Mr. Elma Dedovic-Atilla
International Burch University Sarajevo
elma153@hotmail.com

Doc. dr. sc. Vildana Dubravac
International Burch University Sarajevo
mujcicvildana@yahoo.com

FROM EFL TO ELF: THE NEW KID ON THE BLOCK

Abstract

Today we witness that English has already virtually taken one of the crucial roles on the global stage. Therefore, this paper´s goal is to explore the change that the English Language use has undergone in today´s globalized world that has led to the birth of a new construct in the field of English Language conceptualization, namely English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). In order to achieve this, the paper is organized in several sections covering the following topics: the spread of English throughout the world; a short overview of divergent stances and conceptions of English as a world language; introduction of ELF concept and pinpointing the line of distinction between the concepts of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). The paper accentuates the need for the reconstruction of the places and roles that EFL and ELF assume in present-day linguistic reality, together with the need to raise the awareness about the differences between the two and their implications in English Language Teaching (ELT).

Keywords: World Englishes, EFL, ELF, ELT, ENL, NS, CoP, Global English

Introduction

The position of English as the leading international language used in every part of the world nowadays seems undisputed. Although the causes that account for this phenomenon are manifold, they are interconnected, usually being explained from the two standpoints: geographical-historical and socio-cultural (Crystal, 2003). The former elaborates on how English rose to prominence taking the leading role amongst other world languages,

while the latter provides an account of the factors that enable English to retain its privileged status. Both of these are presented below.

From the geographical-historical view of point, the rise of English seems quite interesting, with the sudden major flourishing of English in global terms starting in the 16th century with British colonialism. At the time, the language became an instrument of imperial expansion and it ended up holding a position of prestige in many conquered territories including Australia, New Zealand, the Caribbean, Canada, South Asia and South Pacific, as well as great parts of African continent. Thus, the 17th and 18th centuries saw the expansion of the English Language through colonization, which was further affirmed and strengthened by the Industrial Revolution in the 18th and 19th centuries, in which Britain played a leading part. Finally, the United States´ emerging political and economic power, towards the end of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century, additionally cemented English prestigious position and linguistic global dominance (Crystal, 2003).

Should we take a look at socio-cultural perspectives contributing to the present-day omnipresence of English, we will notice that the array of factors holding English at the pedestal is extensive. First of all, its role in education is undisputed. Today, as Carmichael (2000) argues, the significance of possessing certain knowledge of English can be closely compared to the importance of being literate in reading and writing in the Industrialization era in Europe. In most countries, English is the first foreign language taught in schools and mastering English has become an essential asset and a permanent element of general education (Huber, 1998).

Another walk of life which heavily relies on English is science and academia. It is estimated that around 98% of all scientific writing published today is in English (Engber, 2013). Thus, in order to reach international recognition and audience and to be acknowledged by the top scientific community, scientists are compelled to resort to writing in English. Therefore, the academic command to "publish or perish" might as well be translated into the language of reality: "publish in English, or perish". Hamel (2007) states that even ground-breaking findings may not find its way into the world and recognition, unless they are published in English.

Similarly, political life cannot be imagined without English nowadays. Although multilingualism is idealistically advocated on international political scene, due to practical and economical

reasons, English is frequently used as a medium in communication amongst different nationals with different native languages within international organizations (van Els, 2000). Besides this top-down process, English has become popularized through bottom-up processes by the media (press, advertising, radio, the Internet and social networks), music, sports and IT. Thus, it became accessible to (and necessary for) any ordinary person.

All the aforementioned clearly shows that English has become a global, international language used across regions and nations. However, its very nature and usage, its functions and its character are so varied and rich, that a number of different concepts and theories regarding the issue have been born to account for all these subtle and indefinable features and variations.

English as a Global Language

Addressing English as it is variously used across the world, we encounter expressions such as World English, World Englishes, New Englishes, Global English, International English, Globish English as an International Language and English as Lingua Franca. Out of all these, the two most prominently used terms to describe the spread of English are World Englishes (WE) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Although there is some overlap in the usage of the terms, over time these expressions have come to denote two separate concepts in linguistics and are categorized into two distinct research fields.

World Englishes

The concept of World English, later gradually altered into World Englishes/New Englishes/indigenized/nativized varieties, was coined by BrajKachru who developed the Three Circle Model of World Englishes in 1985 (Kachru, 1985), which remains to be one of the most influential and most referenced models to group the varieties of English on the globe (Mollin, 2006). Kachru (1985) constructed a pioneering model to account for the expansion and use of English comprising three concentric circles, which he labeled: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle. These circles represent the spread, the patterns of acquisition, and the functional allocation of English in divergent cultural contexts. The Inner Circle represents the traditional bases of English, including just few countries: the USA; the UK; Canada,

Australia and New Zealand. The Outer Circle is represented by the institutionalized non-native varieties (ESL) in the regions colonized during Great Britain´s expansion in Asia and Africa. More than fifty territories fall within this circle. The Expanding Circle includes the regions where English has no political, historical or institutional role, but is learned as a foreign language (EFL) (Xiaoqiong & Xianxing, 2011).

The fact that the model recognizes a pluralist nature of English, acknowledges the sensitivity of native and nonnative dichotomy and accounts for both the historical perspective on the spread of English and its international status today, prompted a large body of researchers to utilize the model in their studies (e.g. Graddol 1997; Jenkins 2006a; Kirkpatrick 2007; McKay 2002; Seidlhofer 2004; Sharifian 2009). However, despite all of the strong points that prove it highly expedient in academic research, the model has a number of limitations, pointed out by different authors: Bruthiaux (2003) criticizes the model for its inability to account for variations in different dialects in English; Pung (2009) notices that the model is unable to act as a guide for other world languages, such as French or Spanish; Jenkins (2003) considers that a simple graphically depicted model cannot be used to determine the proficiency of speakers in English or to explain the role of English for Special Purposes; Burt (2005) argues that the model indeed points out differences between different varieties, but is short of providing all the common traits of Englishes; Crystal (1995) notes that the model does not allow for the mixing of different circles, while reality unfolds a different story, where it is frequently difficult to distinguish between someone´s first and second language.

The criticism has pointed out to some of the critical deficiencies of the model, not allowing it to depict the complex reality of the English language use nowadays. The English language network of use has become so intricate, dynamic and multifaceted, to which the clear-cut, rigid categorization of Kachruvian world simply cannot apply. Therefore, the novel concepts that aim at portraying the linguistic reality more accurately have been born. One of the most influential concepts that tries to reconcile all the conflicting traits within the elusive nature of English Language use today across communities and regions is the concept of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). The following section, therefore, introduces the concept and,

subsequently, attempts to provide the reasons for its divorce from the traditional EFL conceptualization.

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

Defining ELF

It is certain that English linguistic panorama today does not mirror the traditional notions of English and its usage. This is why in the last decades a number of scholars came to differentiate between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (e.g. Jenkins, 2006b; Pakir, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2009; Seidlhofer, Breiteneder & Pitzl, 2006). However, English as a lingua franca is a concept encompassing a myriad of conceptual frameworks within it, proposed by different scholars. Thus, it is impossible to define ELF in plain terms, but its nature can be grasped more thoroughly through by elaborating on the primary features attributed to it. Those notions will be presented in the following section, clearly pinpointing the crucial points where the ELF school divorces from the EFL conceptualization.

Speakers/Learners/Users

Defined in its simplest form, ELF "is a „contact language" between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication" (Firth, 1996:240). Although this presents one of the earlier definitions, the subsequent ones highlight the same key concepts. Thus, when talking about ELF, Jenkins refers to "a specific communication context: English being used as a lingua franca, the common language of choice, among speakers who come from different lingua-cultural backgrounds" (Jenkins, 2009:200). Seidlhofer (2005:339) also refers to it as "communication in English between speakers with different first languages". Although following some earlier definitions, such as House's (1999) and Jenkins' (2007), the communication channel excludes native English speakers, so the ELF interaction can actually take place between native and non-native speakers of English. However, a more frequent scenario, taking place in reality, is ELF being primarily used among non-native speakers of English, who have to resort to a common language in order to engage in a successful comprehensible interaction. In fact, it is said that, more

often than not, communication taking place in English today occurs in interaction between non-native speakers, who have outnumbered native English speakers by a ratio of 3 to 1 (Crystal, 2003).

Therefore, a ground-breaking shift in the conceptualization of ELF, advocated by ELF scholars, is that any person trying to master English is not a learner, as traditionally seen in EFL concept, but rather a language user, a communicator in their own right. Thus, the user is not seen as an individual whose utmost goal should be to reach the native-like proficiency, but rather as a person whose major task is to utilize all communicative strategies at hand to create and maintain successful communication with other parties (Firth, 1996).

In this sense, the perception of what constitutes an error has been altered as well. While traditionally any production that did not conform to the standardized English had to be corrected and the right version was taught, in ELF, errors are not seen as an instigator of a breakdown, but rather as traits that present no obstacle to mutual understanding, which is actually the primary goal of a communicative act (Seidlhofer, 2004; Cogo&Devey, 2011). Thus, instead of teachers´ seeing them as "fossilized" errors or "inter-language" (Byorkman, 2008:36), in ELF settings the following features, for instance, are simply seen as variations not affecting the meaning: dropping of the third person present tense –*s*; confusing the relative pronouns *who* and *which*; omitting definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in ENL, and inserting them where they do not occur in ENL; failing to use correct forms in tag questions (e.g., *isn't it?* or *no?* instead of *shouldn't they?*); inserting redundant prepositions, as in *We have to study about…*; overusing certain verbs of high semantic generality, such as *do, have, make, put, take*; replacing infinitive-constructions with *that*-clauses, as in *I want that* (Seidlhofer, 2004). Following this, Mauranen (2006:147) makes a valid point by saying that we should cease seeing EFL learners as "eternal ´learners´ on an interminable journey toward perfection in a target language. Speakers may opt out of the role of learner at any stage, and take on the identity of language users, who successfully manage demanding discourses despite imperfections in the code".

However, it is important to note that there is still a common denominator that all ELF speakers need to possess in order to create a successful communication channel. Jenkins (2000) named it Lingua Franca Core (LFC), referring to critical traits that need to

be employed, together with other communications skills, in order to communicate efficiently. This is one of the critical points where EFL concept differs from ELF conceptualization. While the former one is concerned with reaching native-like proficiency and is focused on achieving successful communication with model native English speakers, the latter one acts in line with the reality where, more often than not, communication in international contexts involves non-native English speakers. Thus, getting the message across and relaying content, not the form, is of utmost importance. In this sense, we can say that *EFL is concerned more with forms, while ELF stresses functions.*

Finally, MacKenzie (2014) raises another important issue in relation to, native/non-native; i.e. learner/user dichotomy by saying that a perfect native speaker model cannot be just any native speaker, but an educated native speaker. However, this brings an issue of who that educated model is. Davies (2003) argues that although language teachers and linguists take a native speaker as a benchmark, the elusive nature of the concept makes it both a reality and a myth. Kramsch (1997) goes even further and claims that a native speaker is nothing but an imaginary construct. All this virtually means that the prescriptive view of a need to reach the native speaker proficiency is absurd and doomed to failure from the very beginning, as ELF scholars note. Therefore, instead of trying to reach an impossible target, second language acquisition should be, more fairly and naturally, measured against second language (L2) standards, not first language (L1) standards, since native speakers are not the exclusive guardians of their language and the yardstick against which everybody else should be assessed (MacKenzie, 2014).

Community

ELF conceptualization is closely related to the re-conceptualization of the notion of community. Traditionally, community implied a specific group of people who are interconnected together, first of all, by physical proximity, i.e. sharing common grounds, as well as similar values and beliefs, or as Hymes (1962: 30) described it: "a local unit, characterized for its members by common locality and primary interaction".

However, a notion of community has undergone tremendous changes since then and is no longer necessarily characterized by

common space or face-to-face human interaction. Today, in our big global village, with technological advances that enable communication of people from different corners of the world, who are often mutually linked by an intricate web of interests or shared values, the notion of community has drastically changed. Thus, Wenger (1998) introduced the notion of community of practice (CoP), i.e. groups of people who share an interest or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.

This means that there are three essential elements of CoPs. First, there is a shared domain of interest among members who are committed to it. Second, there is a community, i.e. people not only sharing the same occupation, but also interacting and learning together. Finally, there is a practice, which translates into the fact that it does not suffice that a group of people simply share an interest; they need to be practitioners, who develop a shared repertoire of resources. More precisely, it is defined through three terms: enterprise, mutual engagement and a shared repertoire (Wenger, 1998).

The notion of CoP was borrowed into ELF theory as well. House (2003) first applied it to the ELF context and Seidlhofer adopted it as well (2009), arguing that the idea of community cannot account for all the incessant changes in our fast-paced globalized world of communication. Therefore, she claims that communities of practice is a concept that reflects ELF interaction more adequately and that people with specific ELF registers comprising shared repertoires for international and intercultural interaction are ought to be seen as a community (Seidlhofer, 2009: 238-239), regardless of the fact they do not coexist on the same geographical location:

> With the current proliferation of possibilities created by electronic means and unprecedented global mobility, changes in communications have accelerated and forced changes in the nature of communication. And for the time being anyway, it is English as a lingua franca that is the main means of wider communication for conducting transactions and interactions outside people's primary social spaces and speech communities. It seems inevitable that with radical technology-driven changes in society, our sense of what constitutes a legitimate community and a legitimate linguistic variety has to change, too. Thus we are witnessing, alongside local speech communities sharing a dialect, the vigorous emergence of regional and global discourse communities (Swales 1990) or

communities of practice with their particular ELF registers constituting shared repertoires for international/intercultural communication. Closing our eyes to the contemporary reality of English as a lingua franca just because we cannot neatly slot it into familiar categories of 'variety' and do not wish to call its users a 'community' is therefore a case of paradigm myopia in the Kachruvian sense.

Therefore, for ELF scholars the notion of community of practice, which reshaped the notion of what „a legitimate community" means, seems to be the concept that is wholly consistent with the manner in which ELF functions.

Ownership of English

Although the term ownership primarily concerns legal and physical possession over something, it encompasses much broader notions and is closely linked to the notion of language. Traditionally, languages have been considered to be owned by specific nations, who are considered rightful owners and guardians of their language. However, this notion has been re-questioned by different scholars. Brumfit (2001) for example, argues that ownership is linked to the people who use the language, regardless of what their native language is. Widdowson (1994) holds a similar view stating that Standard English is not an exclusive property of one community, but it is an international language, serving a broad array of different communities, transcending traditional communal and cultural boundaries. These communities "develop their own conventions of thought and procedure, customs and codes of practice; in short, they in effect create their own cultures, their own standards" (Widdowson, 1994:382)

Widdowson (1994) further reasons his theory by pointing out that people can call a language their own, when they feel unfettered in their usage, i.e. one achieves a full mastery of a language only then, when they can use it as a tool to fully express themselves, to fashion it according to their needs, to make it their own and make it real for themselves. This cannot be achieved if all linguistic conventions of Standard English are observed, because they stifle creativity and linguistic resourcefulness, they limit a person into a box of traits innate to some other nation´s historical and cultural identity. Hence, a commonly stated feeling among polyglots: that by switching to another language, they feel a shift in their personality too. Thus, paradoxically, Widdowson (1994) claims,

that for an unbound feeling of possessing a language to occur, one must break free of its conventions and bend it to their own will and use it for their own purposes. These purposes have twofold nature: communicative, answering to the needs of interaction, and communal, linked to the group identity. He supports his argument with the following thought:

> The very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it. To grant such custody of the language is necessarily to arrest its development and so under-mine its international status. It is a matter of considerable pride and satisfaction for native speakers of English that their language is an international means of communication. But the point is that it is only international to the extent that it is not their language. It is not a possession which they lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold. Other people actually own it. (Widdowson, 1994:385)

Therefore, these novel notions, which are in line with the contemporary dichotomy in linguistics calling for a distinction between the language for communication and the language for identification, require a comparative analysis of EFL and ELF as well, which is being discussed in the following section.

EFL vs. ELF

A number of scholars do not seem convinced by ELF researchers´ rationale on why ELF should be regarded as a separate language, or a set of language varieties in its own right, providing reasons why ELF conceptualization might be far-fetched (e.g. Ferguson, 2009; Swan, 2012). However, ELF advocates (Jenkins, 2006b; Seidlhofer, 2004) perceive ESL and EFL scholars´ unwillingness to differentiate between a lingua franca and a foreign language, i.e. a nativized variety and a foreign language variety, to be one of the essential reasons impeding them from opening up to the concept of ELF. Therefore, Jenkins (2006b) executes a contrastive analysis between the two concepts, clearly pinpointing their key contrasts, which impede them from being placed in the same linguistic conceptual category.

Firstly, as hinted somewhat earlier, the goals of ELF and EFL users in their efforts of English language usage are quite different. Traditionally, the system, teachers and learners themselves saw their ultimate goal to be in drawing as close as possible to native-like proficiency, opting for either the Queen´s English or General American in their strenuous efforts to sound as British or American

while producing English in their communication with native speakers. On the other hand, ELF is used in international contexts with both native and (mostly) nonnative speakers (Crystal, 2003). Thus, in this context, measuring linguistic competence against the minority of interlocutors seems unnatural and unnecessary. Moreover, as it was elaborated earlier, "model native speaker" and "standard variety" are abstract, imaginary constructs and language in itself is a fluid, dynamic and incessantly altering entity. Thus, instead of teaching one standard variety, at least in ELF contexts, it seems more sensible to teach and train individuals how to efficiently develop, use and broaden their communication skills, employing a variety of strategies, where specific linguistic knowledge is just one piece in a delicate mosaic. In this sense, Widdowson (2003:177) notes:

> I have suggested that rather than seeking to specify goals in terms of projected needs, which for the most part are highly unpredictable, it would be preferable and more practicable, to focus on the development of a more general capability which would serve as an investment for subsequent learning.

Therefore, when a nonnative speaker produces a linguistic, pragmatic or socio-cultural item that is different from the standard nativized variety, in EFL contexts, it would be called "an error" or "deficiency", while ELF scholars would simply call it "a difference". However, as Jenkins (2006b) notes, this stance, where nonnative speakers are judged by native speakers standards, is not a logical thing to do in the case of nativized lingua franca varieties, since nativized Englishes of outer circle and lingua franca Englishes of expanding circle are used in settings where NSs are not the target interactants, and as such should not be used as the model to be strictly followed.

Furthermore, it is important to make a distinction between classifications: while EFL falls within Modern Foreign Languages category, ELF should rightly be classified within World Englishes. In this sense, the concepts of native speaker model, standard variety and reaching native-like proficiency can all be important goals, but only within EFL teaching/learning. In the latter case, observing other set of norms seems to be a more natural choice (Jenkins, 2006b).

Another important concept closely related to language and consequently to the notions of EFL and ELF is culture. The importance of this correlation has traditionally been recognized in

language teaching, resulting in the curriculum including teaching a specific chosen target culture (e.g. Australian, British or American), alongside the language itself. Raising the awareness about the culture one intends to communicate with and drawing comparisons between their own and the target culture seems a natural choice, which is an applicable practice in EFL contexts. However, it is evident that certain issues arise in the case of ELF environment. In ELF interactions, focus is not on a sole specific group of interlocutors, but on a broad range of nationals coming to international stage from a variety of different cultural contexts. Therefore, while in EFL situations, the focus can still be retained on cultural awareness, in ELF settings, a more adequate option might be to supplement it with intercultural awareness. Considering the fact that international communication is characterized by less defined boundaries and more diverse and dynamic groupings, intercultural awareness allows interlocutors to cope with delicate difficulties and issues arising in those kinds of contexts. Therefore, intercultural knowledge becomes an essential part of ELF interactions (Knapp and Meierkord, 2002).

Finally, together with the language and culture, the concept of identity has to be reconstructed within an ELF scenario as well. Language and identity/culture have always assumed a one to one relationship, in which individuals are perceived monolingual and monocultural, existing within confined, specified boundaries of their communities. In ELT, this practically means that together with learning, for example, American General English, its pronunciation, accent and a set of beliefs and values are taught as well, with the aim of learners´ acquiring certain norms and customs that would aid them in blending in the NS environment. However, in the present-day globalized world network, the notions of identity have dramatically changed. Today identity is not seen as a pre-fixed, static category, but rather as an entity that is actively constructed in social interaction (Omoniyi 2006). In this sense, we talk about multiple identities, where the choice of language plays one of the central roles in their construction. This plurality and multilayered identities are in line with an ELF paradigm, where language is selected and adapted to each specific context employing a myriad of accommodation strategies, code-mixing, code-switching etc. Thus, similarly to ELF, identity too is a mutable and malleable category, as Coulmas (2005:179) points out,

> Identities are not mutually exclusive but form a complex fabric of intersecting affiliations, commitments, convictions and emotional bonds such that each individual is a member of various overlapping groups with varying degrees of incorporation. Each individual's memberships and identities are variable, changing in intensity by context and over time.

Conclusion

Taking into consideration all the aforementioned, it becomes evident that a conceptual break between EFL and ELF notions is necessary, especially concerning pedagogical implications it produces in ELT. In conclusion, the following figure summarizes some of the distinctions between ELF and EFL (adapted from Jenkins, 2006b):

EFL
– Part of Modern Foreign Languages
– Native-like proficiency
– Error/Deficit
– To interact with NS
– Code-switching/code-mixing=
– Interference errors

ELF
– Part of World Englishes
– Not (always) native-like proficiency
– Variant/Difference
– To interact both with NSs and NNSs
– Code-switching/Code-mixing=
– Bilingual Resources

It is unanimously agreed by linguists and scholars that English and (the multitude of) its roles in the world have experienced a titanic shift towards the end of the 20th and in the beginning of the 21st century. However, what scholars cannot agree on are the implications of this change in the conceptualization of linguistic constructs and its repercussions on English Language Teaching. Although ESL and EFL approach proponents are unwilling to accept the notion that EFL approach cannot hold up to the needs of gigantic international English language market today, the fact remains that an ELF approach could be of great use if applied in English Language Teaching, not as a substitute, but as an alternative and a supplement to EFL approach, depending on the learners/users´ targets and domain and scope of use. The methods and modes to be used to achieve this successfully have been an area of research of ELF scholars and hopefully in the near future we will witness its broader implementation in the reality of English Language Teaching (ELT).

References:

Bjorkman, B. (2008). So where are we? Spoken lingua franca English at a technical university in Sweden. *English Today, 24*(2), 35-41.

Brumfit, C. (2001). *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching: Helping learners to develop a dialect of their own.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(2), 159-178.

Burt, C. (2005). What is International English. *TESOL and Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 1-20.

Carmichael, C. & Barboour, S. (2000). *Language and nationalism in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cogo, A. and Dewey, M. (2011). *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. London: Continuum.

Coulmas, F. (2005) .*Sociolinguistics: The study of speaker's choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, (2003).*The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Engber, D. (2013). FYI: How did English get to be the international language of science? Retreived from http://www.popsci.com/article/science/fyi-how-did-english-get-be-international-language-science

Ferguson, G.(2009). Issues in researching English as a lingua franca: a conceptual enquiry.

International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19(2).117–135.

Firth, Alan (1996). Discursive accomplishment of normality: On ´lingua franca´ English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*(2), 237-259.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English Language in the 21st century*(Vol. 29). The British Council. Retrieved from https://doanbangoc.files.wordpress.com/2012/07/the-future-of-english.pdf

Hamel, R. E. (2007). The dominance of English in the International Periodical Scientific Literature and the Future of Language Use in Science.*Aila Review, 20,* 53-71.

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

Jenkins, J. (2000). The phonology of English as an International Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2003). Who speaks English today? In Jenkins, J. *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students* (14-21). London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2006a). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca.*Tesol Quarterly 40*(1), 157-181.

Jenkins, J. (2006b). Points of view and blind spots: ELF &SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,16*(2), 137-162.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes 28*(2), 200-207.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language* (73-89). Tubingen: Stauffenburg.

Huber, M. (1998).Afro-European linguistic encounters on the Lower Guinea Coast.*International Seminar on the History of the Atlantic World.*Working Paper Series.

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography in speaking.In Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Washington DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the language and the literature* (11-30).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knapp, K. & C. Meierkord (Eds.) (2002). *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speaker.*PMLA 112*(3), 359-369.

MacKenzie, I. (2014). *English as a lingua franca: theorizing and teaching English*. Hoboken : Taylor and Francis.

Mauranen, A. (2006). Signalling and preventing misunderstanding in ELF communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, C. Meierkord (Ed.), Special Issue, 177, 123–150.

Mckay, S.L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: rethinking goals and perspectives.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Omoniyi, T. (2006).Hierarchies of identities. In T. Omoniyi& G. White (Eds.), *The Sociolinguistics of Identity (11-33).* London: Continuum.

Pakir, A. (2009). English as a lingua franca: analyzing research frameworks
in international English, world Englishes, and ELF. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 224–235.

PUNG, C.S. (2009). Beyond the three circle model: a new model for World English (MA thesis) National University of Singapore.   Retreived   from http://scholarbank.nus.edu.sg/bitstream/handle/10635/16502/CheeSP.PDF?sequence=1

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). Key concepts in ELT - English as a Lingua Franca. *ELT Journal, 59*(4), 339-341.

Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: world Englishes
and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 236-245.

Seidlhfer, B. &Breiteneder, A. &Pitzl, M. L. (2006). English as a lingua franca in Europe: challenges for applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26*, 3-34.

Sharifian, F. (Ed). (2009). *English as international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Bristol: Channel View Publications Ltd.

Swan, M. (2012). ELF and EFL: are they really different? *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca,1*(2), 379 – 389.

vanEls, T. J. M. (2000). The European Union, its institutions and its languages. Netherlands: University of Nijmegen.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 377-389.

Widdowson, H.G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Xiaoqiong, B. H. &Xianxing, J. (2011). Kachru's Three Concentric Circles and English Teaching Fallacies in EFL and ESL Contexts. *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education*, 18(2), 219-228.

OD EFL DO ELF: NOVI KONCEPT U IGRI

Elma Dedovic-Atilla, MA
Vildana Dubravac, PhD

Sažetak

Svjedoci smo da je danas engleski jezik zauzeo jednu od krucijalnih uloga na globalnoj sceni. Stoga, cilj ovog rada je da istraži promjenu kroz koju je engleski jezik prošao u današnjem globaliziranom svijetu, koja je izrodila jedan novi konstrukt u konceptualizaciji engleskog jezika: *engleski kao lingua franca*. Da bi se ostvario zadati cilj, rad je podijeljen u nekoliko dijelova koji se bave sljedećim temama: ekspanzija engleskog jezika u svijetu; kratak pregled različitih gledišta i koncepata o engleskom kao svjetskom jeziku; uvod u concept ELF-a (*engleski kao lingua franca*) te definiranje razlika između EFL-a (*engleski kao strani jezik*) i ELF-a. Ovim radom se želi naglasiti potreba za rekonstruiranjem mjesta i uloga koje EFL i ELF zauzimaju u današnjoj lingvističkoj stvarnosti, kao i potreba da se poveća svijest o razlikama između dva koncepta i rezultirajućim implikacijama u nastavi engleskog jezika.

Ključne riječi: World Englishes (engleski kao svjetski jezik), EFL (engleski kao strani jezik), ELF (engleski kao lingua franca), ELT (nastava engleskog jezika), ENL (engleski kao maternji jezik), NS (izvorni govornik), CoP (zajednice prakse), Global English (globalni engleski).

م ر. اﻟﻤﺎ ديدوفيتش– اتيلا ، جامعة برج الدولية سراييفو

د. ويلدانا دوبرافاتس ، جامعة برج الدولية سراييفو

من ELF إلى EFL: مفهوم جديد في اللعب

ملخص

نشهد على أن اللغة الانجليزية تحتل اليوم أحد الأدوار الحاسمة على الساحة العالمية . لذلك فإن الهدف من هذا البحث هو استكشاف التغيير الذي مرت به اللغة الإنجليزية في عالم اليوم المعولم ، والذي أنتج بناء جديد في تصور اللغة الانجليزية: الإنجليزية كلغة مشتركة . ومن أجل تحقيق هذا الهدف تم تقسيم البحث الى عدة أقسام تتناول المواضيع التالية : انتشار اللغة الإنجليزية في العالم ، لمحة موجزة عن مختلف الآراء والمفاهيم المتعلقة باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة عالمية ، مقدمة عن مفهوم ELF (اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة مشتركة) وتحديد الاختلافات بين EFL (اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية) و ELF . يهدف هذا العمل الى التأكيد على الحاجة لإعادة بناء الأماكن والأدوار التي تشغلها EFL وELF في الواقع اللغوي اليوم ، فضلا عن الحاجة الى زيادة الوعي بالفروق بين المفهومين وما يترتب على ذلك من آثار في تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية .

الكلمات المفتاحية : عالم الإنجليزية (اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة عالمية) ، EFL (اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية) ، ELF (اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة مشتركة) ، ELT (تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية) ، ENL (اللغة اﻹﻧﺠﻠﻴﺰﻳﺔ كلغة أصلية) ، NS (المتحدث باللغة الأصلية) ، CoP (مجتمع الممارسة)، الإنجليزية العالمية