige üks vastus

| Valige üks vastus (55) | Kalduvus, põhjendada kogu inimese käitumist, toetudes nende omadustele, mis tunduvad meile tema peamisteks, nimetatakse ………………. efektiks. | (A) primaarsuse |
| (B) oreooli |
| (C) platsebo |
| (D) Pigmaleoni |
| Valige üks vastus (56) | Milline neist ei ole kooperatiivse õppimise meetod | (A) paaristöö vastamisega õpetaja küsitlemise |
| (B) vastastikune küsitlemine |
| (C) tehtud tööde analüüs |
| (D) tööjaotusega rühmatöö |
| (E) ühisõppimine rühmas |
| (F) loeng-vestlus |
| Valige üks vastus (57) | Biheivoristlik lähenedemine vaatleb isiksust, kui: | (A) oma käitumise tagajärgede mõtestajat (arusaajat) |
| (B) erinevate situatsioonide kognitivset interpreteerijat |
| (C) konflikti, teadvustamata jõudude ja reaalsuse vahel |
| (D) inimestevahelist vastastikust mõjutamist |
Subtest «METHODOLOGICAL COMPETENCE (skills)»

**TEST COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS**

**Test duration — 70 minutes.** The test consists of 5 tasks.

**Tasks 1–4:** You have to solve a methodological task; to analyse and compare lesson plans and choose the most appropriate one by explaining your choice; to compare exercises and give your assessment of their methodological value; to correct mistakes, etc.

**Task 5:** You have to select study materials from the ones available in the examination room and to compose a lesson plan on one of cross-curricula topics by using the materials. The lesson plan shall include didactic materials which you have devised yourself.

**Task 1**

Considering the test categories presented below how would you label a **cloze test employing a passage with every fifth word deleted, beginning from a randomized starting point, which was scored in such a way that only the exact original words of the passage were accepted, and students’ scores were compared with those of other students to determine comparative language proficiency?**

**CONTRASTING CATEGORIES OF ESL TESTS**

Knowledge Tests vs. Performance (or Skills) Tests
Subjective Tests vs. Objective Tests
Direct Tests vs. Indirect Tests
Productive Tests vs. Receptive Tests
Language Sub-skill Tests vs. Communication Skills Tests
Norm-referenced Tests vs. Criterion-referenced Tests
Discrete-point Tests vs. Integrative Tests
Proficiency Tests vs. Achievement Tests
Speed Tests vs. Power Tests

**Task 2**

Define and reason **washback effects** of the following examples of ESL assessment:

1. A progress test which concentrates on one out of for chapters covered in the textbook.
2. An end of year test which concentrates on grammar and vocabulary, even though you have done lots of speaking and listening.
3. A diagnostic test which has shown that your class is very weak on speaking skills.
4. An end of year test of reading, listening and speaking, covering a wide range of material.

**Task 3**

In the coursebook unit on Education there is a vocabulary teaching section with 4 exercises which present and practice new vocabulary of the unit. How would you characterize the coursebook’s approach to teaching vocabulary? Name the techniques of vocabulary presentation and give at least four additional options to follow the communicative approach of ELT.

1. Match the following words from the text with suitable definitions from the right-hand column and translate. <.....>
2. Translate the following words from the listening task. <....>
3. Translate the following subjects and expressions with the word ‘exam’: <.....>
4. Many sciences and other subjects of study end in –ology. How many –ologies do you know? Add to the following list: psychology, geology, climatology, Egyptology… <....>
Task 5

Use the following form of a lesson plan and the materials available in the examination room to compose a lesson plan for a 45-minute consolidation lesson on the cross-curricular topic “Environment” for grade 8 students (14–15 y.o.). The lesson plan should also include activities and didactic materials devised by yourself (at least 1 activity / material).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson stage / activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher’s tasks</th>
<th>Learner’s tasks</th>
<th>Language skills</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LESSON PLAN**

Student’s name:
Grade:
Teaching aids:
Topics to be covered:
Objectives:

1. Language objective (grammar / vocabulary):

2. Skills objective (listening / speaking / reading / writing):

3. Cultural / cognitive / content objective:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Yes / No Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The lesson has clearly stated and realistic learning outcomes in terms of language, culture / content / cognition / learning skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The lesson is built around a certain topic and it is observable in all stages of the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>All the stages of the lesson relate to the topic and support the achievement of the learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The structure of the lesson is well-balanced and logical. Warm-up, teaching / learning and reflection / evaluation / feedback stages are present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The lesson offers rich input in the form of authentic / visual / auditory materials and objects. The input relates to the topic, learning outcomes, previous learning and is accessible but challenging for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The lesson is learner-centred and creates numerous opportunities for students to use the language and participate in the lesson actively. (e.g. role playing, simulations, plays, discussions, presentations, pair and group work, peer and group teaching, problem-solving, creating, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The lesson involves pre-, while- and post-reading / writing / listening / speaking activities to make the content and language more accessible and provide scaffolding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The lesson creates an opportunity for reflection, feedback and evaluation of language (content / culture / etc.) learning (e.g. quiz, discussion, test, mind maps, self-/peer / teacher-directed evaluation, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subtest «PSYCHOLOGICAL-PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE (skills)»

TEST COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

Test duration — 25 minutes. The test consists of 3 tasks.
You shall analyse a pedagogical communication situation. Your assignment is to answer follow-up questions and to complete a task on it.
The recommended time for the task completion: 25 minutes.

1. Ülesanne

Situatsioon: Mari on üldiselt edukas viienda klassi õpilane. Paraku on tal aga üks mure, mis takistab tal edukalt ainult viitele õppimast. Nimelt ei suuda ta klassi ees esineda ja nii mõnelgi korral on teda haaranud lausa paanika.

Küsimused tudengitele:
• Millise õppimisteooria abil on antud situatsiooni võimalik selgitada? Palun tehke seda.
• Millest võib olla selline hirm tingitud? Tooge näiteid erinevate põhjuste kohta.
• Millised oleksid võimalused sellist hirmu taandada või täielikult eemaldada?

2. Ülesanne


Küsimused tudengitele:
Määratlege, millistest temperamenditüübi omadustest on juttu järgmistes näidetes. Põhjendage oma vastust.

3. Ülesanne

Analüüsse järgmist õpetaja ja õpilase vahelist dialoogi E. Berne transaktsiooni analüüsist lähtuvalt ja selgitage transaktsiooni analüüsi skeemi kasutades, miks selles situatsioonis peitub konflikt.

Dialoog:
Õpilane: „Millist peatükki pean ma järgmiseks tunniks ära õppima?“
Õpetaja: „Millist peatükki! Millist peatükki! Ma ju tunnis kõigist sellest juba rääkisin!“
Subtest «RESEARCH COMPETENCE»

TEST COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

**Test duration — 60 minutes.** The test consists of 1 task. You are offered for analysis an academic article from the reading list recommended for independent study. **Your task** is to write a short academic text in the recommended genre (summary, annotation, abstract), to compose a list of sources, to include citing and referencing in accordance with academic writing conventions.

---

**SOURCES**

Towards quality-CLIL: successful planning and teaching strategies¹

Hacia un CLIL/AICLE de calidad: estrategias efectivas de planificación y enseñanza

Oliver Meyer*

---

**Abstract**

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is currently gaining considerable momentum and it is being integrated into curricula all across Europe. However, there is still a lack of appropriate teaching materials and a comprehensive and integrative CLIL methodology has yet to be developed. Legitimate concerns have been raised that practitioners may fail to reach the inherent potential of the CLIL approach unless they embrace the specific CLIL mindset and are provided with the methodological competences needed to bring this innovative approach to life and to ensure quality teaching and learning. This article intends to address this problem by establishing quality criteria for successful and sustainable CLIL teaching and learning and by introducing a flexible planning tool that enables teachers to develop innovative materials based on the 4Cs-Framework (Coyle).

**Resumen**

El aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua extranjera (AICLE/CLIL) está tomando un impulso considerable, prueba de ello es que está siendo integrado en los programas académicos de toda Europa. Sin embargo, hay todavía una falta de materiales didácticos adecuados para su práctica, y queda todavía por desarrollar un enfoque CLIL integral e integrado. Existe la legítima preocupación de que los educadores no lleguen a alcanzar el potencial inherente del enfoque AICLE sino adoptan una mentalidad AICLE y unas competencias metodológicas idóneas para hacer que este enfoque innovador cobre vida y asegurar un proceso de enseñanza y aprendizaje de calidad. Este artículo intenta referirse a este problema estableciendo criterios de calidad que ayuden a conseguir una enseñanza y aprendizaje CLIL exitoso y sostenible, e introduciendo una herramienta de planificación flexible, que permite a los docentes desarrollar materiales innovadores basados en el marco de las 4 Cs (Coyle).

**Keywords:**

CLIL, planning, methodology, criteria, teaching.

**Palabras clave:**

CLIL, planificación, metodología, criterio, enseñanza.
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¹ This article is a shortened version of Meyer, Oliver (2010): «Introduction to the CLIL Pyramid: Key Strategies and Principles for Quality CLIL Planning and Teaching». In: Eisenmann, Maria and Summer, Theresa (eds.) (2010): Basic Issues in EFL Teaching and Learning. Heidelberg: Winter. Forthcoming
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1. Insights from CLIL-Research

CLIL has been a tremendous success story and its influence on practice is currently expanding quickly across Europe and beyond. Recent research has confirmed that CLIL has positive effects on the language skills of EFL learners, placing them well ahead of their non-CLIL counterparts (DESI, 2006; Zyydati, 2007a; and Lasagabaster, 2008). At the same time, studies also indicate that the learning of content does not suffer in this process, in some cases CLIL students even outperformed their non-CLIL counterparts (Badertscher, 2009 and Heine, 2008). Taken together, there is much evidence to suggest that CLIL students are equally, if not more successful, at learning a subject than students learning content subjects in L1. This means that CLIL may be considered as an approach that is mutually beneficial for both content and language subjects.

Despite CLIL’s documented potential, there are still limited methodological resources and practical guidance to enable teachers to plan and teach with a multiple focus that is vital to the successful integration of content and language. The 4Cs-Framework (Coyle, 1999, 2006) offers a sound theoretical and methodological foundation for planning CLIL lessons and constructing materials because of its integrative nature. It is built on the following principles:

- Content: Content matter is not only about acquiring knowledge and skills, it is about the learners creating their own knowledge and understanding and developing skills (personalized learning);
- Cognition: Content is related to learning and thinking (cognition). To enable the learners to create their own interpretation of content, it must be analysed for its linguistic demands; thinking processes (cognition) need to be analysed in terms of their linguistic demands;
- Communication: language needs to be learned which is related to the learning context, learning through that language, reconstructing the content and its related cognitive processes. This language needs to be transparent and accessible; interaction in the learning context is fundamental to learning. This has implications when the learning context operates through the medium of a foreign language;
- Culture: the relationship between cultures and languages is complex. Intercultural awareness is fundamental to CLIL. Its rightful place is at the core of CLIL (see Coyle, 2006: 9-10).

In order to succeed, CLIL teachers and textbook writers need flexible tools and recommendations on how to develop quality materials based on the 4Cs-Framework. The call for quality and accountability (Coyle, 2007) must be answered because recent
studies also show that there are many unresolved issues in CLIL classrooms. Dalton-Puffer’s research revealed that productive language skills, especially speaking, are not promoted in many CLIL-classrooms. Also, she observed a lack of academic discourse functions (Dalton-Puffer, 2007). One of the results of Vollmer’s comparative study was that many CLIL students show very poor academic writing skills, even at the age of 16. More often than not, they failed to verbalize subject-specific issues in an appropriate way (Vollmer, 2008). Vriebock’s analysis of recurring patterns of argumentation in the teachers’ mind-sets shows that the CLIL approach runs a risk of being “misused” as a justification of out-dated teaching habits and methodological monotony (Vriebock, 2006).

In sum, embracing the CLIL approach does not automatically lead to successful teaching and learning. To truly realize the added value of CLIL, teachers need to embrace a new paradigm of teaching and learning and they need tools and templates that help them plan their lessons and create/adapt their materials.

The CLIL-Pyramid is based on the 4Cs-Framework and was developed as an integrative planning tool for material writers and lesson planners. It has been successfully used in both pre- and in-service teacher training courses in Germany and across Europe.²

The following quality principles and strategies are based on the latest insights from CLIL research, second language acquisition (SLA), teaching methodology, cognitive psychology, extensive classroom observation in several countries, as well as a critical reflection of the author’s personal experience as a CLIL teacher, teacher trainer and materials writer.

2. Strategy No. 1: rich Input

Meaningful, challenging and authentic. Those should be the main criteria for selecting appropriate classroom materials. SLA studies have shown that meaningful and challenging input is one of the main pillars of foreign language acquisition. Classroom content should be meaningful in a sense that it focuses on global problems mankind faces (Klafki’s “epochal typical Schlüsselprobleme”) while connecting with the daily lives of our students and their areas of interest. Krashen’s monitor hypothesis and recent insights gained from neurolinguistic studies stress the importance of motivation and its effect on (language-) learning (Dornyei, 2006; Liuolienne/Metiuine, 2006). Put simply, subject learning through a foreign language works best when new topics are presented

² These findings are based on the written evaluation of several Comenius Courses.
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in such a way that the affective filters of the students remain wide open and when students can link new input to prior knowledge, experiences and attitudes.

Video clips, flash-animations, web-quests, pod-casts or other interactive materials on English websites combine motivating and illustrative materials with authentic language input. They constitute a rich source for designing challenging tasks that foster creative thinking and create opportunities for meaningful language output. Such websites also provide ample opportunities for self-directed and differentiated learning, a chance for students to autonomously prepare for the next lesson, to review issues dealt with in class using a different medium/mode of presentation, or for individual portfolio work; or all of the above.

However, the struggle for authenticity can be misleading. It may lead us to assume that we can dispense with one of the key functions of every CLIL teacher: that of acting as a language role-model who actively shows and teaches students how to perform language operations such as analyzing or interpreting pictures, maps, satellite images, video clips, or verbalizing complex higher order thinking processes.

The role of the teacher in the teaching and learning process needs to be reevaluated. What is needed for successful learning is an appropriate balance of teacher-directed and learner-directed activities; thus enabling teachers to provide the necessary, modeling scaffolding and motivation (Gudjons, 2007). Especially in CLIL classrooms, teacher feedback, systematic and professional error treatment, is crucial for successful learning (Meyer, 2010).

One of the key concepts for selecting materials is that of «multi-modal input» (»Wechsel der Darstellungsformen«) (Leisen, 2005). The various ways of presenting subject specific matters visually (through maps, diagrams, etc.) not only allow for diversified teaching and promote visual literacy, they also enable a deeper understanding of the specific subject content and serve to illustrate and clarify complex matters presented in a foreign language.

Converting information from one mode of representation (e.g. text) into another (map, chart, graph, etc.), and from one mode of representation in L1 into one in L2 fosters both language and content learning and it also takes into account the individual needs of students’ different learning styles and their multiple intelligences. To successfully deal with multi-modal input, students need to have a wide variety of study skills at their disposal which makes the scaffolding of language and learning a key component of successful CLIL teaching.
3. Strategy No. 2: Scaffolding Learning

To make sure that students successfully deal with authentic materials and that as much input as possible can become intake, it is essential for students to receive ample support. They need scaffolding\(^1\) to help them cope with language input of all sorts. The quantity and intensity of scaffolding can be reduced as students’ language skills advance.

Scaffolding serves several purposes:

1. It reduces the cognitive and linguistic load of the content/input (= input-scaffolding) which means that scaffolding helps students understand the content and language of any given material.
2. It enables students to accomplish a given task through appropriate, supportive structuring.
3. Scaffolding also supports language production (= pushed output) by providing phrases, subject-specific vocabulary and collocations needed to complete assignments. It helps students to verbalize their thoughts appropriate to the subject manner. In other words, scaffolding done right will boost students’ cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP).

With the scarcity of good teaching materials/textbooks in most countries, CLIL teachers depend on authentic materials. Since these materials are not created with the needs of foreign language learners in mind, these materials contain more lexical items than the students are familiar with, certainly more so than contemporary EFL textbooks.

That does not mean, however, that each of those words has to be introduced to the class or that texts containing unfamiliar words are not suitable for CLIL classrooms. Clearly, this is not the case: the skill to infer the meaning of new words from the context or to find out which passages of a text are relevant for a specific task is of great practical importance and needs to be well-honed. Students need to lose their fear of unknown words and structures.

Questions and tasks have to be designed in such a way that students can easily understand the gist of what is being said even though they do not have complete understanding of the text. Nothing succeeds like success! We need to focus on what

\(^{1}\) See Walqui (2006) for a comprehensive overview on scaffolding and for a conceptual pedagogic framework. For concrete examples on how to scaffold videos, pictures, graphs, texts etc. see Böltger-Meyer (2008).
students can understand, help them express their thoughts appropriately, and give them reasons to be proud of their progress instead of discouraging their natural curiosity and their desire to learn.

In order to help our learners construct their own learning, they need to be taught how to learn efficiently. Learning skills and strategies, and that especially goes for subject-specific study skills like working with maps, diagrams or pictures, must be practised continually and become an integral part of every CLIL lesson. They are the pillars of CLIL learning and their potential for promoting language as well as higher order and critical thinking skills has long been neglected.

Cognitive Psychology, e.g. Anderson’s Adaptive Control of Thought (ACT) Model (Anderson, 1983), views skill learning as the proceduralization of rule-bound declarative knowledge through practice and feedback. Declarative knowledge refers to knowledge about facts and figures whereas procedural knowledge refers to knowledge about how to perform various cognitive activities. The main tenets of ACT are:

- Declarative knowledge is encoded directly from observation and instruction.
- Skill development depends on transforming this knowledge into production rules that represent procedural knowledge.
- Production rules can only be acquired through practice.

(taken from Ranta/Lyster, 2007)

In order to facilitate skill learning, instructional activities should «set up contexts in which these skills can be displayed, monitored, and appropriate feedback given to the shape of their acquisition» (Lyster, 2007: 149). It is clear that a high degree of automaticity, that is fast, accurate and spontaneous effortless use of knowledge, however hard it may be to achieve, is the ultimate goal for most learners. That is both because of the impact on the quality of linguistic output and because it frees up resources for processing message content instead of language (Segalowitz, 2003). It follows that meaningful and systematic practice, which in other fields of studies is simply called training, clearly is of great importance in the CLIL-classroom.

In our studies, experience has shown that students who are not as gifted in language learning as other students greatly benefit from scaffolding. Their motivation for language learning often increases once they understand how and in which order to proceed, and which phrases to use when describing pictures, analyzing charts, or interpreting cartoons for instance.
4. Strategy No. 3: rich interaction and pushed output

Long's Interaction Hypothesis proposes that language acquisition is strongly facilitated by the use of the target language in interaction. Long suggests that feedback obtained during conversational interaction promotes interlanguage development because interaction «connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways» (Long 1996: 451-2). Swain has claimed that modified output benefits L2 development because «learners need to be pushed to make use of their resources; they need to have their linguistic abilities stretched to their fullest, they need to reflect on their output and consider ways of modifying it to enhance comprehensibility, appropriateness and accuracy.» (Swain, 1993: 160f.). Student interaction and output is triggered by tasks which is why task design is at the heart of every CLIL lesson and one of the key competences for every CLIL teacher.

Sample Task #1:
You’ve applied for one of the 10 Most Exciting Summer Jobs Program’s highlights: working as a hurricane co-pilot/tornado hunter. In order to get the job you have to hand in a short video of yourself, you will be interviewed, you will have to show that you know how to read and interpret climate charts and satellite images, and that you know your natural hazards inside out.

Team A will prepare for the interview conducted by team B. The interviews will be recorded and analysed. Then you will switch roles.

Sample Task #2:
Prepare your appearance in a Talk Show about Australia’s minorities based on the materials you’ve been handed out and the movie we’ve watched (Rabbit Proof Fence). Each team will be assigned different roles. Choose a suitable talk show host. The show will be recorded.

The above examples show that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) offers a wide range of methodological opportunities for EFL teaching and, in addition, they illustrate why this approach should be an integral part of CLIL teaching. TBLT focuses on bringing authentic communication into the classroom because — according to TBLT advocates — languages are acquired most successfully when they are learned for communicative purposes in meaningful and significant social situations. The various task parameters and -variables (i.e. pre-planning time, interaction patterns, pressure on language production, task-structure etc.) can be adjusted to foster and improve fluency, accuracy, and complexity of language production.

One of the core-features of TBLT is the so-called gap-principle. It states that authentic communication will occur when there are certain communication gaps (information gap:...
transferring information from a text to a table or from pupil to another; reasoning gaps: deducing a teacher’s timetable from a set of class timetables or working out an optimum course of action given different variables and opinion gaps: completing a story and comparing endings) which need to be bridged by the students.

Teachers can make use of that principle and create authentic communicative situations by providing such gaps and asking the students to fill them through cooperative interaction. Task-repetition is another very efficient way to promote communication skills. Even though the effects of task-repetition on fluency have been documented in several studies (Bygate, 2001), they have hardly been integrated in cooperative classroom activities so far. The innovative multiple-performance-task was developed in one of our CLIL-seminars and combines the communicative benefits of the gap principle with those of task-repetition (cf. figure 1).

- A group of four students is asked to read four different texts (jigsaw reading activity).
- They are then asked to share that information with one of their group members in a way that each student gets to talk to three group members who are not familiar with the content of this text.
- By giving each student the opportunity to repeat their performance twice, students not only get a huge amount of authentic talking time, one can also expect increases in the fluency of the performance because they will feel more and more confident with each repetition.
- If students are allowed to check dictionaries between turns, the complexity of their output can also be expected to rise.

Giving students pre-planning time is likely to increase accuracy and complexity, while reduced planning time is likely to result in more fluency but less accuracy and complexity (Ellis, 2003).

Figure 1: multiple-performance task. This sequence was specifically developed to maximize both output production and the retention rate of subject content in CLIL classrooms operating under real-life conditions.
The relationship between CLIL and TBLT is symbiotic: authentic and meaningful content is used to create motivating and challenging tasks. Authentic communication in different cooperative formats (like think-pair-share activities) triggered by those tasks and the frequent negotiation of meaning necessary to complete them enables a greater depth and bandwidth of content learning.

Research into the complex relationship between language and thinking and its effect on language learning/acquisition has led Swain to formulate the idea of «languageing» which she defines as «the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language» (Swain, 2006: 89). Languageing completes our thoughts/cognition/ideas and transforms them into artifacts that allow for further contemplation, which, in turn, transforms thought. While speaking (or writing), a new or deeper understanding may be achieved (O’Connell cited in Swain, 2009: 5).

There is no need for tasks to be as comprehensive and time-consuming as the ones listed above. Authentic communication can be achieved in short periods of valuable teaching time when:

- students draw a graph based on sharing information.
- students sit back to back and are asked to spot mistakes in pictures handed to them without showing them to each other.
- students create L2 subtitles or an audio track for an L1 video clip or vice versa using software like Microsoft Moviemaker or similar freeware.

5. Strategy No. 4: Adding the (Inter-)cultural Dimension

Grimalda recently examined the degree of interaction among individuals in the process of globalization (Grimalda, 2006). Preliminary results indicate that people's willingness to cooperate significantly increases the better they know each other. This means that students need to learn about other countries. However, factual knowledge about other countries and cultures is not enough for successful intercultural communication; neither are foreign language skills alone. Cultures differ in many aspects including view of self, perceptions of time, and verbal and non-verbal communication styles, which need to be taken into account also.

If we want to prepare our students to succeed in a globalized world, enable them to work in teams across national and cultural borders, intercultural communicative competence (Camerer, 2007) needs to be the ultimate educational goal and at the
heart of our teaching. CLIL can offer a significant contribution to that goal. Students do not only have to learn how to talk about key issues in the lingua franca. They also need to become aware of the hidden cultural codes and the appropriate linguistic and non-linguistic means and strategies to address them and they need to be taught how to keep the flow of communication going without offending the partner.

Looking at various topics from different cultural angles, realizing that other cultures tend to see things differently, have different values and beliefs, is one of the most valuable experiences that CLIL may offer. Studies comparing various CLIL-textbooks have shown that the cultural dimension has not been properly exploited yet.

6. Strategy No. 5: Make it H.O.T.

![CLIL Core Elements Diagram]

Figure 2: CLIL Core Elements ©Oliver Meyer

A word to the wise: of the approximately 80,000 questions asked on average annually by teachers, 80 per cent are at the lowest level of thinking – factual knowledge. (Gall 1984; Watson/Young 1986 in Mehdiari et al. 2006)
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Indeed, thinking skills (H.O.T.s) are the key to success in the Information Age. The citation above shows how far away we are from this goal regarding the teaching of thinking skills in class. Vollmer’s comparative study of CLIL classrooms reaches a similar conclusion:

Another important result is that both groups of learners show considerable deficits in their academic language use, in the knowledge and mastery of academic forms of communication and of writing in particular: the specific competences in handling the language dimension adequately and in expressing their thoughts and findings appropriately or functionally according to the genre(s) demanded are equally low, they show a serious lack of command over or sensitivity for the requirements of academic language use, both in L2 and in L1. (Vollmer, 2008: 272)

This is a very inconvenient truth. Academic discourse functions, the intersection of content, cognition and language, the ability to express complex thought processes appropriately, do not appear automatically but need systematic instruction, both in L1 and L2. This has several consequences for an effective CLIL teaching methodology:

1. The core elements of CLIL (cf. figure 2) i.e. input, tasks, output, and scaffolding have to be balanced in such a way that various cognitive activities are triggered. Effective teaching means creating environments in which students are engaged, challenged, and saturated with various types of thinking – without being overwhelmed (Zwiers, 2006). Michael Pohl and others have shown how the revised Bloom taxonomy can be put to use in order to level tasks according to cognitive demand and how it can be turned into a powerful tool for planning truly differentiated units by combining it with Gardner’s concept of multiple intelligences. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the learning process is probably more concurrent than sequential and that students may not have to go through all the less complex thinking stages like remember or understand in order to successfully synthesize, evaluate or create (Zwiers, 2006).

2. Systematic language work is of paramount importance when teaching thinking. Students need to be shown how to express their thoughts in an increasingly complex manner: «Every learning involves language learning or is language learning at the same time and (that) communication, therefore is of overriding importance also in subject learning» (Vollmer 2008: 273). Zwiers (2006) demonstrates how academic thinking skills can easily be incorporated into one’s teaching routine and how the

---

4 Sample grids that show how to combine Bloom’s taxonomy and Gardner’s concept of multiple intelligences for different age groups are available online: http://www.cap.nsw.edu.au/teachers/tech_based_resources/ml_pages/index.htm
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verbalization of these thinking skills can be fostered through various activities and with the use of writing scripts/scaffolding frames.

7. Strategy No. 6: sustainable learning

«Julia, could you please sum up the main points of last week’s lesson?»
«No, I can’t. You see, first we were doing stuff on the internet and then there were only presentations and we didn’t write anything down. So there was nothing to start with to prepare for today’s lesson.»

Such encounters are not uncommon and this example serves to illustrate what is meant by sustainable learning: we have to make sure that what we teach in class is taught in a way that new knowledge becomes deeply rooted in our students’ long-term memory. Passive knowledge has to be turned into active knowledge. Competent learners are those who can deliberately retrieve knowledge and apply it to solve problems or complete tasks. Ideally, many of their sub-skills have become highly automatized through meaningful practice and they are able to display the accurate and spontaneous use of their knowledge.

In CLIL, sustainable teaching and learning is of great importance since teachers have to facilitate both the learning of the specific content and the learning/acquisition of a foreign language. In addition to that, they have to find ways of making sure that the students can talk about the respective topics in both their L1 and their L2.

To make learning more sustainable in the CLIL classroom teachers should:

— create connections with students’ attitudes, experience and knowledge.
— make the learning process transparent and provide clear structuring (e.g. by using advance organizers).
— make sure that results of group work are shared with all students of the class (through posters, blogs, learning diaries, websites etc.). Effective methodology needs to encompass both the sender and recipient of a message/presentation and strike a balance between teacher-centered communication and cooperative student-centered activities.
— promote autonomous learning and introduce (digital) portfolio work.
— adopt a *translanguaging* approach (Creese/Blackledge 2010) to multilingualism by making strategic use of the L1 to support the learning process. Paraphrasing games like *Taboo* where students are asked to sum up the main objectives of a lesson without
using the words written on the blackboard in L1 or L2 have proven very effective ways to deepen both content and language learning. *Transmediation* activities (where key contents, i.e. a newspaper article, a website, a video etc., have to be transferred from one language to another) are also ideally suited for CLIL classes and maybe the right move to go beyond «squandering our bilingual resources» (Cummins 2005: 585), to move away from multilingualism conceptualized as parallel monolingualisms towards a flexible bilingualism where the boundaries between languages become permeable.  

– embrace a lexical approach to teaching and move away from isolated words and word lists and focus on collocations and chunks instead. Lewis (2002) provides excellent examples on how to introduce, organize and practice lexis according to the lexical approach. His ten principles of organizing lexis are ideally suited for CLIL classrooms but are not widely used.

– promote spiral learning and put great emphasis on learning and study skills.

8. Introducing the CLIL-Pyramid

The CLIL-Pyramid was designed to visually represent the idea that quality CLIL based on the tenets of the 4Cs-Framework can only be achieved when all of the four Cs are considered in lesson planning and materials construction. The four Cs are the cornerstones of the base area of the CLIL-Pyramid which comes into existence when one tries to find the point where lines originating from each corners meet (cf. figure 3). It is meant to be a tool for lesson planning and materials construction/adaptation, and tries to incorporate all the principles and strategies mentioned in this article.

It is important to understand, however, that all the quality principles introduced in this article can hardly ever be incorporated in one single lesson. Therefore, the unit (a sequence of several lessons on one topic) must become the focal point for teachers and material writers. The CLIL-Pyramid suggests a systematical, tried and tested sequence for planning CLIL units and materials, starting with topic selection and ending with a review of key content and language elements that we have come to call the CLIL workout.

1. Planning a CLIL unit starts with content selection. The specific needs of the content subject are at the heart of every CLIL lesson and the starting point for material construction.

2. Providing multimodal input and distributing it evenly across the new CLIL unit produces highly differentiated materials which accommodate different learning styles and activate various language skills. Multimodal input also facilitates the development of new literacies.
3. The nature of the selected input (i.e., texts, charts, maps, video clips, etc.) determines how much and what kind of input-scaffolding is needed. It also indicates which subject-specific study skills need to be practiced with the students so they can successfully cope with that input.

4. Tasks need to be designed to trigger both higher order thinking skills and lead to authentic communication/interaction in different interactive formats (solo work, pair work, group work, etc.).

5. The nature of the desired output (poster, interview, presentation, map, etc.) determines how much and what kind of output-scaffolding is necessary.

To help students and teachers plan their lessons with the CLIL Pyramid, we have developed a template for CLIL units (cf. figure 4):
Using the CLIL-Pyramid and the template offers several advantages:

- The model enables multifocal lesson planning; content, communication, cognition and culture are inextricably linked.
- Higher order thinking skills become an integral part of CLIL lessons.
- Scaffolding, study skills, and learning strategies are essential parts of the planning and teaching process.
- The model raises awareness for multi-modal input. It accommodates individual learning styles, multiple intelligences and leads to highly differentiated lessons and materials.
- It is very flexible regarding various models of interaction/cooperation (individual/pair/group work)
- Intercultural communication is taken seriously.

One of the biggest advantages of using the CLIL-Pyramid as a planning tool is that it makes it possible for teachers/material writers to create an interdisciplinary progression of study skills which can be spread across different units, different age groups or even
different content subjects: academic writing focusing on the academic thinking skill “comparing” introduced in a unit on Japan might be continued and elaborated on in a later unit on Australia or Africa but this skill may also be honed in a history or science lesson, etc. That way, the CLIL-Pyramid can be used to create the kind of cyclical syllabus that Shehan (1998) envisions.

9. Conclusion

To unlock the inherent potential of CLIL, a holistic methodology is needed that transcends the traditional dualism between content and language teaching. The shift from knowledge transmission to knowledge creation in multilingual settings requires students to be skilled in not only assimilating and understanding new knowledge in their first language, but also in using other languages to construct meaning (Coyle/Hood/March, 2010, 153). To realize ‘life-shaping’ potential and to prepare their students for the challenges of a globalized world, teachers should focus on:

devolving the values... of young people’s character, emphasizing emotional as well as cognitive learning; building commitments to group life... not just short-term teamwork; cultivating a cosmopolitan identity which shows tolerance of race and gender differences, genuine curiosity towards and willingness to learn from other cultures, and responsibility towards excluded groups. (Hargreaves, 2003, xix)

The 4Cs-Framework offers a sound pedagogical and methodological base for truly sustainable CLIL teaching and learning. The quality principles and introduced in this article are intended to help CLIL-teachers enrich their lessons and materials while the CLIL-Pyramid offers a proven sequence to incorporate those principles in their CLIL-units. The true potential of the CLIL-Pyramid, however, is in the support it provides to establish and maintain connections between different subjects/topics/units and by making explicit the study skills and literacies which might drastically change the way we think about curriculum planning and the way we structure classroom learning in the future.
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Language-teaching method revisited

Penny Ur

The concept of ‘language-teaching method’—a set of principles and procedures based on a theory of language and language acquisition—is still predominant in the professional literature, in spite of claims to the contrary, the current method at present generally supported by methodologists being task-based language teaching (TBLT). This article suggests that language teaching should not be primarily based on a method but rather on a set of principles and procedures based on teachers’ practical situated experience, enriched by research, theory, and practice relevant to teaching and learning of any subject, as well as those relating to linguistics and applied linguistics. It is suggested that it is unhelpful and counterproductive to urge teachers to use a method like TBLT and that they would be better served by being encouraged to develop theory and practice in situated methodologies that are likely, in their particular teaching context, to bring about good learning.

In spite of claims that we are in a ‘post-method’ era (Kumaravadivelu 2006), many English language teacher preparation courses and the literature on ELT are to this day dominated by the concept of language-teaching method. ‘Method’ may be defined in this context as a coherent set of learning/teaching principles rooted in clearly articulated theories of what language is and how it is learnt, which is implemented through specific types of classroom procedures (Richards and Rodgers 1986). The term is normally taken, in the context of language teaching, to refer to those methods that have been described and promoted (or criticized) in the professional literature, and are presented by their proponents as being more or less universally valid.

If, for example, language is seen as essentially grammar and vocabulary, and if it is best learnt by instruction in grammatical and lexical forms and meanings, then the result is a traditional method such as grammar-translation. However, if it is seen primarily as a set of structural ‘patterns’ best learnt through imitation and drills according to a behaviourist model, then the result is audiolingualism; and so on.
The method predominant in the literature today is task-based language teaching (TBLT), an implementation of the communicative approach. It is based on the assumption that language is primarily a means of communication and is best learnt through the exposure and negotiation that occurs during the course of performing communicative tasks. TBLT courses are based on a series of such tasks, which are designed to replicate as closely as possible real-world situations that the students might encounter. Learning may be enriched by occasional ‘focus on form’, when students can turn their attention temporarily to conscious learning of language features, but the predominant focus is communication. TBLT continues to be the current ‘orthodoxy’ (Carless 2009: 66), promoted in the literature and by many speakers at conferences. However, there has been some substantial criticism, partly because there is little or no evidence that it does in fact lead to better learning, but also because it arguably does not answer the needs of the huge number of learners of English at beginner or intermediate levels in school courses of three or four lessons a week in countries where English has no official status (Swan 2003).

Moreover, the claim that TBLT, or any other method, can be universally valid is disputed (Prabhu 1990). Even when specific methods have been officially adopted by a school or education system, teachers have always adapted and ‘diluted’ them according to local needs and preferences; indeed, many methods were never widely adopted at all. For this reason, added to a general post-modernist uneasiness with predetermined standards and frameworks, a number of articles have been published suggesting that the concept ‘method’ is an invalid, or at least not a very useful, concept (for example, Prabhu op.cit.; Kumaravadivelu op.cit.).

Kumaravadivelu (op.cit.), perhaps the most prominent advocate of a ‘post-method’ condition, suggests that one problem is that methods are top-down prescriptions by theorists and that it should be the teachers who determine how to teach. So far so good. However, some of the components of the alternative he suggests—a set of ‘macro-strategies’—look suspiciously like a method themselves. They are based on underlying assumptions about language and language-acquisition processes and will clearly lead to the favouring of some types of procedures and disfavouring of others; the amount of scope for decision-making by the teacher is still limited. For example, recommended macro-strategies such as ‘contextualize language input’ or ‘integrate language skills’ suggest that activities that present decontextualized grammar or vocabulary, or language skills practised in isolation, are to be discouraged. Other macro-strategies, however, are more flexible and general: no one would oppose a general principle such as ‘raise learning opportunities’.

In general, Kumaravadivelu’s ‘post-method condition’—even if it has, as suggested above, not entirely freed itself from some features of conventional method—constitutes an important step in a movement towards a more flexible, teacher-led methodology. But disappointingly, this trend does not seem to have developed further over the years. On the contrary, it has, if anything, been reversed. As Swan (2012) has noted, ‘post-method’ is not that different from ‘method’, and in a recent survey of the field in this Journal, Alan Waters comments:
In overall terms, thus, an era which began with an anti-method stance has resulted in what is, in many ways, and ironically enough, the renewal of a strand of ‘methodism’ originally developed during the preceding period, a kind of ‘second coming’. (Waters 2012: 443)

Situated methodologies

It seems to me that if teachers reject any specific method recommended by theorists as a basis for their teaching, and instead design their own situated methodologies, driven directly by the question ‘How are my students likely to learn best?’ (within local externally determined constraints, as described below), the result is likely to be a substantial improvement in learning for students and more professional satisfaction for the teacher. Such a situated methodology would be largely grounded in general pedagogical principles and practice, shared by teachers of a variety of different subjects, in contrast with ELT methods, which tend to focus predominantly on issues related specifically to language teaching.

Some more detailed differences between ‘method’ and ‘situated methodologies’ are outlined below.

Both method and situated methodologies are grounded in theory, but the sources of this theory are rather different. In the first case, it is assumed that learning will best be brought about by the implementation of particular theories of language and language acquisition. The sources of such theory are mainly research on linguistics and applied linguistics, particularly second language acquisition (SLA). Topics prioritized are ones like the place of explicit teaching of grammar, the use of L1, inferencing meaning from context in reading, and so forth. Situated methodologies, on the other hand, being driven directly and primarily by considerations of optimization of learning, are based on general theories of teaching and learning, not only those that have to do with language pedagogy specifically. These will therefore include, and possibly even prioritize, topics such as motivation and interest (in general, not just as associated with language learning), the nature of teacher mediation, classroom dynamics, and so on: issues that teachers of all subjects are concerned with. Sources of teachers’ theories and beliefs about teaching are primarily their own reflection on practice and ‘sense of plausibility’ (Prabhu op.cit.) but enriched by the literature on pedagogical and educational issues in general, sociology, cognitive psychology, and so forth, as well as linguistics and SLA research.

Teachers’ practical classroom decisions

Even a teacher who genuinely believes in and tries to implement a given language-teaching method has nevertheless to take a large number of pedagogical decisions every day for which the method gives little guidance. These have to do with common practical classroom issues such as the giving and checking of homework, monitoring participation, lesson planning, classroom management, dealing with weak learners. Such issues are shared by teachers of all subjects, and hence can be included in the concept of a ‘situated methodology’ outlined above.
Any teaching decisions, moreover, are likely to be strongly influenced by local factors. If a teacher’s professional action is driven primarily by the question ‘What are the correct procedures to use according to the prescribed method?’, then most choices as to which procedures to adopt and how to present them will broadly accord with that method, with adaptations that take into account local needs and constraints. If, on the other hand, the main motive is to respond to the question ‘What will best facilitate my students’ learning of the language?’, then such teaching decisions do not just ‘take into account’ local needs and constraints but are very largely driven by them. Some key factors underlying teaching decisions on these and other issues include the nature of the target learner population, expectations and/or demands of stakeholders, upcoming examinations or assessment procedures, and the individual teacher’s own preferences, strengths, and weaknesses. These are summarized in more detail below.

**Learner populations**

Learner populations vary in age, level, learning goals, sheer numbers, and relative heterogeneity, all of which affect the choices made by the teacher in deciding how to teach a particular group. Another crucial consideration is the local culture of learning within which the students have been raised, which will to a large extent determine whether learners will respond well or badly to specific teaching styles: this is the major reason for documented difficulties implementing TBLT in some Asian communities (Hu 2002). Then there is the issue of motivation: if a group is highly motivated, less attention needs to be paid to strategies whose aim is to gain and maintain their interest, and more to academic aspects of task design, and vice versa. Another example is classroom discipline: if the class is an unruly one, the teacher will find it difficult or impossible to run activities that demand student self-regulation.

**Stakeholders**

After the teachers and students themselves, perhaps the most influential stakeholders are the teachers’ employers. The choices available to teachers working within a state school system may be severely limited by the local Ministry of Education: for example they may not be free to choose their own course materials or may have only a very limited selection. Similar constraints may be imposed by private employers in language schools. In some situations, parents of students, or their employers, express specific preferences or demands that will affect classroom practice. This, as well as examinations (see below), may thus affect the ability of the teacher to implement the principle of ‘optimization of learning’ as he or she might otherwise have done.

**High-stakes examinations**

The backlash from high-stakes examinations and other assessment procedures substantially influences the content and teaching method in courses. If, for example, an exam is mainly based on reading comprehension and writing—as most are, since the testing of oral proficiency is relatively expensive and time consuming—then classroom teaching is likely to focus on reading and writing at the
expense of oral skills. If the marking of the exam involves substantial subtraction of points for grammatical and spelling mistakes, then obviously the teacher is going to make sure that he or she devotes lesson time to teaching and practising correct grammar and spelling.

The individual teacher
The professional beliefs, abilities, and preferences of the individual teacher are a major factor influencing choices of teaching methodologies (Borg 2003). In spite of the fact that I have put it last, this may often be the most important ‘local factor’ in the selection of procedures and strategies that go to make up a situated methodology. One teacher may be a strong believer in communicative activities, while another sees them as time wasting; one may be very much better than a colleague at designing grammar activities, but the colleague may have superior skills in using drama to activate students. Yet another may believe in and enjoy doing group work and dislike teacher-led interactions, or the reverse. Teaching is likely to be better if the teacher employs strategies and procedures that he or she believes are effective, and is confident that he or she can use successfully to promote student motivation and learning.

I am not suggesting that there are no generally recommended pedagogical principles that will be valid in most contexts. But the majority of these will be relevant for teachers of any subject, for example, the arousing and maintenance of interest, a high and consistent level of task demands, and the use of formative assessment. Others have to do with language teaching specifically, though not confined to any particular method; plenty of exposure to the target language, for example (for more, see Ellis 2005). However, the differences in the way or extent to which any of these are implemented in different contexts in order to bring about optimal learning outcomes are likely to be substantial. The arousing of interest in learning, for example, may demand a good deal more investment of effort and lesson time in a rowdy class of inner-city teenagers than in a class of EAP students in a university; extensive exposure to the target language may in some cases take the form of texts on the computer screen; in others, it may be mostly based on teacher talk.

Discussion and recommendations
The hypothesis that situated methodologies rather than a particular method are what lead to successful learning and professional satisfaction in most places may go some way towards explaining certain findings from the field of ELT. It would explain why, for example, a currently recommended method such as TBLT does not in fact work very well in some contexts (Hu op.cit.), whereas totally ‘unfashionable’ ones may work very well indeed (Ding 2007). Furthermore, there is the phenomenon of the success of widely different methods of teaching in different classes, or with different teachers, as documented by Clarke, Davis, Rhodes, and Baker (1996): a puzzle if we believe in the superiority of a particular method, but natural and understandable if we accept the validity of situated methodologies.
Another phenomenon in the field of ELT that can be linked to the dichotomy discussed in this article is the sense of dissonance between the method-based approach that appears to predominate in the ELT theoretical literature on the one hand, and the situated methodologies that are implemented in many (probably most) places in practice (Ellis 2010, 2012). The result is a feeling of discomfort on the part of both theorists and teachers. Theorists tend either to blame the teachers for failing to read and apply their recommendations as to the optimal method, or to cast about for ways to moderate or re-explain this method—but not, note, reject it!—in an attempt to make it more palatable to practitioners (for example, Ellis 2009). Teachers with whom I have discussed the issue, in contrast, often either accuse the researchers and theorists of being out of touch with classroom realities, or feel vaguely guilty about the fact that they are not teaching the way they ‘ought’ to be.

Many successful teachers—whether or not they are aware of the dissonance described above—are in fact using situated methodologies in their classrooms, rejecting any particular method in favour of a selection of principles and procedures that accord with their own sense of plausibility and are appropriate to the local context. The same is to a large extent true of designers of successful modern course materials (Waters op.cit.). Thus, for many ELT Journal readers, I am probably preaching to the converted.

But that is not the point. What I am advocating here is the adoption of the ‘localized methodologies’ approach in principle by methodologists and theoreticians, not only by practitioners: de jure, as it were, not just de facto. I am not saying that TBLT, for example, may not work extremely well in particular contexts for which it is appropriate, but rather that neither this nor any other method should be presented as the ‘right’ one, to be recommended and adopted worldwide. Teachers should be encouraged to decide for themselves whether and how far to adopt features from different methods, according to their own situations and preferences. It is, therefore, in my view, the function of writers and speakers on ELT to enhance teaching expertise in the field by providing teachers with information, research-based insights, and guidance on a variety of principles and practices that are likely to be conducive to good language learning and can be used in a wide range of teaching situations, rather than to construct and promote a particular method.

It seems to me that if both theoreticians and practitioners accepted, in principle, a primary focus on situated methodologies as the basis for the study and improvement of ELT, everyone would be relieved. A lot of energy previously wasted on fruitless discussion of why and how a particular method should work could be directed into channels of research, discussion, and creative proposals that would more effectively promote good English teaching in its various contexts worldwide.

*Final version received April 2013*
Note

1 I am using the term ‘methodology’ to mean
a collection and combination of methods or
procedures; cf. ‘phonology’ as referring to a set
of phonemes.
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Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca

I-Chun (Vicky) Kuo

The status of English as a lingua franca (ELF) has become an increasingly popular discourse in Applied Linguistics and current ELT. It has been suggested that native speakers and their Englishes have become relatively unimportant in international communication and that research interests should now fall on non-native speakers and their use of English. In this article, I will examine the conceptual and operational framework underpinning the case for a description of English as a lingua franca and address issues and problems that need to be taken into account if such a description is to be implemented in second language pedagogy. I will argue that a native-speaker model could serve as a complete and convenient starting point and it is up to the TESOL professionals and the learners in each context to decide to what extent they want to approximate to that model.

Introduction

In less than a lifetime, English has developed from ‘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 2001: 9). It has been widely spread through emigration, colonization, and globalization, has been acquired as a first, a second, and a foreign language, and has been used for internal, external, and international purposes. Drawing on these dimensions, Kachru (1985) distinguishes between the inner circle (e.g. the UK and the USA), the outer circle (e.g. India and Nigeria) and the expanding circle (e.g. China and France), with the acknowledgement that it is the users in the expanding circle who actually strengthen further the claims of English as an international or universal language (p. 13).

In the global spread of English, the concept of ‘world Englishes’ has become increasingly popular, since linguistic diversity is inevitable and variation in the aspect of phonology and morphosyntax has already been seen within inner-circle Englishes and among outer-circle varieties. Furthermore, English has often been used in geographically and historically remote settings from the inner circle for purposes ranging from conducting professional discourse to carrying out everyday conversation, which require no participation by its native speakers. Seen from these perspectives, English, in its establishing role as the global language, should be allowed to develop independently in various contexts across the world, regardless of the change and innovations that take place in the inner circle. As a result, one might expect to witness the birth and growth of some kind of ‘expanding-circle English’, or English as a lingua franca.
In this paper, I will explore the case for a description of English as a lingua franca and its teaching implications. I will use native and non-native speakers respectively to refer to users of English in the inner circle and the expanding circle. I will also use non-native speakers and L2 learners synonymously and refer to their curriculum as second language pedagogy, although I am aware that learners in the expanding circle tend to learn English more as a foreign language than as a second language.

One of the main themes running through the discussion of English as a lingua franca is the irrelevance of native speakers, their Englishes, and their ownership of English, evidenced by the fact that English is the language for international communication and is nowadays used used by more non-native than native speakers, and that most non-native speakers will need it in order to communicate with other non-native speakers. This leads to theoretical claims such as ‘World English (WE) belongs to everyone who speaks it, but it is nobody’s mother tongue’ (Rajagopalan 2004: 111) and ‘how English develops in the world is no business whatever of native speakers in England, the United States, or anywhere else’ (Widdowson 1994: 385), and pedagogical assertions that as long as English is learned as an international language, it should not come from an inner circle country and should not be taught as an inner circle language (Matsuda 2003).

Since native speakers are no longer important or relevant in the global spread of English, it now seems rather redundant for L2 learners worldwide to conform to native-speaker norms. L2 learners are now entitled ‘privileges’ hitherto reserved exclusively for native speakers, such as a claim to ownership, a right to use English without others passing judgements, an equal footing with speakers of other English varieties, and, perhaps more profoundly, a right to shape the future of English (Melchers and Shaw 2003). This discourse has become so influential, particularly over the past few years, that any personal or regional, linguistic or socio-cultural attachment to inner circle countries and their Englishes would appear highly politically incorrect. Indeed, it has been suggested that the general public, including students and their parents and perhaps TESOL professionals too, need to be re-educated in order to ‘correct' their attachment to native-speaker norms and their misconceptions towards English as an international language or as a lingua franca (Matsuda op. cit.).

Second language pedagogy, seen from this perspective, should no longer prepare learners to achieve intelligibility for native-speaker receivers (Jenkins 2002) or aim to develop the kind of communicative competence based on descriptions of a native-speaker model. A better way to prepare learners for international communication would be to provide a description, within the field of phonology and morphosyntax, of what learners need in order to achieve and sustain mutual comprehension. A seemingly promising and far-reaching theoretical framework is constructed by Seidlhofer (2001), with the central argument that in order to ‘counteract the reproduction of native English dominance’ (p. 133) and to claim ‘ELF as a use in its own right, and ELF speakers as language users in their own right’ (p. 137), codification in the form of computerized corpus data and
compilation of dictionaries must be undertaken so as to establish a standard on the one hand, and to assert ELF legitimacy on the other. Since both are on an equal footing, ENL (English as a native language) should not and cannot pass judgement on ELF (English as a lingua franca), a distinction made by Seidhoffer (op. cit.), such as referring to an ELF usage as incorrect or ungrammatical. ENL and ELF are both varieties of English, deriving from different users using English in different contexts and, as such, assert the same authority and authenticity in their own contexts.

Issues and problems

The description of English as a lingua franca has, from the outset, restricted its focus down to the very instrumental function of English as the language for international communication. It is primarily and ultimately concerned with enabling learners to carry out international communication in various global contexts, reflecting a view of English as entirely and fundamentally an instrument of communication. It has largely overlooked aspects of language such as literacy, register, style, and various aesthetic concerns and has made no reference to a language’s social functions, such as to project self-image, to establish self-identity, and to develop personal voice. The knowledge that such a description has to offer might be partial. To further elaborate the issues and problems that need to be taken into account if such an ELF description is to be implemented in second language pedagogy, I will address respectively (1) the problem of an intelligibility-driven language model, (2) the validity of computerized corpus data, (3) learner voice, and (4) English for international communication and intra-national competition.

The problem of an intelligibility-driven language model

The cognitive processes involved in producing language, as acknowledged and illustrated by Swain and Lapkin (1995), can be quite different from those involved in comprehending language. Comprehension, generally, allows many linguistic signals to be ignored, such as concord, definite/ indefinite, and singular/plural distinctions, without seriously distorting the message being comprehended (p. 375). Production, on the other hand, particularly that of an L2, would inevitably involve a more complex, bottom-up approach of consciously applying syntactic rules in order to convey intended meanings, as opposed to the more top-down approach involved in comprehension. Swain and Lapkin seek to explore the role of pushed output in second language acquisition and put forward the argument that in producing an L2, learners will on occasion become aware of (i.e. notice) a linguistic problem. Noticing a problem can force learners into a more syntactic processing mode, can push learners to modify their output, and is part of second language learning (p. 371).

The ELF approach would appear to interpret differently the nature of second language learning and, as such, depart from traditional S LA concerns. The notion of ‘a linguistic problem’, for example, has first been challenged and refers only to inaccurate production that causes serious communication problems. As such, the inaccurate use of collocation or subject/verb agreement, as long as the conversation is sustained, would not be worth noticing and does not need to be modified. While S LA researchers seek to enable L2 learners to achieve target-like performance by means of noticing the gap and attending to linguistic signals which can be unattended to in
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comprehension (i.e. enhancing grammatical competence), ELF applied linguists seem to be suggesting that what is needed for comprehension is all that is needed to be produced. Thus Jenkins (2002) suggests a revised pronunciation syllabus, the Lingua Franca Core, and Seidhlofer (op. cit.) appeals for a description of English as a lingua franca. 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 future of ELF seems to rely on the already overwhelming number of non-native speakers using English for international communication on the one hand and the development of computerized corpus data for empirical analyses on the other. ‘Ungrammatical but unproblematic’ features, such as ‘he look very sad’, ‘a picture who gives the impression’ (Seidhlofer op. cit.: 145), once occurring sufficiently frequently in NNS/NNS discourse, would arguably become standardized and exist as a variety alongside ENL. A couple of questions have to be raised in regard to this process of codification and standardization.

An ELF description would inevitably result in a qualitatively and quantitatively reduced version of ENL, following research questions such as ‘what seem to be the most relied-upon and successfully employed grammatical constructions and lexical choices’ or ‘are there commonly used constructions, lexical items and sound patterns which are ungrammatical in Standard L1 English but generally unproblematic in ELF communication’ (Seidhlofer op. cit.: 147). If, for example, grammatical features such as the use of past perfect progressive or the use of question tags are either not found or occur only very rarely in NNS/NNS spoken corpus, the teaching implication would arguably be that they do not need to be taught. As a result, L2 learners would have a perhaps significantly reduced ENL description. Within the reduced repertoire, the quality issue would then involve ungrammatical but unproblematic structures, such as ‘He look very sad’, on the one hand, and inaccurate but intelligible pronunciation, such as ‘I think [sɪŋk]’, on the other. Such a qualitatively and quantitatively reduced description of English would appear to be largely intelligibility-driven and speech-oriented and, it does not seem in any way appropriate to replace current grammatical and phonological descriptions of English for pedagogical purposes, particularly in state education worldwide. It does not address the issue of reading and writing, for example, and is not likely to satisfy learners’ needs that stretch beyond mere international intelligibility.

The frequent occurrence of a specific linguistic feature, both phonologically and morphosyntactically as recorded in computerized corpus data, will need to be supplemented by qualitative analyses in order to give accounts of speaker intention, such as to fulfil interpersonal functions of politeness or contextual appropriateness. ENL computerized corpus data have been under development for more than one decade and have resulted in a significant number of publications, including the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad and Finegan
Drawing on both American and British English sources, the use of ‘will’ and ‘be going to’, for example, and the use of noun phrase prefixes and tags have been accompanied by accounts of interpersonal intention ranging from being listener sensitive to showing personal attachment (see McCarthy and Carter 1995 and Biber et al. 1999).

Occurrences of a phonological or grammatical feature such as ‘He looks very sad’, even though produced and comprehended by learners from widely different L1 backgrounds, may reflect an imperfect command of the target language on the part of the L2 learner. Frequent occurrence of a common error does not constitute a strong case for standardization and popularization. That is to say the ELF corpus would inevitably resort to the quantity-related concept of frequency of occurrence (e.g., how frequently ‘He looks very sad’ has occurred in NNS/NNS conversation without causing serious communication problems), rather than the quality-related concept of fulfilling interpersonal intentions (e.g., why the speaker opts to use ‘He looks very sad’ in a given context), particularly when a frequently occurring linguistic feature is just a common grammatical or phonological error. Moreover, one has to ask what constitutes ‘a reliable source of data’ which helps inform an ELF description. This is an issue concerning the representation of the age, gender, region, the social class and the L2 proficiency of the non-native speakers contributing to the ELF corpus on the one hand, and the criteria for deciding whether a linguistic feature occurs sufficiently frequently on the other. As a result, the validity of an ELF description remains largely in question. English as a lingua franca, seen from this perspective, is the description of the phenomenon that people are making use of their imperfect L2 repertoire to communicate more or less effectively in international and intercultural contexts. This is interesting and revealing but does not necessarily have implications for teaching.

Learner voice

The issue of teaching English as a lingua franca is loosely related to my ongoing PhD research, which aims to investigate how learners from different L1 backgrounds interact with each other in the target language (i.e., English) within the classroom context and how they perceive the usefulness or effectiveness of such interaction. The research is conducted in a British EFL setting and the participant contributions cited below came from young adults aged between 21 and 25. At the completion of my Stage 1 Data Collection (16/02/04–26/03/04), nearly all participants recalled the difficulties, particularly when they first arrived in the UK or first began the course, in understanding each other, caused mainly by a combination of strong accent, inaccurate pronunciation, and incorrect use of vocabulary or grammar. In response to my interview question broadly related to the notion of collaborative scaffolding (Donato 1994), such as how they could help or what they could learn from each other when working in pairs or small groups, one of my participants commented on the aspect of pronunciation,

but it’s not useful for their way to speak because they don’t speak well and they’re not useful for the pronunciation because they don’t use good pronunciation so they don’t help me to improve my pronunciation.

(Participant 1, Interview Data, 09/03/04)
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while another commented on the aspect of grammar,

we are still upper-intermediate class so we make lots of mistake in
grammar such as tense past or present and future I try to speak correct
grammar but maybe I make lots of mistakes and same as partners they
can make mistakes past future present continuous tense is quite difficult
(Participant 2, Interview Data, 10/03/04)

I then asked my Participant 2 whether he would make an effort to correct his
partner’s grammatical error in small-group discussion when he did notice
it. He said,

no just listen sometimes I say it’s wrong because you are talking about
past but you say present or something like this but sometimes I just
ignore just listen what they are talking because if they make a mistake I
can understand what they are talking about if past or present is wrong but
I can understand so I just listen to understand even though I realise it’s
mistake because I can understand ya I don’t want interrupt when they are
talking and when we are talking to teacher teacher try to correct our
sentence if we make a mistake
(Participant 2, Interview Data, 10/03/04)

What seems clear in my participants’ accounts is that a degree of
phonological and grammatical inaccuracy can be tolerated in real world
communication but that a description of such language exchange does not
constitute an appropriate model for learning purposes. As a result, while my
participants seemed to enjoy exchanging ideas, sharing opinions, exploring
different cultures and getting to know people from different parts of the
world, they would only turn to the native-speaker teacher, as it is in this
research setting, when seeking answers to aspects of language such as
grammar and pronunciation.

The point I wish to make here is that my participants were in fact very much
aware of their own and their partners’ linguistic limitations and that, while
interacting more often with other L2 learners than with native speakers in
current and arguably future contexts, they all continued to push themselves
towards more target-like production, referring to a native-speaker model,
i.e. British English, as a point of reference. Rather than anticipating,
creating, or participating in any form of ‘NNS English’, they showed an
apparent interest in and made an apparent effort to approximate to a native-
speaker English norm. What seems, therefore, to be largely neglected in
current ELF research is L2 learners’ perceptions of their own and other
people’s use of English.

In the course of their interviews, a number of my participants showed
various degrees of anxiety, especially towards their forthcoming IELTS
tests, referring to their pronunciation as bad or very bad and hoping I could
correct their phonological and grammatical mistakes in our interview
sections. They included a female Italian law student who wanted to master
French and English in order to get employment in an international law
firm, a female Japanese student who majored in American and British
English studies and wanted to be a flight attendant, and a female
Vietnamese student who studied auditing and wanted to continue her
masters studies in the UK. These three participants of mine, from widely
different backgrounds and learning English in Britain for widely different purposes, all in one way or another look to a native-speaker model to meet their future needs and, while being sufficiently communicative, all wish to be further corrected in order to have an even better command of the target language.

My interim research findings therefore appear to reinforce Timmis’s (2002) report on learner perceptions towards native-speaker norms and international English. That is, to use his words,
	here is still some desire among students to conform to native-speaker norms, and this desire is not necessarily restricted to those students who use, or anticipate using English primarily with native speakers (p. 248).

In an article investigating the impact of English as a global language on education policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Rim countries, Nunan (2003) reports findings such as ‘compulsory English lowered from age 13 to 9’ (Korea), ‘compulsory English lowered from Grade 5 to Grade 1’ (Taiwan), ‘English becoming increasingly significant as university entry requirement’ (China) and ‘overwhelming concern in government and business sectors that Hong Kong will lose economic advantage if English language skills are not enhanced’ (p. 594). While there is a real concern, as reported in the same article, with the impact of an early introduction to English on national language (Malaysia) and national identity (Korea), I wish to draw attention to the fact that English, while being the language for international communication, is also the language for international, and in fact intra-national, competition.

English has been held as one of the most important criteria by many intra-national and international gatekeepers in both education and employment, as experienced by my three participants above. The readjustments of education policies and practices reported by Nunan all in one way or another reflect the even tougher competition faced by the next generation worldwide. English for them is not simply the language to start conversations on a train or to place orders in a restaurant when travelling in a foreign country. It is the language of which they have to demonstrate a degree of mastery so as to win a place in education and employment in their own contexts and abroad. Rather than being the language used by and among non-native speakers in relatively stress-free and accuracy-unimportant settings, English has often been learned as an important school subject under the pressure to sustain accuracy and to provide evidence of proficiency. As such, an appropriate pedagogical model has to be able to satisfy demands ranging from minimum intelligibility, through general accuracy and fluency, up to comparable proficiency to that of a native speaker, rather than drawing exclusively or even primarily on the notion of international intelligibility.

What seems to be more urgently needed in preparing learners from widely different L1 backgrounds to interact with each other in English is to raise consciousness of intercultural understanding, such as being aware of and sensitive to the fact that people from different cultural backgrounds tend to express politeness, gratitude, and condolences in overtly different ways. This in fact is a responsibility shared by anyone who participates in the
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international society, including both native and non-native speakers of English.

Conclusion

It is precisely because English is now used extensively for international and intercultural purposes that in order to ease or smooth the flow of conversation, to reduce the listener’s burden of processing information, and to satisfy learners’ needs that stretch beyond merely international intelligibility, L2 learners should be allowed, if not encouraged, to follow a native-speaker phonological or grammatical model. A native-speaker model, in my view, serves as a complete and convenient starting point, particularly with its socio-cultural richness, and it is up to the TESOL professionals and the learners in each context to decide to what extent they want to approximate to that model.

I am aware that ‘native speaker’ is a highly controversial concept and, to take pronunciation for example, RP or Received Pronunciation, the prestige British accent, is thought to be spoken by fewer than 3 per cent of the speaking population, while the majority of British people have either a regionally modified RP or a regional accent (Jenkins 2002: 84). Despite such a seemingly discouraging picture, the point here remains that L2 learners should be allowed to decide which English to learn, including which accent of that variety to aim towards. Empirical findings from the study of the grammar and phonology of English as a lingua franca might be useful in identifying what appear to be the most or least important linguistic devices in international communication. A native-speaker model, however, as I have illustrated in this article, would appear to be more appropriate and appealing in second language pedagogy than a description of English which is somewhat reduced and incomplete.
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*Teaching English as a lingua franca*
From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: culture in ELT

Will Baker

Cultural awareness (CA) has emerged over the last few decades as a significant part of conceptualizing the cultural dimension to language teaching. That is, L2 users need to understand L2 communication as a cultural process and to be aware of their own culturally based communicative behaviour and that of others. However, while CA has provided a vital base of knowledge in relation to the cultural aspects of language use and teaching, it is still rooted in a national conception of culture and language. This is problematic given that English is now used as a global lingua franca. Intercultural awareness (ICA) is presented here as an alternative 'non-essentialist' view of culture and language that better accounts for the fluid and dynamic relationship between them. Key components of ICA are discussed along with their relevance to ELT practices and suggestions as to how they can be translated into classroom pedagogy.

Introduction

The cultural dimension to language has always been present in language pedagogy (Risager 2007), even if it is not always explicit. Given the closely intertwined nature of culture and language, it is difficult to teach language without an acknowledgement of the cultural context in which it is used. Indeed, culture has been a component of our understanding of communicative competence from early conceptions with Hymes’ (1972) emphasis on the importance of sociocultural knowledge. More recently, intercultural communicative competence, underpinned by the notion of critical cultural awareness (CA) (Byram 1997), has extended the role of culture in successfully preparing language learners for intercultural communication. However, with the English language now used as a global lingua franca in a huge range of different cultural contexts, a correlation between the English language and a particular culture and nation is clearly problematic. This paper argues that while CA has been important, it needs re-evaluation in the light of the more fluid communicative practices of English used as a global lingua franca. In its place, intercultural awareness (ICA) is proposed as a more relevant concept for these dynamic contexts of English use.
Globalization affects all English language teachers from their choices of what materials to use, to which variety of English is most appropriate. As Block (2004) highlights, the role of English in globalization is multifaceted and neither exclusively benign nor evil. Furthermore, the extensive use of English in such a diverse range of global settings calls into question our understanding of the ownership and forms of the English language. In particular, the growth in the use of English in the ‘expanding circle’ (Kachru 1990), in which it is neither an L1 nor an official L2 within a country, problematizes native speaker-based conceptions of English use. Crystal’s (2008) figures suggest that English is now most extensively used in this expanding circle and it thus follows that the majority of ELT classrooms will also be in this circle. English is therefore used most commonly not by native speakers but as a contact language between interlocutors with different language cultures (linguistic and cultural backgrounds). As Krashen (2009: 150) argues in relation to foreign language teaching, this has fundamental implications:

the goals of traditional language teaching have been found wanting in this new era of globalization. Its main tenets (monolingual native speakers, homogeneous national cultures, pure standard national languages, instrumental goals of education, functional criteria of success) have all become problematic in a world that is increasingly multilingual and multicultural.

This is even more so for ELT in environments where English functions as a lingua franca with no native speakers.

The use of English globally as a contact language has been addressed extensively, and at times controversially, in the field of ELF (English as a lingua franca) research (see for example, Seidlhofer 2005; Jenkins 2007). While the native speaker is generally not considered to be excluded from ELF communication, the norms of such communication are not driven by native speakers. Rather ELF communication is seen as emergent and situated with common features negotiated by the participants. For users of English to communicate effectively, they will need a mastery of more than the features of syntax, lexis, and phonology that are the traditional focus in ELT. Equally important is the ability to make use of linguistic and other communicative resources in the negotiation of meaning, roles, and relationships in the diverse sociocultural settings of intercultural communication through English.

To address communication in these kinds of multilingual and multicultural settings, the skills of multilingual communicators are needed. These include the role of accommodation in adapting language to be closer to that of one’s interlocutor in order to aid understanding and solidarity. Negotiation and mediation skills are also key, particularly between different culturally based frames of reference, which have the potential to cause misunderstanding or miscommunication. Such skills result in the ability of interlocutors to adjust and align themselves to different communicative systems and cooperate in communication.

As already noted, knowledge of the lexis, grammar, and phonology of one particular ‘linguistic code’ (for example Standard British English) is not
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adequate for successful intercultural communication through English. This needs to be supplemented by an understanding of the sociocultural context in which communication takes place and an understanding of the sociocultural norms of one particular native-speaker community, for example the United Kingdom or United States, is clearly not sufficient for global uses of English. A more extensive treatment and understanding of the varied cultural contexts of English use is necessary (see for example Porto 2010; Suzuki 2010).

However, we are faced with a difficulty. If, as has been suggested above, the global uses of English detach it from the traditional native-speaking countries, how are we to make sense of the cultural contexts of English communication? Is English inevitably linked to these native-speaker contexts even when used in very different settings, as in the strongest forms of linguistic relativity where our world view is determined by linguistic boundaries? Alternatively, is English as a lingua franca a culturally neutral language? Neither of these views is adequate for explaining the relationship between the English language and its sociocultural settings in global lingua franca uses. The diverse forms, meanings, and uses of different Englishes, as documented by World Englishes studies (for example Kachru op.cit.), have demonstrated that English is not restricted to the linguistic or sociocultural norms of the traditional native-speaker countries.

Furthermore, language, even used as a lingua franca, can never be culturally neutral. Language used for communication always involves people, places, and purposes, none of which exist in a cultural vacuum.

To understand the sociocultural contexts of English as a global lingua franca, we need to approach culture in a non-essentialist and dynamic manner. It should be seen as an emergent, negotiated resource in communication which moves between and across local, national, and global contexts (Baker 2009b). One way of conceiving of this relationship is the influential notion of a ‘third place’ in L2 use (see Kramsch op.cit. for a discussion of its influence and current relevance), in which communication takes place in a sphere that is neither part of a first language/culture (L1/C1) or a target language/culture (TL/TC). Rather, culture is something freer and more fluid in the sense of creating something new and different. Importantly though, Kramsch also recognizes the continued influence and pull of the L1/C1 and TL/TC. This results in a tension between established fixed forms of communicative practice and the more situated dynamic communicative practices of an L2.

In specific relation to the English language, Pennycook (2007) has described the manner in which both linguistic and cultural forms and practices of English exist in global flows. They move through both local and global environments being influenced and changed by both. The importance of being able to negotiate these complex and dynamic cultural references in communicating successfully across cultures underscores the need to incorporate this into our understanding of communicative competence and subsequently EIL.

**Cultural awareness**

An approach to conceptualizing the kinds of knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to undertake successful intercultural communication, which explicitly recognizes the cultural dimension of communicative competence,
has been CA (see for example Tomalin and Stempleski 1993; Byram 1997). At the most basic level, CA can be defined as a conscious understanding of the role culture plays in language learning and communication (in both first and foreign languages). The details of CA are conceived of and implemented in teaching practice in a number of different ways. Nevertheless, many of the approaches agree on the importance of a systematic framework for teaching culture and language together, in which the relationship between them is explicitly explored with learners. Conceptions of CA also stress the need for learners to become aware of the culturally based norms, beliefs, and behaviours of their own culture and other cultures. Furthermore, all share a goal of increased understanding of culture and language leading to successful intercultural communication.

The most detailed account of CA is that offered by Byram (ibid.), as part of a framework of intercultural communicative competence. The crucial component of this ‘critical CA’ is an understanding of the relative nature of cultural norms which leads to ‘an ability to evaluate, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures and countries’ (ibid.: 101). Moreover, in examining the learner’s culture and foreign cultures, as well as different perspectives of them, Byram highlights the need to understand the multi-voiced ‘diglossic’ nature of culture, which contains conflicting and contradictory views.

Finally, CA, as conceived here, rejects the monolingual native speaker as the ideal model and instead proposes the intercultural speaker and intercultural citizen as an alternative. This alternative acknowledges the importance of identity and affiliation in the negotiated communication of intercultural communication, with no one interlocutor providing the norms or ideal model to which the other has to conform. Most importantly, what Byram’s and many other accounts of CA share is a notion of CA as knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be developed by the language learner, which can then be utilized in understanding specific cultures and in communicating across diverse cultures.

Perhaps the most significant limitation to CA, as it has just been described, is that it has commonly been conceived in relation to intercultural communication between defined cultural groupings, typically at the national level. This can be seen for example in Byram’s association of CA with ‘one’s own and other cultures and countries’ (ibid.: 101, my italics). Thus, CA is most usually related to developing an understanding of and comparisons between a CA and a CA or a number of CAs, for example, the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. This is not an appropriate aim in expanding circle environments. Given the variety and heterogeneity of English use in such settings, a user or learner of English could not be expected to have a knowledge of all the different cultural contexts of communication they may encounter and even less so the languages of the participants in this communication.

Therefore, while many of the attributes associated with CA may be relevant, they need to be developed in relation to intercultural communication and an understanding of the dynamic way sociocultural contexts are constructed. Knowledge of specific cultures may still have an important role to play in developing an awareness of cultural differences and relativization.

From cultural to intercultural awareness 65
However, knowledge of specific cultures has to be combined with an awareness of cultural influences in intercultural communication as fluid, fragmented, hybrid, and emergent with cultural groupings or boundaries less easily defined and referenced. Thus, what is needed for successful communication through English in expanding circle lingua franca contexts is not just CA but ICA.

ICA is best conceived as an extension of the earlier conceptions of CA that is more relevant to needs of intercultural communication in expanding circle and global lingua franca contexts, in which cultural influences are likely to be varied, dynamic, and emergent.

A basic definition of ICA, as envisaged here, is as follows:

Intercultural awareness is a conscious understanding of the role culturally based forms, practices, and frames of understanding can have in intercultural communication, and an ability to put these conceptions into practice in a flexible and context specific manner in real time communication.

To better understand this definition and what it entails, a number of features of ICA can be identified and are listed below (Figure 1). These 12 components attempt to build on the previously discussed features of CA, especially those highlighted by Byram (op. cit.), and extend them to the more fluid conceptions of intercultural communication through English in global lingua franca settings.

Level 1: basic cultural awareness

An awareness of:
1. culture as a set of shared behaviours, beliefs, and values;
2. the role culture and context play in any interpretation of meaning;
3. our own culturally induced behaviour, values, and beliefs and the ability to articulate this;
4. others’ culturally induced behaviour, values, and beliefs and the ability to compare this with our own culturally induced behaviour, values, and beliefs.

Level 2: advanced cultural awareness

An awareness of:
5. the relative nature of cultural norms;
6. cultural understanding as provisional and open to revision;
7. multiple voices or perspectives within any cultural grouping;
8. individuals as members of many social groupings including cultural ones;
9. common ground between specific cultures as well as an awareness of possibilities for mismatch and miscalculation between specific cultures.

Level 3: intercultural awareness

An awareness of:
10. culturally based frames of reference, forms, and communicative practices as being related both to specific cultures and also as emergent and hybrid in intercultural communication;
11. initial interaction in intercultural communication as possibly based on cultural stereotypes or generalizations but an ability to move beyond these through:
12. a capacity to negotiate and mediate between different emergent socioculturally grounded communication modes and frames of reference based on the above understanding of culture in intercultural communication.

Figure 1
Twelve components of ICA
These 12 elements of ICA delineate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that a user of English as a global lingua franca needs to be able to successfully communicate in these complex settings. They are presented in an order which builds from a basic understanding of cultural contexts in communication, particularly in relation to the L1 (Level 1: Basic CA, Figure 1), to a more complex understanding of language and culture (Level 2: Advanced CA, Figure 1), and finally to the fluid, hybrid, and emergent understanding of cultures and languages in intercultural communication needed for English used in global settings (Level 3: ICA, Figure 1).

However, it is recognized that learners of English may not develop these elements in this exact order. For example, it may well be that learners of English who have grown up in multilingual environments may be unconsciously or consciously aware of the later elements of ICA.

Furthermore, the elements of ICA are deliberately general in nature since the details will inevitably depend on the particular contexts of English learning and use.

As with CA, knowledge of specific cultures and the influence this may have on communication is still a part of ICA (see Levels 1 and 2, Figure 1), and there is a recognition that participants may initially begin communication by making use of nationally based cultural generalizations (Figure 1, Feature 11). Crucially though, there is also an attempt to go beyond single cultural frames of reference in intercultural communication. The features of Level 3 (Figure 1) proposes that, in parallel to knowledge of specific cultures, an understanding of emergent cultural references and practices is needed and that this needs to be combined with the ability to negotiate and mediate between these dynamic resources in intercultural communication. Such abilities and awareness enable users to cope with the diversity and fluidity of intercultural communication in which cultural frames of reference cannot be defined a priori. ICA should thus be of direct relevance to users of English in global contexts, especially in expanding circle and ELF settings, both as an attempt to conceptualize the cultural dimension to communication and also as a set of pedagogic aims.

This emphasis on skills and the ability to view cultures as dynamic, diverse, and emergent raises a dilemma though. To develop ICA learners need to have an in-depth understanding of culture, and to achieve this, it is necessary for learners to have cultural knowledge, even if that knowledge is no longer the end product of learning. Choosing the content of that cultural knowledge brings us back to the problems already raised in settings associated with English in global contexts. Yet, if the final outcome is to develop skills in and an awareness of intercultural communication, then cultural knowledge and content more appropriate to those skills and the components of CA identified earlier can be selected.

It is not necessary to focus exclusively on one culture, for example the typical focus on the United States or United Kingdom in English; instead cultural content appropriate to the variety of intercultural interactions a learner may encounter in their environment can be selected, which highlight the different components of ICA. In particular, it is necessary to focus on intercultural encounters themselves and examine the different ways in which culturally influenced behaviours are manifested in such.
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communication and the way these are negotiated by the participants in the exchange.

None of this denies the importance of knowledge of other cultures or rejects the idea that detailed knowledge of a specific culture is valuable in developing ICA. Rather, it recognizes the limitations of this kind of knowledge and incorporates the need for a more wide ranging understanding of culture for intercultural communication in the expanding range of contexts in which it occurs for global languages such as English. Thus, the knowledge, awareness, and skills associated with ICA will be constantly under revision and change based on each new intercultural encounter and as such are never a fully formed complete entity but always in progress towards a goal that is constantly changing.

### Applying ICA in classroom teaching

While, as indicated above, the manner in which ICA can be made relevant to different learning contexts will depend partly on that context, there are a number of broad areas, which can be used to develop ICA within the ELT classroom. These are presented here as a set of suggestions, not all of which will be relevant in all settings. Equally, there may be other opportunities not presented here which can be used to develop ICA in specific settings. These proposals can be divided into six strands as follows.

### Exploring local cultures

This begins with learners exploring the diversity and complexity of different local and national cultural groupings. This should lead to an awareness of the multi-voiced nature of cultural characterizations. It should also highlight the manner in which cultural groupings can cut across national cultures and the way in which local communities may connect with global communities, whether it is religious or ethnic groups, identifying with other learners and users of English or groups such as music or sports fans. A discussion between the students within any class, even in supposedly monolingual and monocultural settings, often reveals a surprising diversity of linguistic and cultural influences.

### Exploring language-learning materials

These can be used to critically evaluate images and descriptions of cultures in locally produced textbooks and images of other cultures in local and imported ELT textbooks. For instance, learners can explore how well the images of their own culture presented in their textbooks (if there are any) match their own experiences.

### Exploring the traditional media and arts through English

This can include film, television, radio, newspapers, novels, and magazines and can be used in a similar manner to the second strand to critically explore the images of local and other cultures. For example, literature has been extensively used for such purposes, although English language literature should clearly extend beyond that produced in the inner circle countries.

### Exploring IT/electronic media through English

The internet, email, chat rooms, instant messaging, and tandem learning can be used in a similar manner to the previous two strands to explore cultural representations. Furthermore, these resources can be used to engage in actual instances of intercultural communication, enabling students to develop ICA and reflect on its relevance to their experiences.
These may include asynchronous email exchanges and synchronous chat
room-type communication with language students and teachers in other
countries.

Cultural informants

Non-local English-speaking teachers and local English teachers with
experience of intercultural communication and other cultures can be used
to provide information about these experiences and cultures. This can also
provide another chance to reflect upon the relevance of different elements of
ICA in these situations. Teachers can present their experiences of other
cultures as content for the classroom through, for example, reading texts or
discussion topics.

Face-to-face intercultural communication (often with non-local
English teachers)

These are valuable both in themselves as offering opportunities to develop
and put ICA into practice and for providing materials and experiences to
reflect on in the classroom that can further aid in the development of ICA. In
situations where there are non-local teachers or non-local students (as may
be the case in further education settings), opportunities for intercultural
communication clearly exist. Even where such opportunities do not exist,
students and teachers can bring their own experiences of intercultural
communication to the class for discussion and reflection, for example
considering what was successful or not successful or how they felt about the
experience.

These strands attempt to utilize all the resources available in the language
classroom including the textbook and teacher, as well as those resources that
may be available to learners outside the classroom, such as the internet, but
can then be reflected on in the classroom. The six strands provide
opportunities to gain the necessary experience of intercultural
communication and investigating local and other cultures. This is balanced
with the equally important task of exploring and evaluating those
experiences. It is important to recognize that all of these sources will only
provide partial accounts of cultures and will inevitably be biased. However,
as long as this is made clear and learners and teachers approach the cultural
images and information presented in a critical manner, these can provide
valuable opportunities for experience of and reflection on intercultural
communication and contact with other cultures that can aid in the
development of ICA.

Conclusion

The use of English as the global lingua franca highlights the need for an
understanding of cultural contexts and communicative practices to
successfully communicate across diverse cultures. Yet, it also raises the
problem of naively associating the English language with a specific culture
or nation. Traditional conceptions of communicative competence and CA in
ELT have focused on an understanding of particular cultures and countries
such as the USA or UK and their associated sociocultural norms. English as
a global lingua franca forces us to go beyond notions of teaching a fixed
language and cultural context as adequate for successful communication.

Most significant when examining culture in ELT are the types of knowledge,
skills, and attitudes envisaged in ICA. These relate to understanding
culture, language, and communication in general, as well as in relation to
particular contexts, and an awareness of the dynamic relationship between
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English and its diverse sociocultural settings. An awareness of the multilingual and multicultural settings of English use, therefore, should be a key element of any attempt to teach communication. The ELT classroom is a site in which learners, and ideally teachers, are necessarily engaged in multilingual and multicultural practices and thus provides the ideal environment in which to develop ICA and to prepare users of English to communicate in global settings.
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Notes
1 ELF is also sometimes referred to as English as an international language; although, there is some debate as to whether the two terms are interchangeable (see Jenkins op.cit.).
2 These are based in part on an earlier empirical study of English use in an expanding circle setting (see Baker 2009a for a more detailed explanation of this).
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Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an International Language?

Jennifer Jenkins

The recent growth in the use of English as an International Language (EIL) has led to changes in learners' pronunciation needs and goals. The acquisition of a native-like accent is no longer the ultimate objective of the majority of learners, nor is communication with native speakers their primary motivation for learning English. Instead, what they need above all is to be able to communicate successfully with other non-native speakers of English from different L1 backgrounds. This article proposes that with English assuming the position of the world's major lingua franca, a radical rethink is called for in terms of the role of pronunciation and its aims within the ELT curriculum. In particular, there is an urgent need to consider the question of which pronunciation norms and models are most appropriate for classes aiming to prepare learners for interaction in EIL contexts, and to raise teachers' awareness of the issues involved.

Introduction: the basic conflict

Some years ago, Kachru (1988: 3) described six fallacies about 'the users and uses of English across cultures'. According to his sixth fallacy, 'the diversity and variation in English are indicators of linguistic decay; restriction of the decay is the responsibility of native scholars and of ESL programs'. This fallacy, argued Kachru, 'has resulted in the position that deviation' at any level from the native norm is 'an error'.

Many of us working in the field of pronunciation have moved on conceptually from this position. We no longer regard English as being taught mainly for communication with its native speakers (the goal of EFL), or the target of pronunciation teaching as a native-like accent, with the eradication of all traces of a 'foreign' accent, however unrealistic that target always was. We acknowledge that the EFL-ESL distinction is beginning to blur as the two merge into English as an International Language (EIL). Nowadays English most frequently serves as a worldwide lingua franca for its vast numbers of non-native users, and as Widdowson (1994) so forcefully argues, it is no longer the property of its native speakers. However, faced with a lack of clear-cut alternatives, we have not been able to move on in any practical way; and this situation has been compounded by the relative neglect that pronunciation teaching has suffered in ELT curricula since the advent of communicative approaches, within whose paradigms it does not sit comfortably. As a result, the position that Kachru described is still largely that adopted by teacher educators around the world, and consequently by classroom teachers themselves.
Two main obstacles prevent the conceptual progress outlined above from being translated into classroom practice. The first is the difficulty in resolving the basic conflict between the practical need to harmonize pronunciation among L2 varieties of English sufficiently to preserve international intelligibility; the second is the social and psychological need to respect the norms of the largest group of users of English, i.e. non-natives. So while it is now becoming conceivable for us to dispense with the idea that local non-native norms are wholly inappropriate, and that every pronunciation which differs from a native variety is deviant, clear specific pronunciation goals for teaching EIL are thin on the ground.

**Possible solutions**

Two main approaches to the conflict have emerged. The first is an attempt to establish some sort of simplified, neutral, universal pronunciation variety, intelligible and acceptable to both native and non-native users of English—the phonological equivalent of Quirk’s ‘Nuclear English’ (1981), which endeavoured to do this for syntax and morphology. An example of this is Gimson’s ‘rudimentary international pronunciation’ (1978: 51). Gimson reduced the phonemic inventory of English, i.e. 24 consonant sounds and 20 vowel sounds, to 14 and 13 respectively. The following is typical of the result:

'tens 'fok 'nau 'kærəs ðə 'houl òf 'sæθərn 'ɪnklænt, wɪð fɪsə'plætə at ðə 'mʌksɪməm òf 'ɛtʃ 'mɪtərs

which, transcribed, is:

Dense fog now covers the whole of southern England, with visibility at a maximum of eighty metres.

Of course, few English speakers, native or non-native, would find this sort of thing either intelligible or acceptable, particularly as regards the loss of the voicing distinction for consonants such that, for example, ‘dense’ is pronounced ‘tense’. Equally problematic is the fact that although such schemes cannot be totally dismissed, it would be extremely difficult to impose constraints in this way. Without the help of international pronunciation police, one could not force people either to acquire such forms in the first place, or to maintain them without elaboration in their subsequent interactions. Influences such as the British and American media, local norms, and group identity are likely to intervene to varying degrees to prevent success among either native or non-native users of EIL. Any neutral, universal forms of English pronunciation, simplified or otherwise, will therefore probably have to be unplanned, developing naturally from ‘below’ rather than being imposed from ‘above’, as seems to be happening at present, albeit on a smaller scale, among the different English accents of Singapore.

The second and potentially more promising approach to solving the conflict is that of variationists such as Pennington, whose recent (1996) book on English phonology, subtitled ‘An International Approach’, advocates the provision of multiple models, both native and non-native,
and the teaching of generalized norms according to individual learner need and choice, rather than a narrow focus on a standard British or American accent.

For the present, at least, neither type of approach solves the growing conflict between global intelligibility and local norms in EIL. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that remarkably little research has been conducted into the intelligibility of English among its non-native speakers from different LIIs, be they fluent bilinguals (for whom the epithet 'bilingual speaker of English' seems rather more appropriate than 'non-native': see Jenkins 1996a) or, far more commonly, those speakers who have interlanguages (hence 'non-bilingual speakers of English') and are, by definition, engaged in 'interlanguage talk' when they use English to interact with one another. These latter speakers are, of course, my major concern, since they are the ones who fill our classrooms, and whose pronunciation is likely to provide an obstacle to successful international communication.

**Intelligibility in EIL vs. EFL contexts**

Because of the dearth of research on English used among its non-native speakers, the majority of published materials on pronunciation, whether theoretical or for classroom use, tend to focus exclusively on intelligibility for the native rather than the non-native receiver. This research focus on the native receiver provides important insights into the way native speakers of English structure and decode spoken messages via the suprasegmental system (stress, rhythm, and intonation) and, as such, constitutes an essential source of information for those learning English in order to communicate with its native speakers. However, the assumption that these findings can be applied wholesale to non-native lingua franca contexts is dubious. While it is almost undoubtedly true that the suprasegmentals contribute far more than the segmentals (sounds) to intelligibility for the native receiver, complicating factors in interlanguage talk make it necessary to maintain a balance between the segmentals and suprasegmentals in teaching where the learner's goal is to be effective in EIL rather than in EFL (native/non-native) contexts.

**A compromise solution**

For the purposes of promoting intelligibility through teaching EIL, while at the same time allowing speakers the freedom to express themselves through their own pronunciation norms, I suggest the following approach: we should concentrate the productive focus of pronunciation teaching on the three areas that appear to have the greatest influence on intelligibility in EIL, i.e. certain segmentals, nuclear stress (the main stress in a word group), and the effective use of articulatory setting, to the extent that it underpins the first two areas. Other aspects of pronunciation can then be dealt with purely at a receptive level.

We will now look in greater detail at this proposal for an EIL pronunciation syllabus, taking each of the three productive areas in turn and then going on to consider the receptive areas.

*Pronunciation norms and models*
The crucial difference between a non-native speaker of English and a native speaker (or fluent bilingual) as regards segmentals, is that the non-native may deviate from native models in precisely those sounds that are considered to be ‘core’ sounds of English, and therefore essential to approximate closely because they figure in all native varieties. This core quality applies to most consonant sounds and to the distinction between long and short vowel sounds, and can be extended to methods of cluster simplification, particularly consonant deletion—for example, the deletion of /t/ when it is the middle of three consonants, such that ‘postman’ is pronounced /pəsman/. (See Jenner 1989, Jenkins 1996b for further discussion of the ‘common core’.) As well as deviating from native models in these areas, non-native speakers often deviate differently from each other because of L1 transfer.

Where non-core sounds are concerned we are, for EIL purposes, in the realm of acceptable L2 regional norms—non-standard, but nevertheless non-deviant. This applies generally to vowel quality (provided it is consistent), which varies widely among native varieties, and to the consonants /θ/ and /ð/, which do not occur in the majority of the world’s languages, or even in some native English varieties. Core sounds are a different matter altogether. While accurate production does not of itself guarantee intelligibility or signal meaning, in interlanguage talk lack of accurate production often has the opposite effect, that is, it obstructs meaning by distracting or even opening up possibilities of a different message. This is chiefly because the receiver in interlanguage talk tends to use more bottom-up processing, and to have a narrower band of allophonic (phonetic) tolerance and a reduced lexical repertoire, as compared with a native speaker or fluent bilingual; paradoxically, the effect can be compounded by the correct placement of nuclear stress on the syllable containing the deviant core sound or consonant deletion.

Accurate use of nuclear stress is essential in EIL because learners seem to acquire the native English system relatively quickly for receptive purposes, but do not acquire it productively until considerably later, if at all. This applies particularly to contrastive stress, through which English typically highlights ‘extra’ meanings by moving the nucleus from the last content word to another word in the group. (For example, in ‘My husband drinks a lot of wine’, the most usual position for nuclear stress is on ‘wine’, whereas if this stress was shifted to ‘husband’, some other contrastive meaning, such as ‘but I don’t’, would be established.) The thorough, systematic teaching of the nuclear stress system would undoubtedly go some way to rectifying the learner’s receptive—productive mismatch. However, until pronunciation is given a higher priority in the classroom, such an outcome is unlikely to be widespread, and the effect of a misplaced nucleus, particularly in combination with a deviant core sound, will continue to be potentially disastrous for EIL communication.

Jennifer Jenkins
Articulatory setting

Mastery in this area will both facilitate the production of core sounds and allow the speaker to manipulate these sounds to produce nuclear stress, i.e. to lengthen sounds, change pitch on them, and utter them with greater volume. If the articulators are not comfortably positioned, such manoeuvres will prove difficult, if not impossible, whereas ‘concentrating on this holistic aspect of pronunciation . . . makes it easier to allow suprasegmental and segmental aspects to work in unison’ (Dalton and Seidhofer 1994a: 142).

Areas open to variation

The three phonological areas discussed above have the advantage of being not only teachable but also learnable: systematic, and not riddled with complicated exceptions and fine distinctions, or dependent on individual learners and contexts (for more on teachability and learnability see Dalton and Seidhofer 1994a: 72–4). On the other hand, most other aspects of phonology are neither easily learnable nor necessary for most EIL contexts. Thus, EIL should be able to embrace non-native local norms and/or disregard native norms with no threat to intelligibility for the (non-native) receiver in at least the following areas:

Word stress

The rules are highly complex, containing manifold exceptions and differences among L1 varieties and according to syntactic context. Some words, e.g. ‘controversy’, ‘ice-cream’, even have optional stress patterns within Received Pronunciation (RP), the standard British pronunciation. Reliable rules therefore cannot be easily formulated, let alone learnt.

Features of connected speech

These include elision, assimilation, linking, and weak forms. The suggestion that learners can safely abandon weak forms (the production of words like ‘to’ and ‘from’ as /tə/ and /frəm/ in fast speech) will no doubt prove controversial. However, I would argue that it is possible to highlight some syllables without necessarily reducing others, and that some native varieties do precisely this, along with the vast majority of fluent bilingual speakers. Lack of weak forms may prove disconcerting for some native receivers, but is unlikely to do so for non-natives.

Rhythm

While English is relatively stress-timed, with stresses occurring on important syllables in the speech stream at roughly equal intervals, most of the world’s languages tend towards varying degrees of syllable-timing. While it will always be necessary to retain nuclear stress on the most important syllable of a word group, because English is relatively restricted syntactically and morphologically in its capacity to highlight important aspects of a message in other ways, this does not mean that stress-timing is essential in any strict sense. In fact, rigid stress-timing is no more than a convenient fiction for classroom practice and, if David Crystal’s (1996) tentative prediction is correct, English may be moving towards the syllable-timed end of the stress/syllable-timing continuum, under the influence of other world languages in general and of rap music in particular.
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Thus, while approximation to the native model is probably essential for intelligibility in non-bilingual EIL contexts as regards core sounds, nuclear stress, and relevant articulatory setting, local non-native norms are likely to be both acceptable and intelligible in many other phonological areas. This solution to the conflict involved in the selection of pronunciation goals for EIL offers teachers and learners the best of both worlds: a universal, realistically teachable and learnable core, based on the native model (‘model’ being singular in the sense that the designated areas are common to all native varieties), which can then be fleshed out according to a wide range of acceptable, local non-native norms.

**Implications for teacher education**

If such an approach to the teaching of pronunciation is to be adopted in the EIL classroom, teachers will require substantial awareness-raising and practical preparation. In particular, teacher education programmes will need to prioritize two issues: first, the difference between a model and a norm and, second, the fact and acceptability of L2 sociolinguistic variation.

According to Dalton and Seidloth (1994b: 27), ‘if we treat RP and/or General American as a norm, we connect them strongly with ideas of correctness. The norm is invariable and has to be imitated independently of any considerations of language use. The aim, however unrealistic, is 100 per cent attainment of the norm, which is regarded as an end in itself’. On the other hand, ‘if we treat RP and/or General American as a model, we use them as points of reference and models for guidance. We decide to approximate to them more or less according to the demands of a specific situation’.

Thus, instead of treating a native norm as the goal for production, as has generally been the case hitherto, teachers should be made aware that this is neither a desirable nor, in fact, a likely outcome. They can be shown how to use a native model as a point of reference to prevent local non-native varieties from moving too far apart from each other, as well as to promote receptive competence in interaction with native speakers. However, for active use and correction, they can be directed towards focusing on the comfortable production of core sounds and nuclear stress, and on the rules governing nuclear placement, but otherwise to accept, indeed, to promote the use of LI norms.

Nevertheless, the demands of ‘the specific situation’ of classroom teaching are such that non-native teachers will, themselves, still be required to develop the ability to approximate more closely than their students to a standard native model. This will enable them to provide the classroom exposure that is necessary to provide ‘points of reference and models for guidance’, thus preventing local norms from diverging too far from each other and resulting in international unintelligibility. In addition, teachers, whether native or non-native, will also be required from time to time to satisfy the minority of learners who desire to follow the EFL rather than the EIL route, and achieve more or less native-like
proficiency. Again, the teacher's ability to approximate closely to a standard native model will be essential to this end. In this context, it is important to emphasize that we should all guard against political correctness, in the sense of telling our learners what their goals should be: in particular that they should not want to sound like native speakers if they clearly wish to do so.

All teachers, native and non-native, will need to be well educated in the three core phonological areas, i.e. sounds, nuclear stress, and articulatory setting. They will need a thorough grounding in how and where sounds and stress are produced, in the rules for elision as they relate to acceptable and non-acceptable consonant deletion, and in the nuclear placement system. They will also need to be well informed as to how their learners do these things in their L1s, so that they can introduce contrastive work into the classroom as a means of enhancing productive competence. It is a current irony that although pronunciation teaching tends to be marginalized throughout the ELT world, it is non-native teachers who are generally the better versed in all these areas, and thus the better prepared to embark on teaching pronunciation for EIL.

L2 sociolinguistic variation

Phonological variation, whether L1 or L2, can be both inter- and intra-speaker. Before teachers are likely to promote L2 inter-speaker variation in the classroom, they will need to experience a change of attitude towards it and, in turn, be equipped with the means of changing their students' attitudes (and this includes native-speaker students, possibly at secondary school level). Such an attitude change among teachers will best be effected by the introduction into teacher education courses of a sociolinguistics component dealing specifically with the social and psychological issues involved in accent variation. Translated into pedagogy, inter-speaker variation implies the inclusion of extensive exposure to different L2 varieties of English, particularly in the form of contrastive work, to make the differences salient for learners, and thus to enhance their receptive competence for EIL.

Intra-speaker variation in an EIL context refers to the fact that non-native speakers may be motivated to accommodate their non-native receivers when their own desire to be understood is especially strong. This accommodation is expressed particularly in the suppression of those features of L1 transfer (often relating to core sounds) that have the potential to obstruct meaning for a specific receiver (cf. Jenkins 1999c). It can be elicited especially by means of information exchange tasks between learners from different L1 backgrounds. However, teachers need to be made aware that suppression of L1 transfer through accommodation cannot be expected to occur in any task type, or between learners from the same L1 background.

Clearly, then, both types of variation can be embraced more easily in multilingual than in monolingual classrooms, which involve high exposure to a single non-native variety and lack any genuine communicative need to use English or improve pronunciation for
intelligibility. Moreover, these last two factors sometimes seem to engender a degree of embarrassment about approximating closely to the L2 model in front of the peer group, especially in the case of adolescent learners. Paradoxically, it is also more difficult to convince both teachers and their learners from monolingual settings that L2 variation is acceptable for EIL. Lacking an international context for learning, the inclination tends to be towards EFL rather than EIL, regardless of the future uses to which the learners will put their English. In addition to reforming the pronunciation syllabus, two major tasks for EIL over the coming decades are, therefore, to reposition the crucial pedagogical area of pronunciation centre-stage rather than in the wings, and to make multilingual classes available wherever in the world English is taught and learned in order to serve as an international lingua franca.
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**Answer Keys for Self Check**

Subtest “METHODOLOGICAL COMPETENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL-PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE (knowledge)”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtest “METHODOLOGICAL COMPETENCE (skills)”

**Answer keys for self check**

**Task 1**

**Answer:** indirect, objective, integrative, norm-referenced, proficiency.

**Task 2**

**Suggested answers:**
1. Bad washback. Students will feel that luck was more important than hard work.
2. Bad washback. Students will feel that class work has been a waste of time.
3. Good washback. The information will help the teacher plan his / her course to suit the needs of his / her students.
4. Good washback. Students will feel they have been tested fairly.

**Task 3**

**Answers:**
1. The grammar-translation approach.
2. Matching words to definitions (1), translation (2 and 3) and word-building (4).
3. Any 4 of the following:
   - matching pictures to words;
   - matching parts of the words together;
   - classifying items into lists;
   - using specific words to complete a task;
   - making mindmaps / doing crosswords, etc;
   - filling in gaps in the texts;
   - memory games (pelmanism, Kim's game, etc);
   - word thieves;
   - word seeds;
   - word dominoes.
Subtest «PSYCHOLOGICAL-PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE (skills)»

Answer keys for self check

1. Ülesanne

Vastus: Sellise hirmu põhjuseks võib olla õpetaja negatiivne hinnang Mari varasemale sooritusele, mistõttu kardab tüdruk ütleväit ja järgevad esinemist klassi ees. Samuti võis Mari saada oma klassikaaslaste naerualuseks / tunda alaväärsust oma kaasõpilaste ees, kes teda näiteks mõnitasid.

Põhimõte: Mari on teistele esinedes tunda saanud ühte negatiivset kogemust, mida ta seostab nüüd iga esinemisega. Seetõttu ei suuda ta esineda ilma, et tunneks hirmu.
Järgmise esinemise juures on kuulajateks, lisaks õpetajale, veel mõned sõpradest klassikaaslased. Kindlasti ei tohi õpilase esinemist halvustada, vaid esinejas peab tekitama positiivseid emotsioone. Seejärel toimub esinemine juba suuremale rühmale.
Sellise tegevusega peaks õpilane olema mõne aja pärast suuteline esinema juba kogu klassile ning paaniline esinemishirm on möödunud.

2. Ülesanne

Vastus: ekstravertsus — introvertsus.

3. Ülesanne

Vastus: Õpilane pöördub Täiskasvanu tasandilt Täiskasvanu tasandil õpetaja poole. Õpetaja vastab omalt poolt Vanema tasandilt õpilasele Lapse tasandile. Skeemil need transaktsioonid ristuvad ja transaktsioonilises analüüsis nimetatakse seda konfliktseks situatsiooniks.
ASSESSMENT OF EXAMINATION RESULTS

A student has passed the examination **successfully** if s/he has completed at **least 51 %** of each subtest.

CONSULTATIONS

- Group consultations on examination preparation shall be delivered in autumn and spring terms.
- Individual consultations on subtests can be requested from lecturers-advisors.

Schedule and Topics of Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic and Consultation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.09.14</td>
<td>Introductory consultation: “Master's examination requirements and content”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Introductory consultation: The “Psychological-pedagogical competence” module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Practical consultation: The “Psychological-pedagogical competence” module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Practical consultation: The “Methodological competence” module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Practical consultation: The “Research competence” module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.05.15</td>
<td>Consultation “A day before the examination”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lecturers-advisors

**The “Psychological-pedagogical competence” module**

Sergei Džalalov, Assistant of Psychology and Pedagogy
Natalya Zorina, Lecturer of Psychology and Pedagogy, PhD
Nelly Randver, Assistant of Psychology

**The “Methodological competence” module**

Olga Orehhova, Lecturer of English language, MA
Nina Raud, Lecturer of English language, Head of Division of Foreign Languages, PhD

**The “Research competence” module**

Žanna Razinkova, Assistant of English language, MA