

Erasmus exchange students: A behind-the-scenes view into an ELF community of practice

Karolina Kalocsai, University of Szeged

The present paper examines how some Erasmus exchange students studying temporarily at the University of Szeged or at the Charles University in Prague are socialized in(to) their new communities of practice. The paper adopts a language socialization perspective combined with a community of practice approach, and thus contributes to a vastly under-researched area within ELF. The paper reveals that the participants collect first hand experience of using ELF within their newly emerging Erasmus community of practice. Very importantly, though, ELF, is not the only language that they are using within the Erasmus community; and the Erasmus community is not the only community of practice which they orient themselves to. As will be shown, their experience of language socialization is a multifaceted one, characterized by pride and satisfaction, on the one hand, and dilemmas and regret, on the other.

Introduction

Recently, English as a lingua franca (ELF) research has seen a major shift. Initially, research was conducted from the perspective of second language acquisition (SLA). The communication under investigation was defined as a 'NNS-NNS' (non-native speaker), or an 'L2-L2' (second language learner) type of intercultural communication. The speakers' performance was matched against that of the native speakers (NS), and their deviations from the NS norm were regarded by some as errors or deficiencies. Often the speakers were described in terms of what they 'lacked' and what they did 'wrong'. The focus was on interlanguage communication, with a relatively large body of research done into interlanguage pragmatics (e.g. Meeuwis 1994; Neil 1996; Meierkord 1998, 2000; House 1999). Since the early stages of its development, the field has evolved.

Drawing on Jenkins (2007: 17), Cogo (2008: 59) points out that current research into ELF "sits perfectly 'comfortably within a World Englishes framework'", and "works *with* it, rather than *against* it, in a number of directions" (emphasis original). The term 'World Englishes', used widely since

Author's email: kalocsai2000@yahoo.com

ISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä

© 2009: The author

<http://apples.jyu.fi>

the 1980s (McArthur 1998), promotes a pluralistic view of English and “acknowledges the existence of [different] varieties of English without assigning primacy or superiority to the traditional varieties” (Lesznyák 2004: 31). The main tenets of this paradigm are a shift away from NS norms, and the appreciation of difference. Likewise, in the field of ELF, the NS-NNS dichotomy is considered irrelevant, and the notions of ‘NNS’ and ‘L2 learner’ are avoided. The communication itself is defined as a ‘contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture” (Firth 1990). The efficiency of the talk depends, to a large extent, on the appropriateness of English use in specific contexts. The speakers, who may “operate according to their own “commonsense” criteria” (Seidlhofer 2005a: 161), are referred to as autonomous ‘language users’ (Cook 2002). Due to the ELF speakers need to adopt and adapt the language to their own needs, there are perhaps as many varieties of ELF as the lingua franca contexts (Cogo 2008: 59).

ELF research to date has been mainly descriptive (Jenkins 2000, 2002; Seidlhofer 2004, Jenkins 2006: 170, Cogo 2007). Researchers have compiled a number of corpora, and have put a considerable effort into documenting the features that are common to all ELF varieties, as well as the ones that are specific to distinct ELF varieties, their ultimate goal being to provide an empirical basis for the codification of ELF (Seidlhofer 2004 cited in Jenkins 2006: 170). Remarkable as these developments are, there remain some major problems to deal with. One concerns the question of context in ELF for a great deal of research into ELF still looks at the “code”, and not so much the context; and the other concerns the problem of learning. In much of current ELF research, the concept of ‘learning’ is taken to imply learners aiming at NS norms and it typically evokes negative reactions. This paper suggests that the notion of learning can be reclaimed and reinterpreted positively using a community of practice model, which frames learning on grounds that have until now not been explored in the area of ELF research.

Communities of practice provide a model where ELF speakers learn, while at the same time constructing identities in relation to the community. It views learning as a socially situated discourse. It shifts attention away from the close analysis of language forms and functions to a much broader analysis of communities within which speakers, to varying degrees, participate. The context of learning is, therefore, defined in terms of social engagement. This approach has emerged as an alternative in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) in the past several years. Although there is still some debate surrounding its place in current SLA research, partly because it challenges the dominant view of L2 learning as an individual cognitive process, the new trend is expanding. In this paper, I am encouraging a similar development in ELF. By adopting a community of practice model, my purpose is to show that a practice approach has a huge potential not only for the field of SLA, but also for the field of ELF.

The present paper seeks to explore what some of the Erasmus exchange students’ experiences of language socialization into their temporary communities of practice are. In other words, it focuses on what some Erasmus exchange students, as members of an ELF community of practice, learn socially and linguistically over time. A particular focus is on the role of ELF and other foreign and local languages in the participants’ socialization and community building. Specifically, I address three themes that have emerged as salient in the analysis of the data – namely, the participants’ new repertoire in ELF, their realization of their ELF identity, and their desire for and difficulty in accessing

local student networks. The data for the present study come from two sources: interview data I and a researcher colleague collected under the auspices of the LINEE project, and observational data I individually collected, under the auspices of the LINEE project, for the purposes of my doctoral dissertation. More specifically, the interview data come from 26 Erasmus exchange students who were interviewed in Szeged and Prague in the spring and autumn of 2007; the observational data come from the group of roughly 80 Erasmus students who, while studying temporarily in Szeged in the academic year 2008/09, formed an ELF community of practice.

Theoretical Assumptions

The changing function of English around the world is well documented (e.g. Crystal 1997, Graddol 1997). Socioeconomic and political developments in general, and globalization in particular, have turned English into the world's first global language (McArthur 1998), most evident in the diversity of its users, uses and forms (Lesznyák 2004) and the vast number of its speakers (Coleman 2006). English is no longer reserved for a relatively narrow range of purposes mainly in encounters with NS of the language but is used widely by innumerable people as a vehicle for lingua franca (NNS NNS) interaction (Jenkins 2005). In fact, more speakers use English with other NNSs than with English NSs (Jenkins 2000, 2006; Seidlhofer 2004) and already, more than a decade ago, the non-native (NN) users already outnumbered the NSs in a ratio of about 5:1 (Kachru 1996: 241). These new circumstances present new problems, new opportunities, and new points of view for future research (Jenkins 2000: 6; Seidlhofer 2007: 310).

Current ELF research has benefited from recent research findings which question the NS-NNS dichotomy. Traditionally, the NSs have been seen as norm-providers, that is, providing the norms for speaking and behaving, and the NNSs as norm-followers, that is, aiming to speak *like* and speak *with* NSs. However, researchers who take into consideration learners' identity, norms, goals, agency and voice caution against referring to the NSs as the models for the NNSs. They specify several reasons for why the NS-NNS dichotomy is inappropriate in its traditional sense. One, language knowledge develops in "culturally-framed and discursively patterned communicative activities" (Hall et al. 2006: 228), meaning that not all NSs develop the same linguistic competence. Two, as linguistic knowledge is inseparable from sociocultural knowledge (e.g. Rampton 1990, 1995; Norton 1997, 2000), native-speakerness cannot be restricted to the linguistic competence of a monolingual. Three, the learners are active, rather than passive, participants who take decisions about whether they wish to learn and practice (e.g. Siegal 1996; Pavlenko & Lantolf 2000; Norton & Toohey 2001; Morita 2004), and if so, how much time and effort they want to put in their learning (Norton Pierce 1995). Finally, learners need not adopt the desired L2 cultures and identities, but may well want to negotiate and identify with new cultures and new ways of speaking (Kramsch 1998). In fact, adopting and adapting a foreign language to the speakers' own needs and interests, that is, appropriation (Kramsch 1998: 81) may, in certain contexts, be more valued and appreciated than following pre-set norms and goals.

One of the major concerns of current ELF research, which, as I have pointed out above, shares a common ground with the World Englishes paradigm, is

appropriation. The ‘World Englishes’ paradigm promotes a pluralistic view of English, and “attempt[s] to grasp the present-day diversity of the language” (Lesznyák 2004: 31). It rejects the NS ideology and “refers to a bilingual proficient speaker as an empirically based alternative to native norms (Cogo 2008: 59). The ELF speakers are not labeled as L2 learners “always on the way to native speaker status but doomed never to get there” (Cook 2005: 3); nor are they referred to as NNSs which would imply that they are passive imitators of an external norm; rather, they are referred to as “L2 users”, which implies a speaker who uses an L2 “for the needs of his or her everyday life” (Cook 2003: 5). Their primary motive is said to be achieving efficiency and mutual intelligibility (e.g. Jenkins 2005). Hence, they are given the legitimacy to negotiate the norms of their language use on the spot on a moment-to-moment basis.

In fact, ELF speakers are not only given the legacy to adapt the language to new contexts, but are expected to do so. The essentials of their communication are, amongst other strategies, accommodation and negotiation of meaning (e.g. Jenkins 2000, 2005). Accommodation means the process in which speakers in a given situation “usually unconsciously, adjust their speech and non-verbal behaviour, fine-tune these to become more accessible and more acceptable to each other” (Seidlhofer 2005a: 160). Through convergence speakers co-create a shared ELF repertoire, which may or may not be meaningful outside of the local context. As regards the strategy of negotiation of meaning, it concerns the process in which speakers indicate, react to, interactionally manage, and ultimately resolve non-understandings (Pitzl 2005: 14, 56-58). While these strategies are used by the ELF speakers with the goal of achieving shared understanding in the most efficient way, they do more than ensure mutual understanding. As recent research has shown, they contribute to “a feeling of shared satisfaction” (Hülmbauer 2007: 10), which, at the interpersonal level of talk, may mean the signaling of solidarity and/or the establishment of rapport (e.g. Kordon 2006, Cogo 2007, Cogo in press).

The field of ELF research has been evolving fast, and one of the future directions that might benefit it is orientation to a social approach to learning. The comprehensive study of the social and the cultural in SLA began in the 1990s. Implicit was the assumption that learning and development are situated in, and thus inseparable from, the social, cultural and historical contexts (Norton & Toohey 2001: 310); and that language is the locus of social organization, power, and individual consciousness (Pavlenko 2001: 120).

Various theories and perspectives emerged such as the ‘sociocultural’ theory (Lantolf 2000), the ‘language socialization’ theory (Watson-Gegeo 2004), the ‘situated learning’ theory (Rogoff 1990, 2003) and the community of practice model (Lave & Wenger 1991). While there is not a singular approach or paradigm underlying them (e.g., Silverman 2006: 57, Duff 2008b: 28), they all emphasize the need to look beyond the linguistic details of the learners’ competence or production (Duff 2008b: 18), and thus explore a range of ‘new’ issues. These may be grouped as follows: (1) the learners’ agency, identities, affiliation, desires/needs, trajectories, goals, options and resources (e.g. McKay & Wong 1996, Pavlenko & Lantolf 2000, Morita 2004, Duff 2007); (2), the learners’ acceptance, accommodation, resistance, rejection and ambivalence towards the target community (e.g. Norton 2000, Toohey 2000); (3), the target communities’ practices, behaviors, values and attitudes towards the learner (e.g. Li 2000); and (4), larger macro-contextual social, political, and cultural factors,

or ideologies and their implications for the micro-context of learning (e.g. Duff 1995, 1996; Willett 1995, Siegal 1996, Duff & Early 1996).

The language socialization perspective is an alternative but, I believe, a very fruitful way of contextualizing learning *in* and *through* ELF. Socialization is the process whereby a newcomer to a group develops, through repeated engagement in and experience with the practices of the target group, the ability to participate as a competent member (Hall 1993). Language socialization is the same process but with the additional gain of linguistic learning. As Ochs and Schieffelin (2008: 5) put it, language socialization “encompasses socialization *through* language and socialization *into* language”, the implications being that language is both the *means* and the *goal* of the socialization process. Within such a framework, then, a fundamental question to ask is *how* novices to a particular “culture” acquire the types of knowledge that will make them communicatively as well as culturally competent (Duff 2008a).

Of particular importance to this paper is the so called situated learning theory, or the practice view of language socialization (Langman 2003: 183). This theory implies that language socialization is not simply a developmental process or a training ground preparing individuals for adult participation in a community, but rather a practice in its own right (Langman 2003: 183). It involves the individuals participating in the activities of social communities and constructing identities in relation to these communities (Wenger 1998: 4). Importantly, the practice view suggests that the forms of participation are adjusted not to some fixed norm or value, but rather to norms and values which are in constant state of negotiation (Langman 2003: 183). Possible sites of learning through participation are the so called communities of practice, introduced by Lave and Wenger (1991). The term refers to social groups “created over time by the [members’] sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise” (Wenger 1998: 45). In other words, within communities of practice the actions and interactions are not fixed but are “in the service of [jointly negotiated] enterprises and identities” (Wenger 1998: 125).

Recently, many L2 studies have adopted a community of practice approach. Much research has been conducted into communities related to education, work and entertainment, the most thriving fields of inquiry being L2 writing and academic discourse socialization (e.g. Morita 2004, Kobayashi 2004) and the L2 socialization of mainstreamed ESL students (e.g. Harklau 1999, 2000; Duff 2002, 2004; Willett 1995). In addition, there are studies that explore language socialization into transnational, diasporic, immigrant, postcolonial, and virtual communities (e.g. Potts 2005). This line of research has shown that L2 socialization may well lead to “other outcomes” (Duff 2007: 311) such as, (1) hybrid practices, identities and values; (2) behaviors, attitudes and identities contingent on others in the community; (3) multiple identities; (4) incomplete or partial approximation of the target community; (5) rejection of the target norms and practices; and (6) ambivalence about becoming (fuller) members (Duff 2007: 311).

Language socialization into lingua franca communities, which is the reality of an ever growing number of people in our globalized world, has received little attention in research. This is quite surprising given the fact that current research into ELF (e.g. Jenkins 2000, 2005, 2006; Pölzl & Seidlhofer 2006; Cogo 2007; Hülmbauer 2007) emphasizes the negotiability of norms and the appropriateness of use in specific contexts. To fill the gap, research exploring language socialization into distinct ELF communities of practice is needed. The present

paper is an attempt to contribute to this vastly underresearched area and thus contribute to both ELF and L2 socialization research. More specifically, this paper is an empirical analysis of exchange students' experiences of language socialization and community building.

The data and participants

The present study draws upon two data sources – that is, interviews from the spring and autumn of 2007; and observational data from the academic year of 2008/09. While both were collected under the auspices of the LINEE project (see Footnote 1), the protocol for the interviews and the initial stages of the data analysis procedure for the interview data were worked out by the Szeged research team. To start with the first, the interview data were collected from 26 undergraduate students, including 18 current and 8 former Erasmus exchange students. The students I refer to as 'current Erasmus students' were from Germany, Sweden, Finland, France, Italy, Estonia, Poland and Turkey. At the time of the investigation they were studying at the University of Szeged or at the Charles University in Prague. Thus, for a semester or two they were taking courses taught largely in English at one of the two universities. A few of them also took courses in German or French but that was more the exception than the norm. The participants referred to as 'former Erasmus students', on the other hand, were local Hungarian and Czech students from the University of Szeged or the Charles University in Prague who had returned from their study abroad not long before the study was conducted. The main reason for choosing these students as participants was that they form(ed) an authentic community of ELF users with members from across Europe.

The interviews were carried-out in semi-structured format, usually in groups of three. The goal was to engage the participants in a group discussion through which they could both clarify and exemplify the role of ELF in Europe and their attitudes towards it. Thus, a careful attempt was made to invite native speakers of different languages for the interview, ideally, two current exchange students and one former exchange student. The interviews were conducted by myself and another LINEE researcher, both of us non-native speakers of English. The participants were prompted to discuss various themes including their background in using English, and their attitudes to and experiences with the language and its native and non-native speakers (for the guiding questions used in the interviews, see Appendix 1). The interviews were audio-recorded and fully transcribed (for the transcription conventions, see Appendix 2). In the excerpts in the subsequent sections, the participants are quoted verbatim.

Moving on to the observational data, they were collected from the roughly 70 Erasmus exchange students who, at the time of the investigation, formed a community of practice in Szeged. As some of the 'current' Erasmus students in the interview data, they were studying temporarily at the University of Szeged. They came from a number of countries from across Europe. Their mother tongues varied from German to French, through Polish, Estonian, Czech, Spanish, Italian, Bulgarian, Romanian, Turkish, and English. In Hungary, they took courses mainly in English, and in some exceptional cases, in German, French, or Hungarian. When they got together to socialize they used mainly ELF.

To examine the complex and dynamic processes of learning cultural and linguistic knowledge through participation in an emerging community-of-practice, I engaged in the Erasmus students' community practices as a participant observer. I did my fieldwork in naturally occurring settings, i.e. I joined the participants in their group activities such as the weekly organized European club evenings, their house parties, occasional outings, informal dinners, gatherings in pubs, sports and other activities, and in their Hungarian language classes. From time to time, I met up with some of the members individually as well, primarily in order to build rapport with them. Since the participants all knew about me doing research on them, in the field, I did not play the role of a full participant but rather that of an active participant (Atkinson & Hammersley 1994: 249 cited in Silverman 2006: 83). That I am a student researcher, that I am only a few years older than the majority of them, that English is not my mother tongue, either, and that I have been an Erasmus student myself helped me relate to them as an insider. During the observations, I looked, listened and audio-recorded, while paying attention to both linguistic and social practices. After the observations, I spent time working on my fieldnotes.

The data analysis began with the interview data. With my researcher colleagues, we used an inductive data analysis technique. It involved transcribing, coding, generating and refining hypotheses, and reflective journal writing. Specifically, we read and reread the transcripts, and took notes on recurrent themes relating to their experiences as ELF users. When a particular theme previously coded emerged we compared it with the previous instances. By constantly comparing the coded elements, we constructed tentative categories and sub-categories, and sought for patterns and associations among them (for the coding scheme, see Appendix 3). Once we had made sense of the codes, themes and relations, we generated hypotheses. We processed the tentative categories, and our initial hypotheses in a reflective journal. The reflective journal helped us refine the categories, establish the relationship between the various categories, and continue the data analysis. Once the observational data became available, I examined how the categories set up based on the interview data related to the themes I identified in my fieldnotes. My intention with the inclusion of the observational data in the present analysis was not to verify the findings of the interview data, but rather to better understand what was really going on in the Erasmus students' ELF community of practice.

Analysis of the exchange students' experiences of language socialization

The data analysis will center around three main themes which emerged as salient in the participants' socialization as Erasmus exchange students. The first concerns a new ELF repertoire which they refer to as "Erasmus English"; the second follows from their claim "we are not native English speaker" which highlights new aspects of their ELF identities; and the third can be associated with their statement "I would like to try to discuss more with Hungarian people" which points at their desire for and difficulty in orienting themselves towards different communities of practice.

A new mode of interaction

For the majority of the participants, the main site of language socialization is the Erasmus students' community of practice. In other words, the chances are that the the students, wherever they are, will integrate themselves into the Erasmus students' community of practice. In Szeged and Prague, the Erasmus students' communities of practice are created in and through ELF, this new mode of interaction and the development of linguistic resources being salient issues.

The experiences with ELF strike many of the students as radically different from their earlier experiences with English. In their new community, they find themselves accommodating to and co-operating with other NNSs. This accommodation takes many forms. As it would be beyond the scope of this paper to go into details of the different kinds of accommodative and co-operative strategies I have identified in the data, a few examples will have to suffice. Accommodation is at work when one speaker echoes the other, as when, for instance, one speaker repeats the other's "or something like this"; or when one or more speakers respond to a code-switched element with a code-switched element, as when, for instance, three speakers take turns to comment on the meal, and say, all in Hungarian, "Nagyon finom" (Very delicious), "Jó munka" (Well done), and "Gratulálok" (Congratulations). In other words, the participants learn that they may further collaborate by switching to a particular language routinely. They typically switch to Hungarian, when, for instance, they want to thank, apologize, toast or say hello to one another.

What further characterizes Erasmus students' communities of practice is that the participants also learn that non-understandings and word search moments are opportunities for collaborative work rather than problems to be avoided. They readily signal and skillfully repair non-understandings, or provide language support when a co-participant is in need of help. An example of language support is when, talking of music, the current speaker lacks the word "notes", makes some hesitation signs, which results in a co-participant supplying the missing word. There are also cases of a speaker supplying an utterance after the current speaker facing a word search has asked directly for help, as when, for instance, a speaker code-switches to her L1 Turkish, and asks, from the L1 speaker of Turkish sitting next to her, what the English for "cancel" is. In both cases, the current speaker repeats the supplied element, acknowledges help, and incorporates it into their original utterance. More interesting than this is when the current speaker accepts and incorporates the suggested expression even if it is not the one that they are lacking. An example of that is when a speaker code-switches to her L1 Turkish and requests the English for "deed"; not knowing the missing utterance in English, the other L1 speaker offers the word "paper", which the current speaker accepts and incorporates.

Another rather typical feature is what I would like to call speaking in tandem. This occurs when, in multi-party encounters, two or more speakers hold one side of the conversation and make a joint effort to repair a non-understanding, or supply the word or phrase a co-participant is lacking. To give but one example, in one dinner party conversation, a speaker lacks the expression 'chat up girls' and all the four participants present, "join forces" to guess the missing word, and thus provide language assistance.

Their guessing is characterized by much overlapping speech and many instances of repetitions and latching. After the turbulence of their speech, during which

they produce as many as 8 distinct suggestions, the speaker in need of help goes along with the idea of “pulling girls” which 3 out of the 4 speakers have confirmed and have repeated. Moments of non-understandings and word searching are remarkable not only because they provide a particularly revealing window into the collaborative processes underlying ELF talk, but also because they serve as evidence for the participants recognizing each other’s linguistic skills as a valuable resource.

The participants’ readiness to draw on each other’s linguistic resources and thus create a shared repertoire of negotiable resources (Wenger 1998) is further evidenced by the way they negotiate the meaning of utterances on the spot. A nice example of this is when, in a pub, an L1 speaker of Spanish code-switches to Mexican Spanish to refer to the waiter as a “papi chulo” (a handsome man). In the speech that follows, the current speaker, another L1 speaker of Spanish, one L1 speaker of Italian, and one L1 speaker of French, toss in ideas, one after the other, thus co-constructing the (local) meaning of the utterance. Once, they have agreed on “papi chulo” denoting a handsome man who is not very clever, they go about using the expression in that sense. In the process of collaborating for shared meaning and a shared repertoire, they shift from focusing on the correctness of form to focusing on the communicative and rapport building functions of language. The verb “move” as used by the participants is a good example. Talking of their weekend activities, one speaker repeatedly produces utterances such as “I will move at the weekend”, meaning he will travel somewhere. Over time, more and more participants can be heard using the same verb in the same “incorrect” sense. Since it is unlikely that several participants would, by themselves, make the same “mistake”, it serves as an example for accommodation and rapport building within the community under examination.

The students are both surprised and satisfied when they realize that this new way of interaction actually “works” within the community. In the quotes below, first, an Estonian student points out the highly cooperative nature of NNS communications as evidenced in the process of negotiating meaning; second, a German student expresses her surprise at the new mode of interaction being efficient:

1) When I, when I speak to non-native speaker, she or he may not know something::, some words or something and we have to find a conclusion between us. (171/Est/Sz/6)¹

2) (...) nobody knows (the/maybe,) the rules and often we are listening some words and then we try to express them other way and for my example my, my grammar is () but I think everybody understands what I want to say, and it’s the same with all the other Erasmus students. Everybody use the the grammar of his own language and put it, puts it into English, and it works ((laughs)), somehow it works. No(h)? (115/G/Sz/6)

Through adopting and adapting English, the participants produce a shared repertoire which is unique to their community. It involves, they claim, forms and expressions that are largely meaningful only within the group. Furthermore, they claim their way of speaking is best differentiated from the native English speakers’ linguistic repertoire. To mark its distinctiveness, they use names such

¹ Here and elsewhere: 171/Est/Sz/6=page number in transcript/student’s country of origin / location of interview / number of interview; Est=Estonia; G=Germany; F=France; I=Italy; H=Hungary; Cz=Czech Republic; B=Belgium; T=Turkey; Sz=Szeged; P=Prague.

as "Erasmus English", "English as a code", "European English", "MTV English", "world English", or, as one English major notes, "lingua franca English". Quite remarkably, they are all very positive about it. They value it as a resource and take much pride in it. To give but just a few examples, they use it efficiently to reflect interpersonal relationships, and prevent communication breakdowns. Generally, the stronger the ties between the members, the greater the appreciation of the unique repertoire, and the lesser the desire to be "correct". This kind of sentiment is heard very often in the interviews. For the purposes of illustration, I include the comments of a German and a French student:

3) I liked very much with the English here to speak English with non-native speakers it's the funny new words or new pronunciations that emerge and then you just keep those because you like them so much and not important anymore to say in the right way and even more fun to create this new language, yeah just take some Spanish pronunciation, Italian and that makes it, yeah, very nice. (151/G/Sz/3)

4) Erasmus English is totally different than the real English, but it's like we have uh different accents, dif, we use uh these words and it's not like correct at all, it's like quite awful sometimes ((laughs)), but it's good, we can understand each other. (161/F/Sz/4)

The new mode of interaction thus highlights some of the major differences between the NS and the NNS Erasmus students' linguistic repertoire. Both the participants I interviewed and the ones I had casual conversations with during the observations, often referred to the NS members as a source of communication problems, not due to differences in proficiency but due to the NS not necessarily communicating well in these contexts. The participants share the belief that they perfectly understand each other but have difficulty in understanding the NS Erasmus students who do not accommodate and cooperate when communicating with them. As, however, some of the NNS students point out, some NS Erasmus students do realize over time that there is a need for them to adjust their language, mainly their accent and their speech tempo, and take steps to be more intelligible. In the quote below an Italian student reports on the NSs presenting obstacles to mutual understanding:

5) I see that if I'm in the middle of people that are not English and they're speaking English and so there is no problem understanding them, probably my obstacle was that to understand like really English people talking. (23/I/Sz/1)

Some caution is due here. If the notion of communities of practice is taken to mean that people *want* to be members of the larger (Erasmus) community of practice, it has to be noted that not all NS Erasmus students actually have such intention or desire. The NSs who the NNS interviewees claim do not cooperate are the ones who do *not want* to establish themselves as members of the Erasmus community of practice. The NNSs seem to know this well. They clearly connect the NS Erasmus students' linguistic behaviour to their lack of intention to become a member. They argue that due to their lack of interest in community membership they purposefully segregate themselves, and maintain difference between their own language use and that of the NNSs'. Their reasoning is as follows: if the NSs do not try to speak like they do, it may be a sign of the fact that they do not value membership in their community. This view can be seen in the following excerpt made by an Italian student:

6) There were two English Erasmus girls, mmm only for three months [...] they were always together and uh...all the other Erasmus students were always saying that they were very closed and they didn't tend to let the other people understand really. (96/I/Sz/1)

Obviously, different ELF communities of practice develop and require different repertoires (Duff 2006). Thus, the traversing of communities requires the learning of new repertoires. Those who refuse to learn the appropriate linguistic repertoire of the ELF community of practice run the risk of being ridiculed, mocked, or at its extreme, may never obtain full membership. As the comments of some of the interviewees show, the students seem to know this already. While attending a Finnish language preparatory course in Joensuu, a former Erasmus student needed to adopt "simple English" and use a Spanish and French accent for insider jokes so that he would be well integrated into the local community of practice. However, as soon as he arrived in Turku where he was to do his study-abroad and made the first steps to seek membership in the new community of practice, he realized that new ways of speaking were required. Of course, what he did was adjust his ELF to the local practices and needs:

7) Had to realize like in two weeks that here [in Turku], I don't know why, but but there everybody spoke a much better English and and I really had to improve my English quickly cause cause I said some things and and which I thought I thought this is safe Erasmus English and now everybody's going to understand, and all the people were just laughing at me how stupidly I am saying sentences you know, so I had to realize very quickly that that uh I I have to speak a nice English (188/H/Sz/4).

To sum up, in the Erasmus students' communities of practice in Szeged and Prague, ELF, the primary means of communication, is adjusted to local practices and needs. The participants learn that accommodation and negotiation are highly valued strategies. Even more importantly, they learn that in certain contexts they form the basis of successful communication. From the moment when they first take pride in their new mode of communication they reach a stage when they recognize, and openly express their view that their NS peers fall short of the competences to communicate in ELF contexts well. The differences they notice between their own language use and that of the NSs' raises their attention to the issues of personal identity, to which I now turn.

Aspects of ELF identity

Interacting with NSs makes the non-native English students' identities both as members of their L1 culture and as NNS of English more salient. Through their ELF interactions, the participants realize that they can, and indeed want to, assert their own cultural identity through ELF, thus rejecting the hierarchical relationship and the identification with the NSs. In other words, they recognize that they are not joining a NS culture, rather expanding their linguistic repertoire. This has, at least, one crucial implication. Rather than them adjusting to the NSs, they now believe it is the NSs who should consider their identities as NNSs, and adjust their language accordingly. As an illustration I provide two quotes. In the first, a French student clarifies her using English as a way of expressing her own cultural identity; in the second, another French student

voices the need for the NSs taking into consideration his identity as a NNS of English:

9) (...) so that I am carrying my own culture and if I don't speak a good English I am speaking, I don't know, the people can say that I'm a foreigner and I, I love that, I, I don't want to:: ok, in a way I would love and I would be really proud to:: that the people don't recognize that I am not English, but I love the fact that I am the foreigner and that I'm even I make (...) I mean if you speak perfectly English you would hide your own culture. (25/F/Sz/3)

10) There was two British Erasmus student here. And it was little bit difficult because they were speaking very fast. In fact, they didn't take care a lot about the fact that we are not native English speaker [...] we speak some simple English word, words because we are all not native English speaker (161/F/Sz/2)

In addition, ELF can be used to signal the students' belonging to the group of multicultural speakers. The Erasmus students' communities of practice comprise NSs of many different languages. Thus, the students are in a fairly advantageous position in that they may both practice their previously learnt foreign languages with and learn further foreign languages from the NSs of those languages. By doing so they find out who speaks which languages and start to use foreign language expressions and forms as a resource to express their multicultural identities. As an example, when students meet in pairs or in small groups where, as they claim, no-one is excluded for not understanding the language, some of the L1 speakers of German shift to using French with the L1 speakers of French. In other cases, the students switch to the local Hungarian which is a foreign language for most them. Thus, code switching may be, and often is a resource not for avoiding or repairing communication breakdowns, but for signalling identity. There is little doubt that the participants, as most of the ELF speakers in general (e.g. Seidlhofer 2005b), are multilingual speakers for whom signalling their belonging to the group of multicultural speakers is one, but a true, alternative.

Further down the line, their code-switching for identity may be of two main kinds. One of them is what I have earlier in this paper called switching routinely (see section 4.1.), and involves saying the same thing in the same foreign language most, if not all, the time, e.g. saying "hello" or "cheers" in Hungarian, rather than in English, every time they meet or make a toast; the other is what I would like to call momentary borrowing and involves a speaker creating a code-switched utterance on the spot. An example of that is when an L1 speaker of German, in response to someone's question, utters her date of birth in English, and then repeats it, with some hesitation signals, in Hungarian. In the quotes below, first, a French student reports on NNSs of various languages practicing their French with him; and second, an Estonian student explains the Erasmus students' interest in learning new words in each others' language:

11) There are some Erasmus students that try to speak French with me. They are proud to say they know some French words, and it's the same for me when I try to speak German. (122/F/Sz/2)

12) People tell their words to others, the words in their language and, and it is one of the topics of conversation always that "how is it in your language?",

“how is it in your”, and you, you already learn the new, new words and new things. (106/Est/Sz/6)

In sum, through their involvement in the Erasmus students’ community of practice, the participants realize that they can use multiple languages as a realization of their ELF identity, if they so wish. They may emphasize different aspects of their ELF identity at any single moment during the conversation, and they do so with pride. They expect their NS peers to respect their ELF identities and adjust their language to their specific needs.

Multidirectionality and access issues

The vast majority of the Erasmus students take time and effort to learn the local language. This is remarkable for at least two reasons. One, on a global scale, neither Hungarian, nor Czech are considered very useful; and two, given that they stay in the target country only for a few months, the chances of getting far either in Hungarian, or in Czech are fairly slim. Yet, the students attend formal local language classes and often also engage in tandem language learning or language circles. Equally remarkable is the fact that the students are motivated to learn the local language not only in language classes, but outside of class, too. Many of them report that they seek out opportunities to practice their language skills. This goal, however, is not easily fulfilled. Sadly enough, when the opportunity does arise and they do have the chance to address the locals in the local language, the locals often shift to a foreign language, mainly to English or German. They assume that by doing this the locals are either trying to be polite with them, or are trying to use the opportunity for practicing their foreign language skills. This certainly is something of a power play or the negotiation of accommodation. In any case, for those local students who are also attending university classes in English, and have invested in an English-medium university experience, it is only natural that they choose to use English, rather than their L1, with the Erasmus students. Whatever the reason, what the locals are doing is, in fact, putting them at a disadvantageous position: by preventing them from opportunities to practice, they are preventing them from improving their local language skills; and, in the long run, they are preventing them from establishing closer ties with those locals who do not speak any foreign languages. In this respect, their situation is more of a vicious circle. As illustration, I provide four quotes. The first two quotes are made by a French and a German student, both of whom struggle with their local languages for a lack of opportunities to practice their language skills with the locals.

13) If you are an Erasmus, uh it’s quite difficult to meet some Hungari (...) and if you want to learn Hungarian, for example, it’s very difficult because you don’t speak with the people...every day. (05/B/Sz/4)

14) I’m learning Czech at the moment. It’s very difficult. I think it’s the grammar on the one side, but um we don’t have much opportunities to speak Czech so there is no practical experience. (168/G/P/2)

The third and the fourth quotes come from an Estonian and a German student, respectively. They both express regret about the local students switching to English and German, thus removing opportunities for practice.

15) Very often they start to speak English with me, even if we understand everything in Hungarian (...) just because of the fact that I'm not Hungarian. (61/Est/Sz/6)

16) I can't talk to them [the local Czech students] in Czech because if they don't know that I'm German, they ask something in Czech and I don't understand it very, not fast enough, and they just switch to English or German so it's very hard to use my language skills. (33/G/P/2)

In the above two quotes we have seen how the shift to a foreign language on the part of the local students may disappoint the exchange students. Interestingly, there is evidence in the data that the reverse is also true. The local students may, and very often, do let the participants down not because of switching to English or German, but rather because of *not* switching to one of these potential lingua francas. The Erasmus students enter the class with the expectation that their classmates will accept them as legitimate newcomers, and will help them become more engaged and skilled members of their communities of practice. Since the traversing of communities of practice requires them learning new forms of participation and identity formation (Wenger 1998), these expectations are truly legitimate. However, as the quotations below demonstrate, these expectations are not always met. A Turkish student reports that his classmates disregard him in class; a French student notes that when working on a joint project outside of class, some of his peers overlook the fact that the official medium for coursework is, in this particular case, English, and go about doing their work in Hungarian.

17) Ok, they [the local classmates] don't speak with me, sometimes they see me, they turn their heads, it was too strange and I was thinking that they don't know maybe any language, English or German, but now I realized that they can speak, some of them can also speak English. (22/T/Sz/5)

18) Here I was on (.) one project with two Hungarian persons. And they (.) they we were first speaking English. But sometimes, the girl was was ok. She was always speaking English, it was good. But sometimes I don't know, the guy was speaking Hungarian and (.) I was like excluded. I was a group at that time. It was impossible to work because it was, it ask a lot of time to him to speak English. (188/F/Sz/2)

It obviously remains to be seen why the local peers behave the way they do. The interviewees assume that they know how they could (or should) behave appropriately but refuse to do so. They do not even consider the possibility of them not knowing what to do. It may, however, well be the case that the local students, too, see themselves as newcomers to the community of practice which now involves both Hungarian and non- Hungarian students. If so, it is not surprising that they do not (immediately) find the means of choosing the language and forms of behavior that work the best for the most participants of the community. Another possibility is that they do not see themselves as members of the wider community of practice involving the Erasmus students. Yet other reason for their "inappropriate" behavior may be that they are too shy to speak out in English.

The other source of problem lies in a lack of opportunities to gain access to local people's social networks outside of class. The majority of the current

Erasmus students express regret about not having many opportunities to participate in local activities. Some of them put this down to external circumstances; others point the blaming finger at the locals for not providing them with more opportunities, e.g. by not asking them out; yet others take the blame by acknowledging they have not made enough efforts to socialize more. In any case, it is quite common for the students to experience a shift in attitudes towards the end of their stay. The fear that they may return home without having learnt much about the local culture and practices makes them more determined to seek out and find socializing opportunities. In the quote below a French student reports on his intention to take steps to get to know his classmates more:

19) I have some Hungarian people in my courses but we just say ok, good-bye, how are you. Just, but sometimes I think I have to ask them what we can do this evening, if they want to go outside, because if I go back to France and what about Hungarian people, how are they?, oh I don't know but I can speak about Polish, I can speak about German people, Finnish. No. I would like to try to discuss more with Hungarian people. (153/F/Sz/2)

As far as the former Erasmus students are concerned, they also acknowledge the difficulty in establishing contact with the locals. As one Hungarian student having studied in Finland puts it, "you have to make efforts to find some local friends". However, unlike the exchange students in Szeged and Prague, eventually they all make friends with, at least, a few local students. Their accounts reveal that those students are most successful in making friends with the locals who either share an apartment with them, or engage in sport activities on a regular basis. As the following excerpt illustrates, a Czech student studying in Finland got to know locals by playing volleyball in the university team:

20) I was playing volleyball at the university team and so (...) that was the reason why I met Finnish people quite often (48/Cz/P/2)

It is very important to note that despite the fact that some of the former exchange students participate in the local students' communities of practice, they do not give up their membership in the Erasmus students' community of practice. Quite the contrary. The visiting students' community of practice remains their primary context of socialization throughout their study-abroad. This is well illustrated by the quotation from a Hungarian student having studied in Spain who, despite having local flat-mates, spent most of her free time with Erasmus students.

21) When I was an Erasmus student so I had a chance to meet other Spanish people because I live with Spanish girls. But most of the time, most of my free time I was with Erasmus students. (21/H/Sz/5)

To sum up, in class as well as outside of class, the participants come in contact with local students and local student networks. Their desire to enter these networks, however, is hardly ever met, either because their local peers do not prove willing to treat them as legitimate newcomers, or because of difficulties in accessing such networks due to language barriers. Their learning of the local language is, unfortunately, of little help in this respect.

Discussion

At the outset, I set the goal of examining how students, mainly NNSs of English, studying abroad in the Erasmus program are being socialized in(to) their new communities of practice. To do so, I examined data in connection with three salient issues. The data revealed that through their socialization in(to) their Erasmus communities of practice, the students learn new modes of speaking, and develop new aspects of ELF identities; in the mean time, they learn to strive for multidirectionality and cope with difficulties in gaining access to local peer groups. The data thus point to two main conclusions – namely, in their Erasmus community of practice the exchange students mainly collect experiences which they judge positive; however, their seeking membership in local student networks or communities of practice is an unexpected bone of contention.

The participants, as members of a community of practice (Wenger 1998), “over time and in response to others’ forms of participation, learn together about how to participate most meaningfully and also how to project their desired identities” (Duff 2006: 16). Concerning their communications, they learn that they need not adjust their language to some external norm but may well cope with “incorrect” forms and structures. In other words, they recognize that their inventing new forms, borrowing from other languages, or maintaining an accent, to give but just a few examples, may be an effective tool for communicating content and interpersonal relationships. This being the case, one cannot help asking why they still describe NS English with terms such as “real” and “correct”, as we saw in the excerpts above (see example 4). A possible answer to this question is this: they surely view NS English as “real” and “correct”, but they do not think of NS English as an appropriate goal in ELF contexts (for more on the distinction between target language goals, models and norms, see Peckham et al. in press). Jenkins’ (2000, 2005) point is borne out here: that complying with NS norms may be both inappropriate and irrelevant in ELF interactions. This recognition acts as a catalyst within the Erasmus students’ communities of practice. It frees them of a burden and gives them a sense of freedom, which explains why many of them note towards the end of their stay that they can speak ELF more fluently than towards the beginning.

The participants’ learning with respect to their ELF interactions, however, does not stop at reconsidering the value of NS norms. While it is true that they learn to care about the NS norms less; it is also true that they learn to value certain pragmatic strategies more. Specifically, they learn to think of the strategies of accommodation, negotiation and cooperation as a key to successful communication. This gains particular importance in their interactions with their native English peers. They judge them as uncaring and inefficient communicators simply because of their not using these strategies and not complying with their mode of interaction. Besides, they view the qualitative difference between their and the native speakers’ communications as a sign of their not having the motivation to join their ELF community. What this actually implies is that the strategies of accommodation and negotiation actually serve as a dividing line between members and non-members. That being the case, these strategies are essential features of their ELF interactions, and likely of all ELF interactions as claims Jenkins (2000, 2005).

Equally important is to note that the new forms they create clearly connect with their identities. This is an important point to make bearing in mind early research into ELF which argues that ELF is devoid of cultural reference (e.g.

House 1999, 2002; Meierkord 2000, 2002). The Erasmus students meet regularly to achieve their shared goal, i.e. to make their relatively short stay in Szeged or in Prague livable and, as much as possible, enjoyable. Their mutual engagement in a joint enterprise, as can be expected based on Wenger (1998), necessarily brings about the development of a repertoire of shared ways of speaking. The repertoire they create, plus the freedom and the ease with which they communicate, make them proud and successful communicators. There is no need for them to join the NS culture anymore, and can decide for themselves which of their identities they want to signal at any one moment of the interaction. They may find maintaining an accent and thus revealing their L1 identity just as important as they do switching codes and signaling their membership in the group of multilingual speakers, or using non-native speaker features and thus expressing their non-nativeness. Thus, within the ELF communities of practice I have examined, taking up multiple identities is the norm, rather than the exception. The upshot here is that multiple identities are the reality of the speakers (e.g. Duff 2006, 2007), but should be expected not only when speakers traverse different communities (e.g. Morita 2004), each with their unique stances, values and beliefs, but also when they are practicing within a single (ELF) community of practice.

The code-switching mentioned above implies that in the Erasmus students' local communities of practice ELF co-exists with other languages. The participants are not only motivated to learn further languages, but also seek out for opportunities to develop their multilingualism. They take advantage of the multilingual group they belong to. They thus make efforts to improve their foreign languages with, or learn new foreign languages from each other. On the other hand, they attend formal as well as informal local language classes. They often set the goal of acquiring the local language at least on a basic communicative level. In lack of opportunities to practice the language outside of language classes, however, this goal is usually not fulfilled. To compensate for the lack of opportunities, but also to localize their discourse (Pözl 2003; Pözl and Seidlhofer 2006), the students studying in Szeged often times shift to Hungarian. The lack of opportunities to practice their local languages foregrounds one of the biggest difficulties, or challenges, the participants face during their study abroad. It is this difficulty to which I now turn.

The vast majority of the participants fail to gain meaningful access to the local student networks. They note two main kinds of problems in connection with this. One, they find no meaningful opportunities in which to develop friendships with the locals and in which to practice their newly learnt local languages. To their regret, sometimes several days go by without any opportunities to socialize with local students. Two, even if they come in contact with local student networks, they have difficulty in earning or achieving legitimacy in them. Often the local peers disregard them in the class, and make no attempt to socialize with them outside of class, either, which makes them feel disappointed. Obviously, the role of language, or better say, languages must not be overlooked in this fairly disappointing situation with the local students. Some Erasmus students, especially those who began learning the language already in their home countries, may want to use the local language with the local students; others may prefer, or even expect, their local peers to interact in a lingua franca, such as English or German, with them. Whatever their choice, there is often a mismatch between their own preference and that of their local peers. The problem of gaining access to the local student networks in academic

contexts is not new. For instance, Duff (2006, 2007) shows how finding meaningful access to the Anglo-Canadians' social networks leads some Korean exchange students studying at a Canadian university to redirect their energies from the Canadian peers' English-medium social networks to the Korean exchange students' and non-Korean-Asian students' social networks. By so doing, they, just as the participants studied here, create a 'third space' for themselves, and thus avoid feelings of anxiety or discomfort in the local students' networks.

The present study has some major implications. It draws attention to two problems. One problem concerns the question of NSs in ELF contexts. As the study has shown, successful participants in English conversations with multilingual individuals are not necessarily those whose native language is English, but those who can adjust their language to the needs of their co-participants and the actual context. Since my interviewees see, at least, in the early stages of community building, the NSs as lacking the skills essential in ELF communication, it can be considered necessary and therefore good practice to train them in speaking in a manner which is appropriate with NNSs of English.

The other problem that needs consideration is how to help the exchange students realize their desire for multidirectionality, i.e. how to help them gain better access into the local (student) networks. To remedy the problem, I suggest two solutions, which, I believe, complement, rather than substitute one another. First, and foremost, the exchange students need more resources and opportunities for learning the local language, at least, at a basic communicative level. Local language classes need to be made available for all those interested. Second, following Duff (2006, 2007), the problem has to be approached not from the exchange students' perspective only, but also from that of the target community, that is, the local students. It is true that based on the present study we can make no conclusions about what the local students' reasons for "inappropriate" behavior are; yet, there is one thing that cannot be denied. So that they would readily see themselves and the exchange students as members of the same community of practice, and that they would help the visiting students establish themselves as members in the new, wider, community of practice, they need the ability to use English, or the actual lingua franca, with ease and pride. Those who are shy to speak out, or have a feeling of discomfort or anxiety, will, as we have seen in the case of the Korean exchange students above, avoid interactions, and will probably not take the necessary steps to help the newcomers integrate into their communities of practice. What the local students thus need is awareness raising to the actual circumstances of ELF and the changing functions of NSs and NNSs in ELF interactions.

Conclusion

This interview-based study has attempted a behind-the-scenes view into some Erasmus exchange students' experiences of language socialization and community building. It has shown that the Erasmus students do have the desire to orient themselves to different communities of practice, but only partly succeed in realizing their goals. Their socialization into the Erasmus students' newly emerging ELF community of practice be considered smooth and successful. Over time, and in response to each other's form of participation, they learn to use ELF in ways that make them efficient and proud communicators.

They define successful communication along the lines of certain accommodative and co-operative strategies; but more than this, they define membership in their community of practice based on the use of the above strategies. Regrettably, their gaining access into the local students' social networks to practice their local language, and develop friendships, is much more problematic. They face challenges such as finding meaningful opportunities to socialize and earning legitimacy within the local networks. They end up in a 'third space' (Duff 2006) between their L1 culture and the university community.

The findings are not unique to the Erasmus students involved in the present study. Some recent studies in the field of L2 socialization (e.g. Duff 2006, 2007), and ELF (e.g. Jenkins 2005, 2006; Cogo 2007) have produced similar findings. The biggest contribution of the present study is that it adopts a language socialization approach to the study of ELF, thus combining fields that have usually been kept apart. As regards future research, to gain a fuller picture of the Erasmus students' experiences of socialization interviews have to be conducted with NSs Erasmus students as well as with the local students; in the mean time, I would like to encourage more ethnographic work to be done into the exchange students' communities of practice, and into the ELF speakers' communities of practice in general.

Acknowledgements

The research was carried out under the auspices of the LINEE project (Language in a Network of European Excellence), and was funded by the European Commission's 6th Framework Programme - FP6 - contract number 028388. The Szeged research team consisted of Don Peckham, Emőke Kovács and Karolina Kalocsai. The coding and the initial analysis of the interview data was done by the Szeged team before this paper was written. Some of our initial findings were presented in a joint paper at the GlobEng International Conference, Verona, Italy, 14-16 February 2008. I am grateful to Patricia Duff, Don Peckham and the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions for improving an earlier version of this paper.

Appendix 1

Guiding questions for the interviews with the students

1. Introductions of ourselves
2. Grand tour question to begin with:
 - Tell each other what you like most, what you like and don't like in being a foreigner/exchange student in a foreign country.
 - What's been difficult?
 - What's been surprising?
3. Background in using English
 - What role does English play in your life? (What role did it play earlier?) Do you have any intention to acquire a further foreign language? Why?
 - What's the earliest successful experience you've had communicating in E.?
 - How do you use English in your life these days?
 - In what contexts do you use English (how often/where/when/with whom)? Do you, in the majority of the cases, use English in stress-free and accuracy-unimportant contexts or not?

--How did you learn English?

4. Your own English

--Do you feel like people know you aren't a NS? Why?

--Would you like to sound like a NS, or rather a fluent NNS?

--Are you satisfied with your correctness/appropriateness/accent? Or would you like to improve your English? In either case, what makes you feel like that?

--Are you ever corrected? Is your English commented on by others?

--Has your perception of your English changed since you finished secondary school?

5. Using English in Szeged

--Can you cope with English alone in Szeged?

--Have you had any communication breakdowns? If yes, why? Can you recall situations when either you or your partner has misunderstood what was being said?

6. Experiences with NNSs

--Have you ever been in an embarrassing/funny situation because of miscommunication in English?

--Have you ever experienced that you couldn't make yourself understood or couldn't understand your interlocutor both of you speaking English?

--Have you had any particularly negative or positive experiences?

--How is talking with a NSs different than with a NNS

--Do groups of NNSs speak differently than NSs?

--Do groups of NNSs speak differently when NSs are around?

7. Experiences with NSs

--Have you ever experienced that you couldn't make yourself understood or couldn't understand your interlocutor both of you speaking English?

--Have you ever been in an embarrassing/funny situation because of miscommunication in English?

--Have you had any particularly negative or positive experiences?

--How is talking with NSs different than with NNSs?

8. Advantages of speaking English

--How has speaking E. been an advantage in your life?

--Do you know people who don't speak E.? Is life different for them?

9. Disadvantages of speaking English

--Have you ever had experiences which made you feel that speaking E. is a disadvantage?

--Do you feel that it's a disadvantage to speak E. in some cases?

--Has it ever caused you a problem that you don't speak some other language than English, e.g. that you didn't speak the local language?

10. Being "good" at English

--Describe someone you know who is good at English.

--How does one get to be good at English?

--How does someone who is good at English communicate?

--Is it possible to sound just like a NS?

--Is it possible to communicate just as effectively as a NS?

11. NNS speech characteristics

--How can you tell if someone is a NNS?

--What do you like about NNS speech characteristics?

--What do you dislike about NNS speech characteristics?

12. NS speech characteristics

--How can you tell if someone is a NS?

--What do you like about NS speech characteristics?

--What do you dislike about NS speech characteristics?

Appendix 2

Transcription conventions

- (.) untimed brief pause between utterances
- . sentence final falling intonation followed by a noticeable pause
- ? yes/no question rising intonation followed by a noticeable pause
- , phrase-final continuing intonation followed by a short pause
- : lengthened sound (extra colons indicate greater lengthening)
- () transcription impossible
- (words) uncertain transcription
- (()) comments on quality of speech and context

Appendix 3

Coding scheme

A. Erasmus context

1. Being an Erasmus student;
2. Language of instruction;

B. Languages and speakers

3. Language described: non-English;
4. Language described: English;
5. Non-native English and speakers;
6. Native English and speakers;
7. Solidarity;
8. Models of English;
9. Non natives in your own language; [Includes subjects as NSs]

C. Local context

10. Local languages; [Includes use of local languages]
11. Contact with locals;
12. Locals' attitudes towards E. speakers;
13. Who speaks/doesn't speak English?;
14. Managing with English only; [Includes not managing with English only]
15. Language choice;
16. Ranking of languages;
17. Perceptions and contact with cultures;

D. Varieties named

18. Non-native English varieties;
19. International English vs. English;
20. English as a code vs. source of identification;
21. MTV English;
22. Erasmus English;
23. Lingua franca;
24. Micro language;
25. Native Eng named

E. Advantages/disadvantages of English

26. Advantage of English;
27. Disadvantage of English;

28. Necessity of English; [Refers to general necessity]
29. Personal necessity of English [Refers to personal experience where English was necessary]
30. Pressures of English

F. Personal experience

31. English learning background;
32. Other Foreign languages;
33. Own English needs; [Refers to the specific condition of someone's English, both positive and negative]
34. Goals of own English; [Refers to plans to improved quality of own English]
35. Perceptions of own English; [Refers to general attitudes towards one's English]
36. Insecurity; [Refers to insecurity vis-à-vis other speakers]

G. Personal views on language use and learning

37. Miscommunication;
38. Proper language;
39. View on language learning;
40. Language is communication;
41. Which English to teach/how.

References

- Atkinson, P. & M. Hammersley. 1994. Ethnography and participant observation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 248–261.
- Cogo, A. 2007. *Intercultural communication in English as a Lingua Franca: a case study*. Unpublished dissertation. London: King's College.
- Cogo, A. 2008. English as a lingua franca: Form follows function. *English Today* 95, 58–61.
- Cogo, A. In press. Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Coleman, J. A. 2006. English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching* 39, 1–14.
- Cook, V. J. (ed.) 2002. *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, V. J. 2003. The changing L1 in the L2 user's mind. In V. Cook (ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on the First*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1–18.
- Cook, V. 2005. *Multicompetence: Black hole or wormhole?* [Retrieved in March 2008]. Available at <http://homepage.ntlworld.com/vivian.c/Writings/Papers/SLRF.htm>.
- Crystal, D. 1997. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. A. 1995. An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, 505–537.
- Duff, P. A. 1996. Different languages, different perspectives: Socialization of discourse competence in dual-language school classrooms in Hungary. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 407–433.
- Duff, P. A. 2002. The discursive construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics* 23, 289–322.
- Duff, P. A. 2004. Intertextuality and hybrid discourses: The infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguistics and Education* 14 (3-4), 231–276. [Retrieved in May 2008]. Also available at: <http://www.lerc.educ.ubc.ca/fac/duff/>

- Duff, P. A. 2006. *Problematizing language socialization across postsecondary contexts*. Unpublished paper based on a presentation at the annual conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Montreal, Canada, 17-20 June.
- Duff, P. A. 2007. Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching* 40: 309-319. [Retrieved in May 2008]. Also available at: <http://www.lerc.educ.ubc.ca/fac/duff/>
- Duff, P. A. 2008a. Introduction to Volume 8: Language Socialization. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, vol. 8: Language socialization. Boston: Springer, xiii-xix.
- Duff, P. A. 2008b. *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis.
- Duff, P. & M. Early. 1996. Problematics of classroom research across sociopolitical context. In S. Gass & J. Schachter (eds.), *Second language classroom research: issues and opportunities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1-30. [Retrieved in May 2008]. Also available at: <http://www.lerc.educ.ubc.ca/fac/duff/>.
- Firth, A. 1990. 'Lingua Franca' negotiations: Towards an intercultural approach. *World Englishes* 9 (3), 69-80.
- Graddol, D. 1997. *The Future of English*. London: The British Council.
- Hall, J. K. 1993. The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics* 14, 145-165.
- Hall, J. K., A. Cheng & M. T. Carlson. 2006. Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of language knowledge. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (2), 220-240.
- Harklau, L. 1999. Representing culture in the ESL writing classroom. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Culture in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 109-130.
- Harklau, L. 2000. From the 'good kids' to the 'worst': representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly* 34, 35-67.
- House, J. 1999. Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (ed.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 73-89.
- House, J. 2002. Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca. In K. Knapp & C. Meierkord (eds.), *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 245-267.
- Hülmbauer, C. 2007. 'You moved, aren't?' - The relationship between lexicogrammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness in English as a lingua franca. *Vienna English Working PaperS* 16 (2), 16-35. [Retrieved in February 2008]. Also available at: http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views_0702.pdf
- Jenkins, J. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. 2002. A sociolinguistically-based, empirically-researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an International Language. *Applied Linguistics* 23 (1), 83-103.
- Jenkins, J. 2005. Teaching pronunciation for English as a Lingua Franca: A sociopolitical perspective. In C. Gnutzmann & F. Intemann (eds.), *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom*. Tübingen, Günter Narr, 145-158.
- Jenkins, J. 2006. Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *Tesol Quarterly* 40 (1), 157-181.
- Jenkins, J. 2007. English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. Paper presented at the workshop Perspective on English as a Lingua Franca. 13th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes, World Englishes. Problems - Properties - Prospects, October 2007, Regensburg.
- Kachru, B. B. 1996. The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes* 15 (3), 241-255.
- Kobayashi, M. 2004. *A sociocultural study of second language tasks: Activity, agency, and language socialization*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

- Kordon, K. 2006. "You are very good" – Establishing rapport in English as a lingua franca: The case of agreement tokens. *Vienna English Working PaperS* 52 (2), 58–82.
- Kramsch, C. 1998. *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langman, J. 2003. Growing a *Bányavirág* (Rock Crystal) on Barren Soil: Forming a Hungarian identity in Eastern Slovakia through joint (inter)action. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 182–199.
- Lantolf, J. P. (ed.) 2000. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, J. & E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lesznyák, Á. 2004. Communication in English as an international lingua franca: An exploratory case study. Nordstadt: Books on Demand.
- Li, D. 2000. The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57, 58–87.
- McArthur, T. 1998. *The English languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McKay, S. L. & S. C. Wong. 1996. Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review* 66, 577–608.
- Meeuwis, M. 1994. Nonnative-nonnative intercultural communication: An analysis of instruction sessions for foreign engineers in a Belgian company. *Multilingua* 13 (1/2), 59–82.
- Meierkord, C. 1998. Lingua franca English: Characteristics of successful non-native-/non-native-speaker discourse. *Erfurt Electronic Studies in English (ESEE)*. [Retrieved in May 2008]. Available at: <http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/eese.html>
- Meierkord, C. 2000. Interpreting successful lingua franca interaction. An analysis of non-native-/non-native small talk conversations in English. *Linguistik Online*, 5. [Retrieved in May 2008]. Available at http://www.linguisticonline.com/1_00/index.html
- Meierkord, C. 2002. 'Language stripped bare' or 'linguistic masala'? Culture in lingua franca conversation. In K. Knapp & C. Meierkord (eds.) *Lingua Franca Communication*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 109–133.
- Morita, N. 2004. Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly* 38, 573–603.
- Neil, D. M. 1996. *Collaboration in intercultural discourse: examples from a multicultural Australian workplace*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Norton, B. 1997. Language, Identity and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (3), 409–429.
- Norton, B. 2000. *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. London: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Norton, B. & K. Toohey 2001. Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly* 35, 307–322.
- Norton Pierce, B. 1995. Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, 9–31.
- Ochs, E. & B. Schieffelin. 2008. Language socialization: An Historical Overview. In P. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, vol. 8: Language socialization. Boston: Springer, 3–15.
- Pavlenko, A. 2001. Bilingualism, gender, and ideology. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5 (2), 117–151.
- Pavlenko A. & J. Lantolf 2000. Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. New York: Oxford University Press, 155–177.
- Peckham, D., K. Kalocsai, E. Kovács & T. Sherman. (In press). English and multilingualism, or English only in a multilingual Europe? In *Linguistic diversity in the European Union: First findings of LINEE*, Mouton De Gruyter.

- Pitzl, M. 2005. Non-understanding in English as a lingua franca: Examples from business context. *Vienna English Working PaperS* 14/2, 50-71.
- Potts, D. 2005. Pedagogy, purpose, and the second language learner in on-line communities. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 62, 137-160.
- Pözl, U. 2003. Signalling cultural identity: the use of L1/Ln in ELF. *Vienna English Working PaperS* 12, 3-23. [Retrieved in February 2008]. Available at <http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/views.html>.
- Pözl, U. & B. Seidlhofer 2006. In and on their own terms: the "habitat factor" in English as a lingua franca interactions. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 177, 151-176.
- Rampton, M. B. H. 1990. Displacing the 'native' speaker': Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal* 44 (2), 97-101.
- Rampton, M. B. H. 1995. *Crossing: language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rogoff, B. 1990. *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. 2003. *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2004. Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 209-239.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2005a. Standard future or half-baked quackery? Descriptive and pedagogic bearings on the globalisation of English. In C. Gnutzmann & F. Intemann (eds.), *Globalisation and the English language classroom*. Tübingen: Narr, 155-169.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2005b. English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal* 59 (4), 399-341.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2007. English as a lingua franca and communities of practice. In S. Volk-Birke & J. Lippert (eds.), *Anglistentag 2006 Halle Proceedings*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 307-318.
- Siegal, M. 1996. The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics* 17, 356-382.
- Silverman, D. 2006. *Interpretive qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction* (Third Edition). London: Sage Publications.
- Toohy, K. 2000. *Learning English at school: Identity, social relations and classroom practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. 2004. Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal* 88, 331-350.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willett, J. 1995. Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, 473-503.