

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION OF
THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN**

UZBEKISTAN STATE UNIVERSITY OF WORLD LANGUAGES

On the right of manuscript

RAHMONOVA GULHAYO XALILOVNA

ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA

DISSERTATION

for master's degree

Specialty: – 5A120102

Linguistics (the English language)

The work has been discussed
and recommended for defense.
The head of department
Ph.D. As. prof. Galieva M. R.

Scientific advisor
Ph.D. As. prof. A.T. Iriskulov

“ _____ ” _____ 2014 y

TASHKENT – 2014

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Chapter I. The Linguistic Characteristics of English as a Lingua Franca	9
1.1. The notion of Lingua Franca.....	9
1.2. The Linguistic Characteristics of English as a Lingua Franca.....	18
1.2.1. The Phonological Features of English as a Lingua Franca.....	22
1.2.2. The Grammatical Features of English as a Lingua Franca.....	26
1.2.3. The Characteristic Features of Vocabulary of English as a Lingua Franca..	37
Summary.....	43
Chapter II. The Intercultural Features of English as a Lingua Franca	44
2.1. Cultural Awareness, Particular Steps to Incorporate with Culture.....	44
2.2. Cross cultural pragmatics.....	49
2.3. The Use of Discourse Markers in English as a Lingua Franca Conversation.....	62
2.4. Distinctive features of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) from Standard English (SE).....	70
Summary.....	76
Chapter III. The Importance of Taking into Account the Characteristic Features of English as Lingua Franca in Teaching English at Educational Institutions.....	77
3.1. Raising awareness for varieties of English.....	77
3.2. Teaching ELF in a foreign context.....	82
Summary.....	91
Conclusion.....	93
List of Used Literature.....	97

Introduction

The topic of my dissertation paper is “English as a Lingua Franca”. The reason for choosing this theme is connected with the fact that English today has become an International language. Wherever English is admitted as proper choice for communication among people from various native languages, denomination of the language is evaluated by different precious qualities “as a(n) x”: English as an International Language”, “English as a Lingua Franca”, “English as a Global Language”, “English as a World Language”, “English as a Medium of Intercultural Communication” (Seidlhofer 2004). Any language can acquire one of the statuses above if it develops a particular place that is acquainted in every country of the world. ELF is a medium communication in international conferences and meetings of United Nations in New York. ELF interactions frequently take place in global business, politics, science, technology and media discourse and this process reflects the significance of ELF.

It is well-known that communication with foreign delegations inside and outside of our country is delivered in English. But the truth is that our foreign colleagues come from different countries of Asia, Europe, Africa and America and not all of them speak Standard English. The promulgation of the two Decrees of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan within actually six months about improving of teaching foreign languages, especially English is the proof to that. This is what is said in the Decree PD-1875 “On Measures for Further Improvement of Foreign Languages Learning System“ from December 10, 2012 “In order to radically improve the system of organization of foreign languages to the young generation, training of specialists to be fluent in them through the introduction of advanced teaching methods with the use of modern teaching and information – communication technologies and based on this create conditions and opportunities for their wider access to the achievements of world civilization and world information resources, international cooperation and communication. Teaching of

special subjects, especially on technical and international institutions is conducted in foreign languages.”

Topicality of the research: Everybody knows that in our educational system we do our best to teach Standard English. We train teachers, translators and interpreters who must know what we teach but at the same time they should be aware of peculiar feature of World Englishes like Chinglish, Japlish, Konglish, Indian English in which are pragmatically and culturally nativized. One more very important point is that in near future our countrymen may also develop their own English. e.g. Uzbek English. In the epoch of globalization changes appear to be a constant element in the social life. We are all parts of cultural, social and language fabric that inevitably affects our behaviour. We, future teachers, must identify the changing cultural, linguistic and social conditions that will influence the educational system whether we want or not. If so far we did not pay attention to this fact we shall have to do that now, after President's Decrees. From our viewpoint it is the responsibility of the teachers of English to know the peculiar feature of English as a Lingua Franca and make aware of their students about it so that the future teachers, trainers, translators could take into account in their activities since they are going to work not only at schools but professional colleges, lyceums and Higher Educational Institutions where future specialists in different fields (medical personnel, engineers, economists, biologists and so on) are trained. They will have to know the basic knowledge of ESP (English for Special Purposes) as well. The use of International Language makes the discourse process easier for interlocutors. It is because that majority of learners want to learn English for academic, commercial purposes for short time. In this case, simplification feature of ELF is very particular that is focused on function rather than form, in other words efficiency is more significant than correctness and accuracy.

The aim and objectives of the research: The objective of the dissertation is to understand the nature of ELF by accumulating in the interactions of different subvarieties. Uzbekistan is no exception with regard to English containing lingua franca features. Taking into account this process the research work analyses the

linguistic features of ELF by the Uzbeks, and indicates the pragmatic features of small-talk conversations and includes the following tasks:

- to study the reasons why English is becoming lingua franca;
- to collect and learn the data, viewpoints of scholars based on lingua franca;
- to analyse core and non-core features of ELF phonology that are well spread in Uzbekistan and all over the world;
- to identify insertion of grammatical peculiarities and vocabulary of speakers' native language in ELF interactions;
- to describe and analyse discourse markers in small-talk conversations among the participants of ELF from the point of view of linguaculturology and lingua-pragmatics;
- to compare common and distinctive features of ELF from Standard English.

The method of the research: In research to describe interference and facilitation of Uzbek content in ELF comparative-typological method, to analyse and describe intercultural and pragmatic features in interactions descriptive and componential methods have been applied.

The methodological bases of the research: The law "About Education", the law "About National Program on Preparing Specialists" and the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan and other normative documents that cover strategic directions in science are regarded as the scientific methodological basis of the research. Several linguists' research works, data and scientific analysis and articles by D.Crystal, J.Jenkins, L.Onraët, C. Meierkord, J.House, B.Seidlhofer have great contribution to prepare dissertation paper.

Scientific novelty of the research: As a consequence of undertaking English as a lingua franca several scientific novelties have been accomplished:

- the nativization and englishization involve emerging new subvarieties of ELF;
- New varieties of English which is hybrid of native language and English are defined and interference or facilitation processes may occur learning English.

- The research indicated that in near future our country will also develop its own variant/option of English since Uzbek will render its own influence to the English language as this happened in many countries in the world.

The object of the research: Small-talk conversations of English as a Lingua Franca by the Uzbeks and the data of ELF interactions by several researches.

The subject of the research: Grammatical, Lexical, Phonological properties of ELF, its intercultural implications and cross-cultural pragmatics as well as suggestions how to teach English in ELF classrooms.

The source of the research: The main sources of the research include the books, researches, articles and dictionaries focused on clarifying the properties of ELF. They are the followings: Jenkins J. *The Phonology of English as an International language*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), Seidlhofer B. *Research perspectives on teaching English as a Lingua Franca* (Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 2004. Vol.24. P.209-239), Crystal D. *English as a Global Language*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). Graddol D. *The future of English*. – London: The British Council, 1997.

Scientific importance of the research: The outcomes of analysis of ELF involve developing the theories of sociolinguistics, lingua-pragmatics, and methodology.

The practical importance of the research: The materials analysed in the research may be used in the classes devoted to sociolinguistics and lingua-pragmatics. Furthermore, the research presents several suggestions, activities on teaching English in ELF classrooms.

There is a linguistic point here as well. In comparative (or confrontational typology the terms ‘interference’ and ‘facilitation’ is very often used. By interference the linguists understand the interference or influence of the system of one language to another, most often it is the influence of the mother-tongue to a foreign language. Usually by ‘interference’ we understand the negative influence of the mother-tongue to a foreign language. There are many examples to this in ELF. The majority of examples concerns the pronunciation and grammar

interference. The speakers' mother tongue may render a positive influence which is connected with similarities in the two languages that assist the language assessment. In this case the linguists use the term 'facilitation' (Yusupov 2007). These are linguistic reasons in the development of World Englishes. Besides the linguistic factors there are social, cultural interferences and facilitations in learning foreign languages all over the world. I would like to give one example which will help to understand the social interference. In English conversations often open with a health question: "*How are you?*", while in Malay they say: "*Have you eaten yet?*". It is a communicative interference. In Uzbek we start conversation like it is in English: "Yaxshimisiz? Sog'ligingiz yaxshimi?" it is an example of communicative facilitation.

The results of the research that have been announced: Three articles on the results of dissertation paper have been published in the materials of conferences of UzWLU. They are the articles under the titles of "Varieties of English. English as an International Language", "Teaching Basic English at Higher Educational Institutions", and "Standard and Non-Standard Englishes".

The structure of the research: The dissertation comprises introduction, three main chapters, summary and the list of used literature, total volume is 103 pages.

In the introduction the data about topicality, objectives, methodology, scientific and practical importance of the English as a Lingua Franca, methods used in the research, its scientific novelty are illustrated.

The First chapter of dissertation which is entitled "The Linguistic Characteristics of English as a Lingua Franca" has introduced the notion of lingua franca and its function, the main characteristics. This library research outlines the results of the researches by linguists who undertook on ELF. In addition to them, the analysis of grammatical, phonological and lexical features of ELF in Uzbek, African and Brazilian and other contexts are described and exemplified.

The Second chapter of the research which is called "The Intercultural Features of English as a Lingua Franca" is devoted to explore cultural and pragmatic features of ELF and to analyse common and distinctive features between SE and

ELF. Furthermore, this chapter indicates strategies used in small-talk conversations, discourse markers in different senses.

The Third chapter entitled “The Importance of Taking into Account the Characteristic Features of English as Lingua Franca in Teaching English at Educational Institutions” dedicated to teaching English in ELF classrooms that represents several pedagogical aims: a focus on intelligibility and Basic English which can be learnt in short time.

In the Conclusion the outcomes of research are outlined.

CHAPTER I. THE LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA

1.1. THE NOTION OF LINGUA FRANCA

In the last decades, the term ‘English as a Lingua Franca’ (ELF) has emerged as a way of referring to communication in English between speakers of different

native languages. Since one out of every four users of English in the world is a native speaker of the language (Crystal 2003), most ELF interactions occur amongst non-native speakers of English. ELF is considered as a contact language between speakers who share neither a native tongue nor a national culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication (Firth 1996. p.240). Consequently, a Lingua Franca is a third language that is distinct from the native language of both parties involved in the communication and sometimes as the language becomes more widespread, the native populations of an area will speak the lingua franca to each other as well. In fact, the most common language to communicate technological, scientific information is English and it is currently called “Lingua Franca”. This term is identified in Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (1992) as follows “a language that is used for communication between different groups of people, each speaking a different language. The Lingua Franca could be internationally used language of communication. (e.g. English), it could be native language of one of the groups, or it could be a language which is not spoken natively by any of groups but has a simplified sentence structure and vocabulary and is often a mixture of two or more language...” Etymologically, lingua franca emerged during geographic history, exploration and trade resulted different populations of people to come into contact with one another. Since communicators were of different cultures and so they uttered speeches in various languages, communication was naturally inconvenient and difficult. Over time languages changed to mean and express such interactions among different groups and developed lingua franca. The term lingua franca was firstly used during the Middle Ages and described a language created as a combination of Italian and French which was developed by Crusaders and tradesmen of different language backgrounds in the Mediterranean region. Throughout the time, the language developed into an early version of today’s Romance languages.

Likewise, Arabic was another early example of lingua franca due to the enormous territory of the Islamic Empire dating back to the 7-8th Century. Arabic is the

native language of the people from the Arabian Peninsula but its use spreads with the empire as it expanded into China, India, parts of Central Asia, the Middle East, Northern Africa, and parts of Southern Europe. First of all politically, empire's vast size demands the need for a common language. Secondly, Arabic served as the lingua franca of science and diplomacy in the 1200's since at that time lots of valuable books were written in Arabic rather than any other language belong to the nationalities in the empire. Having lingua francas such as Arabic and others like the Romance Languages and Chinese contributed to make convenient communication in different countries. Similarly, until the eighteenth Century, Latin was adopted as the main lingua franca of European scholars as the language made easy communication by people whose native languages included Italian and French. Nowadays lingua francas have a vital important role in global communication as well because they represent a long history of communication among different nationalities and serve to create commonly understandable languages all over the world. The United Nations defines its official languages as Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish in which all documents are translated and presented during the international meetings. But English has noticeably dominant and importance among the other international languages for each sphere of our life. As soon as English is admitted as preferred language for communication the domination of the language is evaluated by different precious qualities "as a(n) x": "English as an international language" (EIL) (e.g., Jenkins, 2000; McKay, 2002), "English as a lingua franca" (ELF) (e.g., Gnutzmann, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2001), "English as a global language" (e.g., Crystal, 1997; Gnutzmann, 1999), "English as a world language" (e.g., Mair, 2003), "English as a medium of intercultural communication" (e.g., Meierkord, 1996).¹

A language can achieve one of the status stated above if it develops a particular role that is recognized in every country of the world. In order to achieve such a status, a language has to be accepted by other countries around the world.

¹ Barbara Seidlhofer "Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca." Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. 2004. v.24. p.209-239.

Currently, English is the language most widely taught as a foreign language in more than 100 countries, such as Brazil, Russia, Germany, Spain, Egypt, China and at the same time English is emerging as the main foreign language to be encountered in schools, often displacing another language in the process. As an example of replacement of English instead of French in Algeria which is the former colony of France may prove the statement. In fact, historical tradition, political expediency, and the desire for commercial, cultural or technological contact involve a particular language as a basic foreign language. Different viewpoints are exclaimed while describing why the language achieved the success as a lingua franca: 'language is a paragon' due to its aesthetic qualities, accuracy of expression, literary power, or religious standing. Greek, Latin, Arabic and French are among those which at different periods of the history were considered as widely spread languages, and English is no exception. Sometime the structure of English is indicated to explain why it is now so widely spread. 'It has less grammar than other languages', some people estimated. 'English doesn't have a lot of endings on its words, it has no divergent additions to be added to show masculine, feminine, and neuter gender, therefore it must cause easier to learn. (Crystal 2003). Crystal quotes that in 1848 a reviewer in the British periodical *The Athenaeum* wrote: Thank to grammatical construction, its small amount of inflection, its nearly total disregard of the differences of gender, the ease and precision of its terminations and auxiliary verbs, English looks to be adopted by organization to regard the language of the world. Regardless the viewpoints mentioned above are the inseparable peculiarities of English, they are not able to make the language call international language. For instance: Latin was undoubtedly international language, in spite of its many inflectional endings and gender differences. French, Greek, Arabic, Spanish and Russian too, have been languages in similar status, despite their nouns being masculine or feminine and having inflections. Ease of learning can not be the reason for it. People of all cultures learn to speak over more or less the same period of time, regardless of the difficulty or ease in the grammar of their languages. 'A language has traditionally

become an international language for one chief reason: the power of its people – especially their political and military power’ (Crystal 2003). Any language at the centre of such an explosion of international activity would suddenly have become in this precious status. And English was apparently ‘in the right place at the right time’ (Crystal 2003). Crystal emphasizes that two basic reasons provided English as an International Language: British colonization during the nineteenth century involved to spread English around the world, therefore it was a language ‘on which the sun never sets’². It is known from history that by the nineteenth century, Great Britain had become the world’s dominant industrial and trading country. By the second half of the nineteenth century, the British colonial power influenced approximately one fourth of the world’s population that resulted the spread of empire’s language. Secondly, increasing of the population of the USA was larger than that of any of the countries of western Europe, and its economy was the most productive and the most developing and prosperous in the world. In twentieth century, this world presence was maintained and promoted almost single-handedly through the economic supremacy of the new American superpower. Economics replaced politics as the main leading force. And US dollar was another chief reason for spreading the language. In addition, modern technology contributed an increasing necessity for international communication accompanied with English. For example, air-traffic controllers address directly pilots only in English no matter where in the world the airport is situated. Besides, Svartvik and Leech (2006) report to the adoption of ELF as a political reason for keeping on linguistically-neutral ground in some countries where population use several different L1s and intergroup tensions are becoming divisive. Acceptance of English as an official language in India and South Africa Countries combated such disagreements.

There are lots of schemes developed to characterize the spread and diffusion of English and its global status. The most well spread and appropriately adopted among several researches is the *Concentric circle* which was worked out by

² An expression adapted from the nineteenth century aphorism about the extent of British Empire.

Kachru in 1985. The schema supplies contextualization of varieties of English and simultaneously political, historical, sociolinguistic and literary contexts. The following factors are considered as the main features to characterize world Englishes:

- history of diffusion for the area of the language
- model of acquisition
- the usage of English in different levels
- function in local culture and its nativization (Kachru 1988. p.207-228).

‘Nativization’ means the language acquires some formal and functional changes at its linguistic levels such as phonetics, lexis, discourse, speech acts and literary creativity. In his model Kachru distributed three circles: Inner, Outer and Expanding circles.

The Inner circle contains the countries in which majority people speak English as a first language. Kachru claims that Inner Circle countries provide English norms for the Outer and Expanding Circle countries since well-established and accepted varieties of English (e.g. American English, British English, etc.) belong to the Inner circle which is the native language to a majority of the population. Inner Circle countries are the USA, the UK, Canada and Australia and New Zealand .

The Outer Circle countries are the major former British colonies of Africa and Asia in which English is widely used as an L2. English is often adopted as one of the official languages of these countries regardless majority speakers of English are L2 or foreign-language speakers and English is used in education, administration, and the media. If the amount of the Outer Circle countries are compared to the number of Inner Circle countries they constitute a larger number in the world. Kachru (1985) states Outer Circle countries are in developing their own varieties (which he calls “New Englishes”), which both make use of the Inner Circle’s variety norms and are creating their own norms. Outer Circle countries include Tanzania, India, Pakistan, Nigeria, The Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore.

Especially, the peculiarities of Indian English and Singaporean English have been undertaken by scholars.

The Expanding Circle expresses the countries in which English is accepted as a foreign language or L3 because English is used for specific purposes in international communication as in business, education, politics. Expanding Circle countries constitute the largest number of English speakers, although the majority of these are L2 speakers. China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Saudi Arabia can be the famous representatives of Expanding Circle countries .

Kachru emphasizes that the use of English as a Lingua Franca may be occurred among any one of these circles. According to statistics plenty of people in Inner Circle countries like the Britain or America are E-L1 speakers definitely does not mean that there are no citizens who use E-L2 or even E-L3 within these countries. Consequently, if E-L1 speakers and E-L2 or E-L3 speakers make communication with each other, their conversation will be characterized as ELF. Kachru's Concentric circle model has been the main issue to discuss and evaluate the importance of English by many scientists. McArthur estimates (1993) the model as "the democratization of attitudes to English everywhere in the globe" and continues "this is more dynamic model than the standard version, and allows for all manners of shading and overlaps among the circles. Although 'inner' and 'outer' still suggest—inevitably—a historical priority and the attitudes that go with it, the metaphor of ripples in a pond suggest mobility and the flux and implies that a history is in the making." Mollin undertook if ELF should be considered a new variety in Kachru's Expanding Circle or not. Consequently, she refers a variety as a "bundle of idiolects that share certain features (which) may be determined regionally (also called dialects) or socially (sociolects)" (Mollin 2006). Mollin does not support Kachru's Concentric Circle Model in that ELF may occur across all three of Kachru's Circles, but within the Expanding Circle. However, ELF may have a global function in enabling wider communication among users of native speakers who are grammatically and pragmatically unintelligible. Mollin also researched the data project on Euro-English. This project focused on

determination whether European lingua franca communication has been appropriate to name a new, independent variety of English in Europe, called “Euro-English”. During her project she found a corpus of 400 000 words in both spoken and written usage among citizens of the European Union with different L1s. In the information, Mollin searched common lexicogrammatical and morphosyntactic peculiarities from speakers with various native speakers to identify whether these features would be different use of ELF from an E-L1 standard. Moreover, Mollin observed the extracts of Standard English usage against the British National Corpus. Her research result showed that speakers tried to remain to standard E-L1 usage and made idiosyncratic mistakes. The reason for these mistakes depended on the mother tongue of the speaker and their competence in English. Mollin emphasizes that ELF should be considered as a register, which is a “language used for a specific function rather than by a specific group” (Mollin 2006). She does not mean that Kachru’s model has to be revised in order to accommodate ELF. Mollin believes ELF should be outlined in the Expanding Circle of the model as a specific function of English.

Kachru states major features features of ELF that the result of the processes of nativization and englishization. They are characterized by the follows:

- ‘recognition of English in the overall language policy of the English-using nation (e.g., India, Nigeria, Singapore)
- an extended tradition of contact literatures in English that are recognized as a part of national literatures.
- social penetration of the language that has resulted in several social ethnic or functional subvarieties (e.g., Singlish, Bazaar English, Tanglish)
- distinct linguistic exponents of the process of nativization at various levels
- an extended range of localized genres and registers
- Englishized varieties of local languages, some of which may have even acquired distinct names (e.g., Hinglish or Hindlish of India)
- Acculturation of the English language for articulating local social, cultural and religious identities.’ (Kachru 2006).

Nativization is mostly occurred in Anglophone Asian and African contexts. These double functioned procedure reflects both the impact of contact with other languages at different linguistic levels – nativization and the influence of English language and literature to the other languages – englishization. According to Kachru englishization is spread in three major geographical areas:

- The regions whose languages are related to English (e.g., in Western Europe and parts of Europe)
- The regions of non-related languages to English, anglophone, particularly Outer Circle of English (e.g., parts of Africa and Asia)
- Expanding Circles (e.g., Japan, China, The Middle East, and the South America).

As a result of diffusion and stabilization of English across cultures and languages involve ‘new Englishes’ and ‘international’, ‘global’, ‘world English’. The term ‘New Englishes’ mostly refers the varieties in Outer circle because some features do not coincide with British and American varieties. The concept of ‘world Englishes’ dates back to the 1960s. After long discussions, the conference which was held in USA in 1978 concluded that ‘English used as an international and auxiliary language has led to the emergence of sharp and important distinction between the uses of English for international (e.g., external) and and intranational (e.g., internal) purposes.’(Kachru 1997).

Meierkord (2000) states about world Englishes to logo-acronym of the journal *World Englishes* the concept ‘serves to indicate that there is a club of equals here.’ By this statement he meant that ‘ the democratization of attitudes to English everywhere on the globe’ and to equalize ENL (English as a Native Language), ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign language) nations. (McArthur 1993) Moreover, International Language results the linguistic processes which are termed as contact or interference varieties. The contexts in these varieties are formed by of blending two or more languages’ features. Interference varieties mostly appeared in Africa and Asia and brought to English the contexts coloured with multilingual and multicultural features. These

varieties have special characteristics in linguistic levels such as pronunciation, grammar, lexis and discourse. The names of contact varieties are quite often called by blending of English and the name of subvariety (e.g., Singlish in Singapore English, Bazaar or Babu English in Indian English, Japlish in Japanese English). In this contact situation English is considered as a medium which is pragmatically, culturally nativized. Although lingua franca users in the Expanding Circle with several various language backgrounds and represent different levels of English competence, processes of accommodation could result in a new variety, even with appearing unmarked features. In fact, the New Englishes of the Outer Circle are developing non-native varieties. Lingua Franca English in the Expanding Circle thus has the theoretical potential of developing its own variety. The essential features of ELF is dynamic rather than remaining stable and fixed.

1.2. THE LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA

The English language as a lingua franca has several linguistic characteristics. Kachru indicates the following factors:

1. the influence of multilingual Englishes, particularly, in the contexts of Africanization and Asianization of Englishes;
2. the development of bilinguals' creativity in the Outer circle and its implications on traditional linguistic rules;
3. divesting of conventional sacred cows model adopted by inner circle constructs of English;
4. theoretical, methodological and pedagogical implications of New Englishes;
5. intelligibility of intercultural communication;

6. the role of politics and power.

It is reported that approximately eighty percent of verbal exchanges in ESL and EFL do not correspond in ENL. Taking into account the increasing numbers of Expanding Circle speakers Graddol concludes “ native speakers may feel the language ‘belongs to them, but it will be those who speak English as a second or foreign language who will determine its world future” (Graddol 1997). According to statistics, regardless of at least 360 million native speakers of English around the world, non-native speakers of English currently outnumber native speakers (Firth, 1996). The fact that so many people are using English all over the world, inevitably means that the language is changing, as most of non-native speakers interact with each other in the way that they find the easiest. Crystal (2003) states that ‘the reason why linguistic change is so unpredictable is that it is in the hands of so many people, in their minds, rather.’ However, the more traditional prescriptive grammarians argue that there should be a standard in terms of grammar, lexis, and pronunciation in English. It is a complicated issue to identify exactly what Standard English (SE) is. Crystal (1997) attempts to define the idea by summarising five essential characteristics: ‘that SE is a variety of English, like a dialect; that the linguistic features of SE are chiefly matters of grammar, vocabulary and orthography, not a matter of pronunciation; that SE is the variety of English which carries most prestige within a country; that the prestige attached to SE is recognised by adult members of the community and it is the norm of leading institutions such as the government, law courts and the media; and that although SE is widely understood, it is not widely produced.’

House clarifies that interactions in ELF are taken place between representatives of two or more various linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue (House, 1999, p. 74). On the contrary these definitions could be said to capture ELF in its purest form, it has to be remembered that ELF interactions often also contain interlocutors from the Inner and Outer Circles, and can occur in these contexts, such as at academic conferences in Madras or meetings of the United Nations in New York. In fact, ELF

communications quite often occur in global business, politics, science, technology and media discourse. Therefore, as House states “it seems vital to pay more attention to the nature of ELF interactions, and ask whether and how they are different from both interactions between native speakers, and interactions between native speakers and nonnative speakers. An answer to this question would bring us closer to finding out whether and in what ways ELF interactions are actually sui generis” (House, 1999, p. 74). Meanwhile, linguists focus on how ELF’s grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation differ from the rest of varieties. To illustrate with this, researches based on linguistic features of ELF have been undertaking since several years. In 1996 Meirkord carried out pragmatics while Jenkins undertook and evaluated the level of phonology in 2000 and Seidhofer analyzed and worked out lexicogrammatic peculiarities in 2004. There is a linguistic point here as well. In comparative (or confrontational typology the terms ‘interference’ and ‘facilitation’ is very often used. By interference the linguists understand the interference or influence of the system of one language to another; most often it is the influence of the mother-tongue to a foreign language There might be two types of interferences:

- I. Negative interference is the use of a native language pattern or rule which leads to an error or inappropriate form in the target language.
- II. Positive interference is the one which makes learning or translating easier and might occur when both the native language and target language have the same form and meaning. This type of interference is also called facilitation.

Nine aspects of interference are outlined:

- 1) Collocation or lexemes with similar form in SL (Source Language) and TL (Target Language) but different meanings.
- 2) As above but with the same meaning and therefore to be translated ‘straight’
- 3) SL syntactic structures inappropriately superimposed on TL.
- 4) SL word order or word phrase order inappropriately reproduced.
- 5) Interference from third language known to translator.
- 6) Primary meaning of word interfering with appropriate contextual meaning.

- 7) Stylistic predilections of translation.
- 8) The primary meaning of a word, interfering with appropriate contextual meaning
- 9) The translator's idiolect, including his regional and social dialect.

There are many examples to this in ELF. The majority of examples concerns the pronunciation and grammar interference. These are linguistic reasons in the development of World Englishes. Besides the linguistic factors there are social, cultural interferences and facilitations in learning foreign languages all over the world. I would like to give one example which will help to understand the social interference. In English conversations often open with a health question: "*How are you?*", while in Malay they say: "*Have you eaten yet?*" It is a communicative interference. In Uzbek we start conversation like it is in English: "Yaxshimisiz? Sog'ligingiz yaxshimi?" It is an example of communicative facilitation.

Moreover, Uzbek speakers of English may use the following interferences:

- the system of word order in Uzbek do not coincide with English as a result it interferes and affects in the utterances of ELF
- English language is stress timed language whereas Uzbek is syllable timed that involves falling incorrect stress.
- Several uncountable nouns in English are regarded as countable in Uzbek. e.g. money, bread, information.

Moreover facilitation features are possibly occurred:

- In both languages' sound systems possess the sound [ŋ]
- Order of word combinations in attribute + subject are frequently correspond to each other.

e.g. wonderful times

ajoyib vaqtlar

Kate's bird

Keitning qushi

Some of the speakers hold strong accents, making grammar errors based on their first language and misusing lexemes according to their native language. The learners who just want to acquire the language for academic or commercial

purposes not only have interference but also their time to learn is limited. Therefore it is natural to expect interferences and facilitations from different native languages. Chaika (1989) states any target language is being learnt is fallen into the filter of native language. She emphasizes “once a new language is learned, it becomes available as a part of a speaker’s stylistic repertoire. As with dialects and styles, whether a particular language is selected in a given situation depends upon the topic, the social scene, the relative status of speakers, their aspirations and their feelings of identity”. Consequently, different interferences may be observed as an outcome. To illustrate phonological interferences French and German speakers of English usually hear [θ] in thing as [s] and [ð] in this as [z]. Russian speakers seem to hear them as [t] and [d]. Grammatical interference is mostly observed in misusing non-finite forms of verbs such as exchanging gerund with infinitive or vice versa.

e.g. The group minded to come early on weekends. (The group minded coming early on weekends.)

Uzbek and Russian speakers of English frequently fail to use the noun determiners *the* and *a* correctly in oral speech in written form because of the absence of these articles in Uzbek. Lexical interference is considered one of the problematic issue of the process for the learners because some words in English may be observed in the target language in different senses. They are called false cognates and may cause several misunderstandings for the learners.

e.g. Italian *fattoria*, which in America means “factory” but in Italy meant “farm”; greek *karro*, now “car” in English, originally meant “wagon”. They are called false cognates and may cause several misunderstandings for the learners.

1.2.1. THE PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES OF ENGLISH AS LF

Jenkins researched for focusing attention on phonological features and claims in her data, pronunciation was by far the most frequent cause of intelligibility

problems in ELF interactions (Jenkins, 2002). Jenkins's work was dedicated to working out what she has termed the phonological "Lingua Franca Core. She collected the interactions of speakers with a wide range of L1s over several years. Her data was a set of field observation, in which the focus was on instances of miscommunication and communication breakdown in mixed-L1 classrooms and social settings; recordings of different L1 pairs and groups of students engaged in communication tasks such as information gap activities; and an investigation into the production and reception of nuclear (tonic) stress of a group of different L1 users of English. She analyzed them to define which pronunciation "errors" cause intelligibility problems for a different L1 interlocutor and which did not." She pointed out the core areas thus as follows:

1. The consonant inventory with the exception of the dental fricatives [ð] and [θ], and of dark [ɫ], none of which caused any intelligibility problems in the lingua franca data.
 2. Aspiration of word-initial voiceless stops [p], [t], and [k], which were quite often heard as counterparts [b], [d], and [g];
 3. Consonant clusters are not reduced in word-initial clusters, e.g. in 'proper' and 'strap', 'string' but omission may be in word-medial and word-final clusters only permissible according to L1 English rules of syllable structure.
 5. Production and placement of nuclear (tonic) stress when used contrastively (e.g., John was permitted by AUTHORITY vs. John WAS PERMITTED by authority).
 6. Shorten vowels before voiceless consonants: not [bi:t] but [bit].
- It should be pointed out that some particular sounds which are regarded as unique for English are difficult to pronounce by non-native speakers. E.g., the sounds [ð] and [θ] and the dark l allophone, [ɫ]. In the interactions carried out by Jenkins, mastery of these sounds are not considered to be important for mutual intelligibility, and replacement of sounds such as [f, v] or [s, z] or [t, d] for [ð, θ] are permissible and may be found in some native-speaker varieties. The sounds [ð], [θ] and [ɫ] are therefore designated non-core.

There have been plenty of controversial viewpoints about the acceptance of ELF pronunciation. Coury and Carlos report the questionnaire the academics who were interviewed speak English face to face with other people in the following situations: to talk to English speaking visitors who visit the universities and to talk to people at both international and national conferences. When they were asked, the most answers referred that most misunderstandings emerge as a result of pronunciation errors. E.g., in Portuguese [r] is usually pronounced [h]. One Brazilian said he had a communication breakdown when he was trying to say the colour *red*, but the listener understood *head*; many Brazilians pronounce [ed] endings in regular past simple verbs as [id]. Another academic said he has had various problems in making himself understood because he pronounces these final syllables incorrectly (www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/linguafranca.htm). In Uzbek word stress is almost occurred in the last syllable except the borrowings that is why 'ed' in final syllable is mispronounced as stressed syllable by the Uzbeks. Apart from this, Uzbek phonology indicates only one type of stress as primary stress and this language considered as syllable timed language while English as the stress timed. Therefore the speakers of English whose native language is Uzbek may face problems with pronunciation which sometimes cause misunderstanding.

Furthermore, Gough (in de Klerk 1996) analyzes that users of Black South American English and finds that word stress is often assigned to the second-last syllable after it has undergone syllable lengthening (which is a regular phonological rule in indigenous South African languages). He provides examples such as seven'ty, hospita'lity, and cig'arette, where [ə] in the penultimate syllables is substituted by the r full vowels (in this case [e], [i]). This is regarded as an example of nativisation. Keys and Walker (2002, p. 299) argue that Jenkins' approach to ELF phonology achieved "the multiple advantages of being relatively small in number, attainable, and based on a clear awareness of the crucial difference between what is teachable, e.g. nuclear stress placement, and what is only learnable, e.g., some pitch changes." Jenkins' recommendations (2000, p. 24) for the Lingua Franca Core were the followings: vowel quality, weak forms,

features of connected speech, stress-timed rhythm, word stress, and pitch movement. Jenkins emphasizes (2000, p. 144) that in the different dialects of English vowels differ, for it is “not reasonably stable”. e.g., RP (received pronunciation) speakers pronounce “dog” as [dɒg] while, for the most part, in GA (General American) “dog” is pronounced [dɑg]. Vowel quality variation creates difficulties for nonnative learners and consequently, “L2 consistent regional varieties” are preferred among speakers of ELF. About weak forms Jenkins points out to distinguish between weak and strong forms is time-consuming; for example, in sentence (1a) the demonstrative ‘that’ receives strong stress while in (1b) the conjunction ‘that’ has weak stress in British and American English:

1. a. I like that tie you are wearing. [that] = strong
- b. I am glad that you liked the show. [that] = weak

Moreover, in sentence (2a) the pronoun *them* receives strong stress; in (2b) the pronoun *them* has weak stress and is written ‘em’ to represent colloquial speech

2. a. Have you seen John and Mary? No, I haven’t seen them. [them] = strong
- b. Have you seen John and Mary? No, I haven’t seen ’em. [’em] = weak

Sometimes, learning weak forms by nonnative students does not mean that their oral production will be intelligible when they contact with other nonnative interlocutors. Jenkins argues that indeed it is “To ELF or not to ELF?” That’s the question for Applied Linguistics in a globalized world quite clearly the case in both RP and GA that speakers regularly and dramatically decline their use of weak forms in situation where they are taking extra care to be understood, for example, in television interviews and conference presentations (Jenkins, 2000, p. 147).

Jenkins (2000) refers that teaching stress-timed rhythm is “unnecessary” and it is not a part of LFC (Lingua Franca Core). She argues that stress-timing has “no basis in reality”. Besides, Roach (1991) argues that stress-timing “occurs in very regular, formal speech, if it occurs at all”. However, some linguists and language

academies may argue since English speakers should aim for Received Pronunciation. Although as Medgyes (1994) writes ‘Received Pronunciation is unlikely ever to have been spoken by more than three or four percent of the British population’. On the other hand, descriptive grammarians may accept LF features by stating that if two foreigners using English as a lingua franca can make themselves understood, although they are not grammatically correct according to SE, there is no problem and that is how the language is actually spoken or written. Firth (1996) emphasizes that ‘the dominant impression is that lingua franca conversation is not only meaningful, but also *normal* and indeed *ordinary*.’ Furthermore, Medgyes (1994) reports that ‘ordinary native speakers do not expect foreigners to speak a standard variety and any accent is accepted as long as it is understandable without undue effort.’

Indeed, ELF is established for several millions of people in the world who need to learn English but who feel put off by having to acquire an accent which reflects the badge of identity of others with whom they will most likely have little or no contact.

1.2.2. GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF ENGLISH AS LF

In ELF communications different speakers of various L1 s definitely mix either some grammatical features of their language or do not pay attention some rules in Standard English. A number of theses and projects have been undertaken by several linguists and the investigations have indicated a number of uniformities in the use of ELF. One of them Seidlhofer (2000) reports that the use of certain features in ELF which is regarded as “errors” in Standard English are not considered as problematic and do not disturb communicative success. She outlines the following common peculiarities of ELF:

1. Deletion of the third-person singular morpheme –s in Present Simple ;
2. Interchangeable use of the relative pronouns who and which;
3. Not use of definite and indefinite articles in places where they are

compulsory in E-L1, and even using them in places which, according to Standard English, would be considered ungrammatical:

e.g. All members of the group are going to Ø cinema.

4. Incorrect usage in tag questions e.g. isn't it? or no? for all modal or auxiliaries;
5. Usage of useless and unnecessary prepositions e.g. We have to study about;
6. Frequent use of the following verbs: do, have, make, put, take;
7. Using that-clauses instead of infinitive constructions e.g. He admit that;
8. Overdoing explicitness e.g. green color rather than green (Onraët 2011).

McArthur (2002) who outlined the utterances by the Pakistani in Outer Circle as follows: “include a lack of subject-auxiliary inversion in interrogatives, different usage of the definite article, an extended usage of the progressive aspect to stative verbs, a preference for the present perfect over the simple past, and the use of the present continuous for past actions.” Meierkord claims the examples in (1) to (5) where the researcher has input the symbol Ø to express a missing lexical element. (Meierkord 2004).

1. And if it is just Ø normal person, eh then you will say “tum”.
2. I mean, somebody told me, Ø Nigerian degree is not accepted.
3. We went to Ø supermarket.
4. The person who was owning the shop.
5. Why I shouldn't call him a doctor?³

Moreover, Meierkord found that some of representatives of Outer Circle such as the African participants in her data do not exhibit a specific pattern of article use but they do display a lack of subject-auxiliary inversion in special questions, and different usage of prepositions. She indicates several examples and indicates the E-L1 use in brackets.

6. When you will (will you) start practicing?
7. The strongest man from (in) the Middle East.
8. You learn so much of (about) medicine. (Onraët 2011).

³ The researcher's own examples

She outlines that there are two notable syntactic processes in ELF conversations: simplification (by shortening one's utterances) and regularisation (by fronting certain lexical elements in an utterance). Meierkord evaluates that simplifications were used by the more competent ELF users in her data to accommodate those who were less competent in ELF. These simplification may be described into shorter clausal or phrasal units to make the "basic informational units of the interactions"(Meierkord 2004), that are based on making the conversation easier to process for the less competent ELF speaker. Regularisation is a syntactic feature in her data and is used not only used by less competent ELF speakers but very competent users. This is observed in topicalisation of the ELF speakers, which is clarified as "the movement of focussed information to the front of the utterance" (Meierkord 2004). She also defines that mostly lexical items were fronted, the most common of which were noun phrases (NPs).

e.g. Seven years doctors have to study.

Meierkord attributes the appearance of topicalisation involves two basic reasons: Firstly, it is the indication of the different language varieties which the ELF speakers bring to the conversation. Secondly, it is used to make discourse processing easier for interlocutors.

Another well-spread feature of ELF is omission of third person which was clearly analysed and demonstrated by Breiteneder. According to Standard English subject- verb agreement both in number and person is the most typically English feature. Breiteneder (2005) analysed examples of the third-person -s that she came across in an ELF corpus. She analysed where these -s forms took place and did not take place, and whether or not they were "correct" by Standard English norms, formed part of the natural language use of ELF speakers.

Breiteneder finds that these conversations were almost transactional⁴. Breiteneder transcribed the recordings for analysis of the occurrences or non-occurrences of the third person -s of main verbs in ELF. In her analysis, she found that although use of the third person -s is erratic, no single speaker in her corpus was completely ignorant about the rule underlying third-person distinction. In their various turns, all 14 of the ELF speakers at times used the third-person -s but also had instances in which they deleted it, though in most cases it was used according to the Standard English rule. The author also reports the participants use -s adding verb forms which is not required and regarded as overgeneralization, and ungrammatical according to Standard English.

e.g., That was a committee that meets every couple of months.

Above, the third-person -s morpheme is added to the past tense verb met. The addition of the third-person -s could also occur with verbs which have plural subjects.

Specifically, Breiteneder claims that overgeneralisation and erratic omission of the third-person -s does not involve mutual intelligibility between the communicators. Breiteneder's suggestion is that the conflict between the principles of grammatical and notional concord as well as the principle of proximity could clarify overgeneralisation and erratic omission of the third-person -s. Grammatical agreement is a rule in Standard English according to which a verb must agree in number with its subject:

e.g., She congratulates you.

Here the verb congratulates agrees with its subject in 3rd person marking the verb with the third-person-singular morpheme -s. But notional concord is when the meaning of the subject, being opposite to its form, determines the choice of verb form, as illustrated below:

e.g., We should ask the team and see what they think about this.

⁴ Transactional function of communication is driven by the aim of comprehending the information across so that the speaker focuses on the content of his/her message rather than the grammar.

In this example, the team is seen as a plural noun (as clear from the use of the pronoun they); the verb think agrees with this notion of plurality.

On the other hand, the principle of proximity is when “the head of a noun phrase that functions as the subject of the sentence is grammatically singular, yet the verb is chosen in agreement with the closely preceding noun phrase” (Breiteneder 2005). As the following example:

e.g., Everyone apart from his sisters think it’s a good idea. (Onraët 2011).

In this case, ‘think’ should agree in number with its singular subject ‘Everyone’ but the verb is put in agreement with the closest preceding plural noun phrase ‘his sisters’; this is explained through reference to the distance between the subject ‘Everyone’ and its verb ‘think’. Even native speakers of English may hesitate from the Standard English norm following these three principles. Once these principles become part of an L2 speakers linguistic intuitions. In ELF grammar overgeneralisation and erratic omission of the third-person –s may be normalized. There are even more suggested explanations for these phenomena of the third-person –s, namely that it is an effect of consonant cluster reduction. The use of these two strategies aids the pronunciation of word-final clusters:

e.g., Our research last two years.

Likewise, Cogo and Dewey explained that when there is an E-L1 speaker in an ELF interaction, the usage of the third-person –s are much more than when there is no E-L1 speaker in the communication. The researchers conclude that third-person zero “is emerging as the more characteristic, unmarked feature for present simple verb forms in ELF communication” because the third-person –s morpheme on a simple present tense English verb is a linguistic “element so marked in nature (that) it is bound to be prone to change, especially in contact situations”. (Cogo and Dewey 2006)

Gough (in de Klerk 1996 p.61-63) in terms of the grammatical features of ELF provides the following peculiarities with examples that were most commonly found in Gough (1994) and McEwan (1992):

1. Non-countable as countable nouns

e.g., You must put more efforts into your work.

She was carrying a luggage.

2. Deletion of articles

He was Ø good man.

3. Noun phrases not always marked for number

e.g., We did all our subject in English.

4. Extension of the progressive

e.g., Even racism is still existing.

Men are still dominating the key positions in education.

She was loving him very much.

5. Simplification of verbal agreement

The survival of a person depend on education.

6. Simplification of tense

e.g., I wish that people in the world will get educated.

We Ø supposed to stay in our homes.

7. Past tense not always marked

e.g., In 1980 the boycott starts.

We stayed in our home until the boycott stops.

8. Relative pronoun usage

e.g., She was very unhappy of which it was clear to see.

9. Question order retained in indirect questions

e.g., I asked him why did he go.

10. Use of subordinators

e.g., Although she loved him but she didn't marry him.

If at all you do not pay, you will go to jail.

11. Né as an invariant tag question (in Southern African English)

e.g., You start again by pushing this button, né?

12. Use of quantifiers

e.g., Others were drinking, others were eating.

I stay some few miles away.

13. 'X's first time' for 'the first time that X...'

e.g., This is my first time to go on a journey.

14. Can be able to as modal verb

e.g., I can be able to go.

Gough's examples listed above are particularly based on Afro-English peculiarities as well as similarities with other new Englishes.

Malan's (1996) study has shown that the rules of Standard English vary from Outer and Expanding circle in noun-verb agreement. The copula 'be' can take the third-person singular form with plural and singular subjects as in
e.g., children is coming.

Likewise, plural nouns can be used with singular demonstrative pronouns:

e.g., This people laughed at John.

Singular demonstrative pronoun 'that' may be used to mean to plural object:

e.g., That's the teachers that conduct us.

The research also showed an example of the usage of

there's (a contraction of there and is) that is used to refer to both singular and plural subjects or objects.

e.g., There's students who are actually knowledgeable.

Above according to Standard English, "there's" should be replaced by "there are" because the copula is misused for the plural subject students. This contraction may be a state of sound simplification for ease of pronunciation or consonant-cluster reduction since "there're [ðeə:ə]" which is difficult to pronounce, so speakers prefer to pronounce the syllable-final, contracted are-form, 're', with the contraction of 'is'.

Moreover, the data defines that it's (a contraction of it and is) is used to mean both the present tense or past tense form of the copula be. e.g., It's my birthday when I broke my hand playing with my friends.

Furthermore, Malan defines that majority verbs except 'be' get singular subjects with plural verb forms and vice versa :

e.g., Yasin and his friend consults to the audience.

She cook her food in the kitchen.

Omission of auxiliary verbs and contracted forms of 'be' and 'have' as common features of ELF.

e.g., She Ø got a lot of money.

We Ø going to the movies

According to Malan another common feature is that past tense morpheme -ed are deleted by its speakers:

e.g., Two days earlier we watch TV at the cinema.

Malan states that the prepositions 'at', 'with', 'on', 'in' and to can all be replaced with 'by' in new Englishes. She points out the following examples: e.g., I wasn't by (at) the beach.

He get a lift by (with) his father.

Do you know where I did go by (on) Easter Sunday?

My sister is by (in) Yasmin's class.

So she go by (to) a hospital.

Malan (1996) emphasizes about pronouns that “pronominal apposition for topic or focus marking and the dative of advantage” is common in Kachru's Outer Circle:

e.g., My friend he ride home.

I'm gonna buy me a burger.

With regard to adverbials, Malan reports that the omission of the adverbial morpheme –‘ly’ is exemplified in ELF interactions

e.g., Tommy ran quick down the road.

Malan also refers that the double negative is also possible in ELF but only when it comes with another indefinite:

e.g., I didn't catch nothing.

Watermeyer (in de Klerk 1996) deals with the syntax of ELF interactions and analyses some peculiarities which are registered in the studies of New Englishes.

1. Zero-marking of the third-person present tense verb

e.g., Harry combat the problem.

2. Not marking the verb in past tense

e.g., she lose her key at that moment.

3. Usage of aspect rather than tense otherwise using them simultaneously

e.g., If you return it to me on time, I would have got through the exam.

4. Stative verbs may be observed in progressive tense

e.g., She was missing her hometown.

Another common feature to New Englishes is the use of interrogative word order after relative pronouns in subordinate clauses. Watermeyer provides the example :

e.g., My mother asked me what am I doing in office.

With regard to word order in natural spoken language, speakers reduce certain important parts of information in the process of speech and include as afterthoughts but this does not mean that the speaker's linguistic competence is broken. The data for this research show that natural spoken ELF is also halting and ungrammatical. This occurrence is quite often observed by the speakers of ELF whose native language is based SOV (subject + object + verb) construction. On the contrary English as an SVO (subject + verb + object) language involve some difficulties in speech. Sometimes, they use the part of the sentence initially which should be placed finally according to Standard English. In the circumstances the process of nativization appears.

e.g., For inhabitants' health the fumes of the factory affect very much. (instead of The fumes of the factory affect very much on inhabitant's health.)

Here, not only word order but also the incorrect use of preposition were occurred.

However, this phenomenon is also used to structure of information. It was found that some of the South African speakers in the data arrange again their utterances to achieve focus, the result of which is an utterance with selected word order. Gough states (in de Klerk 1996), the part of the sentence in focus is placed in the sentence-initial position. It is interesting to mention that the word in focus can also be moved to the clause-initial position of a subordinate clause. The marked word in focus does not always have to be in the sentence-initial position of a principal clause.

e.g.,[...] and she was going on about how *these black kids they* have lost their culture and their roots and. (Onraët 2011. p.106.)

Here, the subordinate clause contains the item in focus in initial position, these black kids. The pronoun 'they' is used directly after it even though this pronoun usage is repetitive and unnecessary.

On the other hand, adverb and adjective may substitute each other in ELF communications. Some of the speakers used adverbial forms for adjectives and vice versa.

e.g., And that already says how badly your mental perception of anything that's different from me or from you is [...]. (Onraët 2011 p. 105.)

In the example speaker uses the adverbial form badly rather than the unmarked adjective form 'bad'

Moreover, reduced tense marking is mostly occurred with speakers of both BSAE (Black South African English), and AfrE (African English).

e.g., [...] the next thing you know they Ø breaking lifts, emptying fire extinguishers [...].(Onraët 2011 p.107.)

Speaker illustrates an example of this when she omits the auxiliary verb 'are' in the present progressive formation.

e.g., [...] like they had these things, we done them in Linguistics, the Bushisms [...].(Onraët 2011 p.107.)

In this case, the speaker may have done one of them: either she dropped the auxiliary 'had' between the pronoun 'we' and the past participle 'done' in the process of forming of the Past Perfect Tense we had done as in the example a or the author used only the past participle done rather than the past tense did as an example b.

- a) They had these things; we had done them in Linguistics, the Bushisms...
- b) They had these things; we did them in Linguistics, the Bushisms...

Prepositions may be used differently in ELF interactions relevant to their L1 counterparts.

e.g., How big are your classes because I mean by us it's like about we really small.
(Onraët2011. p.108.)

In this example, 'by' can be substituted with 'with' and the meaning of the sentence will not change.

Prepositions can also be deleted or replaced with others:

e.g., [...] Ø the beginning of the year I decided to do Psychology.

In this example, it was dropped the preposition 'at' at the beginning of the sentence. But in the following example put the preposition 'of' instead of 'about' which is appropriate to Standard English.

e.g. I think that is the worst thing of Sociology also.

(Non-) Insertion of articles are frequently used in LF communications, in some cases the speakers use definite and indefinite articles differently to how they should be used in Standard English by omission where necessary or insertion in not required places.

e.g., But the fact that I made it to Ø first team should say something about my hockey skills [...].(Onraët 2011)

Here , native speaker would say: But the fact that I made it to the first team should say something about my hockey skills [...].

1.2.3. THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE VOCABULARY OF ENGLISH AS LF

The vocabulary peculiarities of ELF is another vital point to be undertaken since it has several "loan words" and false cognates which are not inserted in Standard English. 'When one language takes lexemes from another, the new items are usually called loan words or borrowings' (Crystal, 2003). Words from a language or various languages can be integrated into the vocabulary of a particular language because of numerous explanations. It should be mentioned that some languages have been more open to accepting loan words than others. The English language has been flexible in this way. As Crystal states (2003) 'whereas the

speakers of some languages take pains to exclude foreign words from their lexicons, English seems always to have welcomed them'. Currently, the total number of words in English is over 1 million, and growing day by day (answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid). Words may also change their meaning as they become adapted to the new culture. Consequently, changing the meaning involves obstacles for translators and language learners. They observe problems concerning false cognates and loan words when speaking English as a lingua franca. The following words in Russian differ from English variants:

- e.g. 1) decade ten years in English
 decade ten days in Russian
- 2) division the effect of dividing in English
 division squadron, battery in Russian
- 3) prospect wide view over land or sea in English
 prospect ave, wide street in Russian

As a result, these words cause some misunderstandings in communication for those whose first language is Russian.

Godwin and Carlos (www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/linguafranca.htm) deal with Brazilian English in academic world and define that the following misunderstandings in terms of writing arose: problems with false cognates, e.g. *to intend* in English is the verb *pretender* in Portuguese, so a typical error is *I pretend to discuss ...* instead of *intend*, e.g. *currently* in English is *atualmente* in Portuguese, that is why plenty of Brazilians would write *I am actually studying ...*; problems with English borrowed items that have changed morphologically e.g. one person in the data informed that in Portuguese *the disk drive* of a computer is called a *Winchester* and he wrote this in a paper for a conference. The referee who reviewed it exclaimed that he could not perceive this term. Indeed, *Winchester*

disk exists, meaning an inflexible disk in which the storage capacity differs according to the disk size, but in Portuguese it has changed its meaning; problems with register, e.g. one academic said that after having an article corrected by a referee, he discovered he was being too direct when writing certain phrases because of L1 interference. He had written phrases such as *Note that*, instead of *It is worth noting that ...* or *Now look at figure 1*, instead of *Please refer to figure 1*.

Seidlhofer (2004) defines the cases of misunderstanding in ELF interactions by limited vocabulary and deficiency in paraphrasing skills on the part of the ELF speaker. She emphasizes that problems emerge in the interactions in which E-L1 speaker utters idiomatic speech, resulting in the hearer's problems in understanding (most likely an ELF speaker) due to not familiar with certain idiomatic expressions. She provides the examples of metaphorical language use, idioms, phrasal verbs, and fixed E-L1 expressions such as e.g., This drink is on the house (this drink is free)

or

Can we give you a hand? (can we help you?)

that may involve misunderstandings.

In terms of BSAE (Black South African English) vocabulary, Gough (in the Klark 1996 p.61-63) gives a variety of words from various African languages observed in BSAE e.g., the isiXhosa words 'mama' in the sense of a term of address for an older, respected woman, and 'skebenga' in the sense of a criminal. He also shows how the meanings of certain English words change their meanings , as in (1) and (2) below, where touch is used to mean "drop by", and worse is used to mean "especially" or "even more so".

1) She must *touch* the supermarket

2) A: Helen is knowledgeable.

B: Madina is worse (= "Madina is more knowledgeable than Helen").

The word "late" is used in Standard English as an attributive adjective to mean passed away as in (1) but in BSAE it is commonly used as a predicative adjective as if it is homonymous with "not being on time" in (2) and (3).

- 1) My late father used to live in Idutywa.
- 2) My father is late. (= “My father has passed away.”)
- 3) My father is late. (= “My father did not arrive on time”) (Onraët, 2011)

Somebody is used as the semantic equivalent of “person”:

e.g., He is a very important somebody. (Onraët. 2011 p.48)

Moreover, Gough shows differences in stylistic range: words that in Standard English would be used only in a formal context (as *abode*) or only informally (such as *mommy*) but in BSAE they are used in informal as well as formal contexts respectively.

Watermeyer (in de Klerk 1996) emphasizes that South African E-L1 speakers borrow words from Afrikaans, so much so that some words take place in the everyday speech of E-L1speakers:

e.g. *braai* in the meaning of “barbecue” and *stoep* in the meaning of “verandah”.

Watermeyer also reports on pairs of English words being used interchangeably by AfrE speakers to refer to the same entity. Particularly, when a word in Afrikaans has two equivalent words in English. The author demonstrates the following examples:

- *ride* and *drive* (Afrikaans speakers primarily use *ry* to denote both meanings);
- *learn* and *teach* (Afrikaans speakers use *leer* to denote both meanings);
- *lend* and *borrow* (Afrikaans speakers make use of *leen* to denote both meanings);
- *loaf* and *bread* (Afrikaans speakers use *brood* to denote both meanings);
- *when* and *if* (Afrikaans speakers use *as* or *wanneer* to denote when, but confusion arises because Afrikaans *as* can also mean “if” or conditional “when” therefore resulting in confusion of the two terms), and
- *less* and *few* (Afrikaans speakers use *min* before count and non-count nouns to denote both meanings).

Baumgardner (1990) studies Pakistani English and defines its different kinds of word-formation: Compounding from English elements is found in such items as

wheelcup('hub-cap') and side-hero ('supporting actor'), with some productive elements: -lifter(shoplifter) has been base for many new words (e.g. car lifter, luggage lifter, book lifter), as well as wallah/walla (a person who does something', e.g. exam-centre-walla, coachwalla). Distinctive prefixation such as anti-mullah and deconfirm, and distinctive suffixation, using both English and Urdu bases: e.g. endeavourance, ruinification, cronydom, abscondee, wheatish, scapegoatism, oftenly, upliftment, alongside begumocracy, sahibism, sifarashee (sifarash-favour), babuize (babu-clerk). Word-class conversion occurs by the following verbs: to aircraft, to slogan, to tantamount. Shortening are also taken place: e.g. d/o('daughter of '), r/o('resident of'). The author (1998) outlines distinctive collocations, both English only (e.g. discuss threadbare, have a soft corner) and English/Urdu examples (e.g., commit zina—adultery, recite kalam—verse .

Crystal quotes several examples in Jamaican English, for example, the word *cockpit* is used in the sense of 'type of valley' and *beverage* in the restricted sense of 'lemonade' (Cassidy and Le Page 1967). In Ghana, the word *heavy* in the sense of 'gorgeous' and *brutal* in the sense of 'very nice', and a number of semantic changes such as *maiden name* meaning 'given name' (Ahulu 1995) and *linguist* meaning 'spokesman for the chief' Dako (2001). By means of collection of local vocabulary from all sources, a regional dictionary can be established. There are more than 3,000 items gathered in the first edition of the Dictionary of South African English, and later editions and collections comprise the further 2,500 entries. South African Indian English alone has 1,400. The Dictionary of New Zealand English has 6,000 entries. The Concise Australian national dictionary has 10,000 words while Jamaican English includes over 15,000 entries and 20,000 in the Dictionary of Caribbean English usage. Trinidad and Tobago alone produced some 8,000 (Crystal 2003).

Summary

This chapter has introduced the term of lingua franca, the reasons why languages are regarded as a lingua franca and their functions. Diffusion and stabilization of English across cultures and languages involve 'new englishes', 'international', 'global', 'world english' which are close terms to lingua franca. Moreover, this is library research including similar and controversial viewpoints stated by scholars about the vital importance, its role all over the world. I tried to inform about core issues – for the well-spread versions of ELF – phonological, grammatical and lexical features which are considered as a prevalent in ELF interactions. The data showed that many interactions in ELF occur among participants whose speeches are not appropriate to register. Several researches have been undertaken on this topic especially, Meierkord who carried out pragmatics while Jenkins worked on core and non-core phonological peculiarities of ELF. Seidlehofer collected the data to undertake grammar and reported that the use of certain features in ELF which is considered as 'errors' in SE are not estimated as problematic and do not break down communicative success. Meirkord also analysed the syntactic variation in ELF conversations and found out the essential syntactic processes, namely simplification and regularization. Breitender dealt with occasions in which third person singular suffix –s is omitted whereas Onraët illustrated other grammatical features such as exchanging prepositions, omission of articles and word order which occur as a result of interference of native language backgrounds. Regarding to the level of vocabulary Crystal emphasized the role of loan words of ELF in Pakistan, Nigeria, Ghana.

To sum up, the chapter demonstrates that the main processes englishization and nativization are involving to emerge the new varieties in ELF such as Afrikaans English, Japlish, Konglish, Chinlish, Babu English and so on. Indeed, the numbers of speakers of ELF are increasing day by day and this phenomenon is causing to change the state of English.

CHAPTER II. INTERCULTURAL FEATURES OF ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA

2.1. CULTURAL AWARENESS, PARTICULAR STEPS TO INCORPORATE WITH CULTURE

Culture and language are closely interrelated with each other and constantly culture reflects in language. As it was mentioned in initial chapter LF communication comprises at least three cultures although the conversation of LF is estimated as neutral, non-culturally coloured variety, because no language can emerge or be conveyed without culture which includes life style, mentality, world picture, the national character, traditions, beliefs, systems of values and social behaviours. (Ashurova 2012).

In the process of learning any foreign language, the learners come across some challenges to incorporate cultural elements. Michael Paige (Cohen et al. 2003) outlines culture learning model including particular steps:

- “the self as culture
- the elements of culture
- intercultural phenomena (culture-general learning)
- particular cultures (culture-specific learning)
- acquiring strategies for culture learning)”

The self as cultural

Stereotypically, the notion of culture is understood associated with food, clothing, music, art, and literature but others may define culture with conventions such as social interactions, values, ideas and attitudes. There are a great deal of definitions of culture but the briefest and most proper one identified by anthropologist John Bodley (1994). He claims culture “what people think, make and do”.

Every one is a member of at least one culture. Unintentionally, the culture people belong to affects how they think, act, communicate and even transmit knowledge from one generation to another. By understanding and interpreting national culture, learners can facilitate connections across cultures and involve to create a “sphere of interculturality”. (Jerrold Frank 2013).

The elements of culture

The Standard Foreign Language Learning (NSFLEP 1999) worked out a framework including cultural elements by dividing three main patterns and this is called the 3P model of culture:

- **Perspectives** (what member of a culture think, feel and value)
- **Practices** (how members communicate and interact with one another)
- **Products** (art, music, food, literature; the things that members of a group create, share , transmit to the next generation)

Here, products can be clarified because people are able to see, touch, taste or hear them. In contrast, perspectives and products may not be easy to notice since they tend to be ingrained in a society. Brooks (1997) divides culture into two types: “formal culture” (literature, fine arts, history) and “deep culture” (patterns of social interactions, values, attitudes). Similar to products in 3P model, the elements of formal culture are easy to recognize across cultures. On the contrary, the elements of deep culture are estimated as difficult to define because they are ingrained and deeply rooted in the psyches of individuals who are belong to particular culture.(Jerrold Frank 2013).

Edward Hall (1976) inserted his analogy “cultural iceberg” to clarify cultural elements and developed the analogy to describe differences between what can be watched when learner enter new culture (the tip of the iceberg) and the imbedded parts of the culture which is not easily identified (the submerged part of the iceberg). The author took the advantage of metaphor that he could find resemblance iceberg with culture. In fact learners initially can observe only surface of the culture while deep culture is underlying as stakeholder. Unconscious values

and attitudes as deep culture are considered the most complicated element. They are fixedly rooted and ingrained that people treat these as simply right or normal thing. Jerrold Frank (2013) states some example of deep culture: it is strange for Americans to share parents' bed with their children while majority cultures can accept this as a normal state. Likewise, others connected with the nature of friendship, concepts of cleanliness, gender roles and etc. The purpose is to raise cultural awareness of cultural elements in order to understand why people behave differently and reflect them in their language.

Intercultural phenomena

Culture shock, cultural adaptation, cultural adjustment occur when people from other cultures may interpret similar situations differently (Cohen et al. 2003). In the process of learning ELF the students should be aware of what challenges may be observed when they visit English speaking country. The term "acculturation" is used to refer adapting to a new culture. Brown (1994) estimates four stages of this process:

- 1) excitement (about being in a new country)
- 2) culture shock (feelings of frustration and hostility)
- 3) recovery (being convenient in a new country)
- 4) adaption (bridging cultural barriers and accepting the new culture)

Each culture has pros and cons but the person who enter a new culture mostly see negative aspects and find unknown, fresh and exciting points. After excitement, individual twist towards culture shock. Second stage is regarded as the most difficult one in which native and host cultures are unfairly compared. In this case if the person does not know about culture, it makes him frustrated and wish to return homeland. Having become familiar with the new environment, the person may move to the stage three which is called recovery. In the third stage they feel more convenient and even find friends by using the target language. Finally, in the fourth stage they adapt and accept the new culture.

Particular cultures

Cohen (2003) defines the term connected with specific cultural identities which include history, geography, political systems but especially an understanding of the particular characteristics of the society. The key factor to express culture is the context that defines cultural background in which communication takes place. When people from different backgrounds interact it is natural to break down the conversation if they do not share similar cultural contexts. Hall (1976) distinguishes two types of cultures: Firstly, in high-context cultures speaker's intent is more important than words and people belong to them prefer group harmony and consensus over individual achievement. People convey the meanings in utterances implicitly and indirectly. Secondly, low-context cultures are regarded as individualistic and people belong to them appreciate directness with discussions resulting in actions. As a result of differences, communications between high and low cultures may involve problems. Majority countries where English is spoken as a native language are considered as low-context cultures while Asian, Middle Eastern and Latin American cultures are estimated as high-context cultures. To illustrate low-context American culture differs from high-context Japanese because Americans appreciate independence, self-confidence and equality while Japanese tend to value group harmony, collectiveness, family, and cooperation.

Acquiring strategies for culture learning

The last stage in Paige's model demonstrates specific strategies for becoming more culturally competent. The strategies consist of learning about the culture from native informants and then widening cultural observation skills and learn the culture through authentic materials connected with that culture.

Byram (1997) states that if the person is "interculturally competent", they can perceive how cultural elements manifest in behaviors across cultures. He considers that intercultural competence contains the following features:

- tolerance to other cultures
- a perception of social practices and products in not only native but target culture
- the capability to relate something from another culture and make it comprehensible to members of one's own
- the ability to use cultural knowledge in authentic situations
- the ability to criticize the culturally practices and the products of one's own culture and other cultures.

Cultural awareness is one of the inseparable part of language learning and simultaneously it is considered as difficult part to address in the English language classroom. Knowledge only about linguistic forms of a language is not sufficient to be considered competent in the target language. Students can not be considered to have mastered a foreign language until they comprehend the cultural contexts in which the target language is spoken (NSFLEP 1996, 27). Culture study should third culture of the classroom. In the interactions of ELF at least three culture (because in addition to either English or American culture, ELF speakers insert their individual cultural points too and any interaction contain at least one addresser and one addressee) are attended and on the top of them English stands. ELF as medium communication non the less how many and what culture representatives utter in the interaction the culture of English speaking countries influence and serve as bridge to connect the speakers who can not share their native languages.

2.2. CROSS CULTURAL PRAGMATICS

Language is social mirror for public and private face because it reflects in the utterances world picture and lifestyle of the people. Language is undoubtedly tied up with culture, each word is a deep voice with subtle tunes of family, a tribe, a class, a nation. Most people in the world use ELF who acquire several different language backgrounds. Although they take the advantage of English with various degrees of competence with align cultural aspects to English, it is well spread tool to share opinions among the communicators with different first languages. Christopher Brumfit (2001) states “even in Britain, monolingualism may be dying out. The presence in Britain many speakers of other languages as a result of immigration policies since the Second World War has led to reconsideration of attitudes towards languages and dialects other than Standard English for all groups of language users.” ELF as a new variety of English accomplishes different cultural aspects of world languages together with English. Participants in lingua franca communications are representatives of their own cultures. Consequently it is natural to observe interferences from different mother tongues. Simultaneously the users of lingua franca have certain degree achieved norms of British English or American English when learning the language that means in the interactions they use at least three or more culture norms. As a result of this, participants effect of making a unique set of rules for interaction that may be defined as an interculture, “culture constructed in cultural contact” (Koole and Thije 1994) or as a lingua franca culture which has specific linguistic features. At the same time, the speakers must be regarded as learners of the language they use as a lingua franca. Their communicative behaviour is not just reflection of cultural norms but demonstrates the individual stages of their interlanguage with its specific features and the results of adaptation to the interlocutors.

Several researches have been undertaken in ELF pragmatics and most

researches in this area are being made by linguists in a number of Expanding circle countries such as Firth (1996), Meierkord (1996, 2004), House (1999, 2002), Lesznyak (2002) work on the data from various native language backgrounds. The contexts in the researches include dinner conversations, group discussions, simulated conferences and business telephone calls. As a result of analyses several generalizations about the pragmatics of ELF are outlined:

- Misunderstandings are not frequent in ELF interactions; when they take place, they tend to be resolved either by topic change or by open negotiation using communicative strategies such as rephrasing and repetition.
- Interference from native language interactional norms are very rare
- As long as certain understanding is obtained, interlocutors seem to adopt What Firth (1996) has termed “let it pass” principle,” which gives the impression of ELF talk being cooperative and mutually supportive.

From the viewpoint of pragmatics, the variety of ELF distinguishes from the native speaker varieties British and American English with the structure of discourse and politeness phenomena. Meierkord (1996-1998) illustrates that not being similar to BrE or AmE, the speakers of ELF do not frequently use opening and closing phases.

SE

I'd better be off now.

Could you tell me please how I can find the market ?

ELF

I'm off.

How can I find the market?

Furthermore, pauses are used between conversational phases. The participant's utterance demonstrates frequent and long pauses between and within turns. Overlapping is differently analysed because sometimes the speakers do not overlap with their partners in the interactions whereas others speak simultaneously with their interlocutors. The speakers who overlap speech are regarded as competent in English. Several expressions commonly used in native speakers' conversations

are not frequently occurred in ELF. And the speakers in ELF particularly avoid using stereotypical phrases such as ‘How are you?’, ‘Good morning.’, ‘Hello.’, ‘Bye’ (Meierkord 2002).

Other feature which House (2002) indicates that the tendency of interlocutors to behave in fairly “self-centered” way and prefer “parallel monologues” rather than dialogues. Meierkord claims in her empirical study of small talk conversations that communications in lingua franca are “both linguistic masala and a language ‘stripped bare’ of its cultural roots” (Meierkord, 2004,). On the contrary Pözl states that cultural points of interlocutors “can be asserted, negotiated or expanded in lingua franca contact situations” (Pözl, 2003). Sometimes the findings of different researches may contradict each other. Reasons for this may be the attendance of many and different cultures which are far from each other.

In the time analyzing researches’ data several vital important cross-cultural features of pragmatics are observed. They are: the concept of turn, repetition, interactive repairs, self repairs, back channels, code switching or code mixing and thinking aloud which frequently used by the interlocutors of lingua franca communications.

The Concept of Turn

Turn taking is essential characteristic feature of lingua franca spoken conversation that differs from monologue speech. The rules of turn taking are clarified together with transition-relevance-places at which speaker changes. Gough (1996) analysed turn taking process in the study and indicated that turn taking in BSAE (Black South African English) is different from Standard English varieties. In African English speaker may choose themselves to answer in a conversation which is controversial to Standard English varieties. In native English varieties it is the norm that the speaker specifically indicates who will take the next turn. Furthermore, interruption and overlapping in BSAE is less occurred than Standard English. The pauses between turns in BSAE conversations are estimated longer than BrE or AmE conversations.

The pauses are silent and do not cause inconvenient situations and the speakers do not have to use fillers or hesitation markers in order to complete the silence between turns. Overlapping is one of the peculiarities associated with turn. It is characterized as turn-taking error and violation of turn-taking in order to repair the speech. Overlapped speech may be appeared mostly by young speakers in order to express closeness to the uttered speech. In lingua franca communication some cases may be observed unlike the case with speakers of English overlapping speech. The overlapping speech is not cut off and repaired. Instead, current speaker goes on speaking until another participant begins. This event may be observed among Asian countries' interlocutors because they avoid making partners inconvenient positions. However, in the conversations between New Yorkers and Californians misunderstandings belong to the overlaps are regarded as turn taking signals. New Yorkers usually use overlapping to support the speaking partner by inputting short questions but Californians receive them as turn-claiming signals. Japanese conversation is quite different from Standard English because one participant utters one-sidedly that is distinctive feature of Japanese conversations. One participant gives some information and the others completes an information unit which is called by her "wadan" that is very close to the notion of turn functionally. Within one wadan, speakers exchange information that is sentences, phrases and single words.

Repetition

It is used in ELF to show misunderstanding for hearer by repeating problematic part with or without rising intonation. Below Nargiza's speech indicates the example of repetition.

Akmal: Yesterday our headmaster demanded us on making presentation on the topic of the influence of high technology.

Nargiza: *Hm?*

Akmal : Presentation.

Nargiza: *Presentation*

Akmal: It is a set of written and oral speech based on the influence of high technology: drawbacks and privileges .

Here, Nargiza was not sure whether she misheard what Akmal told and she asked a repetition from Akmal by means of enquiring Hm? with rising intonation. He understood this exactly and repeated the word. By repeating the word again Nargiza conveyed her misunderstanding and Akmal explained the requirements of the presentation.

Interactive repairs

ELF speakers use this strategy to prevent misunderstandings during the interaction. This occurs when the interlocutors come across difficulties to find appropriate word or phrase for the situation. The hearer notices the communicative problem of the addresser and fills the utterance with the proper word. Mauranen (2006) states that majority repairs are aimed at continuing the conversation.

e.g. Nomsa: Mm, now we going to be th- It's it's it's it's not uh fact. It's not just an ob- a subjective

Mercia: *objective*

Nomsa: observation. Like in my community, take now like the evarage black community. It's, it's something, it's it's too common.
(Onraët 2011 p.70.)

In the example, Nomsa is not finding or is not sure that the word is exact. Mercia understands that Nomsa needs her help and thinks that Nomsa knows which word she needs but hesitate how to pronounce it. Mercia can predict the word since Nomsa pronounces the initial syllable ob- but it is not definite that if Nomsa wanted to tell *observation* or *objective*. Mercia interactively offers the word *objective* but it seems as if Nomsa stopped after ob- to self repair since she was speaking *objective* which is incorrect, or she just reduced adjective – subjective before the word *observation*. In both cases, Mercia's repair is not taken into account as interactive repair.

Self-repairs

Another strategy used in lingua franca conversations to prevent misunderstandings is self-repair in which the speaker makes a mistake in the content or grammar and himself repairs, corrects the fault. Self-repair usually occurs immediately after a mistaken word has been spoken. After noticing his mistake, the speaker interrupts himself and repairs the word and continues his speech. This self-repair may happen in the end as well.

e.g. And then they and they took someone out and then I put my poster up like that and then the T – the camera shot at me I was like... (Onraët 2011p. 71.)

Here, the speaker starts to tell the acronym *TV* but she stops and repairs herself by uttering *the camera*.

e.g. Because, if you think about it...um, from a student point of view...um. When w-when students have racial fights they always, always try and black I I I mean blame the black people. (Onraët 2011)

In the example, the speaker uttered the word *black* instead of *blame* may be due to phonological similarity. These two terms helped to express the meaning but used in incorrect order. Consciously, the speaker understands his mistake and repairs with help of the clause *I mean*.

Back channels

They are noise, gesture, expression, or word used by a listener to demonstrate that they are paying attention to a speaker. The well spread back-channel signals contain head movements, brief vocalizations, glances, and facial expressions, often in combination. The back-channeling strategy of participants in the conversations is very similar to what has been British English native speakers' (e.g. *mhm*, *right*, *yeah*), whereas verbal back channels are frequently replaced by supportive laughter. Simultaneously, speakers use a comparatively high amount of sentence completions and restatements. However, back-channeling gambits do not significantly differ from native BrE speakers (Meierkord 1996).

e.g. Karen Pelly: Brent might learn a little lesson if his security camera got stolen.

Hank Yarbo: *Yeah*.

Karen Pelly: By someone.

Hank Yarbo: *Hmm*.

Karen Pelly: Someone he trusts.

Hank Yarbo: *Yeah, I suppose*.

Karen Pelly: Someone he would never suspect.

Hank Yarbo: *Yeah*.

Karen Pelly: Plot the camera's motion and approach from a blind spot. You could pull it off. ("Security Cam," *Corner Gas*, 2004)

Back channels such as *yes*, *uh-huh*, *mhm*, and other very short comments are frequently used to describe that the hearer is listening not on the purpose of interruption or turn taking. However they are indications that the hearer expect the speaker to continue.

Besides *mhm*, *right*, *yeah* (or *ja* in BSAE instead of *yeah*) and *uh huh*, *I know*, *exactly*, *I hear you* can be shown as the examples of back-channels.

e.g. Sabina: I'm not sure one of our group mates can change the process and get through CEFR examination

Aksana: Exactly

Sabina: Because none of us can manage the requirements.

Self-doubt of ELF proficiency

This phenomenon is sometimes used by the participants of ELF communication in which they suspect some elements of their speech and convey this doubt explicitly. The following example clearly demonstrates this feature of LF communication:

e.g. Thandiwe: I think we were doing motivation, and we had gotten a case study about um four students who have just been accepted U-into um Stellenbosch and it describes each one's background and how they were all fighting for a social socially acceptable place *if I put that right?*

Nomsa: I wanna say something, but I I've got all the words in my head but now I can't put it together nicely. (Onraët.p.77.)

In the extract which is a part of South African English conversation, Thandiwe demonstrates her unease by the sentence *if I put it right?* with rising intonation. she used self-repair as well (*social socially acceptable*) before telling her doubtful utterance finally. And her partner Nomsa is doubting the formulation of the speech that she herself is planning too. It means she is in doubt about her own proficiency.

Thinking aloud

One of discursive feature essential for ELF is that some of the interlocutors think loudly and voice their thoughts when they have trouble finding proper word or phrase. The strategy was named by Onraët as "thinking aloud". The function of thinking aloud is to get time to the speaker in order to search proper word without making pauses. Thinking aloud is used instead of fillers although it comprises utterances that are longer than a single word.

e.g. I'd like to mention about the thing which is very important for our work, that is um um what is the word – um – requirements is ?

In the example above, speaker is having trouble finding the word he wanted to use. It is proved by his usage of the filler *um* three times to give him a little time to think. Non the less he is not able to find the word that is why he thinks aloud by

uttering *what is the word?* And again uses the filler *um*. After this filler he can manage to find the proper word that he wants – *requirements*.

Besides this, Onraët defines that thinking aloud may function an indirect invitation of the speaker to the listener to request help or repair. Below this function is represented:

e.g. Gulzoda: I came across one word in the text and I didn't catch it. What
was the word, it's like, it isn't promote
Madina: Promulgate?

Here, Gulzoda starts her utterance by description of her misunderstanding and she searches for the particular word after that she thinks aloud by telling *what was the word?* After that she speaks similar word but stops mid-utterance (*it's like*) and self-repair (*it isn't promote*). The listener accepts this as asking for help and makes interactive repair by means of the word (*promulgate*).

Code switching

Crystal emphasizes that “with illustrations like the one from the Sunday Times, it is not difficult to see how the process of variety differentiation might develop further.(....) The door is therefore open to make use of strings larger than a phrase. Even in British English, there are instances of clause-or sentence-size chunks being borrowed from a foreign language (*Je ne sais quoi, c'est la vie*), so in the situations where contact with other languages is routine and socially pervasive, we would expect this process to appear on a large scale, and eventually to have a dramatic impact on the character of the language, in the form of code-switching, the process in which people rely simultaneously on two or more languages to communicate with each other”. He also mentions that code-switching is definitely one of the most noticeable peculiarities of ELF. Any loan-word could be considered as a minimalist example of code-switching, but the notion is more clear

when it is found in utterance which can be clarified a syntactic definition. This kind of language is called with blending name such as Taglish (for Tagalog-English). Mixed varieties involving English are now come across everywhere with colourful nicknames – Franglais, Tex-Mex, Chinglish, Japlish, Singlish, Spanglish, Denglish or Angleutsch and etc (Crystal 2003). These names are now widely used in spite of the direction of the mixing: they have been applied to a variety of a language which has been much anglicized as well as to a variety of English which has made use of other languages. However, the contradictory attitudes towards them are interfering to receive such varieties. People would sneer at Tex-Mex, and say it was neither one language nor the other, or refer to it as ‘gutter-speak’ used by people who had not learned to talk properly. But we can hardly call a variety like Taglish gutter-speak when it is being used in writing by a major banking corporation. But the analyses of ‘mixed’ languages, it is estimated that they are full of great difficulty and subtlety of expression that contain the resources of two languages. Klimpfnger (2007) researches the phenomenon of code-switching and concludes that ELF speakers select code-switching by using different parts of their native and non-native languages such as short word-fragments, single words and short phrases. In code-switching strategy two kinds of languages participate: matrix and embedded languages. Onraët states the matrix language is the language that supplies grammatical structure of the utterances while embedded language provides some fragments, words, phrases which are inserted into the matrix language. According to this, the matrix language is English and the embedded is native or non-native language whose fragments are inserted in ELF communication. Below a few examples of code-switching are outlined that are frequently used in Uzbek State World Languages University by Uzbek, Russian or other Turkic students in ELF interactions.

e.g. We have to waste our time every Friday cause there is *OKHO* at the second pair on the timetable.

Here, the speaker inserted Russian word *OKHO* instead of space. The listeners have

no difficulty to understand the code-switching because Russian as a second language is comprehensive for the addressees.

e.g. You must write *tushuntirish xati* about your missed lessons and this proves that you were warned about the situation.

In this example the speaker used *tushuntirish xati* in Uzbek which means explanatory letter in English. This kind of documental words or phrases are quite often occurred at the University because of more clear and understandable for our students rather than English version.

e.g. I've gotta go to the *rektorat* to take my stipend. Won't you go with me?

The example above indicates the word *rektorat* as code-switching in ELF interaction. The speakers prefer to use *rektorat* rather than University administration or rector's office in communication.

On the contrary, the students at the University take advantage of English words when they speak their L1.

e.g. Можно вас критиковать *in a friendly way*? (May I criticize you in a friendly way?) Here, the speaker whose first language is Russian inserted *in a friendly way* into his utterance because the students who are attending class are able to not only to understand the part but also use in their speech as a code-switching.

e.g. Hozir ish qidirayman, ba'zi joylarga *resume* tashlab keldim. (I'm searching for job and I left *resume* for some places.)

In this sentence, the inserted word *resume* is quite often used because it is almost to be accepted as a borrowed word in Uzbek. Therefore it may be also comprehended by the people who do not acquire English competent.

Moreover, Onraët outlines lots of sentences in South African English involving code-switching due to particular words or phrases inserted from Afrikaans languages.

e.g. I knew absolutely nothing and then *Jool* came and it was like scary (...). (Onraët 2011 p.80)

Here, Afrikaans native speaker inserted the African lexeme *Jool*. It refers to Rag festival which is organized annually at Stellenbosch University to raise funds for charity. This kind of national coloured code-switching can be frequently observed in ELF interactions.

Onraët states the words which are not related to the University as well in her data such as *lekker, skinder, jis, gees, jinne*. Some of them are regarded as loan words and quite often they are taken place in the variety of lingua franca. She provides this with her examples in her data:

e.g. Mandisa: Um the one is doing science, medical sciences or something like that. Um the other one is doing, what is it called? She is majoring in Industrial Psychology if I'm not mistaken. The other one is doing IT. Another one is doing um....what is it called? It's also some medical thing to do with um....what is it now. I can't remember the name of the programme, but they focus on um...

Thandiwe: OT, physio, speech?

Mandisa: Ooh, *jinne*, no. (Onraët 2011 p.81)

In the example Mandisa used the interjection *jinne* (*goodness! In Standard English*) in her utterance which was established as loanword in Afrikaans English. However, some of them are not considered as loans such as *gees* (it means spirit) that is regarded as code-switching.

e.g., (...) but in the end we won um first prize for *gees*. (Onraët 2011 p.81)

Klimpfinger (2007) defines that the reason for the usage of code-switching in ELF is that the speaker feels more comfortable to convey an idea in his native language.

e.g. But I think also because Stellenbosch is known for being sp-sporty or like a *kuirerplek* it'll be hard to move away from it. (Lauren Alexandra Onraët. p.82)

In this case Onraët defines that the speaker feels that the Afrikaans word *kuirerplek* (a place to a party) is the best choice to express the opinion. Perhaps English has no single word equivalent for the *kuirerplek* or finding involves pause or taking time for the speaker.

It is estimated that the usage of code-switching is occurred in order to show the speakers' specific linguistic identities and group memberships.

2.3. THE DISCOURSE MARKERS IN ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA CONVERSATION

A discourse marker is a word or phrase that is relatively syntax-independent and does not function to change the real conditional meaning of the sentence. The instances of discourse markers include particles: *oh, well, now, then, you know, and I mean, and* the connectives: *so, because, and, but, and or*. Traditionally, some of the words or phrases that were considered discourse markers were treated as "fillers" or "expletives" (wikipedia.com).

Discourse makers are often used with a variety of functions, and ELF is no exception. There are controversial viewpoints how often they are used in ELF utterances. House's (2002) study shows that there was remarkably infrequent use of discourse markers while Onraët indicates that the discourse markers featured most frequently in her data such as *like, you know, I mean, I don't know, sort of, kind of*.

Like

Like is an polysemantic and ambiguous word in Standard English. Below the instances of like are outlined:

- 1) Jonathan does not like soup. (verb = "have an appetite for")
- 2) Jonathan does not like it when anyone tells a lie. (verb = "find acceptable")
- 3) Jonathan looks like his granny. (preposition = "similar to")

Grammatically, like can be as a preposition, conjunction, noun, verb, or adjective in formal Standard English, as an adverb in informal Standard English.

- 4) That's not like Botir to swear somebody
- 5) You seem like you are tearing .
- 6) I did all the housework: cleaning, washing, cooking and the like.
- 7) Ann always likes to chat to her close friends on the phone.
- 8) I'm really like my dad.

In addition to these functions, other several informal uses of *like* are conveyed in ELF. *Like* in the sense of *for example*:

- 9) We do not have plenty of literature on this topic in the library but you may search it *like* Internet or other libraries.

Here, if *like* is substituted with *for example*, the meaning of this sentence will not change. Sometimes, tautologically, speakers use *like* and *for example* together:

- 10) She should know *like for example*, It is obligatory for us every time to solve her problems.

Like in the meaning of *because*.

- 11) I can't say "You fat" now, can I? *Like* you've already said it.
12) I didn't speak English so I couldn't converse with other people *like* other

kids were speaking English where I came from. (Lauren Alexandra Onraët. p.90)

In examples above, *like* can be replaced with *because* and the result does not influence to the meaning of the sentences.

Similar to native speakers of English, ELF speakers may use *like* as a quotative. *Like* takes on the meaning of *thought or said*. Below several instances of *like* as many examples of *like* as a quotative are illustrated:

- 13) She was *like* "Thanks a lot" with pleasure.
14) I was *like* "I'm not blaming you"

Like may function to insert elaboration as illustrated in the following example:

- 15) It was so clear the girl tried to make us to do it, *like buy awfully colored dress*.

Here, speaker thinks that using the pronoun *it* is not sufficient to identify what he meant. Therefore, he uses *like* as a means of the elaboration *buy awfully coloured dress*.

Like can be used to describe a self-repair as in example (16)

16) What score did you get for composition like essay on final?

In this example speaker firstly named a piece of writing incorrectly but then repaired himself with the help of like.

You know

This discourse marker is frequently treated as a filler in Standard English. Similarly, it functions identically in ELF. The reasons why you know is used in this way is that it gives the speaker time to take time to think what they are going to express next, or to find the right word to avoid making silence-filled gap.

The instances are outlined with these functions of you know:

17) I had better go to bed earlier because, you know, I have first pair at 8 o'clock.

You know may be used accompanied with other fillers providing the speaker even more time to find the appropriate word or phrase:

18) So, well, you know, I mean, it is enough to tease me, let's turn to another topic.

Here, speaker added another three discourse markers (so, well, and I mean) before continuing with her utterance.

Onraët illustrates several examples in which speaker uses you know together with like (either directly adjacent and in any order, or even repetitively).

19) And I'm short, you know, like I'm not that height, you know.

In this case, you know seems to be used by the speaker as a minimal confirmation check if the listener perceives what the addresser said. The author also states that this phrase may be an abbreviated version of the phrase *Do you know what I mean?*. This function mostly happens with rising intonation and it requires an answer from the listener.

20) Interviewer: A- But you still find there's a bit too much English?

Mercia: But I'm starting to um get adapted to it.

Interviewer: Okay.

Mercia: My English and and I think I must um this will help me in the near future, you know?

Interviewer: Ja. Ja. [...] (Lauren Alexandra Onraët. p.93)

You know is also occurred in self-repair as in the following example:

21) You should look through into your bag once more maybe you, you know, maybe you don't see anywhere.

This use of you know can be regarded as a filler to give the speaker time to formulate what to say next. Furthermore, similar to *like*, you know is used to introduce an elaboration of a sentence or a synonymic word/phrase supplement. An example of you know introducing an elaboration:

22) When Mamlakat saw the other participants of the competition, you know, at the opening ceremony, and then she refused to take part in.

In this example the addresser firstly said when Mamlakat saw the other participants of the competition but in to clarify the utterance the addresser uses you know to insert an elaboration of the utterance. Moreover, you know in this example is multifunctional, giving not just the elaboration, but also providing the speaker more time to find the right words. An example of you know in order to illustrate with a synonymic word/phrase is in the next example:

23) Such a serious attitude towards baby s very ridiculous, you know, funny behaving.

In this utterance, you know introduces the funny as synonymic word of the ridiculous behaving.

Onraët indicates in her data that lexical or phrasal repetition may occur either immediately before or immediately after you know. She outlines the examples in which the repeated phrase more often takes place after you know:

24) [...] the teachers try to make sure that no one falls through the cracks
you know they very they very aware of what's happening in your life at
that time [...]

In this example the phrase *they very* (with the omission of auxiliary verb *are*) is repeated twice after the discourse marker. (Onraët)

25) Mountaineer admits what you know what they are on the doorstep of
the death while climbing.

In this example, lexical repetition immediately before *you know* is exemplified. In Speaker's repetition of the relative pronoun *what* before the discourse marker *you know* may give him time to formulate her utterance.

I mean

The discourse marker *I mean* express a self-repair in Standard English in most cases. This phenomenon by means of *I mean* occurs in ELF as well.

26) If teacher can persuade the audience to this event, the headmaster will
enjoy him for this action I mean encourage.

Here, speaker wanted to say *encourage* but spoke *enjoy* instead. In correcting himself, he took advantage of *I mean* to introduce the self-repair.

In the interactions of ELF *I mean* may be used as the semantic equivalent of *I think* as illustrated below:

27) Well, I think it's really amazing but I mean that is out of date now.

In this case, if one were to replace *I mean* with *I think* the meaning of the utterance would not change

Likewise, discourse marker *you know*, *I mean* is also occurred with other fillers such as *together with* .

28) Like I mean the group have to stop at this stage.

Lexical or phrasal repetition is observed with *I mean* but it (in contrast to *you know*) it only happens immediately after the discourse marker.

29) I mean she's she's not speaking to the point

I don't know

In Standard English I don't know is uttered not just as a sentence which rejects the knowledge of something but also as a discourse marker. Likewise, the speakers of ELF use the discourse marker as utterance-initially and utterance-finally. When it is occurred at the beginning, it serves as a turn-taking mechanism in the interaction and this discourse marker introduces an aspect of modality as well (Onraët 2011).

30) I don't know I never thought it as a correct because.....

If the discourse marker is placed finally, it indicates the end of the speaker's turn. Simultaneously, it estimates an aspect of probability in the overall meaning of the speech. The following example in Onraët's data exemplifies both functions.

31) Interviewer: But like do you feel that there should be more...

Anele: Ja, I'd say the students some of them are still like they have that they're racist. Some of them are not changing ja. I don't know...

Ntombi: I don't think it's changing, hey?

In this example, the use of I don't know in Anele's speech implies the end of her turn in the interaction. Consequently, Ntombi comprehends this as a signal for her to make another contribution to the conversation and continues the conversation by speaking *I don't think it's changing, hey?*

Besides them, I don't know can express an approximation in the following example

32) Amira: What time will you return home today?

Vera: I've classes till two o'clock then I don't know three hours of work at learning centre and the way takes time.

Here, Vera is not sure how much time she works. Therefore she uses I don't know to input her uncertain time at the work as three hours.

Sometimes, speakers of ELF in recorded conversations inserted I don't know to introduce an utterance reformulation.

- 33) I find that [Social Work] to be more I don't know maybe that would interest me more. (Onraët 2011)

In this case, speaker understands the part of the utterance before I don't know (I find that to be more) is not conveyed the meaning as the author wanted so he/she used the discourse marker I don't know and then reformulates her previous utterance to be *maybe that would interest me more*.

Sort of and kind of

It is estimated that the phrases *sort of* and *kind of* are synonyms in almost every aspect. Onraët states there is other synonym for them in African English such as *type of*. They occur in a similar way in ELF as a filler to provide speaker time to find proper word and in ELF interactions sort of is more often used than kind of.

- 34) I sort of typed the questions of midterm and they are ready to print.

- 35) The manager kind of longingly accepted the offers of the workers under his hand.

Moreover, sort of and kind of can be used as semantic equivalents of *almost*.

- 36) When his mother came back home, her kid sort of ate all the chocolates in the fridge.

Here, if sort of is substituted with almost, the sense of the sentence will not change. kind of can be used as the semantic equivalent of almost as well and in the case meaning of the utterance will not change.

- 37) Then you get Shaoxing which is kind of like Cape Town [...] (Onraët)

The distinctive feature between kind of and sort of which was estimated by Onraët is that kind of can be used as the semantic equivalent of *a bit* while this does not

happen with sort of. Melissa in her data indicates an example of kind of in this sense. (Onraët 2011)

38) It's kind of hectic at times [...]

However, only sort of may be used together with other discourse markers whereas kind of was not. Michelle in Onraët's data supplies an example of this function.

39) You know sort of like it wasn't her birthday.

Here, sort of takes place together with the discourse markers *you know* and *like*.

2.4. Distinctive features of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) from Standard English (SE)

Our observations of the literature devoted to English as a Lingua Franca showed that International English has the following features:

- 1) ELF is more dynamic model than SE and permits for all manners of shading and overlaps among the circles because the participants have different language, cultural backgrounds. ELF interactions are focused on function rather than form. In other words, communicative efficiency is more important than correctness or accuracy. Consequently, ELF interactions are very often hybrid and mixture (Firth 2009).
- 2) Nativization is one of the major features of ELF that reflects the language. ELF acquires several formal and functional changes at its linguistic levels such as grammar, phonetics, lexis, discourse and literary creativity. In near future Uzbek- English will also be developed. One can foresee the following type of influence of Uzbek to the English language: in our language word stress is almost occurred in the final syllable except borrowings while in English it is not always fixed. In addition to this, Uzbek phonology possesses only one type of stress as primary while English has primary, secondary and even tertiary types. As a result of this Uzbeks who speak English will try to pronounce words with stress on the last syllable.
- 3) Particular sounds that are considered as unique for English are difficult to pronounce by non-native speakers. They are dental fricatives [ð], [θ] and dark l allophone [ɫ]. Even now they are often substituted by [f,v], [s,z] or [t,d] and [l] that are permissible in ELF interactions because they are not important for mutual intelligibility.
- 4) Aspiration of word initial voiceless stops [p], [t], [k] are pronounced without aspiration or as counterparts [b], [d],[g].
- 5) Shortening of vowels before voiceless consonants

e.g. treat is pronounced as [trit] instead of [tri:t] or sweat as [swit] instead of [swi:t].

6). The following phonological features of ELF may be frequently observed but do not result misunderstandings:

- a) vowel quality
- b) weak forms
- c) other features of connected speech such as assimilation
- d) pitch direction to signal attitude or grammatical meaning
- e) word stress placement

7) Deletion of the third person singular morpheme –s in Present Simple

e.g. Salima know and appreciate all your kindness.

8) Interchangeable use of the relative pronouns whom and which

e.g. the requirements who.....

this is the manager which.....

9) Misusing or omitting definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in SE

e.g. Their mothers are going to Ø school for the meeting tomorrow.

The committee decided to sign agreement which is profitable for its Members.

10) Use of prepositions according to native language

e.g. Let me congratulate you with (instead of on) your success

11) Insertion of prepositions where they are not necessary

e.g. Can you speak in English?

That boy which you mentioned met with a lot of girls

12) Overusing that clauses instead of infinitive constructions

e.g. I know that this sample is very difficult (ELF)

I know about difficulty of this sample (SE)

e.g. They prefer that they buy a new car. (ELF)

They prefer to buy a new car (SE)

13) Redundant explicitness

e.g. white colour rather than white

14) Speakers of ELF do not pay attention to the word order of SE.

e.g. What you are doing? (What are you doing)

Why your group did not attend speaking clubs? (Why did your group not attend speaking clubs)

15) Question word order is mostly remained in indirect questions

e.g. The manager asked what do the hosts need. (the manager asked what the hosts need)

16) The usage of stative verbs in Continuous Tense

e.g. You are believing me

Things are being better

17) Two notable syntactic processes are observed: simplification (shortening one's utterance and regularization (fronting lexical elements in an utterance)

e.g. We Ø supposed to come on time

Library research I should submit today

18) Verb agreement do not coincide with collective nouns

e.g. After the final team wants to have a rest at least a week

19) The head of noun phrase that functions as a subject of the sentence is grammatically singular but the verb is chosen in agreement with the closely preceding noun phrase.

e.g. Anybody except my workers are able to participate in the contest.

20) Some uncountable nouns may be regarded as countable nouns in speaker's

native language that is why they use them as countable
e.g. A maid should carry and deliver your luggage.

21) Simplifications of tense in conditional sentences

e.g. I wish you will be the happiest in the world.

When our teacher will give the material, our group will start the rehearsal.

22) Omission of auxiliary verbs

e.g. He representative of Greek poetry

We unaware of the latest news.

23) The use of negatives twice in a sentence

e.g. I did not accept none of you

She had not hardly spoken French

24) 'Can be able to' as a modal verb

e.g. You can be able to publish your article.

25) Several loan words are false cognates that may mean differently in English and speaker's native language. As a result the speaker is confused while using such words.

e.g. decade – ten days in Russian

decade – ten years in English

26) The participants of ELF interactions are too direct while asking questions or expressing an utterance whereas SE speakers use opening and closing phrases.

e.g. SE

ELF

Please refer to figure 1

Now look at figure 1

I'd better go somewhere

I'll go somewhere

It is worth noting that

Note that

27) Collocations are not regularly used in ELF correctly because they may use one of the parts of collocations as in their native languages.

e.g.	SE	ELF
	sharp difference	big difference
	take tablet	drink tablet
	young lawyer	baby lawyer
	let me pass	give me way

28) ELF interactions include at least 3 cultures while SE reflect only one culture.

Because in addition to either English or American culture, ELF speakers insert their individual cultural points too and any interaction contain at least one addresser and one addressee.

29) Pauses are quite often occurred in ELF interactions and it does not result inconvenient situations. The speakers do not regularly use fillers or hesitation markers in order to complete the silence between turns

e.g. Dildora: What was the word you exemplified for lexicalization

Jurabek:Uhm.....

Dildora: custom – customs

30) Overlapping is differently analysed because ELF includes the participants from various language backgrounds. Stereotypically, among Uzbek interlocutors overlapping speech is not cut off and repaired. Instead current speaker continues talking until another participant begins.

31) Another unique feature of ELF is the use of repairs such as interactive and self repairs.

e.g. Feruza: Yesterday Naima wanted to show a set of her practical works

on teaching. It's, it's not a portrait

Sahib: portfolio

Feruz: yeah, yeah, exactly.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to explore cultural and pragmatic features of ELF and to observe common and distinctive features between ENL and ELF. As Brumfit mentioned “No language is a single language...” because any language contains borrowings and accepts international terms and words. Culture and language always interrelate with each other and constantly culture reflects in language. Due to having three or more cultures in the ELF interactions, intercultural interpretations may be illustrated according to cultural background of the speakers because each participant in LF communication is the representative of his own culture.

The chapter indicates the outcomes small-talk researches by Meierkord, Onraët and illustrates their examples. Furthermore, I exemplified interactions in ELF by Uzbek students which I observed at our University. Essential features of lingua franca conversations such as the concept of turn taking, repetition, self-repair, interactive repair, back-channels, self-doubt of his proficiency, thinking aloud and code-switching, their emergence reasons are described. Generally, the linguistic feature (behavior) of participants in lingua franca face to face communications is based on two principles: Firstly, they prefer save face. The speakers avoid insulting behaviour such as using expressions their listeners might not comprehend. Secondly, they try to be benevolent attitude to each other when misunderstandings appear as a result of native cultural norms and standards and take advantage of supportive back-channels in the form of both verbal and laughing.

Moreover, several discourse markers that are frequently observed in LF interactions with their mixed diversity of functions are identified. Regarding discourse structure, unlike British or American speakers, lingua franca speakers do not often use opening and closing phrases, instead they prefer pauses. All in all, non the less intercultural pragmatics of ELF demonstrate different culture norms, participants tolerate to each other and place intelligibility in the first plan.

CHAPTER III. THE IMPORTANCE OF TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

3.1. RAISING AWARENESS FOR VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

The adoption of English as a Lingua Franca definitely affects the life of teachers. To illustrate with ‘New Englishes’ are regarded as ‘evolved’ forms of English that are commonly used in contexts where English is already considered and used as lingua franca. These languages have regular grammatical forms, their vocabulary and idioms and they are represented in literature that is appreciated as masterpiece. (John Norrish 2008). Because Nobel Prize for the literature was awarded to Soyinka and British- based prizes for fiction go to the authors whose works demonstrate multilingual background (Brumfit 2001). It should be pointed out that the adoption of English as International language involves inequality between native-speakers and non-native speakers of English in several cases. To illustrate, Japanese scientists would not win the Nobel Prize if they represented their discoveries in Japanese. Actually, it is not fair since this requires more time, energy to present their researches in English than in Japanese while the speakers of English L1 do not have necessity to do this. In this case, all world languages should be respected equally. On the contrary, the status of English as prevalent Lingua Franca is the opportunity to interact with people who can not share identical language. Furthermore, it is true that no one can master all world languages for international communication (Takagaki 2005).

New Englishes illustrate natural human creativity and playfulness with natural language: in West Africa ‘motorway’ does not mean usually used M25 but a wide receding forehead. Another example is ‘myself’ is a humiliating term used by tax drivers towards the owners of cars to mean ‘I’ll drive myself’. Likewise, ‘chop-bar’ is to refer open-airing, stand up eating-place. West Afrikaans use an answer to convey the need for short investigation ‘Wait small, I go come’ (Norrish 2008). Similarly, in the expanding circle interactions include such phenomena. In fact,

English has been lingua franca for a long time at least for business communication. In past the use of non-standard variety of English has been disapproved by English teachers. At present is it possible to refuse this process and do we need teach English as a Lingua

Franca? As Norrish exclaims that the obstacle to ELF approach is the viewpoints conveyed by plenty of learners that they want to know the variety of native speakers and refuse any other target than Standard English. These opinions mostly expressed by the learners who study English as specialty. In this case that's regarded as a proper decision because the language is their profession and they have sufficient time to acquire the language with several linguistic and cultural points. On the other hand, hundreds of people are eager to learn English for special or academic purposes. They just want to know the language in order to interact with people whose native languages are not identical with them for commercial purposes otherwise they intend to acquire language in order to study abroad for particular science.

The variations, style of the language are studied in sociolinguistics which includes the topics such as language policy and English as an international language. Sociolinguistics currently is regarded as significant trend in language learning. In fact, in majority educational institutions: schools, colleges, even some Universities teach English as Standard English without informing about its varieties. Therefore, students do not know major countries where English is spoken and their variations. Students deal with vocabulary and grammar accompanied with four skills but it is limited and one-sided view of English language while they are not aware of sociolinguistic perspective (Takagaki 2005). Having information about various varieties of English contribute learners to broaden their language knowledge. In addition to this, when students study the topic, they comprehend one variety is not better or inferior to another variety and results the tolerance for speakers of various dialects or varieties. Simultaneously, they consciously understand the role of English as Global language and inform about

multilingualism and the functions of English as an International Language. In order to inform about varieties of English Takagaki illustrates several ‘workshops’ – activities: (Takagaki 2005)

Activity1: English around the world

It is focused on raising student’s awareness of different varieties of English which are spoken all over the world. The teacher asks students to write the names of the countries where English is primary language and waits a couple of minutes. Students response mostly four major English-speaking countries Great Britain, The United States of America, Canada and Australia. Others may outline the countries where English is adopted as an official language but not native one such as Nigeria, India, and Singapore. The role of the teacher is that he should separate the countries into two columns on the blackboard. The first column comprises the countries where English is used as native language while the second column includes the countries where English is used as second or foreign language. After columns, teacher might explain Kachru’s circle model and exemplify countries. To illustrate, the Inner circle which contains the countries here English as the first language: e.g. Great Britain; the Outer circle in which English is used as a second or official language: e.g. India; the Expanding circle countries where English is studied as a foreign language: e.g. Korea. The next step of the teacher is to identify the differences of the varieties from one another. Moreover, he may take advantage of audio materials in which interactions may be uttered by the speakers who are belong to different circles. After playing track twice or more, teacher asks the students to guess the countries of the speakers. Definitely, it is difficult task and the aim is to raise awareness of various varieties of English not to score how many correct answers students can find.

Activity2: Variation within language

This activity is used to familiarize students with types of variations which take place in one country that is more difficult than the previous workshop. The purpose is to demonstrate in any country social and regional factors influence the way of speaking English. Takagaki illustrates his own example to manage the activity with the sentence of Japanese language. He puts down the sentence *Sonna kotowo shiteva ikemasen* in Japanese which means in Standard English *Don't do such a thing*. He asked students to give their own dialectal versions to this expression in order to capture attention to the different lexical choices of the dialects within one language. Finally, he exemplifies his sentence to indicate how it varies from others. In this case teacher can explain that social factors such as age, class and gender affect to emerge distinctive dialects. In order to more clarify the issue of dialect, teachers may outline several dialects which are spoken in English-speaking countries. Takagaki advises to show the video from the musical *My Fair lady* in which professor linguist Higgins tries to teach Standard English to the girl called Eliza who usually speaks Cockney which is spoken in London. Especially, one extract which professor uses *The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain* is very essential to demonstrate the distinctive features of the dialect. Because Eliza pronounces all [ei] diphthongs as [ai]. After watching the video he writes this part with gaps on the blackboard:

The _____ in _____ _____ in the _____.

Then, Takagaki orders the listeners to complete the gaps as they have listened on the video. In this activity he tried to show the concept of language style and proves that the speakers may use either formal or informal register depending on the situation that they may speak to their friends differently in the interaction with their boss. After watching the video controversial opinions are expressed by the students. Takagaki states that majority students commented the video as funny while others admitted that they learned about the dialects of English.

Activity 3: English as an International Language

The aim of the workshop is practically explain the importance of English as International Language. First of all the workshop starts with brainstorming activity such as how many languages are existed in the world and outlining ten of them which are spoken by more than 100 million native speakers. Then he lists ten countries in the following table.

Table 1. Top ten most commonly spoken languages (Takagaki 2005)

Rank	Language	Number of speakers
1.	Mandarin	1 billion
2.	English	508 million
3.	Hindustani	497 million
4.	Spanish	392 million
5.	Russian	277 million
6.	Arabic	246 million
7.	Bengali	211 million
8.	Portuguese	191 million
9.	Malay-Indonesian	159 million
10.	French	129 million

After indicating the amount of ‘top ten most commonly spoken languages’ by native speakers, the teacher should explain the adoption of English as lingua franca for business, aviation, science at the present time. Meanwhile, he may inform students that non-native speakers outnumber about four times over native speakers of the English at the present time (Crystal 2003). Consequently this statistics increases the state of English as an International Language and proves having the necessity to teach English as a Lingua Franca.

3.2. TEACHING ELF IN A FOREIGN CONTEXT

In fact, literature based on teaching English is published in Britain, United States or Australia but a great number of teachers and instructors of English are dealing with learners from quite different cultures. One of the crucial issues is methodology which is suitable for specific sociocultural contexts (Vitanova 2007). Several scholars (Pennycook 1994; Canagarah 1999) exclaim that teaching English as Western pedagogies and techniques, particularly, communicative approach might not always be appropriate in the other cultures. Canagarajah (1999) exemplifies how the students in Tamil high school opposed the Western cultural ideology and social values forced them with the use of American textbooks. Teaching students for ELF contexts is problematic issue because today's significant English has become lingua franca in which most of speakers want to learn the language for business or academic purposes. Naturally, the perspectives in teaching of English change from place to place and from time to time. It was considerable value to differentiate teaching process between ENL and ESL 50 years earlier (Brumfit 2001). At the present time we are moving to solve the problems of how to teach ELF. Researchers conclude that globalization of English changed the concept of native speaker, significantly for language educators and the process of teaching itself (Vitanova 2007). The concept of teaching differ from the past and the notion of the teacher as instructor changed to teacher as facilitator.

Teaching ELF intends several pedagogical aims: a focus on intelligibility rather than correctness, the strategies of interaction provide friendly relations, sensitivity in the chosen cultural context and respect for the local culture of teaching and learning (McKay 2002). Teachers frequently come across misunderstandings in terms of cross-cultural communication. It is impossible to prepare a student for each individual situation the learner may meet in alien country or while talking to a foreigner but discussions can be held in the time of the class connected with various cultures. In this case, it will be profitable for the teachers to know about other cultures, to get experienced life in other countries or merely communicate with the people from various cultures.

It goes without saying that the increasing awareness of the unique global role of English and its cultural, ecological, sociopolitical and psychological implications is directing to the realizations that this development involves linguistic changes. As a result if a language is received to be changing in its forms and its usage, it is inevitable to expect changing process in teaching as well (Seidlhofer 2004). But it does not mean descriptive facts should determine what is taught. Widdowson says that “linguistic descriptions can not automatically meet pedagogic requirements,” and it would be inappropriate to think that “findings should directly and uniquely inform what is included in language courses” (Widdowson, 2003, p.106).

An important step is to be taken into consideration new developments in the conceptualization and description of ELF since it is a variety that constitutes the essential content of language teaching. Gergana Vitanova demonstrates the results of questionnaire focused on how to teach EFL among the participants with particular experiences with oversea students. The issues to be discussed were the following:

- “How well does TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) education in the United States prepare students for the challenges of international sociocultural settings?
- What are the major difficulties EFL teachers encounter?
- What base of knowledge/ what courses do teachers find essential in teaching English as an international language?
- Can they apply the methodologies they acquire in North American-based programs to a different, foreign language milieu?” (Vitanova 2007).

In this questionnaire thirty five teachers took part in and all of them were well-educated at least with master’s degree, some of them had doctoral degree in teaching English as a Second language. The goal of the study was to find appropriate way how prepared graduates were for ELF contexts. Each of the participants were the teachers who taught English and observe the circumstances of

the countries such as Hungary, China, Japan, Germany, Spain, Bulgaria, Jordan, Turkey, Thailand, Colombia, Korea, United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Qatar. The time of filling the questionnaire continued two years to find out the perceptions of teaching abroad. And the answers were accepted in person or by e-mail and in person interview. Among the answers one participant wrote that several Chinese students felt inconvenient with teaching techniques. During in-person interview, she was asked to identify the techniques used and whether they belong to TESOL program. She criticized Western methodologies and their application in the foreign language context. When she taught in China she estimates as 'hardest time' making her college students move around the crowded classroom or order them to 'sit in circle and to do this communicative activity'. Consequently, this teacher found that her TESOL had not included this distinctive features between what the United States programs and the other countries in the world where traditional approaches were more prevalent. Another participant conveys that it is appropriate to adapt ESL materials to EFL environment and communication (Vitanova 2007).

All the responses concerned with difficulties and appropriateness with TESOL programs were reviewed and the findings were categorized into several parts:

- Perceived difficulties belong to teaching overseas
- Teachers perceptions of preparedness
- The methods in the international setting
- Essential knowledge types to teach abroad

Perceived difficulties

In the study most of attention is focused on to find difficulties for teaching abroad. The most of them comprise the lack of teaching aids, finding authentic materials, technical equipments and classroom conditions, especially large sized classes in some countries. The teachers emphasize critically about sociopedagogical level that is demonstrated in the speech of one participant:

“The problem is that institutions say they are teaching communication when indeed they are leaving it out because grammar, syntax, vocabulary is what counts. This is the schema students, most teachers, and most administrators have”. The participants also reported about sociopolitical difficulties such as anti-American attitudes. (Vitanova 2007).

Perception of Preparedness

The consequence of study indicates that only four of the participant teachers out of thirty five responded that they felt prepared confidently and seven stated that they were not ready while the rest both ‘yes’ and ‘no’ by proving particular circumstances. Furthermore, teachers criticized TESOL programs in the following levels. They are very theoretical except practical aspects of the teachers about how to design a lesson plan and the ways of teaching class with crowded students. The others complained about the shortage of training in English grammar.

Use of Methods

Among methods in English language teaching, communicative teaching method is widely used on the first plan in the countries that are called by Holliday (1994) as BANA (Britain, Australia, North America). This method involves activities that comprise authentic materials and interaction in a pair or small group. In plenty of countries around the world this method is frequently practiced and results efficiently. Most of the teachers in the study reflected these activities in EFL. One of the participants who worked in China claimed that her role as an English teacher is to create as many speaking chances as possible during the class. The question in the study whether the use of methods in ELF should differ from ESL. Majority of the participants responded ‘yes, definitely’ and ‘absolutely’ and provided their answers by referring different educational purposes. Below several viewpoints are illustrated by the teachers who practiced in the study:

“When I was in graduate school, explicit grammar instruction was very much discouraged. However, out in the real world, I’ve found it necessary and even helpful for students to be taught grammar.”

“I believe in basic conversational skills, first of all, everyday, practical, useful language. And I believe in getting students to speak and getting them to communicate with each other and giving them oral practice. I believe in group work and group interaction But I found that in China the students were not ready just to get up out of their seats and start exercising with me..... And it was completely foreign to them. They were very uncomfortable at first.”

“Methods are not the key. A teacher’s flexibility in adjusting to classroom situations and learners is the key.” (Vitanova 2007)

These examples refer that majority of teachers were informed about being sensitive to the necessities of their students. On the other hand other instructors in the study consider communicative approaches are appropriate in EFL situations. The participant exclaimed controversial points are as follows:

“Don’t underestimate the local teaching talent; they understand more the way of thinking of your students. Listen, adapt, try out and then decide on your teaching materials. If you are going to teach only by using English book, I am sure your class will be really boring.”

On the top of his words, he advises those who teach abroad to be tolerant to the local ways of learning and teaching and accept criticisms about Americanism. (Vitanova 2007)

Knowledge perceived essential for teaching abroad

What knowledge should teachers acquire beyond the subject matter in order to teach abroad? The responses for the question demonstrate that teachers should

know host culture, at least some general attitudes. Essentially, having some knowledge about local language and culture prevent lots of annoyance during the class. Furthermore, instructors who practiced abroad emphasize that they should acquire the following essential knowledge: They must be able to explain nuances of modern grammar of English to International students. One of the instructors who worked in Japan admitted that the native speakers of English know how to speak English but they do not know “the ins, the outs, and the whys” of its grammar without essential training. Teachers recommend that they teach students basic phonetic rules which are necessary to avoid misunderstandings and sociolinguistics that “tells you how language works basically in everyday life, how people use language, and for what purpose.” (Vitanova 2007). Currently, the most important issue of TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign language) is to be aware of English as an International Language and using its strategies in teaching. Unfortunately, majority of teachers around the world still do not admit the role of ELF and feel reluctance to teach other varieties except British or American. However, lots of learners want to acquire English for their own purposes. As Norrish (2008) refers teachers go on to be guided by the wants, wishes and needs of the learners and the social, professional or pedagogic in which they require to use the language. Therefore teachers have to know that the status of English is changing and the ownership of English is no longer in the hands of the native speakers. The various speakers of English as a lingua franca insert their own sociopolitical world pictures to the language and it is impossible for students to achieve each variety all over the world. However, teachers should acknowledge the existence of regional variants and appreciate for the variety of teaching methods that originated and are used in other countries.

Currently, English is the language most widely taught as a foreign language in more than 100 countries, such as Brazil , Russia, Germany, Spain, Egypt, China and at the same time English has become as the main foreign language to be encountered in schools, often displacing another language in the process. As an

example of replacement of English instead of French in Algeria which is the former colony of France may prove the statement.

In fact the speakers of English as an International language currently far outnumber native speakers. (Graddol 2006). This movement is strengthened by the awareness that the possession of English has moved away from native speakers towards non-native speakers who use English between themselves more than with native speakers. To the majority of speakers, English was something that students wanted to learn for their own purposes and such requirements carry special pedagogical implements. ELT (English Language Teaching) professionals and institutions are increasingly in demand to design and deliver English as LF. The first step to achieve this aim was the invention of reduced, easily learned auxiliary *Basic* English by C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards in the early 1930s. It was unique experiment in the pedagogy and design of English as an international in the early years of EFL profession. Basic English is not first stage of the Standard English for elementary learners but it is reduced model of the full language which comprises massive recycling of the core vocabulary. (Bill Templer 2006). The aim of the auxiliary language correspond to **B**usiness, **A**dministrative, **S**cientific, **I**nstructional and **C**ommercial uses that is not just minimal lexis and essential English grammar, as Templer quoted Richards “but a highly organized system designed throughout to be as easy as possible for a learner” Basic English is possibly to consider as “English in a nutshell” (Bill Templer 2006). This system includes 850 headwords which do the functions of 20 000 words and supply a second or international language which will take not much time to learn English. These words are selected according not to the frequency of occurrence but the conception of semantic sequencing. The classic Basic English with 850 word list contains 100 operation Words, the 600 things (400 General and 200 Picturable) and 100 Qualities and the 50 Opposites put in columns on a single sheet of paper, is an emblem of that economy in learning effort, compactness of presentation, and the separation from the content words. The words were selected as a result of researches for 7 years based on the powers of English words and how they could

take over the work of others. Of 850 essential words, 513 are monosyllabic and a further 254 have penultimate stress that reduces problems connected with stress which is especially difficult for Asian tone languages because initially, Basic English was created in order to economical contact with the countries in Asia Pacific region as the first step of ELF. The original Basic comprises 16 verbs and operators: *come, get, give, go, keep, let, make, put, seem, take, be, do, have, say, see, send*, together with *may and will* as well as 20 prepositions and particles. Taking advantage the suffix *-ed*, lots of additional verbal qualities may be created, such as “*I was surprised* from the noun *surprise* or *it was covered with flowers* from the noun *cover*” (Bill Templer 2006). Otherwise noun is formed by adding the suffixes *-er* and *-ing*: *writing, writer* for 300 hundred nouns in the list. Paraphrasing is the one of the main technique in teaching Basic English. e.g., *give up* instead of *abandon, abdicate, resign, vacate*; *go down* instead of *jump*; *have a sleep* instead of *sleep* and etc. The verb *know* is substituted by *have a knowledge of, be certain of, be clear about*. The verb *forget* may be expressed with the help of merely one or two of 16 operators in the Basic list: *not take into account, not keep in memory* or *remember may be to keep in memory or to get back in memory*. The examples above can prove how Basic gives opportunity the learners of ELF to tell things with the help of words in the list, in this case, *memory* and *account* are outlined in the list. Making phrasal verbs is the main capability of Basic English which is taught very systematically. Furthermore, about 50 international words were included as supplement the prime vocabulary(850 words) along with numbers, months and days of week. In addition to them there is a list of 50 words for specialized fields about business and science. The General Basic English Dictionary (Orthological Institute, 1940/1993) contains 40 000 meanings of 20 000 words in Standard English, all defined in Basic English. The Basic Dictionary of Science (Graham, 1966) outlines definitions of 25 000 scientific terms in.

Another convenient feature that should be stated learning Basic English does not last much and can be taught at minimum cost and in low-resourced learning environments. Ogden emphasized that it would take seven years to learn Standard

English, seven months to learn Esperanto and seven weeks for Basic English (Wikipedia, 2006). Jenkins states that oral presentations at scientific conferences, particularly by nonnative speakers of English need a lean and effective medium for EAP (English for Academic Purpose) with simplified phonology and cross-cultural comprehensibility (Jenkins 2006) and Basic having relative cultural neutrality can be a tool for practical communication and understanding among nonnative speakers. In teaching ELF Basic English can serve as very effective means with its ease and comfort.

Seidhofer claims that "one of the traditional problems of language pedagogy has always been how to simplify the language input for learning. This has generally involved denaturalizing actually occurring language input for learning in a somewhat adhoc fashion. Basic can be said to be systematic 'denaturalization' which provides for such necessary simplication".(Seidhofer 2002. p.295). Basic English indicates main features of pedagogical principles of learnability and teachability rather than styles and registers of native speaker language use. Teaching Basic English for the first year students during two months in not only non-special but also special institutions can be very appropriate and effective because it serves as foundation for those who continue learning English.

Summary

This chapter is dedicated to revealing the characteristic features of English as a Lingua Franca. We can not but agree that English has become an International Language and the future specialists of English (teachers, translators, interpreters) should know the peculiar features of World English. In our opinion there must be a brief course on the subject mentioned because in our country as it is stated in the Decree of the President the Republic of Uzbekistan (PD-1875 from December 10, 2012 “On the Measures for Further Improvement of Foreign Languages learning System”): we shall have to radically improve the system of teaching foreign languages to the young generation, training of specialists to be fluent in them, through the introduction of advanced teaching methods with the use of modern teaching and information-communication technologies and based on this we shall have to create conditions and opportunities for their wider access to the achievements of world civilization and world information resources, international cooperation and communication. We cooperate not only with specialists of USA and Great Britain but with world community and our students should be aware of peculiar features of World Englishes.

In the chapter three workshops by Takagaki contribute to the organization of the lessons to make students aware and differentiate the varieties of English and finally to perceive why English is used as an International Language.

The following part of the chapter reports about important features that should be taken into consideration in teaching oversea students. Teaching ELF includes several pedagogical aims: a focus on intelligibility rather than correctness, the strategies of interaction that provide friendly relations, sensitivity in the chosen cultural context and respect for the local culture of teaching and learning (McKay 2002).

Furthermore, the chapter concerned with initial step of English as an International language. It was invented particularly for Asian countries regarding their linguistic peculiarities. It is well organized system to ease learning and reduce

time for learning process. This English contains merely 850 words including mostly monosyllabic words and hot verbs which are very productive to make collocations. One of the authors of Basic English Ogden emphasized that it would take seven years to learn Standard English, seven months for Esperanto and seven weeks for Basic English (wikipedia.com). As Seidlhofer mentioned if one of problems of the language pedagogy is to simplify the language for learning, in this case Basic English obviously acquires this quality. Teaching Basic English in ELF classrooms is particularly effective because most of the learners want to learn English in a short time for commercial or academic purposes. On the other hand, teaching Basic English at Higher Educational Institutions of English Specialty during two months involves the increasing communicative competence of the learners and after that the students may continue broadening their language knowledge.

Conclusion

The concept of ELF means democratization of attitudes to English everywhere on the globe and equalizes ENL, ESL and EFL notions. The variety of ELF has special characteristic features in language levels such as pronunciation, grammar, lexis and discourse. The essential features of ELF situations have often new conversation partners so speaker community is dynamic rather than remaining stable and fixed. The data in the research indicates that all distinctive features of ELF interactions depend on the speakers' linguistic background since the participants in lingua franca conversations are the representatives of their individual mother cultures. Therefore it is natural to expect interferences and facilitations from different native languages. As for Uzbek the following interferences may be observed:

- the system of word order in Uzbek do not coincide with English as a result it interferes and affects in the utterances of ELF
- English language is stress timed language whereas Uzbek is syllable timed that involves falling incorrect stress.
- Several uncountable nouns in English are regarded as countable in Uzbek. e.g. money, bread, information.

Moreover facilitation features are possibly occurred:

- In both languages' sound systems possess the sound [ŋ]
- Order of word combinations in attribute + subject are frequently correspond to each other.

e.g. wonderful times

ajoyib vaqtlar

Kate's bird

Keitning qushi

The key factor is to express culture is the context that defines cultural background in which communication takes place. When people from different backgrounds interact it is natural to break down the conversation if they do not share similar cultural contexts. Therefore being intercultural competent containing the following features prevents breakdowns in ELF interactions.

- tolerance to other cultures
- a perception of social practices and products in not only native but target culture
- the capability to relate something from another culture and make it comprehensible to members of ones own
- the ability to use cultural knowledge in authentic situations
- the ability to criticize the culturally practices and the products of one's own culture and other cultures.

In the interactions of ELF at least three cultures (because in addition to either English or American culture, ELF speakers insert their individual cultural points too and any interaction contain at least one addresser and one addressee) are attended and on the top of them English stands. ELF as medium communication non the less how many and what culture representatives utter in the interaction the culture of English speaking countries influence and serve as bridge to connect the speakers who can not share their native languages.

The research demonstrates pragmatic features of ELF interactions in the main part addressing several researches by linguists in a number of Expanding circle countries such as Firth (1996), Meierkord (1996, 2002), House (1999, 2002), Lesznyak (2002) work on the data from various native language backgrounds. The contexts in the researches include dinner conversations, group discussions, simulated conferences and business telephone calls. Simultaneously, I analysed ELF interactions among Uzbek students and consequently it should be pointed out that from the point of view of pragmatics, ELF differs from SE with the structure of discourse and politeness phenomena. The participants of ELF do not frequently use opening and closing phrases and present frequent and long pauses between and within turns.

A large working memory goes with good conversational and communication skills. Studies in some countries (Sweden) show that working memory becomes smaller when we can not "hear" well. Phonological processing is the most basic brain activity for all language tasks. In order to have good communicative

competence the specialists in all fields must know different pronunciation, grammatical and vocabulary usage properties of English as an International language. I state this because Uzbekistan is developing political, economic relations not only with such countries as Great Britain, USA the citizens of which speak Standard English but many other countries of the world who make wide use of English as an International Language or Lingua Franca which have their own features in its structure. I'm sure this in near future our country will also develop its own option of English because Uzbek will render its own influence to the English language, as this phenomenon has occurred in India, Japan, China and many other countries. It is reality and everybody is aware of this. Our brains are shaped by the native language, and they remain so life-long. When we hear a phoneme that is similar to one in our own language, the neurons fire as if it were the same and this process helps to learn foreign language easily.

All specialists should know the peculiarities of Lingua-Franca, especially the teachers of English. Because they are going to schools, lyceums and colleges and Higher Educational Institutions where the future specialists (diplomats, engineers, biologists and so on) are trained. Therefore, it is a must to know Lingua-Franca for everybody. To achieve good results the specialists must be competent not only in their field of specialty but in language. Our choice of the topic as a dissertation paper can be explained by the facts mentioned above.

Our research revealed that Uzbek ELF speakers use frequently discourse markers for different functions. With regard to the agreement between verbs and their subjects, speakers produce errors of concord. However, they are not completely deficient in the use of third-person verb form markers because there are some cases in their conversations where these agreements are formulated correctly according to SE. Moreover, the Uzbeks code-switch inserting from their native language for different discursive reasons and word order changes are observed since Uzbek is considered as SOV constructed language while English is SVO. Moreover, they reduce copula between subject and verb in nominal predicative.

As for teaching English in ELF classrooms the following aims and approaches are maintained:

aims:

- intelligibility rather than correctness
- supporting learners develop interaction strategies
- fostering textual competence (reading and writing skills for learner selected purposes)

approaches:

- sensitivity in the choice of cultural content in materials
- reflexivity in pedagogical procedures
- respect for the local culture of learning

Being aware of unique global role of English, its cultural, ecological, sociopolitical and psychological implications are gradually leading to the realization that these developments have linguistic consequences.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining "Chet tillarini o'rganish tizimini yanada takomillshtirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida" gi 2012 yil 10 dekabrdaqi N PQ-1875-sonli qarori.
2. Ashurova D.U. Text Linguistics. – Tashkent: Tafakkur qanoti, 2012. 204p.
3. Breiteneder, A. The naturalness of English as a European lingua franca: the case of the "third person –s" // Vienna English Working Papers, 2005. – Vol.14. №2. – P. 3-26.
http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/ang_new/online_papers/views/archive.htm
4. Brooks N. Teaching culture in foreign language classroom // In Pathways to culture: Readings on teaching culture in a foreign language class, ed. P. R. Heusinkveld. – Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1997. – P. 11-38.
5. Brown D. Principles of language learning and teaching. – San Francisco: Prentice Hall Regents, 1994. 266 p.
6. Brumfit Ch. Individual freedom in language teaching. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. 270 p.
7. Canagarajah S.A. Resisting linguistic imperialism. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. 230 p.
8. Cogo, A., Dewey M. Efficiency in ELF communication: from pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation // Nordic Journal English Studies, 2006. – Vol.5. №2. – P. 59-93.
9. Cohen A.D., Paige R.M., Kappler B., Demmessie M., Weaver S., Chi J.C. and Lassegard J.P. Maximizing study abroad: A language instructor's guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use. – Minneapolis: Center for advanced research for acquisition, University of Minnesota, 2003. 300 p.
10. Crystal D. English as a global language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 212 p.

11. Firth A. The discursive accomplishment of normality. On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis // *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1996. Vol.26. – P.237–259.
12. Firth A. The lingua franca factor // *Intercultural pragmatics*, 2009. – Vol.6. №2. – P.147-170.
13. Frank G. Raising cultural awareness in the English language classroom // *English teaching forum*, 2013.—Vol.51. №4. P.2-11.
14. Gnutzman C. Teaching and learning English as a global language. Native and non-native perspectives. – Tubingen: Stauffenburg, 1999. 202 p.
15. Gough D. Black English in South Africa. In de Klerk, V. (ed.) 1996. From the series *Varieties of English around the world. Focus on South Africa* Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. Vol. 15. – P. 52-77.
16. Graddol D. The future of English. – London: The British Council, 1997. 215 p.
17. Graddol D. English Next. Why global English may mean the end of “English as a Foreign Language.” – London: British Council, 2006. 217 p. Retrieved February 21, 2006. from <http://www.british.org/learning-research-englishnext>.
18. House, J. Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca // In Knapp, K., and C. Meierkord. (eds.) *Lingua franca communication*. – Frankfurt Am Main: Peter Lang, 2002. P. 245-267.
19. Hall E.T. *Beyond culture*. – New York : Anchor Press. 1976. 176 p.
20. House, J. The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca // In Trosborg, A. (ed.) *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*. – Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 2010. P. 363-390.
21. Holliday A. *Appropriate methodology and social context*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 354 p.
22. Holliday A. *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. 215 p.

23. Jenkins J. The Phonology of English as an International language. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 148 p.
24. Jenkins J. A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language // Applied Linguistics, 2002. – Vol.23. №1. P.83-103.
25. Jenkins J. Global intelligibility and local diversity: Possible or paradox? // In M. Saraceni & R. Rubdy (Eds.), English in the world: Global rules, global roles. – London: Continuum, 2006. – P. 32-99.
26. Kachru B.B. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle // In Quirk, R., and H.G. Widdowson (eds.) English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and the British Council, 1985. P.11-30.
27. Kachru B.B. The spread of English and sacred linguistic cows // In Lowenberg P.H.(ed.) language spread and language policy: issues, implications, and case studies. (GURT 1987). – Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 1988. – P.207-228.
28. Kachru B.B. World Englishes 2000: resources for research and teaching // In Smith L.E. & Foreman M.L. (eds.) World Englishes 2000. – Honolulu, HI: Hawaii University Press, 1997. – P.209-251.
29. Kachru B.B. English: World Englishes // In Brown K. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. P.195-202.
30. Kirkpatrick A. World Englishes. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 278 p.
31. Klimpfinger T. “Mind you, sometimes you have to mix” – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca // Vienna English Working Papers, 2007. – Vol.16. №2. P. 36-62.
<http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views.htm>

32. Koole T. and Thije J. The construction of intercultural discourse // Team discussions of educational advisers. – Amsterdam, 1994. P 32-36.
33. Leznszyak A. From chaos to smallest common denominator. Topic management in English lingua franca communication // In Karlfried K. and Christiane M. (eds.) *Lingua Franca communication*. – Frankfurt: Lang, 2002. P.164-194.
34. Malan, K. 1996. Cape Flats English // In de Klerk V. (ed.). 1996. *From the series Varieties of English around the world. Focus on South Africa.*— Vol.15. – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. P. 125-148.
35. McArthur T. “The English language or the English languages?” // In Bolton W. & Crystal D. (eds.) *The Penguin history of literature: English language.*—London: Penguin Books, 1993. P.323-341.
36. McArthur, T. *The Oxford Guide to World English*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. 248 p.
37. McKay S.L. *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches.*—Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. 302 p.
38. McEwan M.J. A comparative study in grammatical competence of standard ten English second language learners from different native language backgrounds, namely English and Afrikaans // Unpublished Honours essay. – Rhodes: Rhodes University Press, 1992. P 17-22.
39. Medgyes P. *The non-native teacher*. – London: MacMillan, 1994.
40. Meierkord C. Interpreting successful lingua franca interaction: an analysis of non-native-/non-native small talk conversations in English // *Linguistik online*, 2000.—Vol.5.
http://www.linguistikonline.de/1_00?MEIERKOR.HTM
41. Meierkord C. “Language stripped bare” or “linguistic masala”? culture in lingua franca communication // In Knapp K. & Meierkord C. (eds.) *Lingua franca communication.*—Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 2002. P.109-134.
42. Meierkord C. Syntactic variation in interactions across international Englishes // *English World-Wide*, 2004. – Vol.25. №1. P.109-132.

43. Mollin S. English as a lingua franca: a new variety in the new expanding circle? // *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 2006. – Vol.5. №2. P. 41-57.
44. Mollin, S. New variety or learner English? Criteria for variety status and the case of Euro-English // *English World-Wide*, 2007. – Vol.28. №2. P.167-185.
45. Norrish J. Adopting English as a lingua franca // *Voices*, 2008. – January-February. P. 4-5.
46. NSFLEP (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project). Standards for foreign language in the 21st century. – Yonkers, NY: NSFLEP, 1996. 27 p.
47. Onraët L.A. English as a Lingua Franca and English in South Africa: distinctions and overlap. Diss. ...mas. philol. – Stellenbosch, 2011. 168 p.
48. Pölzl, U. Signalling cultural identity: the use of L1/Ln in ELF // *Vienna English Working Papers*, 2003. – Vol.12. №2. P.3-23.
http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/ang_new/online_papers/views/archive.htm
49. Pennycook A. The cultural politics of English as an international language. – London: Longman, 1994. 234 p.
50. Seidlhofer B. Mind the gap: English as a mother tongue vs. English as a lingua franca // *Vienna English Working Papers*, 2000. – Vol.9. №1. P.51-68.
http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/ang_new/online_papers/views/archive.htm
51. Seidlhofer B. Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca // *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2001. Vol. 11. №2. P.133-158.
52. Seidlhofer, B. Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca // *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 2004. – Vol.24. P.209-239.
53. Seidlhofer B. Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca // *World Englishes*, 2009. – Vol.28. №2. P.236-245.
54. Svartvik J. and G. Leech. *English: one tongue, many voices*. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 301 p.

55. Takagaki T. Raising students' awareness of the varieties of English // English Teaching Forum, 2005. – Vol.43. №2. P.4-7. 16-17.
56. Templer B. Revitalizing “Basic English” in Asia: New directions in English as a lingua franca // TESL Reporter, 2006. – Vol.39. №2. P.17-33.
57. Vitanova G. English as an international language pedagogy: What teachers' voices tell us // TESL Reporter, 2007. – Vol.40. №1. P.1-16.
58. Watermeyer S. Afrikaans English // In de Klerk V. (ed.), 1996. From the series Varieties of English around the world. Focus on South Africa. – Vol. 15. – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. P. 99-123.
59. Widdowson H.G. Defining issues in English language teaching. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. 306 p.
60. Махкамова Г. Межкультурные измерения ценностных ориентаций, языка, дискурса и поведения. – Ташкент: Tafakkur qanoti, 2012. 118 с.
61. Юсупов У.К. Теоретические основы сопоставительной лингвистики. – Ташкент, 2007. 179р.

DICTIONARIES

62. Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary. – London/Glasgow, 1992. 753 p.
63. Graham E.C. The Basic dictionary of science. – New York: Macmillan, 1966. 178 p.
64. Hornby A.S. Oxford student's dictionary of current English. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984. 770 p.
65. Iriskulov A.T., Butayev Sh. English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionary. – Tashkent: Fan, 2008. 837 p.
66. Richards J.C., Platt J., Platt H. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. – Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1992. 205 p.

INTERNET SOURCES

67. www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/linguafranca.htm

68. Wikipedia Foundation, Inc. (2006). Basic English. Retrived mrch 4, 2006,
from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Basic_English

67. answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid