EduLingua

6/1 (2020)

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

Impresszum

EduLingua

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

Kiadja/Published by:
LoGoS Kutatócsoport
Szegedi Tudományegyetem, Angoltanár-képző és Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Tanszék

Felelős kiadó:
Doró Katalin

A szerkesztőség és kiadó címe:
6722 Szeged, Egyetem u. 2.
Telefon: 62/544-024
E-mail: logos.szeged@gmail.com
Honlap: elteal.ieas-szeged.hu/logos

Megjelenik:
évente kétszer

Elérhető:
ingyenes, nyílt hozzáférésű az elteal.ieas-szeged.hu/edulingua címen

ISSN 2415-945X

EduLingua

Alkalmazott nyelvészeti folyóirat

Journal of Applied Linguistics

VI. évfolyam 1. szám

Volume 6 Number 1

2020

LOGOS
LANGUAGES GOALS STRATEGIES

Tartalomjegyzék
Table of Contents

TANULMÁNYOK

STUDIES

Language learning and learning strategy use in international university students' English as a lingua franca communication

Donald W. Peckham[1][2]

University of Szeged

DOI: 10.14232/edulingua.2020.1.1

English as a lingua franca (ELF) has received wide interest in the past decades from researchers, teachers, and users of English in general. The present study investigates whether or not speakers of English approach ELF contexts not only as contexts for communication, but also as contexts for language learning. Interview data was collected from 12 international university students in Czechia and Hungary to explore if indeed they believe they are using ELF communication for their own language learning, and if so, what learning strategies they use. Results show that these English speakers are indeed learning in these contexts and employ a variety of strategies to do so. Implications for how secondary school English language instruction might prepare students for learning while using English as a lingua franca are discussed.

Keywords: English as a lingua franca, language learning strategies, study abroad, English language teaching and learning

Introduction

Each year in the European Union, around 9.5% of students in higher education are international students (OECD, 2020), including, in 2018, nearly 350,000 students participating in the Erasmus+ program (Directorate–General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture, 2020, p. 32). Many of these students attend English-language medium undergraduate and graduate programs which attract a multinational and multilingual group of students (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). English may also be used to interact with fellow students outside of class, and in almost all cases, students will be using English as a lingua franca. For most of these programs, the focus is not on English language learning, but on learning academic content, and previous research on the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) in these contexts has mainly focused on classroom interaction (e.g. Smit, 2010) or the development of a community of ELF users outside the classroom (e.g. Kalocsai, 2014). Little research has focused on English language

[1] Author's e-mail: peckham@lit.u-szeged.hu

[2] I would like to thank the two reviewers of this paper for their detailed and valuable feedback.

learning itself in these situations. This paper will address English language learning in an EU study abroad program by raising the issue of whether students themselves engage in activities which can potentially lead to language learning through using ELF. That is, are students who are interacting with fellow students simply using their English skills and practicing them, or are they actively developing them? And furthermore, how does the context of doing this through ELF affect their approach to learning? This paper will add to the literature which highlights the importance of ELF interaction as a site of active language learning, an issue which is important for both English language teachers and learners.

Literature Review

ELF simply refers to the use of English in situations where non-native speakers are the major participants and norm setters (Jenkins, 2007). In the past 20 years, it has received a great amount of attention with the recognition early on that there are more non-native speakers of English in the world and that a large percentage of communication in English either involves non-native speakers or is exclusively between non-native speakers (Graddol, 2006). Issues had previously been raised concerning the "ownership" of English (Widdowson, 1994) which led to discussion about what the language norms for non-native speakers should be based on (Seidlhofer, 2000). In their review of the field, Jenkins, Dewey and Cogo (2011) note that early on a major effort was made to provide a coherent structural description of English as a lingua franca, but that this goal was not reached due to the large amount of structural variation found in ELF interaction. But efforts were much more fruitful in describing how ELF interaction takes place and what makes such interaction successful. This movement away from a structure description of ELF meant that emphasis was placed on how participants learn the communication practices of using ELF in short- or longer-term encounters.

In a recent discussion framing ELF, Mauranen (2018) describes ELF from three interrelated perspectives. From the macro, or sociolinguistic perspective, Mauranen notes that thinking of ELF as a particular variety is problematic because there is no one ELF speech community and that within a group there is great amount of variety present when ELF is used. Instead, she posits that ELF begins with "similects" (p. 9) which are developed when speakers of the same first language learn English as a foreign language; that is, similects are the result of contact between one common first language and English, and thus contain, among other things, various transfer features which would be expected from that first language. ELF, then, involves contact between speakers of different similects and thus is "a higher-order or second-order" language contact (p. 10). She notes that spaces where ELF communication happens range from ephemeral service exchanges to more long-lasting encounters such as in professional organizations or in the EU governing bodies, and that "In short, ELF communities are diffuse, network-based multilingual communities where English is a dominant lingua franca" (p. 12).

There has been controversy over describing speakers in ELF interaction as "language learners" since this may imply an English as a foreign language learning perspective with native English goals, and, particularly as studied from the second language acquisition perspective, is seen to imply a "deficit" approach that focuses on speakers' divergence from native English norms (Ranta, 2018, p. 146). This, along with the sidelining of the goal to describe ELF as a variety, as mentioned above, led to scant focus on structural learning in ELF communication, but in recent years this question has been raised again in contexts where ELF is used as an academic lingua franca in higher education settings. Smit (2010), in her book-length discussion of the subject, points out that given their wide variety of backgrounds, ELF users may also be English language learners who engage in explicit learning: "Therefore, some participants might pursue the intention of improving their English language proficiency and unite in themselves the roles of (ELF) language user and of English language learner, be it for general or some specific purposes," (p. 69). Similarly, Kalocsai (2014) discusses in her monograph presenting the Erasmus students as a community of practice, that through ELF interaction, a goal of many of the students was improving their English skills and "gaining self-confidence in ELF" (p. 171). Furthermore, Mauranen (2018) also discusses specific processes by which participants in ELF interaction are learning. At the meso level, where interaction takes place, this involves accommodation and explication, that is, explaining and elaboration. At the individual cognitive level, this involves entrenchment, where the most frequent uses of forms become the one most likely to be learned, and abstraction, where rules and patterns emerge though the encountering of exemplars. Thus, this perspective on learning relates to usage-based views on language learning in the second language acquisition literature which claim that language learning emerges though language use (Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006). Thus, although speakers may see themselves as users of English, learning is also possible (Hynninen, 2016, p. 13).

While it is possible that learning does happen in ELF encounters, it is rather difficult to assess this learning in the short or long term. Given the fluid nature of ELF encounters as higher order language contact situations, it is unclear what standards could be used to measure this change in knowledge and skill. Increased fluency could be measured due to the proceduralization and automatization of whatever forms are known (see De Jong & Perfetti, 2011), but it would be difficult to assess what new structures have been learned. A partial solution to this problem is using self-report data. This provides a weaker measure of what exactly has been learned but will provide an indication that learning of some kind is happening. In the present paper, two self-report measures will be used: reports on the language learning strategies of participants, and reports on perceptions of learning.

Concerning learning strategies, the goal of this present paper is not to classify students' behavior into groups of already existing strategies (such as Oxford 1990), but to establish from the bottom-up that they are indeed using strategies. Therefore,

establishing a definition of learning strategies is important. Cohen and Henry (2020) offer a succinct definition that language learning strategies are "the conscious and semi-conscious thoughts and behaviours used by learners with the explicit goal of improving their knowledge and understanding of a target language," (p. 169). This definition would certainly apply to language classrooms and self-study but appears too limited for learning through communication in ELF contexts where language use and learning are always linked. On the other hand, Oxford (2017) gives a more complex definition:

> L2 learning strategies are complex, dynamic thoughts and actions, selected and used by learners with some degree of consciousness in specific contexts in order to regulate multiple aspects of themselves (such as cognitive, emotional, and social) for the purpose of (a) accomplishing language tasks; (b) improving language performance or use; and/or (c) enhancing long-term proficiency. (p. 48)

In this definition, learning and use are linked together and the definition is sensitive to a wider range of activities, contexts, and purposes. Furthermore, Pawlak and Oxford (2018) in an article looking at new directions for language learning strategy research, call for research in specific contexts, stating that "research into diverse influences on the use of strategies and the ways in which such use translates into learning outcomes would become more revealing if it were complemented by a situated, context-sensitive and dynamic dimension" (p. 529). Situations where ELF is used is one such dynamic and complex context.

It is also important to define what is meant by "learning" in this paper. Following a usage-based perspective learning is seen as establishing and developing the multitude of form-meaning "constructions" (Goldberg, 2006) which are the foundation of language. Here, the concept of construction, rather than grammar and lexis, is particularly suitable for investigating learning in ELF contexts. Even though exemplars are abstracted through experiencing multiple iterations of the same pairings of form and meaning, these constructions are inherently bound to communicative contexts (Bybee, 2010). Thus, learning refers to learning constructions on any level from words and phrases, and also may involve various levels from establishing a new form-meaning relationship and strengthening it through iteration, to the abstraction of an exemplar – all of which may be described by participants themselves as learning "grammar and vocabulary".

This leads to the following research questions that this paper addresses: 1) Do participants in ELF interaction report learning which helps them to successfully participate in tasks, improve their skills, or develop their proficiency in the long term?; and, 2) What strategic learning behaviors do participants in ELF interaction engage in to successfully participate in tasks, improve their skills, or develop their proficiency in the long term?

Methodology

Data for this paper is drawn from interviews with 12 Erasmus students studying abroad in Hungary and Czechia[3]. The learning strategy data from seven students whose data was representative of the larger group is presented below. Among the seven students, five were from Germany, and one each from Finland and France. The students came from a variety of backgrounds in the arts and sciences and were spending one or two semesters abroad. All participants had at least one month of experience studying abroad at the time of the data collection. Students in Prague were interviewed after their first semester abroad, and students in Szeged were interviewed during a summer Hungarian language course prior to their first semester abroad.

The data collection consisted of two parts: a communicative task which pairs of participants completed, and an immediately following retrospective interview with individuals. Both the task and interview components were recorded. For the communicative task, pairs of participants were asked to assemble a set of PowerPoint slides about the city they were studying in which could be used in a presentation to encourage other international students to study there. The purpose of the task, which consisted of choosing and arranging a set pictures and providing captions for them, was to prime participants for thinking about using ELF and to give them an immediate experience of using English with a fellow student to refer to. The interaction and negotiation between the two participants as they created their PowerPoint slides was recorded. Individual retrospective interviews were carried out following the task, and it is these interviews which form the data for this paper. During the interviews, a participant and researcher together listened to the recording of the just-completed task of organizing the PowerPoint slides, and participants were invited to comment on language related episodes (Jackson, 2001), that is points where participants were negotiating about, focusing on, or discussing language itself. Furthermore, during and after listening to the completed task, participants were asked to comment on their use of ELF and potential learning in the ELF context in general. The interviews lasted between one and one-and-half hours.

The data was transcribed and then analyzed using content analysis to collect participant comments around common themes concerning using and learning English in ELF contexts. The recorded interaction data between the participants was not analyzed for this present paper. From these themes and using the definition of learning strategies

[3] The data for this paper comes from a larger project on English as a lingua franca in Europe, which in turn was part of the EU-wide Languages in a Network of European Excellence (LINEE) research project which was carried out between 2006 and 2010 (funded by the European Commission's 6th Framework Program, FP6# 028388). Data collection and transcription was done by Karolina Kalocsai, Emőke Kovács, and the author. Previously, some of this data was reported on in Jenkins et al. (2010) and published in Cogo and Jenkins (2010). The analysis of the data in this present paper is the author's and was first presented in Peckham (2009a).

discussed in the literature review, several general learning strategies were isolated. It is important to note that this is a bottom-up analysis of the data done in order to see which strategies emerge. The data was not analyzed in terms of existing taxonomies of learning strategies. This is justified on two counts. First, there is a tendency in learning strategy research itself to move away from asking participants about the use of particular strategies, to asking participants if they have strategies that they use in particular situations or for certain functions (Tseng, Dörnyei, & Schmitt, 2006). And second, the ELF context is one where very little strategy research has been done, and it is likely that the kinds of strategies that emerge will be highly dependent on these contexts. For example, see the "let it pass" strategy (Firth, 1996), which is probably unique to ELF contexts.

Results and Discussion

Prior to presenting the results, it should be mentioned that all of the ELF use that participants discussed in their interviews occurred outside of their academic classes. That is, no participants mentioned developments in their academic English; all discussions about interaction concerned out-of-class interaction in English. There can be two main reasons for this. First, not all students were using English as the medium of instruction in their classes in their study abroad program, and so their individual experiences may have been different. Second, and more importantly, the students we interviewed were using English in close social relationships with other international students and locals, and this is a hallmark of the collective experience of international students as has been shown in previous studies (Kalocsai, 2014; Peckham, Kalocsai, Kovács, & Sherman, 2012; Kalocsai, 2009). Thus, it was natural for these participants to see interaction with fellow international students as the center of their English usage.

Reports on Learning

Each of the participants reported on learning some type of constructions, or as they were conceptualizing it, vocabulary and grammar, or they reported on developments in their ability to use English in some way, but there was variation in their responses. As would be expected, less proficient and less experienced students more frequently reported on learning, and highly proficient and more experienced students reported less on learning. For some of the participants, this was the first time they used English extensively, or they had not been using English recently, as is reflected in the comments from a German student in Excerpt 1[4].

[4] Excerpts were edited for clarity, often times minimizing or leaving out the contributions of the interviewer where it was not necessary. This was done to make the examples more readable, but all efforts were made to preserve the original meaning and wording.

> (1) *Yeah, this [thinking about language] is every time a problem because I'm um not very used on it, here in Hungary it's the first time that I'm talking in English for more than one week, not even for more than one day […].*

This particular student's limited experience led him to be thinking extensively about language while using English, as he reported. Others noted they simply did not care much about English, or that they had had more extensive experience in ELF contexts or with native speakers. For example, in Excerpt 2, a German student reported that she believed she had learned a single word during her time in Prague.

> (2) *I don't think my English improves at all, I don't think I get more fluently because in Germany I also had to talk in English sometimes, and I don't think that I learned, so I didn't learn any new words, only once since it was burning in the kitchen in our dormitory and I tried to explain that they used the "fire extinguisher" so this was the new word. So, OK, I learned one more word since I'm here.*

Thus, despite differences in proficiency and previous experience, all participants noted changes and development in their English on some level. Some participants had more to say and others less, which is also to be expected given the general questions that they were asked. Also, since learning might, as noted before, be happening at the most subtle levels, the effects themselves might be too subtle to be noticed. But, participants' reports on their use of learning strategies will tell more about the possibility of their learning, and I will turn to that next.

Reports on Learning Strategies

Due to limitations of space, I will focus on seven participants' data and four emergent strategies which are representative of the experiences of the larger group of 12 participants: paying attention to context, finding a relative expert, having an agenda, and learning independently.

Strategy 1: Paying attention to context

Due to the high context-dependency of ELF communication as higher-order language contact between speakers of varying proficiency and different similects (Mauranen, 2018), paying attention to context is a key strategy for both using ELF and learning. In previous research, students noted this highly specific nature of ELF interaction, one describing it as "It's like more like a liquid and it's actually created every time when some people meet" (Peckham, 2009b, p. 455). Variation is thus dependent on people and contexts, and users of ELF need to pay attention to this. Below, three different aspects of this strategy will be presented based on the features that the participants were attending to.

First, the multilingual nature of ELF communication contexts was commented on by many participants. This can be seen in Extract 3, below, where a German student studying in Hungary presents the situation of choosing which language to speak.

> (3) *Sometimes we even try to use Hungarian because there are some students who don't know how to talk in English, they are not able to speak English. For example, Russian students, and they learn some German but not enough to communicate with us and so sometimes it's just the easiest way to talk in Hungarian […] but, um it's hard, and I'm not one of the best ones, so, but it's too hard for me. There are some others who talk Italian, Spanish or something, you get to know each other, you ask yourself, you ask […] the other um […] just Hungarian which language he speaks and then you probably find one language that both […] speak and then you communicate in that language.*

In Extract 3, the student is describing the negotiation that goes on concerning which languages are available to communicate in and which they must or would like to use. The point is that before English can even be used, a decision must be made to use it rather than any of the other shared languages.

This is also shown in Extract 4 where another German student notes the wide variety of languages she uses, and also highlights, incidentally, that English is not her strongest language.

> (4) Student: *And so the last three years […] um, well, I've, how do you say, they've passed, they've passed three years without just talking English and now it's really difficult because there's Hungarian and Spanish and German, and well, OK*
>
> Interviewer: *So do you use four languages with the participants of the summer school, with the students?*
>
> Student: *Yeah, yeah, I try. Yes, there's just one Spanish person, um but it's OK and it's fun because for me it's really a relaxing just, well, be abling to express myself without, well, without any problems or, yes*

The participants quoted above know though practice that ELF is used in a multilingual setting, which is different in this respect from a native speaker environment, where only one language, English, might be used. As Jenkins (2015) points out, current views see ELF in the context of multilingualism, noting that "English, while always in the (potential) mix, is now conceived as one among many other languages, one resource among many, available but not necessarily used, with ELF defined not merely by its variability but by its complexity and emergent nature" (p. 77).

As well as negotiation for which languages can be used, students report code switching in conversations with the knowledge that there are people involved in the interaction that might understand the code-switched segments. This is shown in Extract

5, where a French Erasmus student reflects on the task of assembling the presentation which he just carried out with a Finnish student. In that interaction they were negotiating about the use of a different word than "famous".

> (5) *[That] is a French word and I know she can speak a very very few words in French, so I tried even if just to try, and that no she didn't get it, so "famous", but it's not really the same meaning, I would prefer to say "linked to reputation", or that I don't know the word, and I wanted her to understand something linked to reputation, but no, so OK, say "famous", less meaningful but say famous.*

This type of codeswitching, or "micro-switching in ELF talk" is well documented in the ELF literature, and has a wide variety of functions (Motschenbacher, 2013, p. 62). To learn through interacting in ELF, one needs to clearly understand what the context is. Here it is always a multilingual context, and part of what is learned here are the strategies for negotiating that context and how to draw on collective linguistic resources, something which can be seen as an aspect of multicompetence from a usage-based perspective (Hall, Cheng, & Carlson, 2006).

A second aspect of understanding the context is to recognize where a speaker is from, that is, their similect, and also their level of proficiency, two of the other variables which are at work in all ELF contexts. Most of the students were highly attuned to this dimension. In Extract 6, a German student discusses evaluating non-native speakers when she meets them.

> (6) Interviewer: *So when you speak with other non-natives you may have a sense you know of how good someone is or*
>
> Student: *yeah, how good he is and where he might come from and whatnot […] It's just, yeah it's automatically.*

This evaluation of others' English is something that nearly all participants discussed. Here it is interesting to note that this student says that it happens "automatically" that their level of English is guessed at.

Third, what happens after this is that more proficient speakers often accommodate to those who are speaking differently or who are perceived to be at a lower level. This can be seen in Extract (7).

> (7) Interviewer: *Does [knowing their level] change the course of your talk to them?*
>
> Student: *Yeah usually, what happens is just I start talking like normally like this and they either you see from their face that they're a bit like, uh what? what? what? or yeah so that's when you make, uh, when you kind of decide or make the decision to slow down, and change the kind of language that you speak or to continue (...) with a non-native speaker that is on a lower level I really have to think what I'm saying and how I'm saying it, it's it's*

> *you have to produce the speech in a different way and it's much more complicated.*

This type of conversational adjustment has been noted in the ELF literature, for example in business ELF communication (Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2010). Accommodation in this sense is a way of ensuring that communication can happen and that all voices can be heard. It is also a driver of learning, and has been shown to be relied on in ELF conversations. It can mean speaking like other speakers, that is, picking up their way of speaking, their vocabulary, pronunciations, mannerisms, etc., as a means to show belonging to a group, something which has been described extensively by Kalocsai in her study of Erasmus students (2014, p. 133). In this sense we can think of accommodation as an example of awareness of other speakers, and the adjustment of one's speech as learning. Here, participants are learning not just how to communicate, but what means can best be used to communicate in a specific situation.

The same Finnish student from a previous extract highlights the "let it pass" strategy (Firth, 1996), which is common in ELF conversations, where speakers let unclear parts of communication pass by on the assumption that if it is important, it will be returned to or elaborated on by the speaker. This strategy, used in a slightly different way, is mentioned below in Extract 8.

> (8) Student: *I remember I was a bit confused what he was talking about, and then thinking about what is he trying to say and tell me […] and I still said, yeah yeah, because I think it was more to get along to get on, and I wanted to hear, and I often say yeah yeah yeah to get the, you often understand more when they, if I thought he would explain it a bit more.*
>
> Interviewer: *So you didn't want to interrupt him because you thought it would become clear?*
>
> Student: *Yeah, because we communicate with so many people with so many levels of English, so it's sometimes it's a bit frustrating to ask all the time I'm sorry what do you mean? So, what I've realized that it's easier to give them a bit time and let them to explain the thing, and the same way, if I try to explain something to someone else, it's easier to kind of, if they give you a bit time and a bit space to get your idea there.*

Here the Finnish student is giving the other person the chance to continue explaining themselves, which is a strategy she uses based on an evaluation of the context. What this strategy does is give speakers the chance to reformulate their utterances to become clearer and more precise if necessary.

Thus, this first strategy involves evaluating the context, the possible languages which can be used in conversation and to which degree, and the presumed proficiency of other speakers and how they are using language. This evaluation leads to language choice, code switching, conversational strategies, and changes in one's own English through accommodation and adjustment. ELF communication is highly context

dependent and knowledge of that context allows speakers to adjust and develop their language use appropriately in order to carry out tasks or become part of a group. As Mauranen explains, accommodation and "enhanced explication" through interaction leads to a "feedback loop" between language users, thus causing change in groups' and individuals' language (2018, p. 13-14).

Strategy 2: Finding a relative expert

The second strategy relates to the linguistic models that participants look to in ELF interaction. The assumption in the standard second language acquisition literature is that learners will be looking to native speaker models while learning through interaction and in study abroad contexts. But, a hallmark of ELF communication is that norms are local and are not necessarily based on native-speaker models. In the present research, participants reported on looking for a "relative expert" who could serve as a model, that is, someone who appears to be more proficient or experienced than them who they can accommodate to or from whom they can actively borrow words and phrases. Students who reported having less experience with English or saw themselves as lower proficiency were more likely to look for a relative expert from whom they could learn. In Excerpt 9, a German student speaks about choosing someone to follow in learning.

> (9) *I'm uh listen every time I talk to uh to someone who speaks good English, um I try to uh to learn the expressions […] Yeah it depends um for example, she [referring to the person he carried out the presentation task with] is a very good speaker I think and yeah good pronunciation and so I try to learn from her, um I've got a […] friend in the course it's a Korean guy, and uh he doesn't speak so good English and so um no I don't try, I don't try to learn from him.*

This participant notes that he listens for new expressions and tries to learn them from other non-native speakers whom he sees as better speakers of English. No mention is made here or anywhere in the data that these people are more native-speaker like, but merely that they are better.

One French student spoke of finding a pronunciation model and noted that non-native speakers are easier to understand, as seen in Excerpt 10.

> (10) *Um as usual when speaking with her boyfriend [who is Australian], uh, I'm in front of my lack of English, and it was easier the previous semester because I was with a Greek guy and it's easier when people have an accent, when with their rolled r it's easier to listen to, like work or word [trilled r], work [with trilled r] is closer to French and it's hard when they speak too good English*

This situation where it is easier to understand other non-native speakers is mentioned often in the ELF literature (see Peckham, Kalocsai, Kovács, & Sherman, 2012) and was mentioned several times in the data. Moreover, the French student later goes on to say

in Excerpt 11 that not only are non-native speakers easier to understand, but it is the non-native accent that he wants to emulate.

> (11) *When we met I try to catch some expression or way of pronunciation. At the beginning in September it was the first time when I was forced to use English, and it sounds like uh "good morning" [said with a French accent] [laughs] but […] the Greek guy had a Greek accent but not so stressed I picked some way of speaking from him, and yeah, I try to pick up some expression of melody […]. Hmm what did I learn? Mostly the pronunciation, uh, and after having spoken a long time with the Greek guy, in Greece they have a very different way of pronunciation, melody, and at the end I […] realized I was speaking in a Greek English way [laughs].*

The French student has chosen someone to learn pronunciation from whom he finds has a clear accent in English. This makes sense from the point of view that an important goal of ELF is effective communication and not meeting a native speaker model. In this case, the fact that the Greek student is a non-native speaker of English has actually made him a more attractive model or "expert" for the French student. What is at stake here is the multicompetence knowledge that makes a person an effective user of English as a lingua franca.

There is no reason to assume that there are groups of participants who either see themselves as "novices" and "experts". Indeed, there may be many things that can be learned from different types and levels of experts. Furthermore, a participant may be a learner in one situation and an expert in another. This is shown in Excerpt 12, also by the same French student, where he finds himself in the role of expert.

> (12) Interviewer: *What are the things you pay attention to when speaking to other non-native speakers? How does it depend on your partner, on the person you're speaking to?*
>
> Student: *It depend mostly on his or her level of English, uh for example with the Kazakh girl [his current roommate] I don't speak so quickly and I yeah I try to keep a part of my French accent, she can get more of the words, and but yeah with native speakers or with good English speakers I just try to speak far away from French pronunciation.*

Here he notes how he is changing his speech to be more understandable for the lower-level participant in interaction, and in this case, he is keeping his French accent, presumably using less of the Greek accent he mentioned earlier. He demonstrates that he can be both in the role of "expert" and learner or "novice".

Thus, by using the "finding a relative expert" strategy, students are showing that they are looking for models and goals among their ELF interactants and are potentially learning in this way. Certainly, they are employing this as a strategy for learning, whatever the outcome. While learning through interaction has been widely researched, what is interesting here is that the best communicators – not native speakers or

classroom teachers – are seen as the goal setters and thus relative experts. This makes sense: if learning is happening here, participants are developing their knowledge of how to be multicompetent users of ELF.

Strategy 3: Having an agenda

A third learning strategy that participants reported on was to have an agenda for aspects of language that they want to learn. This "agenda" could be a specific list of items which they were on the lookout for in conversations, or a specific area of language which they were working on.

Excerpt 13 is from a German student who notes that he is looking for "grammar" in conversations.

> (13) Student: *Um yeah it's um how to use of, in, on, and so on, and so like it depends ON, yeah I'm trying to learn this, uh yeah and the tense like uh have been and so on, when you use it and when you use I was and*
>
> Interviewer: *So you're sort of listening for grammar and…*
>
> Student: *Grammar, yeah and I think my vocabulary is not bad and I can understand English language better than I can speak it, so it's not a great problem.*

The student in Excerpt 13 notes that it is not vocabulary he is looking for and looking to learn in conversations, but grammar, in this case prepositions, phrasal verbs, and verb tenses. When he speaks of "grammar", though, he is talking about looking for certain combinations of words, as would be expected from a usage-based, constructivist position on grammar where learning happens though the development of exemplars and not through learning "rules".This same student also notes that he is listening for pronunciation, but of particular words.

> (14) *I've got these words I'm listening to the pronunciation like "rather" I wasn't sure about like "rether" or something like that so I got these words I always try to find in in discussions or something like that and conversations and when I hear it I think oh it's "rather".*

Again, this participant is focusing his attention on and looking for particular words in conversation that he has a question about, and, in doing so, he is learning in an ELF context, in conversation with other non-native speakers of English. Furthermore, he is being highly selective in what he is looking for.

Other participants focused on vocabulary. In Excerpt 15, a German student describes how communicating in English highlights her lack of vocabulary in certain areas, and this leads her to focus on word learning.

> (15) *Well in general, um, if there's a conversation, um and it's a certain topic and I miss the vocabulary because it's really, well my vocabulary is so*

> *basic that many times I must think, Oh, how is it called? Well then I just can't express what I want to say, and um well the grammar is not that big problem um because the others can understand me or able to understand me, but many times I just feel uncomfortable, I just think OK you have to improve and just like this, and that's what I'm going to do…*

Participants noted that it is the experience of using English actively for the first time which pointed to areas where they lacked vocabulary for the situation. Excerpt 15 highlights the communicative power of lexical items in conversation. The participant notes that concerning grammar, other interactants are able to understand her, but her lack of words makes her feel "uncomfortable", and she has a plan to address this situation.

Similarly, in Excerpt 16, another student notes how it is the frequency of the experience of realizing that she does not know a word that leads her to learn it.

> (16) *So if I'm telling a story and I need a word and it doesn't come to mind and if I look for this word several times or if I'm missing this word several times then I look it up at home, then I really need to look it up. But if I'm only missing it once and can explain it with other words, then I'm too lazy or I forget about this.*

Again, in this case and the previous one, it is the event of communicating in ELF which leads the students to expand their vocabulary. That is, their need arises directly from the communicative context they are engaged in.

Students also noted more complex relationships between language and communicative context as is illustrated in Excerpt 17, where a student discusses the pragmatics of how to respond appropriately in particular situations.

> (17) Interviewer: *Do you feel like you've learned how to communicate between people, between non-native speakers, let's say?*
>
> Student: *Yeah, I think so. Because the most problematic thing for me at the moment is that, in every country I think – I can only speak for Germany – there is some kind of code how to introduce yourself, how to introduce others, how to say things in a polite way. So, for example if I want to come up with things like "I do not like what you did there and there" or "I would appreciate it if you did it like this and this" so if I want to say something like that I know very precisely how to phrase it in German. I can get the message through on the one hand, but on the other hand I can stay polite. And this is one thing which is really hard for me at the moment because I have the feeling that I'm either too polite or I'm too rough, so this is a problem, but I think I begin to learn how I can phrase these things in English so that people would not be […].*
>
> Interviewer: *And do you learn it from them?*

> Student: *I think I learn because I see their reactions, so I can see like OK this was too fierce or they do not understand this word or this was maybe not the right word to say, you would say it in German but for them it sounds very impolite for example because it's often the case because, yeah, maybe Germans have a tendency to say things as the think, and so I learn this but, this is like an intercultural thing. This doesn't really have to do with, it has to do with language but still Italians see it differently from Finnish people, Finnish people see it differently from American people, so it's like I always have to get to know the person I'm talking to and then I can react, but I think this is one of the best ways to learn language because you can react to everybody and then you have to choose the register of language you will employ at that time.*

This long excerpt shows that the student has identified a particular issue in communication, and then uses ELF interaction to develop her knowledge. She is aware that her first-language pragmatic competence may not necessarily transfer to this context and is on the lookout for how she is being received. Also, she is aware that her interlocutors are not adopting Anglo-American pragmatic norms, but are using English as a vehicular language, and not as a means of cultural identification. She knows that speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds may have different pragmatic considerations that color their expectations in English. This type of linguistic knowledge is highly context dependent and generated and learned through use. Here it is also important to note that what the student is finding out is not necessarily how Italians or Finns behave linguistically, but how in the context of ELF communication speakers from various linguistic backgrounds carry out communication. The student approaches it as a linguist would, carrying out an analysis and testing hypotheses, and as such she is in an excellent position to clearly understand and learn how ELF communication is organized.

In sum, these examples show that these learners approach ELF interaction with the intent to learn various aspects of the language, from vocabulary and grammar, to accent and pragmatics. The ELF interaction they have opens up the opportunity for learning these aspects of language, no matter what their previous experience is. One student may have an agenda to learn which prepositions are associated with which verbs, while another is examining how subtle changes in her language affect the responses of those around her. Overall, what this strategy allows these participants to do is to focus their attention on elements of the interaction which are relevant for their own personal development. In this sense, having an agenda helps drive what can be considered explicit goal-driven learning. That is, rather than simply experiencing incidental and even implicit learning which may naturally accompany language use, these participants are acting like learners who have clear language development goals that they want to achieve.

Strategy 4: Learning independently

The final strategy presented refers to students deciding to work on their own, outside of interaction with other speakers, to develop their language skills. It should be noted that this work was done outside of any kind of classes or coursework that they might be involved in. Whereas the previous strategy may have led to work outside of the conversational context, the learning independently strategy refers to what participants actually did on their own.

First, some students noted that realizing they needed conversational English skills, they turned to British and American films and television to either make a transition from the language classroom to actual language use, or to balance out their recent approach to focusing on academic English, as is shown in Excerpt 18.

> (18) *Here because I have a fast internet connection I can watch like news or TV shows and so on, and this is like I can learn everyday language, and this is much more practicable in the situations I'm in here with the other Erasmus students […]. You don't have to say or employ this academic English because this is complete nonsense in here so these TV shows they really help me to get to know every-day English language. And the others do the same.*

In this excerpt the student realizes that to fit in better in the group with English she needs to learn more colloquial English, and so turns to television. It is interesting to note that whether or not watching English and American TV will help her become a better ELF communicator, she has realized that the context of ELF communication requires something other than her previous, academic approach to English. The goal here is to fit in better with the group.

Using a different approach, the participant in Excerpt 19 describes practicing conversations so that he can be prepared to speak when he meets up with his friends.

> (19) Student: *Uh, yeah, when I'm when I'm alone like on my way from school to my flat um I'm imagine I'm tell I don't know an English or Korean guy, uh something in English, I want to tell him about my day or something like that, and then I'm I want to translate directly so I have the German sentence and I won't describe it just uh say it directly and when a word is missing I'm trying to look it up in the dictionary. Yeah, those are my BIG strategies.*
>
> Interviewer: *That's great. So you're actually telling stories with yourself, actually role playing*
>
> Student: *Yeah yeah role playing […]*

Thus, in this situation the participant is rehearsing what it is he might want to say, and then looking up words in the dictionary when he realizes what he does not know. Again,

it is the immediate context of communication which is motivating the student to take this action.

This student also describes how interacting with others highlighted his need for basic vocabulary and so this led him to preemptively look up words that he thought he was going to need, as is seen in Excerpt 20.

> (20) Student: *I'm living in a flat and in this flat we […] a Mexican guy, very comfortable, yeah and in the flat I'm living with a Finnish girl and so you have to do you have to tell everything in English and um so I'm looking up for words like for water basin and, yeah and so on.*
>
> Interviewer: *So it sounds like you have a strategy of if you want to say something you can, you need it a lot, like water basin you look it up then*
>
> Student: *Yeah, I walked through the kitchen and yeah I think it's uh better than um than describe everything, you know you don't know the word for water basin and you only say the the thing that water, uh yeah*

In both of these cases this student is actively preparing for using English based on his experience of what he needs to communicate about. This is happening independently, outside of speaking with others. The above excerpt shows that he knows the communication strategy of circumlocution but decides to use the learning strategy of noting and looking up the word.

Another student discussed how she takes notes on things she says and is unsure of, and marks them for study later. This is seen in Excerpt 21.

> (21) Student: *Well, often there's a situation then I just think OK, then I'm not sure about the use, um of, I don't know any grammar, yes and those are the situations when I think OK, you have to do this and this and this and, um, sometimes I even take notes, so that I can write, OK you have to do that and that one, and then, OK*
>
> Interviewer: *What kind of notes?*
>
> Student: *Well, just about, well, for example, I don't know, something easy like "if clauses", because, I don't know.*

The participant in Excerpt 21 is using the ELF communication context to note instances of grammar that she imagines that she should know more about to be a more effective communicator. While there is no report from the student concerning whether or not she uses this information to test out a hypothesis in conversation later, it is still possible to see that it is this conversational context which has given rise to her question.

All of these examples of the learning independently strategy show that the participants in these programs were led by their experience to learn more about the language, either words or styles of speaking. This learning inspired by ELF interaction allows for three potential effects. First, this independent work gives students an

opportunity for further encountering new language which they can bring to ELF interaction – for example, new words can be looked up for which there will likely be a need. Second, working on their own gives these participants the opportunity to consolidate those things which they are learning and experiencing. This consolidation phase of learning is also an important element of organized, classroom-based learning, but can be applied here. After "improvising" through using language, consolidation allows speakers to "prepare for language production" and "go beyond the basic presentation of their message" (Willis, 2003, p. 22). And third, independent learning allows for the possibility of rehearsal, as was seen in Excerpt 19. This kind of task pre-planning and rehearsal have been shown to have a positive impact in fluency and accuracy (Ellis, 2009), and thus similar to consolidation this can lead to learning. Furthermore, up to date with current thinking about language instruction, these participants are focusing on form in communicative context (Lightbown & Spada, 2013), and working independently gives these participants the chance to attend to the connections without the immediate attention-draining pressure of communication at that moment.

General Discussion

Overall, then, concerning learning through ELF communication, evidence has been found for both research questions raised in this paper. All students reported on learning at least something in their recent experience. More importantly, across the group of students a variety of learner strategies were reported on. These strategies meet the definition of strategies of being thoughts and actions taken to accomplish tasks and develop long- or short-term language proficiency, as discussed above. Indeed, as was noted, with study-abroad students in general, language itself is a central concern, and this is also evidenced specifically by the present participants' willingness and ability to discuss their own language use and learning in great detail. Thus, there is indirect evidence that learning is happening through their reports of learning and use of learning strategies. On a group level, then, this suggests that using English as a Lingua franca is a context where speakers not only are communicating messages, practicing what they have already learned, and interacting using English in general, but that they are indeed learning language. Speakers are taking personal initiative to focus their attention on form and meaning for the purpose of developing their language competence on levels ranging from phonology to pragmatics. In short, this is a site for language learning, and given the prevalence of opportunities for using ELF, it may be for some the preeminent opportunity for language learning.

One objection to this conclusion could be that indirect reports of learning are not evidence of learning. Indeed, this is true, but there are three lines of thinking which support a connection between learning and the participant reports. First, learning through interaction is seen in the field of second language acquisition as one of the most

important ways in which language learning happens both inside and outside the classroom, and has been the subject of a tremendous amount of research which suggests that conversational interaction is an important venue for learning (Mackey, 2007a). Second, there is precedent in the second language literature to look for secondary, indirect indicators of learning which do not depend on the measurement of learning outcomes. The presence of markers of "negotiation for meaning" has long been used as an indicator of the potential of learning in that these moves focus the attention of speakers on specific aspects of language to be learned (Mackey, 2007b). And third, in research on learning strategies work has been done from the early work on the "good language learner" (Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1995) to the present which suggests that there is indeed a connection between the use of language learning strategies and learning. Thus, although it was not possible to measure actual learning in the present study, there is a likelihood that it is happening in this situation.

A second potential objection centers on focusing on language learning itself in ELF interaction. The objection here is that participants in ELF communication are not learners of English using an imperfect version of native speaker English which they will forever be short of mastering, but that they are users of ELF in a space where native speaker English, standard English, and "real English" are not valid norms. That is, to discuss learning is seen to suggest that the participants in ELF communication are somehow deficient and to impose an English as a native language viewpoint. But, it needs to be emphasized that the definition of ELF as higher-order language contact between similects sets the stage for the competence being unique which is developed and expressed there, and that participants in the present study see themselves as learning through ELF interaction in that very context. Moreover, considering language competence as context-dependent and usage-based multicompetene (Hall, Cheng, & Carlson, 2006), it is apparent that ELF communication is indeed a space where language learning must be happening – it is where form, meaning, and social context meet, and in fact this, for some speakers of English, may be the first and perhaps only context where they are actually using English, as was reported by some of our speakers. As such, it is of interest to investigate learning in this context – with the caveat that what is developing may not reflect, or need not reflect, idealized native speaker competence.

Thus, there is good reason to believe that there is learning of form and meaning connections happening in the context of ELF communication.

Conclusion

There are limitations to this current study due to its small-scale nature and inability to precisely measure that learning has happened. Nevertheless, there are some possible implications for the teaching of English. First, it is worth noting that English language learning continues after speakers have finished foreign language classes in secondary school. It is not the case that learners only become users outside of the classroom. This

study shows that they can remain active learners. Second, one of the most likely settings for using and also continuing to develop competence in English is going to be using English as a lingua franca, and thus in order to prepare students for this, they need to be aware of the particular nature of this setting, something which is noted as lacking in English as a foreign language materials (Yu, 2015, p. 36). Third, it is important to note that the skills and strategies which are useful in learning in lingua franca contexts are applicable to all contexts if indeed the goal is developing the multicompetence which allows speakers to navigate varying linguistic situations. The skills that are needed involve making sense of language – that is, "languaging", in Larsen-Freeman's view (2003) – and not simply adherence to prescribed norms based on idealized speakers. Speakers develop over a lifetime of experience by responding to new contexts, languages and modes of communication, and it appears that much this experience for many English speakers will be happening in ELF contexts.

As a final note, it should be mentioned that research for this present paper was carried out more than ten years ago, but the use of ELF and the study of this phenomenon has grown considerably during that time, making considerations of how English is used and taught even more important. Furthermore, with the United Kingdom having left the European Union, it is now the case that English, commonly used in the public and private spheres in the EU, is no longer the official language of any member state. This can provide a new context for the further development of use of ELF and raise more questions about the teaching and learning of English.

References

Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, usage and cognition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cogo, A., & Jenkins, J. (2010). English as a lingua franca in Europe: A mismatch between policy and practice. *European Journal of Language Policy, 2*(2), 271-294. https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2010.16

Cohen, A. D., & Henry, A. (2020). Focus on the learner: Styles, strategies and motivation. In N. Schmitt, & M. P. Rodgers, *An introduction to linguistics, 3rd edition* (pp. 165-189). London: Routledge.

De Jong, N., & Perfetti, C. A. (2011). Fluency training in the ESL classroom: An experimental study of fluency development and proceduralization. *Language Learning, 61*(2), 533-568. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00620.x

Directorate–General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. (2020). *Annex Erasmus+ Annual Report 2019.* Luxembourg: European Commission.

Ellis, N., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics—Introduction to the special issue. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(4), 558-589. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml028

Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(4), 474-509. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp042

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On conversation analysis and 'lingua franca' English. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 237-259. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8

Goldberg, A. E. (2006). *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next.* London: The British Council.

Hall, J. K., Cheng, A., & Carlson, M. T. (2006). Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of language knowledge. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 220-240. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml013

Hynninen, N. (2016). *Language regulation in English as a lingua franca.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Jackson, D. O. (2001). Language-related episodes. *ELT Journal, 55*(3), 298–299. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.3.298

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

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2*(3), 49-85. https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 281-315. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444811000115

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., Peckham, D., Tamah, Sherman, T., & Sieglová, D. (2010). *Learning, use and perceptions of English as a lingua franca communication in European contexts.* LINEE WP7a Research Report.

Kalocsai, K. (2009). Erasmus exchange students: A behind-the-scenes view into an ELF community of practice. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies, 3*(1), 25-49.

Kalocsai, K. (2014). *Communities of practice and English as a lingua franca: A study of Erasmus students in a central-European context.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kankaanranta, A., & Louhiala-Salminen, L. (2010). "English? – Oh, it's just work!": A study of BELF users' perceptions. *English for Specific Purposes, 29*, 204-209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.06.004

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching Language: From grammar to grammaring.* Boston: Thomson Heinle.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A. (2007a). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A. (2007b). Interaction as practice. In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 85–110). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, A. (2018). Conceptualizing ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 7-24). London: Routledge.

Motschenbacher, H. (2013). New perspectives on English as a European lingua franca. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1995). *The good language learner.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

OECD. (2020). *International student mobility (indicator)*. Retrieved 2020 December, from https://doi.org/10.1787/4bcf6fc3-en

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston, MA: Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies, 2nd edition.* London: Routledge.

Pawlak, M., & Oxford, R. L. (2018). Conclusion: The future of research into language learning strategies. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 8*(2), 525-535. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.15

Peckham, D. W. (2009a). *Informal and incidental learning in ELF contexts.* The second conference of English as a lingua franca, University of Southampton, April 6-8.

Peckham, D. W. (2009b). The names of English: Non-native insights into English as a lingua franca. In A. Borbély, I. Vanconé Kremmer & H. Hattyár (Eds.), *Nyelvideológiák, attitűdök és sztereotípiák: 15. Élőnyelvi konferencia* (pp. 454-457). Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

Peckham, D. W., Kalocsai, K., Kovács, E., & Sherman, T. (2012). English and multilingualism, or English only in a multilingual Europe? In P. Struder, & I.

Werlen (Eds.), *Linguistic diversity in Europe* (pp. 179-201). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Ranta, E. (2018). Grammar in ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 244-254). London: Routledge.

Seidlhofer, B. (2000). Mind the gap: English as a mother tongue vs. English as a lingua franca. *Vienna English Working Papers, 9*(1), 51-69.

Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Tseng, W., Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006). A new approach to assessing strategic learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 78-102. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami046

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014.* Bonn: Lemmens Medien GmbH.

Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 377-389. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587438

Willis, D. (2003). *Rules, patterns and words.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yu, M. H. (2015). Developing critical classroom practice for ELF communication: A Taiwanese case study of ELT materials evaluation. In H. Bowles, & A. Cogo (Eds.), *International perspectives on English as a lingua franca: Pedagogical insights* (pp. 35-54). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Imagined future teacher self at the point of entry to teacher education

Katalin Doró[1]

University of Szeged

DOI: 10.14232/edulingua.2020.1.2

A growing body of literature has focused on teacher identity development, but very few of these target students at the beginning of their studies. This article discusses the future teacher selves that first-year undergraduates imagine for themselves before receiving any instruction on teaching-related subjects. Results suggest that students are, nevertheless, able to envisage a surprising variability and detail in their essays that underwent mix-method analysis. The most commonly occurring traits were grouped under five larger themes, focusing on personality and teacher self, teacher-student interaction, classroom teaching abilities, becoming members of a community of teachers, and altruistic goals. These teacher selves are mostly realistic and positive, with a clear understanding of the dynamism that teacher identity is formed as on ongoing process. It is argued that learning about freshly admitted students' views related to teaching serves as valuable information to enhance pre-service teacher education programs.

Keywords: teacher self, imagined future teacher self, teacher identity, teacher training, transition to higher education

Introduction

The choice of a university education program is a decisive moment in a young adult's life. This step is often difficult and is influenced by many factors. Research has found that students who make good educational decisions and have high specialty satisfaction show higher self-esteem and have better chances to perform well in school (Alsalkhi, 2018). A growing body of literature has discussed how students start their university education with initial images of university life and their student and adult selves and what challenges the transition may imply (see e.g., Gale & Parker, 2014; T. Balla & Bajnóczi, 2015; Money et al., 2020; Vosniadou, 2020).

Some university systems and programs leave educational and life choices open for some years, such as specialization after an introductory year, choosing or changing majors or minors during the course of study or a large selection of further study options after a BA degree. On the contrary, in many educational systems, some professions (typically e.g., medical, engineering and legal) have a determined course of long years of study and students not only choose a study program, but also their career options

[1] Author's e-mail: dorokati@lit.u-szeged.hu

when they apply for university. Teacher education falls into this latter category in Hungary, where students in recent years apply for a five or six-year program towards a certificate of elementary or secondary school teachers in two subjects. Earlier, students interested in English received first a BA degree in English or American Studies and then could choose to continue with the same at the MA level, to choose from other degree programs in teaching, translating and interpreting or international relations or even take a gap and gain job and life experiences. The system is now changing again to allow for enrollment in a short-track, single major teacher training program after or in parallel with a disciplinary MA program.

Students enter teacher training programs with attitudes towards teaching, beliefs about what makes good teachers, and expectancies about the study program, all influenced by their student experiences, their families' and society's expectations and attitudes towards teachers. These beliefs will continuously be challenged and shaped by their university courses and instructors, their pre-service teaching practice, school environments and teaching-related educational policy changes (Chong et al, 2011; Day & Kington, 2008; Glodjo, 2020). While numerous studies have focused on teacher identity formation during and after university training (especially of pre-service and novice teachers), the discussion of the initial stage at the entry point is largely missing. Nevertheless, it is important to know what students bring with them to their teacher education as this will largely influence also how they react to course content, how much they benefit from their pre-service training and how they will later manage to deal with the frequent conflicts between imagined selves and real-world experiences. This study discusses the imagined future teacher selves (IFTS) of a cohort of first-year English language teacher trainees at a large Hungarian university through a mixed-method analysis of essays written about their study choice and imagined teaching career.

Background to the study

The present study draws on research on language teacher identity development, beliefs about the effective language teacher, students' motivation to choose teacher training and, finally, the transition to higher education and student retention. Each of these areas has direct influence on how freshly admitted students to a teacher education program may see their future career and teacher selves.

Language teacher identity development

At the beginning of a teacher training program, students mainly think about themselves as students and by the end of the program they develop a teacher identity as well and navigate between student and teacher selves. Teacher identity, as much as other career identities, should be considered as socially constructed and culturally embedded influxes of change. Teacher identity has different disciplinary understandings and many

definitions (for a review see e.g., Gray & Morton, 2018; Li & DeCosta, 2018). For example, Barkhuizen and Mendieta (2020) offer an understanding of *teacher identity* as socially constituted, constantly changing, tied to context, enacted or performed and including various parallel identities.

The term *teacher self* refers to a personalized understanding of what makes teachers who they are; the navigation between their different identities. *Future teacher self* refers to the way teachers-to-be envisage themselves as teachers. This is a *possible self* that may contain elements of *actual self* (attributes someone possessed in a given moment), *ideal self* (qualities someone would like to possess) and *ought-to self* (obligations and responsibilities), but with great emphasis on the ideal self (Hiver, 2013; Kubanyiova, 2009). The difficulty of student teachers in constructing a teacher identity early on in their student career (or before it) lies in the fact that identity formation requires the practice of teaching, the discovery of how subject knowledge, ideal teacher selves and prior classroom planning need constant adaptation and reaction to the teaching context. They, therefore, use *imagined identities* compared to the *practiced or professional identities* (Xu, 2012). When picturing themselves as future teachers, they may rely on positive and negative role models they have had as students, their limited volunteer tutoring or working with children and, later on during their studies, on their pedagogy and psychology classes. In a narrative study carried out among second and third-year Finnish teacher trainees, Kalaja and Mäntylä (2018) found visible differences in the imagined ideal classrooms of those with no teaching related courses and those with already some of these.

Day and Kington (2008) distinguish between three dimensions of teacher identity, namely *professional identity*, *situated located identity* and *personal identity*. The first one is an ideal picture about the good teacher that may be influenced by social norms and policy expectations. Situated located identity is context bound and adds to teachers' long-term identity formation. The environment it shapes includes students, colleagues and the given school or classroom. Day and Kington point out that the ideas concerning the ideal teacher self may have conflicts with professional development, roles, responsibilities and workload demands teachers face. The third dimension is the personal self which is connected to outside of school roles.

Drawing on earlier research on teacher identity development with reference to social, psychological, anthropological and political science perspectives, Friesen and Besley (2013) discuss the identities (student) teachers may have. Teacher identity is situated in the trajectory of *personal*, *role* and *social identities*. Someone may choose to fulfill a teaching role without experiencing a psychological identification with the given role. This will not have a meaningful result on a personal level, neither on a social level in the form of a shared feeling of union with colleagues. However, in order to develop a professional identity one needs to view themselves as teachers, as part of a teaching community. Through this, they invest their personal self in the work, think about their

beliefs, values and inspirations and also closely consider these in their colleagues and monitor how these influence their own beliefs and values.

Danielewicz (2001) offers an excellent picture of the complexity and delicacy of teaching, its demand to constantly consider and adapt to "variables such as students, texts, knowledge, abilities, and goals to formulate an approach to teaching, and then to carry out – every day, minute to minute, within the ever-shifting context of the classroom" (p. 9). She stresses also the difference between playing a role and developing a teacher identity as follows:

> Roles are flimsy and superficial, transitory and easily adopted or discarded. They seem to be whole and complete, like a ready-made set of clothes that one can put on before class and take off after. I wouldn't be a very good teacher if I felt I was playing a role (and neither, I believe, would my students). Identities require the commitment of self to the enterprise in a way that acting out a role does not. A teacher must rise to the occasion time after time; the self goes on the line every day. (Danielewich, 2001, p. 10)

Compared to this quickly growing body of literature on teacher identity development, very few studies target students at the beginning of their studies. In one of these Friesen and Besley (2013) used a questionnaire study with first-year students at a New Zealand university involving questions on teacher identity, personal identity, student identity, ethnic/cultural identity and generativity (connection to other people, responsibility for others, transition of knowledge to others and contribution to the community). They found relatively high levels of perception of teacher identity, personal identity, and student identity. Results showed that increased levels of personal and social identities and generativity were associated with increased teacher identity. Likewise, increased age, parenthood and experience working with children also led to higher levels of teacher identity. They concluded that younger students (without children and extensive work experience with children) must rely on their memories of teachers that have had. This is visible in our data as well as first-year students often draw on positive or negative teacher examples to find role models and to build these into their teacher selves.

As stated above, one aspect of teacher identity is the reflection on what good teaching entails (for a review see e.g., De Costa & Norton, 2017). However, it is not only the teachers themselves who reflect upon this question and compare it to their self-efficacy beliefs. Participants in the learning-teaching context (students of various ages, parents, teachers, school directors, policy makers, teacher trainers) may have fundamentally different views of teacher efficacy. As for the effective English language teachers, studies have found both similarities and differences between the views of secondary school students, teacher trainees at different stages of their education and practicing teachers (for some recent studies see e.g., Alzeebaree & Hasan, 2020; Bremner, 2020; Çürt Aşıkferki et al., 2018; Külekçi, 2018). Alzeebaree and Hasan (2020), for instance, noted that Kurdish secondary school students placed the most

emphasis on English language proficiency, followed by self-confidence and self-control, listening to student's opinions, being fair, having good classroom management and being prepared. Bremner (2020) used a narrative study with Mexican university students. In contrast with the previous study, students did not highlight language proficiency as the most important trait, but marginally mentioned the problem with the lack of it. Results also revealed that the participants placed high importance on modern and engaging teaching approaches and positive student-teacher relationship, including personalized attention. Interestingly, for almost half of the reviewed teacher cases, students discussed negative teacher examples to illustrate what is lacking in ineffective teachers. In earlier studies with Hungarian students we could also see a difference between the perceptions of first-year students, those close to graduation and in-service teachers (Doró & T. Balla, 2014, 2019). Students in the first-year group suggested a student's perspective rather than that of a prospective teacher. Also, while MA level teacher trainees found most of the listed traits and characteristics essential, drawing an ideal picture of the good language teacher, in-service teachers were more aware of the limitations daily work may entail.

Students' motivation to choose teacher training

The selection of a student's specialty is influenced by many interrelated factors. These are often led by their interests, good grades in given subjects, and the perceived difficulty to get into and finish a study program. Many also consider financial aspects, such as educational expenses and the social and economic benefits the degree promises (secure job, social mobility, good salary, balanced family and professional lives). Many are advised or otherwise influenced by family members, friends or teachers, but also the availability of certain study programs, distance from home, social prestige and imagined career self. Many students change their decisions or give up their studies after admission because they cannot envisage themselves in a certain career. The early school and life experiences that push young adults to apply for teacher education serve as crucial first steps in teacher identity formation. They also have an impact on students' expectations of their future teacher selves.

However, not all students enter teacher education with a strong commitment to become teachers, which entails that they do not at this point have a strong imagined future teacher self. Miskiniene and Rodzeviciute (2005) conducted research among Lithuanian students entering a prestigious pedagogical college and found that the majority of them had influencing teachers and loved children or the idea of working with people. They also wished to get better in the chosen area that was often their favorite school subject. However, many chose the institute itself rather than the specific program and signed up for teacher education as a necessity due to the teaching profile of the college. This was reflected in the fact that over 40% of the students considered becoming a teacher of minor importance. Many simply sought opportunity to become a

tertiary student and to enjoy the benefits of higher education or ended up in teacher education by chance, thinking that the given school was easier to get access to than others. Very little research is available on Hungarian students' motivation to become teacher traninees or English teachers. Bosnyák and Gáncs (2012) interviewed MA level students and found that some are lacking intrinsic motivation to become English teachers and "regard teaching as a fallback career or as a stepping-stone to other professions" (p. 75). In addition, in a questionnaire study with second-year students in the 6-year teacher training program, Smid (2018) found his participants to be more instrinsically than extrinstically motivated both towards learning English and becoming English teachers.

Transition to higher education and student retention

The transition from secondary school to higher education or the switch from one study program to another may imply a drastic change in a student's academic, personal and social life, their level of independence and coping strategies, which is affected by a variety of factors. Research has shown that apart from students' socio-economic status, grades and subject knowledge, non-cognitive factors such as attitudinal, affective and personality variables also play an important role in their rate of success and graduation (Witkowsky et al., 2020). Often there is a mismatch between students' beliefs, expectations and the academic and life demands they face. Those who are more college-ready and have a so-called *growth mindset* show a higher success rate compared to those who have a *fixed mindset* (Dweck, 2006; Korstange et al., 2020). Members of the earlier group are more successful because they believe that their academic abilities and social skills are changeable and, therefore, look at challenges as opportunities to grow. Those with a fixed mindset, on the other hand, treat their abilities and skills as something given and they soon lose their motivation if they face difficulties (Yeager & Dweck, 2012). Haimovitz and Dweck (2017) found that children's mindsets about intelligence, which means their perception of intelligence as a quality they can improve versus a trait they cannot change, directly influence their motivation and academic and non-academic achievements.

Gale and Parker (2014) note that research on student transition to higher education and university practices have shown three distinct typologies. The first one (*transition as induction*) looks at transition as periods of adjustment during which students need to learn about new institutional and disciplinary context, norms and procedures. The second approach (*transition as development*) follows the maturational stages of student and career identities during which students navigate socio-cultural norms and expectation. However, this second view still largely treats transition as a linear change and development of distinct identities. The third type (*transition as becoming*) views transition as an ongoing, whole-life experience during which parallel identities are formed and negotiated in a non-linear way. Teacher trainees' identity formation of adult

selves, student selves and future teacher selves has been seen to pertain to all three of these types, but best fits the third view of transition as becoming.

Studies have documented that the academic success of undergraduates greatly depends on their first academic year. Castleman and Meyer (2018, p. 249), for example, found that a "student's freshman year of college is pivotal for determining the trajectory of their postsecondary success". They argue that intervention programs can be best tailored early on in student careers. Doró (2011) also concluded that those English majors at a Hungarian university who struggle with their first semester language courses are likely to show low completion rate of their first year. Korstange and colleagues (2020) have also rightly pointed out that the documentation of students' ideas at entry point is more valuable for student retention than doing retrospective data collection with successful higher-level students. It can be concluded, therefore, that learning about students' beliefs and expectations at the entry point to undergraduate programs and during their first semesters offers an important starting point for assisting students to make the most out of their studies and for designing successful study programs.

Methods

Participants

Participants in this study were 63 first-year teacher trainees at a large Hungarian university, participating in a so-called undivided five or six-year teacher education MA program which begins directly after secondary school. Although participation in the study was voluntary, this number covered all students in the English teacher training program of the given year. Participants had double teaching majors, English language and literature and another one from a large pool of subjects (e.g., another language, History, Music, Physical Education, Math, Media Studies).

Data source

As part of a longitudinal study, in September 2016, during their first weeks of study, students were asked to write a take-home essay in English of at least 500 words with the title "My professional future, the way I see it at the moment". Based on earlier studies (e.g., Doró, 2010, 2011; Dupák, 2019) and the researcher's own experience working with similar student populations, it was foreseen that some of the students would be at B2 English proficiency level or lower, had not written long essays in English and would have difficulty elaborating on the topic without some guidance. Therefore, the following optional orienting questions were suggested from which they could focus on as many as they wished and were also free to add other focal points.

> Why did you choose teacher training and your specific subjects? Have you had inspiring teachers? Is a teaching career attractive today? What are your

> main goals as a future teacher? If you are not sure you want to be a teacher, why is it so? What other career options do you have? What makes someone a good teacher? Do you have these qualities? Do you have any experience working with people? What would you like to learn during your studies that help you in your career choice?

This proved to be useful as students were given an extra focus to their narratives, could write about similar subtopics of teacher identity, educational and career choices and even those with language difficulties reached the requested length.

Data analysis

A grounded theory approach to the data was taken, looking first for general themes in the narratives, using the qualitative data analysis program QDA Miner. These, driven by the subquestions provided to students, included reasons for choice, evaluation of choice, people influencing choice, teacher identity, experience working with people and career goals. As a result of a double round of analysis, the initial coding scheme developed into a rich coding pattern with added main themes and several codes for each theme.
As the present analysis focuses on the explicitly stated imagined future teacher selves of the participants, our current analysis was then narrowed to sections of the essays in which students stated how they envisage themselves as teachers, using first person singular forms. The majority of these sections started as follows: *I would like to…*, *I (can) imagine myself…*, *My main goal is…*, *One day I want to be a teacher who is…*, *As a teacher I want to…*. As an alternative writing strategy, many reviewed characteristics of a favorite teacher and then added sentences like this one: *This is the type of teacher that I intend to become*. This called for a careful reanalysis of not only the data with the the code of "future teacher self", but also "influencing teachers" (to see if students stated they would like to be or act as the mentioned person) and "career goals" referring to teaching a selected age group or working in a specific school. The additional code of the "uncertain teaching career" was also established, as this data serves us with useful information concerning the strength of the imagined future self. A discussion of a good teacher, the general evaluation of a teaching career and motivational themes for choosing the teacher training program were excluded from this analysis, although they also influence teacher identity formation.

Segments with the code "imagined teacher self", "specific career goals" and "uncertain teacher identity" were further analyzed. This meant 103 text segments. While some students had more than one text segment referring to their imagined future teacher selves, eight students of the 63 did not specifically refer to themselves as future teachers, but discussed good language teachers or life goals in general. The extracts fulfilling the above criteria were then further analyzed for themes. These text segments were also searched for frequently occurring verbs and adjectives using the text analyzer tool Sketch Engine as the imagined selves referred to almost always to the teaching

practices they would employ and the character traits they would have. The concordancing function of the same tool was used to manually check the referents of the adjective and verbs in the text segments and eliminate those that do not describe the students' imagined identities.

Results and discussion

This section presents the patterns of future teacher selves that emerged from the essays. Some of these patterns could be grouped under five larger themes, such as personality and teacher self, teacher-student interaction, classroom teaching abilities becoming members of a community of teachers and altruistic goals. Several excerpts were selected from the corpus to illustrate the diversity of the data. The excerpts are quoted verbatim without making any change to them. Some students had language difficulties, but this rarely interacted with the understanding of the intended meaning.

1. Personality and teacher self

Personality characteristics

Almost all the essays that in some form referred to imagined teacher selves listed positive personality characteristics. Students often gave long lists of the characteristics they would like to have, while others selected only one or two as in Excerpts 1 and 2 versus 3 below.

> (1) *I would like to be a really good teacher. I mean I would like to be kind, smart, patient, creative*. (SZ16)

> (2) *I want to be a good teacher, who is patient, responsible, have good communication skills, likes people and is able to understand the youth*. (SZ28)

> (3) *I want to be as an inspirational teacher for my future pupils as my principal was for me*. (SZ19)

In order to get a fuller picture of these characteristics, the text segments referring to the imagined future teacher selves first underwent a frequency analysis of adjectives. This analysis revealed that apart from a few more frequent adjectives, many were used only once or twice to refer to future selves. The two adjectives that top the list are *good* and *patient* teachers (each referring to the imagined self six times). Being *strict* is mentioned four times, after which come the following adjectives with only two examples: *fair, successful, creative, reliable* and *self-confident*.

A number of other adjectives describing positive teacher characteristics appear only once in the corpus and these are *perfect, suitable for children, smart, funny,*

friendly, hard-working, humble, validated, beloved by students, popular, precise, open-minded, enlightened, inspiring, inspirational, responsible, kind, and *consistent*. Less positive adjectives occur very rarely, and example is *stern*. This shows that students imagined a variety of positive selves, but none of these stood out as a must.

The corpus was also search for verb phrases describing teacher characteristics. Only a few of these were found, but with no recurring elements. This again suggests that students were not simply reproducing a set of clichés, but choose from a large set of personality traits and characteristics. Examples for these teacher characteristics are the following: *have good communication skills, have great problem-solving skills, have special relationship with students, want my students to be hard workers, want the best for everyone* or *be good communicators*.

Self-fulfillment and self-growth

A positive personal gain coming from the teaching job is voiced by only some of the students. The excerpts below reflect on a sense of achievement, positive change in personality, constant influences and job satisfaction.

> (4) *I think in this field I will have a lot sense of achievement, a lot of good experiences and many clever student all around me that will be my responsibility. That is the way I see my future at the moment*. (SZ29)

> (5) *As I imagine my work, the basis of it will be leading by example through the positive changes in my personality. I want to solve every conflict in school with mediation*. (SZ34)

> (6) *To sum up teaching is one of the best jobs I can have in my life because helping people makes me happy, it satisfies me on it's own*. (SZ57)

Specific career plans

Four participants expressed a plan to go back to their former school and enjoy the known and friendly environment. This definitely offers them a secure career goal and a clear future teacher self, even though plans may change with time. Student in Excerpt 8 was the one with a surprisingly detailed, step by step plan for his future teaching career; however, the goal of becoming a principal in 5 years is a bit too ambitious and will likely to be modified as time passes.

> (7) *I'd like to be an English-History teacher in my secondary school in K*. (SZ30)

> (8) *I would like to go back to my gymnasium and get a job there. The atmosphere was joyful and I had an excellent relationship with my teachers. After 3 years of teaching I will start an institution management course which will take 2 years. After 5 years I fill in all the requirements to become*

> *a principal, because this is my final plan. I want to be the head of my old school. I have so many ideas how can I make a school even better, and how can I make the students learn more efficient*. (SZ6)

Others expressed preference for a chosen age group or form of education (high school versus elementary school, mandatory education versus language school or private teaching). Examples for this are below in Excerpts 9 and 10. It is important to point out that all of these students are being trained to be teachers of two subject areas, English and something else, and therefore develop either two parallel teacher selves or a merged one. Language teacher identity research almost exclusively target English teacher identity in which case there is little or no reference to other teaching experiences. The author of Excerpt 10 was the only one making explicit distinction between being an art teacher and an English teacher, imagining herself in an elementary school for the first one and oscillating between the same for English or doing private tutoring (which is a very common scenario for language teachers).

> (9) *But there is one thing I know right now: I want to be a teacher in a high school, not in a primary school. I don't know why, I just feel better when I have to teach older students*. (SZ5)

> (10) *As a future [art] teacher I would like to make children like drawing lessons … As an English teacher maybe I would become a private teacher or I would teach only at school*. (SZ60)

Unclear teacher self

While the above examples indicate that some students come to teacher education with clear plans, many voice some uncertainty about working as a teacher, having necessary skills or being successful in their career. A third of the students discussed alternative career plans that included mainly jobs closely connected to one of their majors (such as kindergarten teacher, journalists or interpreter), but unrelated jobs were also mentioned (such as beekeeper or musician). Some degree of uncertainty is understandable from 18-year-olds in the case of a program that lasts for at least five-six years, not mentioning those who get delayed with their studies. This is such a long time and some cannot imagine what the training is going to be like, while others feel that they should have a clearer teacher self from the beginning, which causes stress (see Excerpt 11 vs. 12).

> (11) *At the moment I think I will be a teacher ... in my opinion I will not be mad or angry if I won't be a teacher*. (SZ2)

> (12) *To tell you the truth, at the moment I am so nervous and confused. I absolutely like being at such a famous university like …, but I am the type of person who can panic in a few situations. This situation is one of them. In my opinion I am self-confident, but I keep asking myself the question: am I going to be successful at this university and at this profession?* (SZ32)

2. Teacher-student interaction

An important category in teacher identity research is teacher-student interaction. In our corpus participants also emphasized the importance of positive, respectful teacher-student relationships (see Excerpt 13). Some long for a relatively equal relationship between students and teachers, but one that is born out of mutual respect. This may lead to creating a positive teacher view in students (as in Excerpt 14) or being liked by students (Excerpt 15).

> (13) *I would like to be not just a teacher but a good teacher. I will respect my students as much as my best teacher did.* (SZ23)

> (14) *The other one is achieve that if they think about teachers, teacher's work, they have some positive opinion*. (SZ43)

> (15) *My main goal as a future teacher is to be successful and respected in this profession. The most important for me is to like and be liked by children. It could be the best pleasure when you feel that you are important for them and the person who they admire.* (SZ40)

Others emphasized good relationship to the point that teachers become personal guides or mentors for students and show availability after class to discuss non-teaching related topics. This need for personalized attention was voiced also in Brehmer's (2020) study.

> (16) *I would like to achieve that students can trust me and turn me with their problems, good news, everything what they want to share*. (SZ43)

> (17) *Before and after our lessons she talked with me a lot about my life and plans. And I felt then that she is not just my teacher she is more, because she helped me a lot and I felt that she is really interested in her students' lives. So I hope I can be somebody like her. Somebody who is for the students, always*. (SZ21)

Interestingly, none of them envisaged to develop a more equitable teacher-student relationship in which a very friendly and relaxing atmosphere may jeopardize teacher authority. This overtly relaxed atmosphere was found by Li and DeCosta (2018) for one of their novice Chinese teachers and is something that both students and young teachers seem to often long for.

3. Teaching skills and abilities

Another larger category of the teacher self is teaching skills and abilities in which several smaller themes were identified.

Subject knowledge and teacher as life-long learner

Subject knowledge seems to be taken for granted as only very few students mentioned it in some form. One referred to the positive example of former teachers who "had a command of their subject matter content", next to being humorous, motivating and being good communicators. Another one complained about the English proficiency level of a substitute teacher in his bilingual secondary school who was unable to teach History in English. A very positive finding is that two other students discussed their teacher selves as life-long learners (see Excerpts 18 and 19).

> (18) *Learning would not end for me by finishing the university. I plan to take part in teacher training programs and get to know the new teaching methods. To my way of thinking, a language teacher should improve herself all the time as languages are always changing and I want to keep pace with the changes in grammar or in vocabulary.* (SZ62)

> (19) *I believe that we can learn much easier if we do it with some creativity but most of the schools do not provide this kind of education… There are many different ways to teach the same thing and it is a challenge to discover which method has to be used for each classes. We can say being a teacher is a lifelong learning because it is important to keep up with technology what the student use in their everyday life.* (SZ20)

Choice of methodology

Having observed teachers from a students' perspective for years and with no methodology classes yet, it is of no surprise that the participants expressed vague ideas about what made the classes of former teachers enjoyable or how methodology should be selected. Examples for this is teaching in an "understandable way" or having "so impressive" teaching methods. Two students reflected on using modern technology versus traditional methods. They may find this important to state as they themselves experienced the sharp differences in using one or the other. The importance of the use of computers and other modern technology was also reported by Brehmer (2020)

> (20) *In my opinion, we have to make balance between the current technology life and the traditional education. We have to find out the benefits of the computers and the smart phones and take advantages of these.* (SZ35)

> (21) *Maybe this is the one thing what cause that when I become a teacher I want to teach students in a different way too. At the moment I don't really know what will I do about this but I am working on it. I have already got some ideas, for example I want to teach the language with the help of the electronic things that 21st century got (like interactive table or laptops, maybe mobile phones too) and on the other hand I would like to maintain*

awareness by telling unusually stories and strange details about the people and the topics they have to learn about. (SZ5)

Curriculum management

Two students also reflected on curriculum management. Drawing on her student experience, student in Excerpt 22 would change art classes and offer students more creativity in regular and also in extracurricular classes. Excerpt 23 reflects on how to make the curriculum more enjoyable and interesting for students with the use of technology or realia.

(22) *As a future teacher I would like to make children like drawing lessons, because as far as I can see it now, they almost hate it. I think it is because of the art history and because they can't draw or paint whatever they want, but what they have to because of the curriculum. If I will have the opportunity, I will definitely make an after school drawing course where everyone could draw what they wanted.* (SZ60)

(23) *If I'm going to be a teacher I would like to teach the students in a way which will make the curriculum more exciting. We live in the ages of the Internet so I'd show them videos and pictures which will make the studies more colourful and interesting*. (SZ16)

Making students like the subject/school

A number of students expressed the wish to make students like the given subject or school (educational system) in general. The excerpts below show various degrees of liking, from not hating to loving a given subject. Liking or not liking subjects seems to be a crucial student concept and could come from their own experience or that of their classmates.

(24) *One of my goals is to achieve that most of the students of my class like or do not hate the subjects which I teach*. (SZ43)

(25) *I don't want to be one of the teacher who can't motivate and listen to his students saying: "Oh, no English again".* (SZ45)

(26) *As a teacher I would like to have my pupils to master my subjects fairly easily with my help while also develop a love for the given subject*. (SZ19)

(27) *I would like to give my experience to the future generation and I may be able to change some pupils' opinions about the educational system*. (SZ32)

Helping students achieve academic goals

Two students also voiced specific academic goals their students should be achieving. The first one is having outstanding students performing well in a nation-wide academic competition. This may be a school culture that some students are bringing with themselves from their high-standard secondary school. In contrast, the idea of helping students pass language exams (as in Excerpt 29) is a general requirement from language teachers in Hungary, built into the education system, let it be in public schools or private language schools or while working as private tutors.

(28) *I would also like to have student who could excel in competitions and bringing home sweet results like a TOP 30 position in the OKTV.* (SZ19)

(29) *I think it should be fantastic to help a kid to speak an other language and help to take a successful language exam.* (SZE54)

Being a good teacher

A very interesting aspect of the corpus is the few references to the "good teacher" as imagined identity, not only as part of a general discussion of teacher efficacy. We can see a continuum between the denial of the existence of a good teacher (as in Excerpt 30) and the self visualization of a brilliant one (as in Excerpt 33). Excerpt 31 warns against perfectionalism and sees the primary characteristic of a good teacher in trusting students and forming a good academic relationship with them. The author of Excerpt 32, on the other hand, visualizes herself as the live example of a good teacher, someone with all positive traits, a role model.

(30) *There is one question which is really annoys me which is Will you be a good teacher? I hate this question because in my opinion "good teachers" are not exist. We are all humans and we all make mistakes. There is no good and bad or right or wrong in this job we always had to find the middle way.* (SZ18)

(31) *Nobody is perfect, and personally I don't want to be a perfect teacher. I wanna be a good teacher, who can trust all of his students, like being a member of a team.* (SZ30)

(32) *This is exactly what my goal is. To become a teacher somewhere in a High School, and when someone asks my students, they tell all these thing. listed above about what makes a teacher a good one, and at the end they say: that's Ms. M.* (SZ37)

(33) *I have a lot of dreams. One of them is connected to my professional future because I want to be a brilliant teacher It is easy to say that in 6-7 years I will working as a teacher and making a very good income.* (SZ49)

4. Becoming part of a community of teachers

As the literature above indicates, a significant aspect of teacher identity is the social interaction with other participants of the teaching-learning context. Two students expressed this in their future teacher self which reflects a mature view, not a student experience-based one.

> (34) *I'm really looking forward to practicing what I learnt in school in real life but in my opinion being able to work together with others and help each other out is also a very big aspect of this career in order to be successful.* (SZ50)

> (35) *As I will finish my university studies I would like to go back to my former high school to teach, because I am keen on the atmosphere of that building, and according to my personal opinion teachers in my high school have a unique community, they can rely on each other, help the others, and it would be a specific occasion to get to know my former teachers as my colleagues*. (SZ52)

5. Altruistic goals

Some of the imagined selves reflected on aspects that go well beyond teaching a given subject, helping students going to school or participate in classroom work. These were named altruistic because they do not offer a direct gain for the teachers themselves as in the case of good student-teacher relationships or improved teaching skills.

Helping and motivating people

Through the example of former teachers who had a significant positive influence on their lives, three students talked about wanting to help others overcome their difficulties or to become a source of motivation for students to dream big and achieve their goals.

> (36) *I want to help the others. I have a lot of inhibitions, and it is still difficult for me to speak. I want to show, that we should enjoy the process of learning instead worrying about the oral part. And in my opinion we should concentrate on what we know already, instead of what we don't know yet.* (SZ44)

> (37) *The teacher career is attractive for me, because I can help people or students to achieve their aims.* (SZ27)

> (38) *It inspires me that maybe I can be a motivation for them once, as my teachers motivated me when I was just a butterfly-chaser little girl*. (SZ47)

Ability to influence lives for good

Similarly to the previous category of helping and motivating, some students aim for assisting students to find life or career goals, "finding their path" or talent or becoming successful. Several examples are listed below to show the diversity in the way these aims are voiced.

(39) *So I would like to be a teacher who can help kids find their path.* (SZ22)

(40) *I want to care about other people, mainly youngsters. I would like to help them during their teenager years when lots of them do not know what they want to do with their lives and who they want to be*. (SZ38)

(41) *In addition, I would love to be a teacher and I know I wouldn't do this for the money, but for the pride it gives you, when you see your former students becoming upstanding, successful people and environmentalists.* (SZ4)

(42) *I strongly claim that teaching is always needed for people to get more and better opportunities of work, and for this reason I also would like to help youngsters – to find their own way, and find the profession they like – as my teachers done in high school*. (SZ52)

(43) *Each of the students is different and everyone is talented in something. I believe in this and I would like to help them to find this, because it is also a teacher's job, and this is what makes a teacher a good teacher.* (SZ56)

Contribution to the society

Even more general altruistic goals are expressed by two students who seem very determined about making our society or the world better. These may seem to be very general or even idealistic goals, but the way they are expressed shows that these students really believe in this altruistic, world-changing future teacher self.

(44) *I ask myself, what better job could there be. My answer is none because teaching is more than a job. It is an important contribution I can make to better our society, and I am excited about the opportunity to do so.* (SZ17)

(45) *I see myself as an enlightened, open-minded, precise, independent woman, I have great problem-solving skills and I am determined as hell! I am full of energy, I can't wait to start a life as a teacher, and my main aim is to make our world a better place.* (SZ47)

Conclusions

This paper had the aim to capture the imagined future teacher selves (IFTS) of a cohort of first-year English language teacher trainees at a large Hungarian university. The literature reviewed above suggested that teacher identity formation begins before entry into a teacher training program and that, before enrolling into teaching related university course and doing teaching practice, students envisage the teacher career strongly based on the models they have experienced at school or at home. This and the long years of teacher training ahead of them may imply that students have difficulty voicing a professional identity. What we found, in contrast, is that the participants were able to discuss a future teacher self in the majority of the essays in a surprising detail. They reflected on various areas of teacher self, including a long list of personality traits and abilities, positive teacher-student interaction, mentoring students to love their subject (and school in general) or even assisting them in reaching out of school goals. The picture of the future teacher selves they draw are mostly realistic and positive, with a clear understanding of the dynamism that teacher identity is formed as on ongoing process, in relation to social interactions with students and colleagues. Those who are not certain about the teaching career also provided a rich picture of their uncertain teacher self and reflected on the skills they need to improve at and alternative career options.

This study contributes to a greater understanding of the complexities of the emerging teacher identity at the point of entry to teacher training. Although it is limited to one specific university and one chosen year, it is a good starting point to understand what beliefs, goals and concerns students enter their higher education with. The data reported in this paper are valuable for instructors in teacher training programs to better understand students and to frame how they can contribute to their personal and professional development. As the essays contain reflections on a number of other identity related issues and reasons for study choice, further analyses will provide an even more comprehensive picture of the topic. The present study also offers a firm ground for longitudinal observations on how identity and beliefs change over time. A longitudinal study is planned to compare the essays written at entry point with those that students wrote on the same topic in their fifth year, with a large proportion of the training behind them. The results may be used to enhance pre-service teacher education programs of the given university or elsewhere, in the form of classes on identity formation (with a growing number of programs adopting it as part of the curriculum) or in individual or group meetings between students and university instructor or mentor teachers in schools.

References

Alsalkhi, M. (2018). Satisfaction of academic specialization among students of the department of educational sciences and its relation to self-esteem. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(4), 107-122. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1148a

Alzeebaree, Y., & Hasan, I. A. (2020). What makes an effective EFL teacher: High School students' perceptions. *Asian ESP Journal, 16*(2), 169-183.

Barkhuizen, G., & Mendieta, J. (2020). Teacher identity and good language teachers. In C. Griffiths, & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. 3-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bosnyák, J., & Gáncs, N. (2012). The motivational dispositions of English language teacher trainees. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy*, 6, 64-78.

Bremner, N. (2020). What makes an effective English language teacher? The life histories of 13 Mexican university students. *English Language Teaching, 13*(1), 163-179. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n1p163

Castleman, B. L., & Meyer, K. (2018). Nudges, Norms, and Navigation: Behavioral insights to improve student success. In R. S. Feldman (Ed.), *The first year of college: Research, theory, and practice on improving the student experience and increasing retention* (pp. 249-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chong, S., Low, E. L., & Goh, K. C. (2011). Emerging professional teacher identity of pre-service teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(8), 50-64.

Çürt Aşıkferki, N., Karahan, F., & İnan-karagül, B. (2018). A comparison of the Kosovan and Turkish university students' perceptions of an ideal language teacher. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Education, 2*(3), 58-65.

Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching selves: Identity, pedagogy, and teacher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Day, C. & Kington, A. (2008). Identity, well-being and effectiveness: The emotional contexts of teaching. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 16*(1), 7-23.

De Costa, P. I., & Norton, B. (2017). Introduction: Identity, transdisciplinarity, and the good language teacher. *The Modern Language Journal, 101*(S1), 3-14. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12368

Doró, K. (2010). Meeting the language barrier: The experience of first-year students of English. In I. Hegedűs & S. Martsa (Eds.), *CrosSections: Selected papers in linguistics from the 9th HUSSE conference* (pp. 289-297). Pécs: Institute of English, University of Pécs.

Doró, K. (2011). English language proficiency and the prediction of academic success of first year students of English. In M. Lehmann, R. Lugossy, & J. Horváth (Eds.),

UPRT 2010. Empirical studies in English applied linguistics (pp. 173-185). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.

Doró, K., & T. Balla, Á. (2014). Beliefs about the effective language teacher: The challenges of training (future) English teachers. In B. Fregan (Ed.), *Success and challenges in foreign language teaching: international conference for language instructors* (pp 49-54). Budapest: Nemzeti Közszolgálati Egyetem.

Doró, K., & T. Balla, Á. (2019). English teacher trainees' changing views concerning the effective language teacher: A self-reflective interview study. *EduLingua, 5*(1), 41-56. https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2019.1.3

Dupák, K. (2019). Language learning experience of first year English majors as they see it. *Edulingua, 5*(1), 23-39. https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2019.1.2

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.

Friesen, M. D., & Besley, S. C. (2013). Teacher identity development in the first year of teacher education: A developmental and social psychological perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36, 23-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.06.005

Gale, T., & Parker, S. (2014). Navigating change: a typology of student transition in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(5), 734-753. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.721351

Glodjo, T. (2020) *Undergraduate students' identity work and critical engagement in a BATESOL Program: A short story analysis*. Doctoral dissertation, J. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 28153451.

Gray, J., & Morton, T. (2018). *Social interaction and English language teacher identity*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Haimovitz, K., & Dweck, C. S. (2017). The origins of children's growth and fixed mindsets: New research and a new proposal. *Child Development, 88*(6), 1849-1859. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12955

Hiver, P. (2013). The interplay of possible language teacher selves in professional development choices. *Language Teaching Research, 17*(2), 210-227.

Kalaja, P., & Mäntylä, K. (2018). "The English class of my dreams!": Envisioning teaching a foreign language. In Mercer, S., & Kostoulas, A. (Eds.), *Language teacher psychology* (pp. 34-52). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Korstange, R., Brinthaupt, T., & Martin, A. (2020). Academic and social expectations of incoming college students. *Journal of College Orientation, Transition, and Retention, 27*(1). https://doi.org/10.24926/jcotr.v27i1.2334

Kubanyiova, M. (2009). Possible selves in language teacher development. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 314-332). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Külekçi, G. (2018). Identifying the perceptions of prospective English language teachers on characteristics of effective teachers: Who is the ideal teacher? *Novitas-ROYAL,12*(1), 1-15.

Li, W., & De Costa, P. (2018). Exploring novice EFL teachers' identity development: A case study of two EFL teachers in China. In S. Mercer, & A. Kostoula (Eds.), *Language teacher psychology* (pp. 86-104). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Miskiniene, M., & Rodzeviciute, E. (2005). What motivates students to choose the teachers' profession: A Scientific educology of university students. *cd-International Journal of Educology, Special Issue*, 38-50.

Money, J., Nixon, S., & Graham. L. (2020). Do educational experiences in school prepare students for university? A teachers' perspective. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 44*(4), 554-567. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2019.1595547

Sahakyan, T., Lamb, M., Chambers, G. (2018). Language teacher motivation: From the ideal to the feasible self. In S. Mercer, & A. Kostoula (Eds.), *Language teacher psychology* (pp. 53-70.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Smid, D. (2018). Hungarian pre-service teachers' motivation to become English teachers: Validating a questionnaire. *Journal of Adult Learning, Knowledge and Innovation, 2*(1), 19-32. https://doi.org/10.1556/2059.02.2018.02

T. Balla, Á., & Bajnóczi, B. (2015). Have changes brought about changes? Findings of a longitudinal study conducted among first-year students of English. *EduLingua, 1*(2), 43-52. https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2015.2.4

Vosniadou, S. (2020). Bridging secondary and higher education. The importance of self-regulated learning. *European Review, 28*(S1), S94–S103. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1062798720000939

Xu, H. (2012). Imagined community falling apart: A case study on the transformation of professional identities of novice ESOL teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(3), 568–578. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.42

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(4), 302–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.722805

Witkowsky, P., Garnar, M., Starkey, K., Andersen, A., & Clayton, G. (2020). Approaches to advising incoming college students with dual enrollment credit.

Journal of College Orientation, Transition, and Retention, 27(1). https://doi.org/10.24926/jcotr.v27i1.2285

Diachronic investigation of learner language: Twenty years of the JPU corpus

József Horváth[1]

University of Pécs

DOI: 10.14232/edulingua.2020.1.3

Corpus linguistics studies have by now become a staple of linguists and teachers worldwide. Even practitioners who are not directly involved with corpus development or analysis are increasingly aware of this domain and its results. Thus, we can say that the time has come to investigate the long-term effects of the findings connected to corpus linguistics. This paper focuses on a specific sort of corpus: the learner corpus. It argues that what used to be a more traditional approach represented in the EFL (English as a foreign language) discipline has evolved into a perhaps more appropriate one represented in ELF (English as a lingua franca) partly because of the work of learner corpus research. To demonstrate any existing long-term effects of work with learner corpora on language education, an L2 corpus, the JPU Corpus, is presented. Five of the ten hypotheses originally set up in the early 2000s are revisited and critiqued by applying both quantitative and qualitative investigations. The results indicate that a diachronic learner corpus approach further establishes the shift from EFL to ELF approaches, a potentially useful and relevant change for students and their teachers across the world, especially within the framework of writing pedagogy.

Keywords: writing pedagogy, English as a lingua franca, learner corpora

Introduction

The educational and linguistic movements of the 1990s were truly momentous in Europe. It was the time, among others, that corpus linguistics experts began turning to learner language studies, building the first English as a foreign language (EFL) corpora as well as other L2 corpora. Today, looking back at those early beginnings, we can witness in those efforts the first winds of another change that would take place later: the emphasis on English as a lingua franca (ELF), a framework that offers equal status to all members of the English speaking community. In this sense, learner corpus (LC) researchers and practitioners can be said to have been the forerunners of an educationally, culturally, and socially significant change.

[1] Author's e-mail: horvath.jozsef@pte.hu

To probe a dimension of that change, the present article undertakes to demonstrate a unique case study, involving one of the earliest EFL corpora, developed by Horváth (2001).

Literature review

A corpus is a principled collection of written *or* spoken, or written *and* spoken texts that serves some descriptive purpose. Following the work of such classic corpus linguistic (CL) studies as Sinclair's (1991) and Kennedy's (1998) that identified and assessed the essential conceptual, theoretical, and empirical aspects of CL, the 1990 saw the first attempts to put this theory into practice as a driving force within learner language studies (see, for example, Granger, 1994, 1998). As described by Horváth (2001, p. 2), learner corpora can aid in the development of at least three types of pedagogically and linguistically relevant projects: those concerned directly with language use, those that yield valid research results, and those that may inspire pedagogical applications. It is worth considering how novel and unique the CL approach was at the time, when a large segment of the profession up to that point had been restrained to a prescriptive endeavor in many contexts, especially within the framework of error analysis.

With the advent of LC studies, however, a descriptive analytical focus started to gain ground, showing the first indications that a traditional EFL approach was slowly being replaced by an ELF principle, which represented a more modern, equitable, and possibly more sustainable educational cultural milieu. It would be hard to overestimate the significance of LC studies informing writing pedagogy, especially in the European educational context, but also in Japan and elsewhere (Mindt, 1997; Ooi, 2002). One example of this development was the increase in motivation at seeing one's work not as a repository of mistakes and errors but in its own right, as a text that is worth looking at from a more content-oriented and stylistic point of view. When all of this is done in order to collect evidence for valid descriptive, rather than prescriptive purposes, the result was a significant achievement, even if in some cases this may have been a mere side effect rather than a principled intention.

From these beginnings, we have witnessed a rapid spread of the approach, with the early 2000s and the past decade both yielding significant research informed by the LC stance. Authors such as Flowerdew (2014a, 2014b), Izumi and Isahara (2004) and Zhang (2014) have analyzed, respectively, notions pertaining to academic contexts of student writing in general, revisited error analytical tenets within the LC study framework, and compared and contrasted L2 and L1 data to capture the degree to which notions of overuse were justifiable.

Furthering the scope of working with learner corpora are attempts that innovate the domain, and it is refreshing to see that such efforts are continually in the forefront of the applied linguistic arena – see, for example, the groundbreaking investigations of Bolton, Nelson and Hung (2004) and Doró (2015, 2016). Part of this trend in LC studies

is the work of Horváth (2001, 2013) which aims to bridge a gap between linguistic investigations with writing pedagogy.

There seems to be little doubt about the observation that CL and learner corpora are here to stay. The discipline has identified a valid and reliable methodology for corpus development and implemented appropriate ethical and legal procedures as it continues to encourage independent, autonomous student involvement (see, for example, the seminal work of Johns, 1991, who first started applying this technique with his students).

The JPU Corpus

This paper revisits a LC study from 2001, so it seems necessary to introduce some essential components of the corpus itself.

The name is JPU Corpus, one of the largest learner corpora twenty years ago. An English written corpus developed at a university in Hungary, it contains over 400,000 words in 332 scripts, each by a different student. (The corpus is available for concordancing applications on Cobb's website, 2020). According to Horváth (2001), it is made up of five sub-corpora, each representing a course where the texts (essays and research papers) were produced. The sub-corpora are:

- Early stages of corpus development (E), 30 scripts
- Language practice courses (LP), 74 scripts
- Writing and research skills courses (WRS), 130 scripts
- Russian retraining course (RR), 16 scripts
- Postgraduate courses (PG), 82 scripts

For more details on corpus development, contents, and rationale, see Horváth (2001). (See the Appendix from a representative script from the corpus.)

Ten hypotheses were set up after the development of the JPU Corpus, with the intention of identifying pedagogically and statistically significant facets of the contents of the scripts contained in the corpus. The ten hypotheses were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: The RR subcorpus will contain a number of inaccurate uses of the definite article. (One of the five hypotheses investigated in this study, this will be referred to as the *Definite article hypothesis* in the rest of the article.)

Hypothesis 2: The coordinating conjunction *but* will be most frequently used as a transitional phrase.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a relatively high frequency of *above* in anaphoric verbal phrases, with a significant verbal collocate being *mention.*

Hypothesis 4: Aims of writing will be primarily identified by the I *would like* + *to infinitive* structure. (The second hypothesis studied in this paper, this will be referred to as the *Aim hypothesis*.)

Hypothesis 5: There will be an overuse of the epistemic stem *I think.* (The third hypothesis studied in this paper, this will be referred to as the *I think hypothesis*.)

Hypothesis 6: The adverb *very* will have a high frequency in the JPU Corpus, but less significant in the PG and the WRS sub-corpora.

Hypothesis 7: The frequency of *case, thing, good, interesting,* and *etc*. will be lower in the PG and the WRS sub-corpora than in the rest of the JPU Corpus.

Hypothesis 8: There will be lower frequencies for *the fact that* and *in order to* in the PG and the WRS sub-corpora than in the rest of the JPU Corpus.

Hypothesis 9: There will be a correlation between the type of introductory sentence and the length and vocabulary of it. (The fourth hypothesis studied in this paper, this will be referred to as the *Introduction hypothesis*.)

Hypothesis 10: There will be a correlation between the type of concluding sentence and the length and vocabulary of it. (The fifth hypothesis studied in this paper, this will be referred to as the *Conclusion hypothesis*.)

Research question

Following these theoretical and corpus-development considerations, the question arises whether LC studies may hold long-term relevance for the teacher profession. Thus, the current paper undertakes to investigate five of the ten hypotheses first presented in the early 2000s to identify and evaluate the specific areas where relevance can be detected. The five selected for this study are the ones that seem to have most relevance after two decades.

Method

As we have seen, the JPU Corpus was developed in the late 1990s, with the first analyses published in the early 2000s (Horváth, 2001). For the current investigation, the method applied was as follows. Five of the ten hypotheses (*Definite article*, *Aim*, I *think*,

Introduction, and *Conclusion*) set up to investigate the JPU Corpus twenty years ago are briefly described with their original results, followed by an interpretation of the validity and reliability of those results as well as an interpretation of their potential validity in the current situation.

Results and discussion

*The **Definite article** hypothesis*

The original hypothesis twenty years ago claimed that the RR sub-corpus would contain a number of inaccurate uses of the definite article, the rationale being that students who contributed to this sub-corpus had had little exposure to English, having had to retrain from being teachers of Russian to teachers of English due to political changes. In addition, the lack of the definite article in Russian further exacerbated the issue. Upon investigating the scripts, no significant incorrect use of the article was found in the corpus, with the explanation that students in the RR course were exceptionally motivated for professional reasons.

Today, looking back at the essence of this investigation, we can identify in it an attempt to turn something negative (error) into something positive (solution). The LC served to test the hypothesis and revealed a significant result when the hypothesis was rejected.

Notwithstanding, the definite article continues to pose problems for many students around the world, and we can state with confidence that inquiring into how it is learned, taught, and used has not lost any of its relevance in CL as well as in writing pedagogy.

*The **Aim** hypothesis*

As Horváth wrote (2001, p. 126),

> the study of [the issue of various collocates of *I* in expressing the aim of texts] was necessitated by a potential pedagogical outcome: I wished to gather data on what the 332 writers of these texts identified as their aims and methods in their texts, either in explicit thesis sentences and statements of method or in topic sentences referring to a particular point made in the main body of the text. This information is necessary to form an overall view of the types of aims students identified for their scripts, and can serve as the basis of evaluating writing strategies in students' texts.

It is not unusual that students, in Hungary and elsewhere, have vague notions about the aim of their essays and research papers, which may have been one reason for the preponderance of the stem "I would like to" in this position. Other, seemingly more academic expressions were seldom employed by them.

What we can add today is that the perhaps naïve sounding expression of an aim does not necessarily have to be regarded as inadequate – rather, a stage of the development of the learners who are on their way of integrating with the academic discourse community specifically in terms of the written standards. How this written form of expression is related to spoken interactions with peers and professors can be an exciting direction for future research. It is hypothesized that in delivering lectures, professors, too, tend to overuse the "I would like to" phrase, which may then become an analyzed chunk relegated to the acceptable academic cluster.

*The **I think** hypothesis*

The third hypothesis revisited is concerned with the epistemic stem *I think*. Its frequency in the JPU Corpus (normalized for 200,000 words) was contrasted with a similarly normalized frequency in the International Learner English Corpus (ICLE) and a native English written corpus (L1). The JPU data (21) came in between the L1 corpus result (3, least frequent) and the ICLE result (72, most frequent).

It is in relation to such comparative and contrastive investigations that currently the views may be different from those twenty years ago. Without knowing more details about the contexts of the actual texts in which students were working in the three situations and a closer analysis of what the thoughts were that followed the epistemic stem it would be hard to argue that a simply quantitative analysis would be the right basis for any meaningful pedagogical action. Moreover, today it may sound not just a little odd to consider L1 student users of English the standard with whom, for example, non-British L2 users of English be compared. Changes in how we perceive writing and, in general, literacy, have meant that in the current ELF context a more equitable approach be, if not adopted, at least adapted for the specific circumstance in which one operates.

There is also the question, tightly connected to the previous argument that the time may have come for a re-interpretation of the notions of overuse and underuse. In fact, even in the past two decades, one may argue that, from a strictly descriptive CL standpoint, the relative value loading of frequencies as can be detected in L1 and various L2 corpora was fundamentally flawed, as it introduced a prescriptive element, which some may be inclined to classify as alien to the CL endeavor. Whether that is the case remains to be seen.

*The **Introduction** hypothesis*

The Introduction hypothesis and the Conclusion hypothesis followed the same pattern in their initial investigation twenty years ago, the only difference being which part of the scripts was involved. As far as the Introduction hypothesis is concerned, the

investigations revealed the stratification of introductory themes, presented in Table 1 (Horváth, 2001, pp. 132-133):

Table 1: Rank order of types and frequencies of introductions in the WRS sub-corpus of the JPU Corpus

Rank	Type	Frequency
1	definition	47
2	personal	15
3	obvious	12
4	historical	10
5	aim	7
6	method	4
7	five short terms	3
8	citation	2
9	reader ambiguous narrative question title	1

An ANOVA statistical test was run, which revealed no significant correlation among themes and sentence length. Although it was felt that ambiguous and obvious ways of introductions (that is, qualitative features) may correspond with token and type figures (that is, quantitative features), no such observation could be made.

Often, researchers prefer it when their analyses reveal significant results, as this is favored by the academic community at large. However, looking back, we can perhaps agree that it was just as well that no such correspondence could be quantified and verified, as this result lent further credit to the principle that in evaluating a student's approach to a theme, the relevant, inherently necessary, or even original and unexpected framing of a topic is what eventually matters. (The current paper, incidentally, uses a historical reference in its introduction.)

*The **Conclusion** hypothesis*

As we have seen, this hypothesis only differed from the previous one in that it looked at the conclusions of the scripts. The ANOVA test, however, did yield significant results for the Conclusion hypothesis. Table 2 shows the types and frequencies of conclusions in the sub-corpus.

Table 2: Rank order of types and frequencies of conclusions in the WRS sub-corpus of the JPU Corpus

Rank	Type	Frequency
1	qualitative	47
2	practical	26
3	obvious	9
4	unclear	7
5	quantitative	5
6	question	3
7	hypothesis limitation non-sequitur	2
8	citation reader	1

The statistical test revealed a significant relationship (p=0.02). As Horváth documented (2001, p. 138), the hypothesis "claiming that type of sentence affected length was verified." Further: whereas "the mean length of the qualitative and practical type of concluding sentences was almost identical (23.36 vs. 24.23 words), the length of the combined group of obvious and unclear type sentences was 15.62, for which the analysis confirmed significant variation.

That is, it was revealed twenty years ago that students who tended to have more vague notions of how to arrive at the end point of their papers showed that hesitation in cutting their ideas shot and tending to produce significantly shorter concluding sentences.

Today, we can add that even though this was a statistically verifiable result, its practical implications would need further substantiation. There is nothing wrong with a shorter than average sentence length. In fact, many such utterances may be effective and memorable, often requiring serious thought and continuous revisions to produce. (A preview: the concluding sentence of this article combines the limitation technique with that of the hypothesis.)

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to provide an example of how learner corpus studies can be conducted with a diachronic set of goals, by comparing initial investigations and their results with what we can observe by exploring the current educational landscape. Using the example of an early LC, the JPU Corpus, it has demonstrated what can be regarded as constant and what can be regarded as different when investigations are extended to the present and brought under critical scrutiny. It has also argued that notions of overuse and underuse may be regarded as potentially problematic modes of approach in LC research because of the disproportionate emphasis they often seem to lay on prescription on lieu of description.

Similar longitudinal and diachronic research can be implemented with other learner corpora as well as across different learner corpora. For this to be feasible, we need to establish factors, such as original aims of corpus development and content features, that would yield meaningful results as well as inspire application in relevant classroom contexts.

Inevitably, however, this paper has limitations, too. It had to remain, for the present purposes, within the confines of comparative and contrastive analyses, leaving questions such as data-driven learning applications and corpus data adaptations for such tasks unanswered. It is hoped that such studies will be conducted in the near future so that there may be a real continuity of efforts, some of which inspired by past and contemporaneous LC studies.

References

Bolton, K., Nelson, G., & Hung, J. (2002). A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing: Research from the International Corpus of English in Hong Kong (ICE-HK). *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *7*(2), 165-182. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.7.2.02bol

Cobb, T. (2020). Concordance. *Compleat lexical tutor: For data-driven learning on the web*. Available at https://www.lextutor.ca/conc/eng/

Doró, K. (2015). Changes in the lexical measures of undergraduate EFL students' argumentative essays In P. Pietilä, K. Doró & R. Pípalová (Eds.), *Lexical issues in L2 writing* (pp. 57-76). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Doró, K. (2016). Linking adverbials in EFL undergraduate argumentative essays: A diachronic corpus study. In M. Lehmann, R. Lugossy & J. Horváth (Eds.), *UPRT 2015: Empirical studies in English applied linguistics* (pp. 152-165). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.

Flowerdew, L. (2014a). Corpus-based analyses in EAP. In *Academic discourse* (pp. 105-124). Routledge.

Flowerdew, L. (2014b). Learner corpus research in EAP: Some key issues and future pathways. *English Language and Linguisics, 20* (2), 43-60. https://doi.org/10.17960/ell.2014.20.2.003

Granger, S. (1994). Learner corpus: A revolution in applied linguistics. English Today, 10 (3), 25-29. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 514 886)

Granger, S. (Ed.). (1998). *Learner English on computer. Studies in language and linguistics*. London: Longman.

Horváth, J. (2001). *Advanced writing in English as a foreign language: A corpus-based study of processes and products*. Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport. Available at https://books.google.hu/books?id=XsmxiVsSPjAC

Horváth, J. (2013). What are BA and MA students proud of? *Argumentum*, *9*, 178-185. Available at http://argumentum.unideb.hu/2013-anyagok/kulonszam/08_horvathj.pdf

Izumi, E., & Isahara, H. (2004). Investigation into language learners' acquisition order based on an error analysis of a learner corpus. In *Proceedings of IWLeL 2004: An interactive workshop on language e-learning* (pp. 63-71). Available at https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1cb7/53bc79591978cc1df3a7cbd1baa3927b3e15.pdf

Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven learning. *ELR Journal, 4,* 1-16.

Kennedy, G. (1998). *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. London: Longman.

Mindt, D. (1997). Corpora and the teaching of English in Germany. In A. Wichmann, S. Fligelstone, T. McEnery & G. Knowles (Eds.), *Teaching and language corpora* (pp. 40-50). London: Lomgman.

Ooi. V. (2002). From Shakespeare to Hungarian EFL writing: Using www corpora to motivate student learning. In M. Tan (Ed.), *Corpus studies in language education* (pp. 163-177). Thailand: Assumption University.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhang, R. (2014). Overuse and underuse of English concluding connectives: A corpus study. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, *5* (1), 121-126. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.1.121-126

Acknowledgment

This paper is dedicated to the memory and outstanding work of Tim Johns (1936-2009).

Appendix: A script from the JPU Corpus

W 057 F

INTRODUCTION

Students at Janus Pannonius University from Pécs have the opportunity to attend the Writing and Research Skills seminar where everyone can learn about and improve writing skills. For the sessions students have some writing tasks to do, for example: preparing essays on topics suggested by the teacher or chosen by the students; and accomplishing a small-scale research paper.

During the Fall 1998 semester we used for several times William Zinsser's book On Writing Well: An Informal Guide to Writing Non-Fiction, which was a great help for us in forming our writing style.

Zinsser is a free-lance writer, the author of humorous and non-fiction writings. He was a teacher as well: he taught even at Yale University. His main teaching and conception on writing well is to write as simply as possible and to avoid clutter. Cluttering is when a writer expresses ideas, thoughts with the help of more words than needed making confusing sentences. Simplicity is quite the contrary of clutter: it shows clear thinking. Clear and simple sentences are easy to understand but it is not always easy to produce them. Zinsser says: "Writing is hard work. A clear sentence is no accident. Very few sentences come out right the first time, or even the third time" (Zinsser 1998, 12).

In the chapter entitled "Simplicity" from the book On Writing Well, Zinsser presents two pages of an earlier version of the same book and I found the way he simplified his sentences very exciting.

I thought it would be interesting and useful for me as well as for other students to compare the two versions and to see how a professional writer gets his final edition.

METHOD

As its title itself shows, the chapter "Simplicity" deals with the importance of simple and clear writing and explains that "the secret of good writing is to strip every sentence to its cleanest components" (Zinsser 1998, 7).

As an example for how to simplify sentences, the author shows the reader on pages ten and eleven a piece of draft, an earlier version of the final, edited work. On the two pages of the draft we can see a text and a lot of corrections on it: words and sentences crossed out, some new words written between the lines replacing something dropped out.

I wanted to know how many words were dropped out from the text and how many were substituted with new words and expressions, so I counted every item from both versions. I was also curious to find out if the content of the final version changed as compared to the content of the draft.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to Zinsser, the draft shown on pages ten and eleven was already the fourth or fifth version and he could still find a great number of unnecessary words in it.
There were 538 words in the text shown on the two pages of the draft, and after the author revised it once more, he left out 123 elements, which means that almost one fourth of the text (22.8 % exactly) was left out finally. In spite of the large number of omitted words from the draft the final text does not change in meaning, it has the same content and meaning but it is shorter and more simple, thus it is easier to follow and to comprehend the ideas the author shares with his readers.

There were only seventeen additions or substitutions. Zinsser replaced several phrases or even sentences with shorter terms, for example: constructions of a definite article and a noun were replaced by personal pronouns; sentences were substituted with verbs; adjectives were left out where the noun carried the meaning of the adjective; noun phrases were replaced by nouns and long verb phrases with short verbs with the same meaning. In three cases he left out complete sentences without any replacement.

A very common problem of both professional and amateur writers is the use of redundant adjectives, I mean the use of adjectives that are not necessary for the understanding of the noun they belong to. That is why I expected adjectives to be the most numerous among those items that were crossed out but I was wrong. They were on the third place on the list. The group of verbs was the leading one of the list containing different parts of speech. The most frequent types of omission were: the verb ”to be” and verbs in the infinitive form. See Table 1 to find out about the number of words belonging to different parts of speech.

Part of speech	**The number of left out items**
Verbs	28
Adjectives	15
Adverbs	14
Nouns	13
Articles	8
Consjunkctions	3
Others	22

Table 1: The number of omitted words belonging to certain parts of speech in decreasing order

Zinsser considers revising to be very important. Revising our writings we can realize how many words and phrases can still be omitted, changed or replaced by shorter ones. He says: “Be grateful for everything you can throw away” (Zinsser 1998, 18).

Simplicity assumes brevity and clarity of thoughts and expressions, clutter is everything that can be left out without altering the meaning of what we want to express.

CONCLUSION

Simplicity makes a writing valuable. Sentences with many unnecessary elements in them, very elaborate and confusing sentences, or simply: cluttered sentences, will make the reading difficult.

Zinsser in his work gives several writing tips for those who want to improve their writing style, for those who would like to learn how to be simple in our writings. He convinces us to revise all the time what we write and to drop out as many elements as needed. The most important thing according o him is to be as simple and clear as possible.

Everyone who wants to be read must think first of all of the reader, “this elusive creature” (Zinsser 1998, 9), whose attention must be captured. If the reader gets lost among the confusing ideas of a writing, he will stop reading.

Cluttered sentences make the reading difficult. Simple sentences are easy to understand and we must always try to simplify for the sake of good writing and for the sake of better understanding.

We must try to substitute long subordinate clauses with some verbs that contain the same meaning, to use adverbs and adjectives where they are required, to be attentive at nouns that already carry the meaning that can be expressed also with an adjective.

Examples of cross-linguistic influence in learning German as a foreign language: The case of third-year students of foreign languages at Al-Kawakibi Secondary School in Touggourt, Algeria

Fatiha Sadouki[1]

English Applied Linguistics PhD program, University of Szeged

https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2020.1.4

The present study sheds light on cross-linguistic influence and language transfer in third or additional language learning and explores the factors affecting the learning of third or additional language in a multilingual context. It aims at investigating the extent to which the typologically more similar language influences the language being learned. This study was carried out with the participation of 30 third-year students in the foreign languages stream at Al-Kawakibi Secondary School-Touggourt in Algeria. The participants had Arabic as L1, French as L2, English as L3 and they were learning L4 German. The instruments included two translation tasks and a paragraph writing in German, in addition to a questionnaire about learners' self-rated language proficiency of their non-native languages. The findings show that students tend to translate into the language which is typologically more similar to German, in this case English, that influences learning L4 German the most.

Keywords: Arabic L1, cross-linguistic influence, English L3, French L2, German L4, multilingualism in education

1. Introduction

Third language acquisition (TLA) has emerged as a new field of research in the last three decades to extend traditional second language acquisition (SLA) research and to involve more than two languages. The interest in TLA has been and still is the cornerstone for many researchers to investigate and understand the mechanism in third or additional language learning research (Cenoz, 2001; Ringbom, 2001; Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008). The number of languages involved leads researchers to ask the question which language influences the other one(s) and which one of the previously acquired language(s) affect(s) the learning of new languages. Researchers also examine cross-linguistic influence (CLI), language transfer and the factors that affect the process of learning (e.g., Cenoz *et al*, 2001; Odlin, 1989; Kırkıcı, 2007; De Angelis, 2007).

[1] Author's e-mail: sadoukifatiha1994@gmail.com

Cross-linguistic influence is one of the most common topics in third and additional language acquisition research. Several studies confirm that the more languages you know the more learning a new language becomes easier (e.g., Cenoz, 2003; Negadi, 2015).

Although there is an increasing number of studies in TLA in general and those about learning German as L3 in particular, to the best of my knowledge, no studies have investigated the language combination of Arabic, French, English and German in the Algerian context. Therefore, the present paper is an attempt to explore cross-linguistic influence in learning German and sheds light on the types and factors affecting cross-linguistic influence in a multilingual context. I believe that this study is a valuable contribution to third and additional language acquisition research.

In this study, I focus on the impact of the previously acquired languages (L1, L2, and L3) on learning German to discover which language affects learning German more than the other(s) and to find out how participants transfer particular lexical, syntactic and grammatical aspects from the second and third languages (French and English) to the fourth language (German). Taking this specific language combination as a basis, I intend to shed light on some examples of cross-linguistic influence in learning German as a foreign language. My aim is to explore factors that trigger cross-linguistic influence in learning L4 German by students who have Arabic as L1, French as L2, English as L3 and they are learning German as one of the compulsory courses in the foreign languages stream in a secondary school in Algeria. Another aim of the present study is to find out what linguistic knowledge participants rely on when learning L4 by giving examples for lexical, syntactic and grammatical cross-linguistic influence. It is hypothesized that various CLI types will occur at different levels in the production of German, and it is assumed that English will influence the production of German L4 the most. Based on the above-mentioned objectives and the research hypotheses, I formulated the following research questions:

(1) What are some instances of lexical, syntactic and grammatical cross-linguistic influences in learning L4 German?

(2) What linguistic knowledge do Algerians tend to rely on when learning German?

(3) What factors trigger cross-linguistic influence in learning L4 German?

2. Multilingualism and multilingualism in education

Multilingualism is a very important concept in third and additional language acquisition and learning. Nowadays, people globally tend to learn more than two languages, and the number of multilingual individuals is constantly increasing. McArthur (1992) defined a multilingual as an individual who has "the ability to use three or more languages, either separately or in various degrees of code-mixing. Different languages are used for different purposes; competence in each varies according to such factors as register,

occupation, and education" (p. 673). Tucker (2001) also sheds light on multilingualism in education and on the factors that lead to involve languages in education as follow:

> The use of multiple languages in education may be attributed to, or be a reflection of, numerous factors such as the linguistic heterogeneity of a country or region (...); specific social or religious attitudes (...); or the desire to promote national identity (...) In addition, innovative language education programs are often implemented to develop proficiency in international language(s) of wider communication, together with proficiency in national and regional languages (p. 332).

In Algeria, for instance, multilingualism predominates, and the education system adopts more than one language. The most dominant languages in education are Arabic and French, starting from primary school. In middle school, English is added to the curriculum. In secondary schools in Algeria, there are more than five streams from which students choose the one that suits their future goals; for example, science, mathematics, economics, literature, or foreign languages. If learners opt for foreign languages, it means they have to learn other languages besides Arabic, French and English, for example, German, Italian, or Spanish.

In today's world, monolingual societies are rare due to the intercultural development, which promotes, to some extent, the desire to learn new languages. Therefore, "due to historical and political reasons, two or more languages are used, but it is also common in the case of individuals who need to communicate in several languages and in schools where two or more foreign languages are taught" (Cenoz, 2008, p. 219). That is, recent research focuses on learning languages beyond the second one, which is widely investigated. Research on third or additional language learning draws different conclusions on different contexts and shows that languages influence each other (e.g., Hermas, 2014; Dewaele, 1998; Hammarberg, 2001; Bardel & Falk, 2007; Kautzsch, 2010; Falk & Bardel, 2010; Talebi, 2013; Tápainé Balla, 2008 and 2009; T. Balla, 2013). The source of cross-linguistic influence in L3 can be the L1, L2 or both (e.g., Flynn *et al*, 2004; Slabakova, 2016).

Studying third or additional languages is considered more complex than second language acquisition (Cenoz, 2008, p. 221). There are only two languages involved in SLA: the first language L1 and the second language L2. The influence between them is bidirectional while in TLA and multilingualism there may be mutual influence. According to Cenoz (2008, p. 222), in third or additional language acquisition (TLA/ALA), learners have a large linguistic repertoire that can be used as a source they refer to when learning additional languages and may reflect cross-linguistic influence in third/additional language acquisition. Therefore, this linguistic repertoire determines the acquisition of a new language; it either facilitates this process or makes it more complicated and difficult. Based on the studies investigating cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition, various factors trigger cross-linguistic influence, which

can differ from one context to another (e.g., Cenoz, 2001; De Angelis & Selinker, 2001; Tápainé Balla, 2008).

2.1 Third and additional language acquisition

There is a difference between the acquisition of the mother tongue (that is L1) and later acquired languages as the second, third, fourth and so on. According to Ortega (2009), second language acquisition is defined as the learning of languages beyond the first one. Concerning third or any additional language learning, Cenoz (2003) defines them as learning languages apart from the second language. It is generally thought that languages have an impact on each other. The first language might affect the acquisition of the second language, and, in third and additional language learning, both L1 and L2 might influence the learning process in multilingual contexts. This interference between languages reflects cross-linguistic influence. It is not surprising that the number of studies that have been conducted to investigate this phenomenon is increasing due to the number of the various multilingual contexts where different languages are involved.

The theory of cross-linguistic influence describes how and under which conditions the previously acquired languages influence the learning of a new language (De Angelis, 2007). The history of cross-linguistic influence research has long been of interest for researchers in second language acquisition. It is traced back to contrastive analysis hypothesis in 1957, and later to error analysis in 1975 where the focus was on learners' errors during second language acquisition. Later, researchers started to focus on the aspects of cross-linguistic influence in learning a third language to understand how learners transfer across languages and find out the factors triggering cross-linguistic influence in L3 (De Angelis, 2007).

2.2 Factors triggering cross-linguistic influence

It has been proved that may factors affect the learning process in third and additional language acquisition. Cenoz (2001), for example, lists the following factors: psychotypology, level of proficiency, the context of the acquisition, language mode, the foreign language effect, age, and recency. We may find some similarities between Cenoz's classification of the factors and that of De Angelis (2007) who listed them as follows: cross-linguistic influence, language distance, proficiency, the source language, recency, exposure to the target language, environment, order of acquisition and context. These factors are resulted from different studies in different contexts (e.g., Tremblay, 2006; Rothman & Cabrelli, 2009; Cenoz, 2003; Bardel & Falk, 2007; Hanafi, 2014, T. Balla, 2012). Kırkıcı (2007) states that the scope of cross-linguistic influence has been extended to go beyond L1 and L2 influence and examine multilingual contexts by studying more complex combinations of languages (L1-L2-L3-Lx).

Studies on cross-linguistic influence and language transfer can be classified into three main groups. Studies in the first group support the idea that the source of transfer in third or additional language learning is from the learners' native language (e.g., Hermas, 2014; Cenoz, 2001). Studies in the second group argue that the transfer in L3 acquisition and learning is related to the first non-native language, i.e. L2, which is also known as foreign language effect or L2 status (e.g., Bardel & Falk, 2007; Hammarberg, 2001; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998; Kırkıcı, 2007; Türker, 2017). Cenoz (2003) mentions that "studies involving L3 speakers of different combinations of languages have consistently reported that learners use a second language which is typologically closer to the L3 as the supplier language rather than a typologically distant first language" (p.2). This is related to the level of proximity, i.e. typological similarities between two languages due to the similarities between English and German (De Angelis, 2007). And, finally, studies in the third group claim that third and additional language acquisition has nothing to do with the order of the previously acquired languages. That is, learners of L3 transfer from both their L1s and L2s, and the typological similarity determines and controls the acquisition of third or additional language, which occurs in syntactic transfer and morphological transfer (e.g., Hammarberg, 2001).

Language distance refers to the degree of similarities and differences that exist between two languages or more in addition to psychotypology which is related to learners' awareness of the existence of these differences (Ellis, 1994). Psychotypology makes learning easy when learners know the similarities that exist between languages that may facilitate their learning when L2 has an additive role in L3 learning (Cenoz, 2003; Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Negadi, 2015). Second, when the level of awareness is low, learners may encounter difficulties recognizing the similarities and differences between the languages involved, and their production reflects negative transfer (Calvo cortés, 2005). In the L3 context, learners have the possibility to build on two background languages (L1 and L2) in learning L3 compared to second language learners who have only their first language to use as a source (Cenoz, et al, 2001).

2.2.1 Typological proximity

One of the most important factors that trigger cross-linguistic influence in L3 learning is typological proximity (De Angelis, 2007). Rothman (2011) states that under certain conditions, cross-linguistic influence reflects the role of typological proximity between the third language and prior linguistic systems. Various L3 studies provide evidence that language distance plays a significant role in the learning process (e.g., De Angelis & Selinker, 2001; Tremblay, 2006; Rothman & Cabrelli, 2009). According to Rothman (2011), the more typologically similar language to L3 can be considered as a source of transfer, and learners depend on the language they perceive to be similar to the target language. According to Odlin (1989), "transfer is the influence resulting from

similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired" (p. 27). Odlin (1989) proposes a list for the outcomes of CL similarities and differences like positive transfer, negative transfer, and the differing lengths of acquisition. The perceived similarities and differences may work as a form of facilitation in several ways as well as may reflect negative transfer such as the case of false cognates.

There is a wide agreement that learners transfer from the language that is more closely related to L3 than languages that are typologically distant (e.g., De Angelis, 2005; Cenoz, 2001). De Angelis (2007) discusses the notion of typological proximity in which she uses language distance to refer to "the distance that a linguist can objectively and formally define and identify between languages and language families" (p. 22). She also mentions that formal similarity can be found in some features and components between two languages even if they are not genetically related.

2.3 Languages in Algeria

Maamri (2009) describes the different phases languages went through in Algeria. She presents Algeria's language policy before and after independence (between the French Algeria, i.e. during the French colonization and the independent Algeria, i.e. after independence in 1962). When the French colonization controlled the society and tended to impose the French language on the Algerian society, French was considered the first language in Algeria for more than 130 years (Maamri, 2009, p. 77). In the early 1960s and in an attempt to reconcile the Algerian identity, Modern Standard Arabic replaced French as the first language of instruction in primary school and later in secondary school. After independence in 1962, Arabic was considered the first official language of the country. In the last 50 years and following the intercultural movement, some foreign languages have been adopted in addition to the first languages (Arabic and Beber) as a first foreign language, typically French. However, Maamri (2009) considers French a second language rather than a first foreign language since it is used in everyday life. Starting from 1992, English has been regarded as a second language in Algeria alongside French as the compulsory foreign languages, to be taught starting from the third year in primary schools for French and starting from middle schools for English. More foreign languages such as German, Spanish or Italian were added to the school curriculum as compulsory courses in middle and secondary schools (precisely in the foreign languages stream, cf. below) and at universities for those who choose to study languages. Figure 1 presents the languages that are used as language of instruction or as compulsory languages in the Algerian education system in a more detailed way.

Primary school (6-10 year olds)

Arabic	*French*
The language of instruction	Learning French is compulsory from the third grade

Middle school (11-15 year olds)

Arabic	*French*	*English*
The language of instruction	Compulsory language course	Compulsory language course from the first year

Secondary school (15-18 year olds)

Arabic	*French*	*English*	*German/Spanish/Italian*
The first language of instruction	Compulsory language course	Compulsory Language course	Compulsory language in 2nd and 3rd year Foreign language stream

Figure 1. Languages in the Algerian education system (WENR 2006)

As mentioned above in Figure 1, Algerians acquire Arabic from birth, and sometimes Arabic and French in the case of bilinguals. Students start learning French at the age of 6 or in some cases at 5, whereas learning English starts in the middle school at the age of 10 or sometimes 11. In secondary schools, they have French and English as compulsory language courses, in addition to German, Italian or Spanish from the age of 15 for those who are registered in the foreign languages stream.

Since there are four languages involved in this study (Arabic, French, English, and German), it is relevant to clarify the typological relationship between these languages. Regarding language genetic relatedness, Arabic is part of a Semitic language family that is typologically different from all the other three languages i.e. it has a special script, and as it is written from right to left. French, English, and German are all Indo-European languages that share similar features such as script, some grammar rules, some words), but, of course, they also differ in many aspects (e.g. syntactic structures, grammar rules, lexis). Concerning syntax, Arabic has special syntactic features that build up a complex syntax which differs from those of the European languages (El-Shishiny, 1990, p. 345), and it follows the VSO syntactic structure whereas French, English, and German have the SVO order. French, English and German are Indoeuropean languages; French is a Romance language, while German and English both belong to the Germanic branch, and therefore they are typologically closer to each other than to French. However, because of historical reasons English and French also share a lot of vocabulary.

3. The study

3.1 Context

The context of the present study is Algeria, where, as mentioned above, secondary schools offer foreign languages as one potential study stream. If learners opt for foreign languages, it means they have to learn other languages besides their native Arabic, and on top of French and English, which are compulsory for everyone. Languages typically chosen as an L4 include German, Italian, and Spanish. Students start taking courses in the previously mentioned languages in their second year at secondary school. In this study, I intend to focus on learning L4 German as a foreign language to find out what prior linguistic knowledge Algerians tend to refer to when learning German. In the case of the Al-Kawakibi secondary school where this study was carried out, German is taught as a foreign language besides Arabic, French, and English in the foreign languages stream.

3.2 Instruments

The study includes four types of instruments: a questionnaire on the participants' linguistic background (see above), two translation tasks, and a writing task. The questionnaire was adopted from T. Balla (2012) concerning the linguistic and language-learning background of the participants, and was modified to suit the context of the present study by removing some questions [from question 4 to 12] (see T. Balla, 2012, p. 170). I added two other sections about the participants' perception concerning the four languages. The modified questionnaire has three types of questions: personal information about the participants, questions about their linguistic background and questions about their perception concerning the way they use, learn and evaluate their language proficiency level in the four involved languages. Using a 5 point Likert scale, participants were asked to answer questions regarding their experience in learning the languages they know, as the following examples show:

> 1. If you want to understand a word in German, do you think your mother tongue helps?
>
> 2. Do you think that English helps in learning German?
>
> Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

Concerning the first translation task, participants were asked to translate seven sentences from German into one of their non-native languages (French or English). The sentences were chosen according to a set of criteria in which they are not too difficult and not too easy to be translated. They included words that are similar to their equivalents in English such as *Studentin*, *Freundin, or Musik*. These sentences were

structured in a way that the participants are familiar with, and the tasks are similar to the tasks they used to do during their German classes. Participants were free to choose either French (their L2) or English (their L3) to translate into. The purpose of this task was to find out which language participants prefer to translate into. 'Fatima ist meine Freundin und sie ist dreiunddzwanzig Jahre alt' is one of the seven sentences in this task. In addition, they were given a question in Arabic at the end of this task, which aims to know the language participants translated into as follow:

Which language do you prefer to translate the sentences into? Why?

The second translation task includes seven sentences that participants were asked to translate from Arabic into German. These sentences were structured in a way that they include words that are similar to their equivalents in English such as *fish*. The purpose of this task was to find out in which way the non-native languages influence language production in German.

The last task was designed to explore cross-linguistic influence in German L4 through a writing task. Participants were asked to write a short paragraph in German about their last summer holiday in which they were asked to answer six questions about their vacation such as: where did you spend the vacation?, for how many days?, how was it?...etc. The duration of each task was about 45 minutes except for the writing task that took about one hour. The paragraphs were collected and analyzed to explore the factors of cross-linguistic influence in learning German L4 based on participants' errors. The main aim of the second translation task (from Arabic into German) and the purpose of the writing task was to analyze the written production of the participants to find out about the influence of the non-native languages on learning German and which one affects learning German the most.

3.3 Participants

The participants include 30 third-year students in the foreign languages stream at the al-Kawakibi Secondary School in Touggourt province, Algeria. In secondary schools, only second and third-year students in the foreign languages stream learn German. In this study, participants have Arabic as L1 and French as L2. They have studied L3 English as a foreign language for seven years as an obligatory course in middle and secondary schools, and they are learning German as L4.

All participants were asked to fill in a questionnaire about their linguistic backgrounds. The questionnaires revealed that 70% of the participants use French with their families whereas only 5% state that they are taking extra classes in French and 20% join private schools to learn French to develop their level for exam purposes. Concerning English, 10% of the participants use English at home with their families, 60% of participants are taking extra classes and 25% are registered in English courses in private schools for different purposes. Some of them take extra classes to learn English

grammar and writing and are registered in private schools since they are planning to join an English language program at university. Concerning their use of German, a small percentage uses German at home i.e. 2% and 4% are taking extra classes, whereas 30% mention that they are registered in German courses in private schools. In brief, 70% of the participants use French at home, 60% take extra classes in English and 30% attend private schools to improve their German.

As far as the non-native languages are concerned, we can see that the participants had the same experience with the formal language instructions in French and English as obligatory courses taught at school expect for the 35% of the participants who acquired French from birth. We can notice that they, to some extent, form a homogeneous group in terms of language experience. Participants were in the 12th grade and were 16-18 years old at the time of the data collection. They started to learn French at the age of 7-9, and they have been studying English for 6 years. Beside the four languages that this study focuses on, 8 participants had some (2-8 months') experience with other languages such as Turkish, Hindi, Japanese, and Spanish.

In brief, participants were also asked to rate their proficiency levels in each of the four languages involved in this study. 40% of the participants who acquired French from birth consider themselves proficient C1/C2 in French, while those who took extra courses in English rated their proficiency level as B2. Concerning German, the majority of the participants (over 70%) consider themselves beginners to intermediate learners.

3.4 Procedure

The study was carried out in January 2020 in three days. On the first day, the students filled in the questionnaire, which provided background knowledge about the participants and their perception concerning the languages they know and how they use them and which one they think helps them in learning German. On the second day, they did the two translation tasks; from German into French L2 or English L3 in the first task and from Arabic L1 into German L4 in the second task. In the first translation task, I calculated the French and English translations of each sentence in order to know which language participants prefer to translate into (see Table 2). On the third day, they wrote paragraphs on the specific topic of "last summer holiday". The paragraphs were collected and analysed referring to the types and factors of cross-linguistic influence in German in the presence of three previously acquired languages (Arabic, French and English). The analysis of the writing task aims to present some examples of cross-linguistic influence that reflect the impact of the previously acquired linguistic systems on learning German. The results of the questionnaire and the four tasks are presented and analyzed in the following section.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Language choices in the first translation task

As stated above, the primary purpose of this study was to find out how the previously acquired languages influence learning German when the latter is learned after French L2 and English L3. From the analysis of the tasks, it is found that students tend to translate the sentences of the first translation task into English. The results of the first translation task (from German into French/English) are summarized in Table 1 below. It presents the numbers of participants who translated the sentences into French and those who translated into English.

Table 1. Language choices in the translation task (From German into French/English)

Sentence	**Number of participants who translated the sentence into French L2**	**Number of participants who translated the sentence into English L3**	**Number of participants who did not translate the sentence**
1. Ich bin Dalal und ich bin einundzwanzig Jahre alt.	12	18	0
2. Fatime ist meine Freundin und sie ist dreiundzwanzig Jahre alt.	9	18	3
3. Ich bin Studentin an der Kasdi Merbah Universität.	9	21	0
4. Ich mag Musik hören und tanzen.	15	15	0
5. Das ist mein Großvater.	6	24	0
6. Dieses Mädchen hat drei Hausaufgaben.	10	20	0
7. Putzen sie sich die Zähne nach dem Essen.	6	15	9

As shown in Table 1, the majority of the participants translated the first sentence into English. Over 60% of the participants translated sentences 3, 5 and 6 into English, while 60% of the participants chose English as a target language when translating sentences 1 and 2. Also, three participants did not translate sentence 2. Half of the participants translated sentences 4 and 7 into English, while 9 students did not provide a translation

for sentence 7. These percentages show that the majority of the sentences was translated into English, and participants preferred English as the target language they translate into. As for the non-translations of sentences 2 and 7, I assume, they were more difficult for some participants to translate into French or English. This will need further investigation in future research to find out why some participants do not translate particular sentences during the task.

When asking participants about their preferred language choice, the responses were as follows:

(1) *I translated these sentences into English because I think English, in this case, is easy to translate into.*

(2) *Absolutely English! There are some words easy to translate into English than into French.*

Other answers reflect the psychotypology of participants in which they claim that there are some kind of similarities between English L3 and German L4 as follows:

(3) *English, I like it, and it is closer to German in some words.*

(4) *English, it is more similar to German than French.*

(5) *English, I don't know maybe there are things in common between English and German.*

(6) *Even though my level in French is better than in English, I chose English because there are words that look like the same in English and German such as: Jahre alt = years old, Studentin = student, and Grossvater = grandfather.*

As we can see from the students' justifications, they reflected on the similarities between English and German and referred to them as a facilitating factor during translation. English and German are perceived to be the most similar by the participants.The analysis of the first translation task reveals that L4 learners of German prefer to translate into a language that is typologically more similar to German (English), than the other foreign language (French) they are familiar with. Another explanation for the participants' choice of English as the preferred language they translate the sentences into is their proficiency level. They mentioned in their answers, for example, that "my level in English is better than in French". Language preferences can also be considered as reasons behind choosing English as a target language to translate into as stated in one of participants' responses: "I choose English just because I like it". Another explanation that can be added from the participants' answers is the perceived easiness of a language as mentioned in one of the answers: "The language I translated into is English because it is easy to learn."

4.2 Types of cross-linguistic influence

Based on the similarities between German and English, the participants' errors in the second translation task and the writing task were analysed and classified based on cross-linguistic influence types. The first one is lexical transfer that occurred on many occasions throughout the tasks such as the use of cognates. Another type of cross-linguistic influence that occurred in the participants' answers is the grammatical/syntactic cross-linguistic influence as in the form of comparative adjectives rules, and verb selection.

4.2.1 Lexical transfer

While evaluating the second translation task (from Arabic into German) and the writing task, I observed that students tend to activate their English knowledge and rules when translating from Arabic into German. I classified the errors that students made when translating from Arabic into German into different types of transfer categories. The first one is lexical transfer, which occurred rather frequently throughout the participants' answers.

Table 2. Types of lexical transfer in the second translation task (Arabic into German)

Full lexical switches	**Morphological forms**	**Orthographic forms**
Families (Eng), familles (Fre), brun (Fre), Brown (Eng), blue (Eng), bleu (Fre), physic (Eng), Physique (Fre), friend (Eng), story (Eng) Fich (Eng)	friendin	zwantzig, zwentzig, Swendzig, twansig, twansig, brawn, Familian, Famile, familien, eint hundret, hundert, Blaue...

As shown in Table 2 above, participants used non-standard German orthography and word forms, which can be classified into three types of lexical transfer: full lexical switches, morphological forms, and orthographic forms (Kırkıcı, 2007, Tápainé Balla, 2008). Some examples of the words that were written in different forms are: *Zwantzig* (correctly in German: Zwanzig, meaning in English: twenty), *einhundret* (correctly in German: Einhundert, meaning in English: one hundred), *Familian* (correctly in German; Familien, meaning in English: families), *Blau* (correctly in German: Blau, meaning in English: blue) and *Braun* (correctly in German: Braun, meaning in English: brown). It is necessary to consider the transfer from English L3 in the learning of German L4 since they are typologically closer to each other. For example, there are morphological hybrid

forms that occur in the students' translation such as the word *friendin* (correctly in German: Freundin, meaning in English: female friend). This word is mistakenly written in different forms *Friend*, *friendin* and *Fraundin*. The first form (*Friend*) can be considered a full lexical transfer when it is written as in English, but capitalized as if it was a German word *Friend*. It can be considered a morphological hybrid form when the first part of the word is in English and the second part is written in German as in *friendin*. Other orthographic forms reflect neither English nor German, as in the word *Fraundin*; it is a new form that does not reflect either the English word *friend* or the German word *Freundin*. Another example in which French influences the learning of German is the word *famille* [English: family]. The latter is the French equivalent of the German word *Familie*. That is, the source of this lexical transfer, in this case, is from French L2. Also, frequent incorrect forms also occur in participants' translations which are not clearly related to any of the previously acquired languages. In the case of certain forms, it is difficult to decide whether the incorrect word form is a result to the influence of English and French or maybe it may simply be related to the developmental errors that participants may commit when learning German L4.

Lexical transfer also occurs in the writing task in several words such as *zuletzt, schnell, interessant, schön, Sommer, Leute*. Examples of lexical transfer from the writing task are presented in the following examples:

(7) *In der lasten summer, ich habe zum ein gut und new Stadt.* (Hybrid form)

(8) *Dies war ein sehr interesting fur mich.* (Full lexical switches)

(9) *Wir haben viele laute kennengelerte.* (Hybrid form)

(10) *Mein Hobby ist tanzen und music hören.* (Full lexical switches)

(11) *Wie Assen das traditionelle Essen dieses Ortes*. (Full lexical switches: French word *traditionelle*)

In Example 7, the influence of the English word *last* in the German phrase *Im letzten Sommer* is clearly seen: the participant used the English word last instead of the German letzt/e/n with the appropriate German adjective form in dative. There are similar examples where participants misspelled words in German, and they wrote the English equivalents of the words, such as *interesting* (example 8), *people* (example 9), and *music* (example 10). These full lexical switches prove that participants used their L3 knowledge in learning German L4, and wrote the words incorrectly in the target language. Cenoz, Hufeisen and Jessner (2002) concluded that even when languages are closely related, there are specific cues that make the difference such as using the onset capital letters in German nouns.

4.2.2 Transfer of grammar rules

Deviation from grammar rules is also considered one of the types of cross-linguistic influence such as the errors in comparative and superlative rules, which clearly reflect the influence of English on learning German. Table 3 presents some examples of conjugation and verb selection errors that occurred in the participants' writing, most likely due to the similarities and differences between English L3 and German L4, such as applying English grammar rules in the production of German L4 in the case of modal verb conjugation.

Table 3. Conjugation errors and verb selection

Conjugation error/verb selection	**Correction**	**Justification + source of transfer**
1. Und meine Mutter sagte: 'du must essen'.	*Und meine Mutter: 'Du musst essen'.	- *must* instead of *musst* - *must* = English model verb
2. Er müssen darüber nachdenken.	* Er muss darüber nachdenken.	-using the infinitive form of the model verb *müssen*
3. Mein kleiner Bruder ist hunger.	*Mein kleiner Bruder hat hungar. -Mein kleiner Bruder ist hungrig.	- misuse of the verb *haben* -*to be* instead of *to have* -Influence of English
4. Ich bin geschlafen während mein Freund ist gekocht.	*Ich habe geschlafen **während** mein Freund gekocht hat.	-misuse of the verb *haben* -using the verb *sein* instead of *haben* - word order mistake -influence of English L3 on German L4.
5. Wir bekom vorsichtiger.	* Wir werden vorsichtiger.	- using the verb *bekommen* instead of *werden*
6. Ich fande es stressig.	*Ich habe es stressig gefunden.	- conjugation

The participants used the infinitive form of the model verb *müssen* with different pronouns which reflects the rule of modal verbs in English where the infinitive form of the modal verb is used with all pronouns, however, in German it has to be conjugated.

As can be seen in Table 3, the participants' written productions show common types of cross-linguistic influence from English L3 in learning German L4. Modal verbs in English and German have the same functions within a sentence, but in English, for instance, the modal verb *must* has the same form with all pronouns (e.g. they must, she must, and he must) whereas in German it has different forms based on tense and pronouns (e.g. ich muss, du musst, and er/sie/es muss).

In the first sentence (Table 3), the modal verb *müssen* is misspelled. It was replaced by the equivalent model verb *must* in English L3, which may reflect a full lexical switch, or a spelling mistake: one –s, instead of two –ss-es. In the second example (Table 3), the modal verb is not conjugated according to their rules in German, but rather it is used in the infinitive form, in the same way as in English: the rule is that they take the same base form after all pronouns. This occurred in different cases when participants did not conjugate the modal verb according to the pronouns such as the use of *müssen* with the pronoun *er* [first person singular] instead of *muss*. Second, the use of the verb *to be* instead of *to have* in sentences 3 and 4 reflects the influence of English on learning German. In English, we express *I am hungry* with the verb *to be*, while in German we use the verb *to have* as in *Ich habe Hunger*. This reflects the cross-linguistic influence of English L3 on learning German. Even in French, in such a case, we use the auxiliary *to have* to express hunger by saying *J'ai faim* not *je suis faim*.

Third, the selection of inappropriate verbs is found in students' written production, which can be considered cross-linguistic influence such as in the case of false friends. The verb *bekommen* was used as the equivalent of the verb *to become* in English whereas it means *to get.* The misuse of verbs and words discussed above is caused by language distance and the degree of similarities and differences between English L3 and German L4.

A further example of cross-linguistic influence from Arabic is the transfer of the syntactic features of Arabic such as the VSO structure as in the following examples which reflect transfer from Arabic when participants transferred the VSO structure from Arabic into German. The latter has the SVO system as in English and French.

(12) *War das Dorf sehr schön.* (cross-linguistic transfer from Arabic)

More examples are presented in Table 4 below, showing the influence of the participants' background languages on learning German at the level of syntax.

4.2.3 Syntactic transfer

Another type of error found in participants' translation tasks and the writing task is related to the syntax of the sentences. Participants followed some syntactic rules in Arabic, French and English and applied them in German production, as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Syntactic transfer

Syntactic error	Explanation/Source of transfer
1. Begann unsere reise in Djelfa und ich erinnere mich an die ersten tage in sehr Nachten kalten.	Arabic L1 : Literal translation (Structure rules of Arabic)
2. Wo die malerische Natur und die wasserfalle und die fliessenden Taler und die reinen Taler mehr als einen Monat lang in Tranen ausgebrochen waren.	Literal translation (Structure rules of Arabic)
3. Wie haben versuchen die Essen traditionnelle von diseser Stadt.	French L2
4. Am Freitag, wir gingen zu Annaba.	English L3: Transferring sentence structure forms
5. In der lasten summer, ich habe ein gut Reise in eine neue Stadt.	English L3
6. Es war ein Sportcamp, in dem gerne wir verschiedene sportarten ausubten.	English L3

In Table 4 we can see that transfer did not only occur at the lexical and morphological level, but also at the syntactic level. Participants transferred some structures from their L1 Arabic, L2 French or L3 English. As shown in the first and second examples, the participants wrote sentences that clearly reflect literal translations from Arabic. In Arabic, the sentence usually starts with a verb as in the first sentence in Table 3 above, following the VSO structure rather than constructing the sentence according to German rules.

In the case of the previously acquired languages (Arabic L1, French L2, and English L3), it is mainly the literal translation that clearly reflects the structure of these languages. Other types of errors can be classified under grammatical errors. As shown in Table 5 below, participants tend to transfer rules of comparative and superlative from English and apply them in German, which is consistent with some studies that show the influence of the similar language on the target language (e.g. Cenoz, 2001; Ò Laoire & Singleton, 2009).

Table 5. Transfer of grammatical rules

Error/transfer of rules	Correction	Source of transfer
1. Das Reise war mehr Gefährlich als die vorherige.	* Das Reise war gefährlicher als die vorherige.	English L3
2. Ich war der jüngest in der Gruppe.	* Ich war der jüngste in der Gruppe.	English L3
3. Sommer ist die best option zu haben ein pause.	* Sommer ist die beste Option um eine Pause zu haben.	English L3

In addition to the cross-linguistic transfer mentioned above, some other types of transfer occurred in the participants' written production, such as false cognates (Example 13) and the incorrect use of gender articles (Example 14). Also, the misuse of prepositions in some cases was very clear such as *für,* and the incorrect plural forms among others. The findings show that the participants tend to transfer from English since it is perceived to be more similar to German.

(13) *Er Bekom ein Schwimmer* (false friends)

(14) *Dies war ein sehr interesting für mich* (transfer of the article)

Overall, we can see that several factors trigger cross-linguistic influence in learning German L4 after French and English. Arabic, the participants' native language, seems to impact learning L4 mainly in applying the Arabic syntactic structure in German, which reflects literal translation on various occasions. The effect of the non-native languages is also considered one of the main factors of cross-linguistic influence. Since French and English are both Indo-European languages, they can be considered more useful in learning German than Arabic, which is a Semitic language. We can also notice that language distance and psychotypology are the determining factors of cross-linguistic influence in learning German L4.

5. Conclusion

This study shed light on the role of the previously acquired languages in third and additional language acquisition. The present study highlighted three research questions. Concerning the first research question, it was found that various types of cross-linguistic influence in learning L4 German occurred at different levels such as lexical and syntactic cross-linguistic influence. Answers to the second research question supported

the prediction that participants rely on English L3 when carrying out a translation task as it is the preferred language for the participates to translate into. According to their language choice, they perceive that English is more similar to German than the other previously acquired languages. Regarding the last research question, the factors that affect leaning L4 German are language distance and the psychotypology of learners concerning the similarities and differences between the languages involved which may help the learning of the target language. The participants relied on English more than on any of the other languages they were familiar with. Second, participants tended to rely on L3 English in learning L4 German. L3. Third, the factors triggering cross-linguistic influence found in this study are due to the perceived similarity between English and German. This study showed that language distance has a facilitative and non-facilitative influence. My results confirm the findings of previous studies (Dewaele, 1998; De Angelis, 2005; Cenoz, 2001), which also concluded that psychotypology plays a significant role in learning third/additional language.

This study presents examples of cross-linguistic influence in learning German as L4, and it shows that language distance is one of the important factors in third and additional language acquisition as it was stressed by De Angelis (2007), Cenoz (2001) and Hall and Ecke (2003). As any study, this study has its limitations that should be taken into consideration in future research such as individual differences that might affect their performance. A further limitations is that only 30 participants took part in the present study, and they all come from the same high school and thus have the same linguistic background. Also, the designed research instruments could only cover certain areas of language, therefore only a limited range of lexis, morphology and syntax could be examined. Future research may focus on one type of cross-linguistic influence and study it in detail and in different contexts. Future research is encouraged to focus on syntactic cross-linguistic influence as there are few studies investigating CLI at the syntactic level. Also, various models on morpho-syntactic transfer can be tested to explore the factors that trigger CLI in TLA.

6. Acknowledgement

I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers who read my manuscript and provided helpful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of my manuscript. Also, this work could not have been accomplished without the endless support of my advisor, Dr. Ágnes T. Balla, senior assistant professor at the Doctoral School of Linguistics at the University of Szeged and Dr. Katalin Doró, associate professor at the same doctoral school.

References

Bardel, C. & Falk, Y. (2007). The role of the second language in third language acquisition: The case of Germanic syntax. *Second Language Research, 23*(4), 459-484. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658307080557

Calvo cortés, N. (2005). Negative language transfer when learning Spanish as a foreign language. *INTERLINGÜÍSTICA, 16* (1), 237-248.

Cenoz, J. (2001). The effect of linguistic distance, L2 status, and age on cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 8-20). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J. (2003). Cross-linguistic in third language acquisition: Implications for the organization of the multilingual mental lexicon. *Vereinigung für angewandte Linguistik in der Schweiz*,78, 1-11.

Cenoz, J. (2008). The acquisition of additional languages. *ELIA,* 8, 219-224.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2010). The diversity of multilingualism in education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 205, 37-53. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2010.038

Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (2002) (Eds.), *The multilingual lexicon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & U. Jessner. (2001) (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

De Angelis, G. (2005). Interlanguage transfer of function words. *Language Learning, 55*(3), 379-414. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00310.x

De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

De Angelis, G., & Selinker, L. (2001). Interlanguage transfer and competing linguistic systems in the multilingual mind. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 42-58). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dewaele, J. M. (1998). Lexical inventions: French interlanguage as L2 versus L3. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(4), 471–490. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.471

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

El-Shishiny, H. (1990). A formal description of Arabic syntax in definite clause grammar. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Computational Linguitics*, 3, 345-347. https://doi.org/10.3115/991146.991214

Falk, Y., & Bardel, C. (2010). Object pronouns in German L3 syntax: Evidence for the L2 Status Factor. *Second Language Research, 27*, 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386647

Flynn S, Foley, C., & Vinnitskaya, I. (2004). The cumulative-enhancement model for language acquisition: Comparing adults' and children's patterns of development in first, second and third language acquisition. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 1*(1), 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668175

Hall, C. J., & Ecke, P. (2003). Parasitism as a default mechanism in L3 vocabulary acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen & U. Jessner (Eds.), *The multilingual lexicon* (pp. 71-85). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hammarberg, B. (2001). Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 production and acquisition. In Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U (Eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 21-41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hanafi, A. (2014). The Second Language Influence on Foreign Language Learners' Errors: The case of the French language for Algerian Students learning English as a foreign language. *European Scientific Journal*, 2, 30-38.

Hermas, A. (2014). Multilingual transfer: L1 morphosyntax in L3 English. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 8, 1-24

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York: Taylor & Francis Inc.

Kautzsch, A. (2010). Exploring L1 transfer in German learners of English: High front vowels, high back vowels and the bed/bad distinction. *Research in Language*, 8, 63-84. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10015-010-0003-8

Kırkıcı, B. (2007). Meine Hobbys sind Müzik hören und Swimmen: Lexical transfer in L1 Turkish-L2 English learners of L3 German. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 12(3), 15 S.

Maamri, M, R. (2009). The syndrome of the French language in Algeria. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences, 3*(3), 77-89.

McArthur, T. (1992). *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press.

Negadi, M. N. (2015). Learning English in Algeria through French-based background proficiency. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 496-500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.537

Ó Laoire, M., & Singleton, D. (2009). The role of prior knowledge in L3 learning and use: Further evidence of psycotypological dimensions. In L. Aronin, & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition* (pp. 79-102). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Hodder Education.

Ringbom, H. (2001). Lexical transfer in L3 production. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 59-68). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rothman, J. (2011). L3 syntactic transfer selectivity and typological determinacy: The typological primacy model. *Second Language Research*, *27*, 107–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386439

Rothman, J., & Cabrelli, J. A. (2009). What variables condition syntactic transfer? A look at the L3 initial state. *Second Language Research, 25*(4), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658309349410

Slabakova, R. (2016). The scalpel model of third language acquisition. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 21*(6), 651–666. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916655413

T. Balla, Á. (2012). *The role of second language English in the process of learning third language German*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. https://doi.org/10.14232/phd.1658

T. Balla, Á. (2013). The perceived role of L2 English in the process of learning L3 German. *Romanian Journal of English Studies, 10*(1), 62-76. https://doi.org/10.2478/rjes-2013-0005

Talebi, S. H. (2013). Cross-Linguistic transfer (from L1 to L2, L2 to L1, and L2 to L3) of reading strategies in a multicompetent mind. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(2), 432-436. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.2.432-436

Tápainé Balla, Á. (2008). What does an L3 learner already know? In O. Marti Arnandiz, & M. P. Safont Jorda (Eds.), *Achieving multilingualism: Wills and ways. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Multilingualism (ICOM).* Castello de la Plane: Universitat Jaume I, 468-478.

Tápainé Balla, Á. (2009). Angolul és németül tanuló nvelvtanulók transzferielenségei. [Transfer phenomena of learners learning English and German]. In Á. Zimányi (Ed), *Proceedings of the MANYE XVIII Conference.* Eger: Eszterházy Károly Főiskola, 701-707.

Tremblay, M. C. (2006). Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: The role of L2 proficiency and L2 exposure. *CLO/OPL Ottawa,* 34, 109–119.

Tucker, G. R. (2001). A global perspective on bilingualism and bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis, & T. Ai-Hui (Eds.), *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics 1999* (pp. 332-340). Washington DC: Georgetown Univesity Press.

Türker, E. (2017). Language transfer in third language acquisition: A study of Japanese influence on the acquisition of Korean for L1 English speakers. *The Academy of Korean Studies Grant* (AKS-2016-R41). Arizona State University.

WENR (2006). https://wenr.wes.org/2006/04/wenr-apr-2006-education-in-algeria.

Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Languages switches in L3 production: Implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(3), 295-333. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.3.295

Hogyan lehet támogatni a (nyelv)tanulást a fejlesztő értékelésen keresztül?

Csépes Ildikó[1]

Debreceni Egyetem

DOI: 10.14232/edulingua.2020.1.5

Tanulmányunk célja, hogy áttekintést adjon a fejlesztő értékelés különböző értelmezéseiről, a nyelvtanulás kontextusát külön is kiemelve. Bemutatjuk az osztálytermi értékelés megítélésének változását az elmúlt közel 30 év alatt, és hogy a fejlesztő értékelés miért kapott egyre több figyelmet napjainkra. Értelmezésünk szerint az értékelés átszövi az osztálytermi gyakorlat egészét, és jelentősen befolyásolhatja a diákok tanulási motivációját és magabiztosságát, melyek egyaránt döntő hatással lehetnek a tanulás eredményességére. Bemutatjuk a fejlesztő értékelés három megközelítését: a tanulást támogató értékelést, a dinamikus értékelést és a tanulás-orientált értékelés. Mindhárom felfogás rendelkezik sajátos jegyekkel, de abban egységesek, hogy az értékelést a tanítás szerves részének tekintik. Végül rövid kitekintést adunk a fejlesztő értékelést vizsgáló magyarországi kutatások eredményeit illetően. A közoktatás keretében zajló angolórák osztálytermi értékelési gyakorlatáról kibontakozó kép egyértelműen alátámasztja a szemléletváltás szükségességét.

Kulcsszavak: osztálytermi értékelés, fejlesztő értékelés, tanulást támogató értékelés, differenciált értékelés, értékelési műveltség

1. Bevezető

A 21. század derekán tanúi lehettünk egy olyan pedagógiai szemléletváltás iránti igénynek, mely előtérbe helyezi a tanulóközpontú oktatást. A tanítás ennek megfelelően differenciálásra épül, és minden eszköztárával azt támogatja, hogy a tanuló önszabályozóvá váljon és képes legyen magáért felelősséget vállalni, ezáltal is megalapozva az élethosszig tartó tanulás esélyét. Ezeket a célokat tűzte ki az OECD Oktatáspolitikai Bizottsága „A jövő oktatása és készségei 2030” (Future of Education and Skills 2030) projekt elindításával 2015-ben, melyhez kapcsolódóan már elérhetőek tantervi és útmutató füzetek Magyarországon (Lásd Katona és mtsai, 2020). A pedagógiai kultúraváltás szükségességét Magyarországon azonban nemcsak a korszellem, hanem az idegennyelv-tanulás viszonylagos sikertelensége is indokolja (Einhorn, 2015). A 2012-ben felvett Eurobarometer adatok (Europeans and their Languages, 2012: 15) szerint Magyarországon, az Európai Unióban abszolút

[1] e-mail: csepes.ildiko@arts.unideb.hu

sereghajtóként, a megkérdezetteknek mindössze 35%-a állította magáról, hogy legalább egy idegen nyelven beszél. Ez az adat az előző felmérés eredményéhez viszonyítva még rosszabb képet fest rólunk, mivel 2006-ban a megkérdezettek 42%-a állította ugyanezt (Europeans and their Languages, 2006: 9). A meglehetősen kedvezőtlen tendencia megállításához intervencióra van szükség. Feltételezésünk szerint a tanárok jelentős mértékben hozzá tudnának járulni ahhoz, hogy a problémát orvosolni lehessen. Ehhez elengedhetetlen azonban, hogy kritikusan megvizsgálják saját osztálytermi értékelési gyakorlatukat és készek legyenek a szükséges változtatásokat végrehajtani.

Einhorn véleménye szerint a magyar közoktatás pedagógiai kultúrája viszonylag konzervatívnak tekinthető, hiszen a tanítási órákat tanárközpontú, ismeretalapú megközelítés jellemzi. Az osztálytermi értékelés alapjában véve „beskatulyáz és megbélyegez" (2015: 54), és ezért a tanuló vesztesnek vagy nyertesnek érezheti magát. Az értékelés legfőbb alapja tehát a másokkal történő összehasonlítás (normaorientált értékelés) és célja a minősítés (szummatív értékelés) ahelyett, hogy az értékelés a tanuló egyéni fejlődését célzottan támogatná. Az osztálytermi értékelés területén tehát indokoltnak tűnik a szemléletváltás. Ennek eredményeképpen egyrészt csökkenne az értékeléssel szembeni negatív hozzáállás, másrészt az értékelés változatos formáit a tanulás eredményességének szolgálatába lehetne állítani. Az osztálytermi mérés és értékelés ez utóbbi felfogását Black és Wiliam (1998) 'a tanulást támogató értékelésnek' nevezi (assessment for learning*)*. A differenciált értékelés a pedagógiai kultúraváltáshoz azért elengedhetetlen, mert az eredményes (nyelv)tanulás katalizátora lehet.

Tanulmányunkban rövid áttekintést nyújtunk az osztálytermi értékelés főbb céljairól (diagnosztikus, minősítő és fejlesztő), melyek közül a fejlesztő értékelés fogalmát részletesebben is tárgyaljuk. Bemutatjuk, hogy az osztálytermi értékelés megítélése általában és célzottan a nyelvtanulásra vonatkozóan hogyan változott az elmúlt közel 30 év alatt, és hogy a fejlesztő értékelés miért kapott egyre több figyelmet napjainkra. Áttekintésünk során az osztálytermi értékelés néhány értelmezését külön is megvilágítunk, mivel mindegyiket fontosnak ítéljük a fogalom fejlődése szempontjából. Ezek közé tartozik a tanulást támogató értékelés (assessment for learning), a dinamikus értékelés (dynamic assessment/DA) és a tanulás-orientált értékelés (learning-oriented assessment/LOA).

2. Az osztálytermi értékelés céljai

Az osztálytermi értékelésnek három főbb célját különböztetik meg. Az egyik a helyzetfeltáró (diagnosztikus) értékelés, mely a teszt típusok egyik jól ismert fajtája (Green, 2014). A másik két típus megnevezését oktatási programok értékelésére vonatkozóan először Scriven (1967) használta, aki megkülönböztette a tanulási folyamatot fejlesztő (formatív) és minősítő (szummatív) értékelést. A három eltérő céllal kivitelezett értékelési formát Brassói és mtsai (2005), valamint Bognár (2006)

meglátásai alapján definiáljuk. A helyzetfeltáró értékelés célja, hogy a tanár a diákok szükségleteihez illeszkedő tanmenetet tudjon kialakítani azáltal, hogy feltárja a tanulók előismereteit és hiányosságait, melyeket igyekszik pótolni a pedagógiai folyamatok tervezésekor. A minősítő értékelés során a tanár megítéli a tanulói teljesítményeket, rangsorolja a tanulókat meghatározott standard vagy követelmény alapján. A fejlesztő értékelés pedig arra irányul, hogy „a diák eredményesebb tanulását segítse, ne ítélje meg (különösen ne ítélje el) az [addigi] munkát, hanem mutasson rá azokra a lehetőségekre, amelyekkel a tanulási folyamat eredményesebbé válhat" (Brassói és mtsai, 2005: 4). A fejlesztő értékelés tehát a tanulási folyamatot támogatja, formálja. Mivel a tanulók egyéni szükségletei eltérhetnek, a fejlesztő értékelés kiegészülhet differenciált tanítási/tanulási módszerek megjelenésével is.

Bognár (2006) szerint a fejlesztő értékelésnek három lényeges jellemzője van: (i) a tevékenység gyakorta előfordul, (ii) a folyamat interaktív, azaz a diák is aktívan részt vesz benne, (iii) a diák fogalmazza meg a tanulási célokat, de a későbbi értékelési tapasztalatok alapján szükség szerint módosítja őket, hogy elősegítse a folyamatos fejlődést. Bognár szerint ez a három jellemző különbözteti meg a fejlesztő értékelést a diagnosztikus értékeléstől.

Brassói és mtsai (2005: 9) a fejlesztő értékelést támogató keretrendszert is felvázolják, mely a következő szempontokra terjed ki:

- Olyan osztálytermi légkört kell kialakítani, amelyben a diákok biztonságban érzik magukat, amely a diákok számára nem versenyhelyzetet teremt, hanem a feladatmegoldásra és az érzelmi-akarati tényezőkre helyezi a hangsúlyt.
- A tanulási célokat egyértelműen kell meghatározni, és az egyéni tanulói fejlődés lépéseit monitorozni kell, mert ezek segítségével fokozható a tanulói motiváció. Versenyhelyzetben a tanulók egymáshoz hasonlítják az elért eredményeiket, és emiatt a gyengébb tanuló elveszítheti meglévő motivációját és önbizalmát is.
- A különböző tanulási igényű tanulók szükségletei eltérhetnek, ezért kívánatos, hogy a tanár sokféle tanítási módszert alkalmazzon.
- A tanulók előrehaladását, teljesítményét változatosan kell értékelni. Ez megvalósulhat akár minősítő értékelési formák újszerű felhasználásával, de olyan alternatív értékelési formák alkalmazása is javasolt, mint a portfólió, önértékelés vagy társértékelés.
- A tanulói teljesítményre, előrehaladásra reflektáló tanári visszacsatolást lehetőség szerint gyakran kell alkalmazni.
- Fontos, hogy a tanulók aktívan vegyenek részt a tanulási folyamatban.

Bognár (2006) véleménye szerint nem egyszerű áttérni a fejlesztő értékelésre olyan iskolai környezetben, ahol a hagyományos szemléletet tükröző minősítő értékelés dominál. Az osztálytermi értékelés gyakorlatának megváltoztatásához szükséges szemléletváltást részben a tanárok számára elérhető képzések biztosíthatják a fejlesztő értékelés módszereinek és eljárásainak bemutatásával, részben pedig az, hogy az egész nevelőtestület elfogadja-e, elköteleződik-e mellette, hiszen teljes körű elfogadottság és támogatás esetén a sikeres gyakorlati megvalósítás esélye is megnő.

A minősítő és a fejlesztő értékelés közötti határvonal azonban nem olyan egyértelmű. Rea-Dickins és Gardner (2000) szerint a határvonal elmosódása leginkább abban érhető tetten, hogy a fejlesztő értékelésnek is lehet adott esetben olyan súlya és következménye, mint egy minősítő értékelésnek. Például akkor, ha a tanári visszajelzés összességében alul- vagy felülértékeli a diák teljesítményét, vagy a diák nem megfelelő feladatok alapján kapja a visszacsatolást, netán a kapott információkat tévesen értelmezi. Ezek a példák mind arra világítanak rá, hogy a fejlesztő értékelés megvalósítása számos csapdát rejt, még ha célját tekintve oly vonzónak is tűnik. Bennett (2011) viszont azt emeli ki, hogy a minősítő értékelés másodlagos célja eleve a fejlesztés, hiszen a minősítő teszt is tanulási lehetőséget nyújt a tanuló számára.

Golnhofer 2001-ben egy nemzetközi viszonylatban akkor még újnak nevezhető értékelési kultúra megjelenéséről adott számot, mely képes a nevelés és az oktatás eredményességének, minőségének, illetve hatékonyságának növelésére. A fejlesztő értékelés fentebb vázolt ismérveivel sok tekintetben összecseng a Golnhofer által vázolt értékelési kultúra néhány jellemzője, mint például az, hogy megnő az értékeléssel kapcsolatos tudatosság és stratégiahasználat, kibővül az értékelők köre, és felerősödik a felelősségvállalás igénye. Jóllehet a fejlesztő értékelés a múlt században is létező eszköz volt a tanár kezében, nem álltak rendelkezésre a fejlesztő értékelést a minősítő értékeléssel összevető szakmai ajánlások. Az elmúlt két évtizedben ezt a hiányosságot sikerült jórészt pótolni, bár a mai napig nincs egységes és átfogó definíció a fogalom értelmezéséhez. Bennett (2011) rámutat például arra, hogy a fejlesztő értékelést egyesek eszközként, mások folyamatként definiálják, holott szerinte a kettő elválaszthatatlan egymástól, hiszen kiegészítik egymást. A fogalom megszületésekor is ilyen elképzelés társult hozzá Lau (2016) szerint, aki hasonló véleményt képvisel azzal kiegészítve, hogy a fejlesztő értékelés manapság sokak számára a ‘jó’ értékelés, míg a minősítő értékelésre a ‘rossz’ értékelés címkét ragasztották. Ez a megítélés tükröződik abban is, hogy a tanároknak illendő az utóbbit minimalizálni és az előbbit pedig előtérbe helyezni. Lau kiemeli, hogy eredetileg a két értékelési típus egyensúlyban volt, de a 2000-es évekre a minősítő értékelés domináns lett a külső vizsgák egyre nagyobb térnyerésével, elsősorban az összevethetőség az elszámoltathatóság fokozódó nyomása miatt. Azonban a külső vizsgák megnövekedett társadalmi szerepével párhuzamosan a fejlesztő értékelés is egyre inkább kiemelt figyelmet nyert, elsősorban az oktatáskutatók oldaláról.

Az 1990-es években több elnevezés is napvilágot látott, melyek a minősítő értékelést hagyományosnak (eredmény-centrikusnak és normaalapúnak), a fejlesztő értékelést pedig – akkor még – új, alternatív értékelésnek állították be (Lau, 2016). Birenbaum (1996) az előbbit például tesztelési kultúrának (testing culture), az utóbbit értékelési kultúrának (assessment culture) nevezi. A létrejött szembeállítás (dichotómia) azt sugalmazza, hogy a kettő közül választani kell, melynek eredményeképpen a fejlesztő értékelés szerepének a vizsgálata egyre több figyelmet kapott a 2000-es évek elejére (Assessment Reform Group, 2002; Stiggins, 2002, 2007). Inbar-Lourie (2008) azonban a minősítő és a fejlesztő értékelés szembeállítása helyett a kettő egymást kiegészítő jellegét hangsúlyozza, és az értékelési kultúra fogalmát egy tágabb elméleti és gyakorlati keretben értelmezi, amely a tudástranszfer konstruktivista szemléletű felfogásán alapszik. Ennek megfelelően az értékelés alapját több mikro- és makroszintű adatforrás biztosítja, és az értékelés folyamatában minden érintett fél aktívan részt vesz. Az értékelés területén is szükséges a tanuló készségfejlesztése, mely az egész életen át tartó tanulását támogathatja. Inbar-Lourie arra is rámutat, hogy az eredetileg Gipps (1994) nevéhez köthető fogalom, a tanulás eredmény-orientált értékelése (assessment of learning), a behaviorista tudástranszfer szemléletet jeleníti meg, mely a hierarchikusan egymásra épülő kisebb, izolált tudáselemek átadását jelenti. A tanulás eredmény-orientált értékelése szerint a tudást egységesen, standardizált tesztek segítségével mérik annak érdekében, hogy rangsorolni vagy kiszűrni lehessen a tanulókat. Harlen (2005) hasonlóan ítéli meg a tanulás eredmény-orientált értékelésére vonatkozó tudástranszfer szemléletet, hozzátéve, hogy ez a fajta értékelés sokszor káros teszthatást generál (leszűkítheti a tananyagot), mivel a tanárok a tanítás során a külső tesztek tartalmára koncentrálnak, valamint a tesztre való felkészítést gyakori próbateszteléssel és a tesztben alkalmazott kérdéstípusok begyakoroltatásával érik el. A negatív hatás adott esetben még úgy is értelmezhető, hogy bár a tanulók a kiválasztott teszten jó eredményt érnek el, összességében a megszerzett tudásuk alkalmazhatósága limitált. A tanulók motivációját is kedvezőtlenül befolyásolhatja a gyakori osztálytermi tesztelés, mivel az elért alacsony eredmények növelhetik szorongásukat és csökkenthetik az önmagukba vetett hitet. A fenti jellemzők alapján a tanárok osztálytermi gyakorlatát lehet teszt-orientáltnak vagy tanulás-orientáltnak nevezni (Harlen, 2005), az utóbbi esetben a fejlesztő értékelésnek értelemszerűen nagyobb szerep jut. Összességében megállapíthatjuk, hogy a külső vizsgákat, osztálytermi tesztelést előtérbe helyező oktatási közegben a tanuló egyénre szabott, képességeihez és igényeihez illeszkedő, fejlesztő jellegű támogatására kevés esély van, hiszen a tanár figyelmét lekötik az adott külső teszthez kapcsolódó tevékenységek. A minősítő és fejlesztő értékelés közötti kapcsolat normalizálását Harlen (2005) abban látja, ha a két alapvető értékelési cél (minősítés és fejlesztés) fenntartása mellett, az értékelési formák és eljárások átjárhatóvá válnak: a fejlesztő értékelés szolgáljon alapul a minősítő értékeléshez és fordítva.

3. A tanulást támogató értékelés

Az elmúlt közel három évtized alatt egy sor új fogalom jelent meg a szakirodalomban, melyek végső soron ugyanazt a célt szolgálják: a tanuló (nyelv)tanulásának támogatását, tudásának fejlesztését. Az értékelés minősítő, a tanulás eredményességét ellenőrző szerepével szemben a fejlesztő értékelést többen is újraértelmezték, köztük Black és Wiliam (1998), valamint Stiggins (2002). A tanulást támogató értékelés (assessment for learning) mint fogalom megjelenése elsősorban Black és Wiliam (1998) meta-analízisének köszönhető, melyet az Assessment Reform Group (Értékelési Reform Csoport) felkérésére készítettek. Black és Wiliam 250 empirikus tanulmány eredményét tekintette át, mely azt mutatta, hogy ha a fejlesztő értékelés bizonyos elvek és eszközök alkalmazására épül, az pozitívan hat a tanulók eredményességére, különösen az alacsony szinten, azaz gyengén teljesítő tanulók esetében. A tanulmány címe, „A fekete dobozon belül" (Inside the Black Box) is sokat sejtetően hangzik, mivel egy igen nehezen vizsgálható, szinte kifürkészhetetlen terület feltárását célozza meg: hogyan lehet a tanulást támogatni, a tanuló fejlődését elősegíteni osztálytermi közegben. Taras (2009) szerint Black és Wiliam munkásságának jelentősége abban is megmutatkozik, hogy két olyan metafora, új fogalom megalkotása fűződik hozzájuk – a fekete dobozon belül (inside the black box) és a tanulást támogató értékelés (assessment for learning) – melyek lángra gyújtották számos kutató és oktatási szakember képzeletét az oktatáspolitika átalakításától az osztálytermi értékelési gyakorlat megváltoztatásáig.

Black és Wiliam (1998) tanulmányukban a konstruktív visszacsatolást jelölik meg mint kulcsfontosságú tényezőt, mely képes pozitívan befolyásolni a tanulói eredményességet. Megállapították, hogy a tanuló munkájával kapcsolatos visszacsatolás nem lehet csak leíró jellegű, hanem a továbblépés érdekében útbaigazítást is kell adnia a tanuló számára, továbbá kerülni kell a többi tanulóval való összehasonlítást. Sadler (1998) is fontosnak ítéli a visszajelzés szerepét, melynek minőségét az emelheti, ha az a tanuló számára könnyen értelmezhető, az előrehaladást hatékonyan képes támogatni, illetve a tanuló magabiztosságát és képességeibe vetett hitét erősíti.

Black és Wiliam (1998) kiemelik, hogy számos sikeres oktatási kísérlet alkalmazott tanulói ön- és társértékelést a fejlesztő értékelés támogató eszközeként, és az eredmények alapján levont következtetésük az volt, hogy a fejlesztő értékelés és az önértékelés szorosan összetartozik, az önértékelés az előbbinek szerves része. Black és Wiliam értelmezése szerint:

> (…) a tanuló önértékelése messze nem luxuscikk, valójában a fejlesztő értékelés alapvető eleme. Amikor bárki azzal próbálkozik, hogy valamit megtanuljon, az erőfeszítéseire vonatkozó visszacsatolásnak három elemet kell tartalmazni: a tanuló legyen képes beazonosítani a számára kitűzött tanulási célt; szolgáljon bizonyítékkal a tanuló számára jelenlegi pozíciója és eredményessége megértéséhez; értse meg a tanuló, hogy a tanulási célja és a jelenlegi pozíciója közötti szakadék hogyan hidalható át. Ahhoz, hogy a

> tanuló előbbre tudjon lépni, mindhárom elemmel tisztában kell, hogy legyen. (1998: 143; Ford. a szerző)

A visszacsatoláson és tanulói önértékelésen túl Black és Wiliam (1998) megállapítása szerint a tanári kérdezéstechnikák is jelentősen befolyásolhatják a tanulói eredményességet. A tanulók és a tanár között létrejövő órai párbeszéd azt a célt kell, hogy szolgálja, hogy minden tanuló elgondolkozzon és véleményt mondhasson. A tanár által feltett kérdéseknek ezért átgondoltnak, reflektívnek, és célzottnak kell lenniük.

A Black és Wiliam (1998) által szintetizált kutatási eredményeket az Értékelési Reform Csoport gyakorlati útmutató formájába öntötte, melyben a tanulás eredmény-orientált értékelését és a tanulást támogató értékelést egyértelműen elkülönítik, az utóbbi megvalósítását öt kulcstényezőhöz kötik (Broadfoot és mtsai, 1999: 4–5):

- hatékony visszacsatolás biztosítása a tanulók számára;
- a tanulók aktív bevonása saját tanulásukba;
- a tanmenet és/vagy az alkalmazott tanítási módszerek módosítása az értékelés eredménye alapján;
- annak felismerése, hogy az értékelés jelentősen befolyásolhatja a tanulók motivációját és önértékelését, melyek egyaránt döntő hatással lehetnek a tanulás eredményességére;
- annak az igénynek elismerése, hogy a tanulóknak képeseknek kell lenniük az önértékelésre, és meg tudják érteni, mi szükséges saját fejlődésükhöz.

Broadfoot és mtsai szerint a tanulást támogató értékelés során a tanulók tudatosítják a tanulási célokat és az elérni kívánt normákat, és az értékelést megosztva, a tanárral együttműködve végzik. Összességében az értékelésnek azt az üzenetet kell közvetítenie, hogy minden tanuló képes a fejlődésre.

A tanulást támogató értékelést azonban számos tényező hátráltathatja, melyek között Broadfoot és mtsai (1999: 5) a következőket nevezik meg:

- az a tendencia, hogy a tanárok az osztálytermi munka mennyiségét értékelik a tanulás minősége helyett;
- a tanárok nagyobb figyelmet szentelnek az osztályozásnak, ami sok esetben csorbítja a tanuló önértékelését, és nem ad kézzelfogható útmutatást a tanulónak ahhoz, hogy fejlődni tudjon;
- a tanárok nagy hangsúlyt fektetnek a tanulók egymással történő összehasonlítására, ez demoralizálja a kevésbé sikeres tanulókat;

- a tanulók számára adott visszacsatolások gyakran más célokat szolgálnak (pl. csoportszervezési, szocializációs cél), nem pedig a hatékonyabb tanulás támogatására irányulnak;
- a tanárok nem ismerik elég jól tanulóik tanulási igényeit.

A tanulást támogató értékelés gyakorlatban történő megvalósítását többen is igyekeztek megvilágítani (Assessment Reform Group, 2002; Black és mtsai, 2004). Az Értékelési Reform Csoport arra mutatott rá, hogy azok a hétköznapi osztálytermi tevékenységek, amelyekben a tanár a tanulókkal együtt vesz részt, valamilyen formában az értékeléshez kapcsolhatóak, hiszen a tanulók által teljesített feladatok vagy a tanár kérdéseire adott válaszok alapján a tanulók ismereteiről, készségeikről képet lehet alkotni. Ez azt jelenti, hogy az értékelés lényegében átszövi az osztálytermi gyakorlat egészét. Black és mtsai (2004) konkrét technikákat is ajánlanak az önértékeléshez „közlekedési lámpák" megjelöléssel: a zöld színű pohár jelzi, hogy a saját teljesítményüket jónak vagy egy adott probléma megértését megfelelőnek értékelik. A piros szín a sikeres feladatteljesítés vagy problémamegértés hiányára utal, míg a sárga szín részleges feladatteljesítést és megértést jelöl. Az önértékelést követően a tanulók megvitathatják meglátásaikat és érveiket kis csoportban, és így a társértékelésre is lehetőség nyílik. A tanulók véleménynyilvánításához, a feladatteljesítés tanulók általi kiértékeléséhez a tanárnak lehetőséget kell biztosítani, mivel ezek a lépések a tanulási folyamat szerves részei. Az érdemjegyek vagy pontszámok mellőzése is erősen javasolt a tanulók teljesítményének értékelésekor, helyette a tanulók fejlődéséhez szükséges konkrét lépéseket, teendőket, javaslatokat kell megnevezni. Black és mtsai (2004) azt is a lehetséges osztálytermi eljárások közé sorolják, hogy a tanulók egymásnak kérdéseket írnak, vagy egymás feladatmegoldásait kiértékelik. A teszt összeállítása és az értékelési kritériumok alkalmazása egyaránt fokozhatja a tanulók értékelői tudatosságát és készségét.

Broadfoot és mtsai (1999) szerint a tanulást támogató értékelés a fentebb részletezett jellemzők alapján nem teljesen fedi le a fejlesztő értékelés fogalmát, attól részben eltér. A kettő közötti különbséget az adja, hogy a tanulást támogató értékelésnél a tanuló személyre szabott visszacsatolást kap a továbblépéshez, vagy maga is aktívan részt vesz saját vagy tanulótársai teljesítményének értékelésében. A tanulást támogató értékelés fogalmát az is megkülönbözteti a fejlesztő értékeléstől, hogy az utóbbi irányulhat csupán csak arra, hogy a tanulók előrehaladásáról információt nyújtson a tanárnak, hogy szükséges-e a tanmeneten változtatni (Stiggins, 2002). A tanulást támogató értékelés azonban soha nem szorítkozhat csak az ellenőrző szerepre, hiszen eredeti funkcióját úgy tudja betölteni, hogy a tanulók továbbhaladásához megadja a konkrét lépéseket is.

Earl és Katz (2005) a tanulást támogató értékelés definícióját tovább árnyalta azáltal, hogy az értékelést a tanuló számára külön elsajátítandó területként azonosította.

Az utóbbi olyan metakognitív folyamatokat foglal magába, melyeket a tanuló tanári segítséggel az értékelés végzése során aktivál. Ezen folyamatok kiteljesedése a következőkben érhető tetten:

- az önértékelés modellezése és a készség elsajátíttatása;
- segítségnyújtás a tanulási célok megfogalmazásához és azok eléréséhez;
- a tantervi célokat tükröző minőségi teljesítmény modellezése;
- a jó gyakorlat kritériumainak megvilágítása a diákokkal történő szoros együttműködés során;
- segítségnyújtás abban, hogy a diákok kifejlesszék a belső visszajelzést adó, önszabályozó mechanizmusaikat annak érdekében, hogy ellenőrizzék vagy megkérdőjelezzék saját gondolataikat, tudják tolerálni a kétértelműséget vagy a bizonytalanságot, amely minden új ismeret megszerzését jellemez;
- rendszeres és megfelelő kihívást adó gyakorlási lehetőségek biztosítása, hogy a diákok kompetens önértékelőkké válhassanak;
- a diákok metakognitív folyamatainak és tanulásának monitorozása, azokról leíró visszacsatolás biztosítása;
- olyan tanulási környezet biztosítása, melyben a diákok szabadon és bátran kockáztathatnak.

A fejlesztő értékelés a fenti értelmezésben előtérbe helyezi a diákot mint értékelést végző személyt. Ez a szerep a hagyományos, tanárközpontú értékeléstől idegen, hiszen ott az értékelés a tanár felelősségi körébe tartozik.

A tanulást támogató értékelésre vonatkozóan Taras (2009) fogalmazott meg kritikai észrevételt. Szerinte a fogalom értelmezése és gyakorlati megvalósítása nem elfogadható, ha a fejlesztő értékelés kiszorítja a minősítő értékelést, mivel az osztálytermi értékelés nem szorítkozhat csak a tanuló fejlesztésére. A minősítő értékelés minimalizálását, esetleges kivonását az motiválhatta, hogy a tanulást támogató értékelést az egyén tanulásán túlmutató, egyéb társadalmi jelentőséggel is felruházták. Broadfoot és Black (2004) például a társadalmi reform lehetséges eszközének tekintette a tanulást támogató értékelést, hiszen az egyéni önmegvalósítás és kreativitás felerősödhet, a közösség támogató ereje segíthet a kitűzött célok elérésében, de az egyén számára saját sorsának vagy karrierjének irányításához is megfelelő alapot nyújthat.

A minősítő értékelés és a tanulást támogató értékelés közötti kapcsolat hiányának oka az is lehetett, amire Stiggins (2007), illetve Black és Wiliam (1998) is felhívta a figyelmet: az USA-ban és Angliában az 1990-es évekre a külső, standardizált tesztekbe vetett hit az osztálytermi értékelésben úgy csapódott le, hogy a minősítő értékelés jelentőségét felnagyította, holott az a tanulás eredményességét nem az elvárt módon

befolyásolta. A minősítő értékelés lebonyolításához azonban a tanárok lényegében csak minimális alapképzésben részesültek, azaz értékelési műveltségük (assessment literacy) meglehetősen hiányosnak volt mondható. Stiggins (2007) elismeri mind az eredmény-orientált, mind a tanulást támogató értékelés fontosságát, de rámutat arra az általa mítosznak nevezett téves nézetre, mely szerint az érdemjegyek és tesztpontszámok képesek növelni a tanulók motivációját és tanulási eredményességét.

A fentebb vázolt tanulást támogató potenciál és egyéb előnyök ellenére a tanulást támogató értékelés széles körű alkalmazása nem valósult meg, melynek okait Black (2010) a következő tényezőkkel hozza összefüggésbe. Számos nemzeti oktatási rendszerben meghatározó szerepet játszanak a külső, standardizált vizsgák, melyek tétje igen nagy, adott esetben tanulók sorsát pecsételhetik meg. Ilyen oktatási kontextusban a tanárok úgy ítélhetik meg, hogy a vizsgára való felkészítés, a tanítás vizsgának történő alárendelése a helyes és üdvözítő döntés. Ez értelemszerűen korlátozza az osztálytermi munka lehetséges formáinak kiválasztását. Ennek feloldásához a tanárnak rendelkeznie kellene megfelelő mérésszakmai ismeretekkel, más szóval értékelési műveltséggel, hogy döntéseit azokra alapozva, és ne külső kényszer vagy vélt társadalmi elvárások mentén hozza meg. Black szerint a tanárnak ismernie kell a minősítő, eredmény-orientált értékelés alapvető szakmai elvárásait (pl. a teszt érvényessége és megbízhatósága), valamint hogy azokat hogyan lehet biztosítani. Ugyanakkor a tanárnak tisztában kell lennie a fejlesztő értékelés elveivel és lehetséges technikáival is. A két értékelés szinergiája nyújtja a tanárok számára a megfelelő szakmai alapot osztálytermi értékelési feladataik megvalósításához.

A tanulást támogató értékelés áttekintése után még két fejlesztő értékelést jelölő elnevezést vizsgálunk meg röviden, melyek visszhangja lényegesen kisebb a szakirodalomban, azonban mindkettő a tanuló idegen nyelvi fejlődését meghatározó aspektusokra fókuszál. A tanulást támogató értékeléssel összevetve a dinamikus értékelés (dynamic assessment) és a tanulás-orientált értékelés (learning-oriented assessment) az értékelés osztálytermi folyamatokba való beágyazottságát sokkal kiemeltebben hangsúlyozza.

4. A dinamikus értékelés

A dinamikus értékelés (Lantolf és Poehner, 2008; Poehner és Lantolf, 2005) a tanár és tanuló között létrejövő szóbeli interakciót vizsgálja a Vygotsky-féle (1978) szociokulturális elmélet keretein belül, mely szerint a társas interakció döntő szerepet játszik az egyén fejlődésében, hiszen gondolkozásunkat és ismereteinket a környezetünkkel (másokkal) történő interakció segítségével konstruáljuk. Vygotsky elmélete szerint a tanuló rendelkezik egy úgynevezett legközelebbi vagy köztes távolságra lévő (proximális) fejlődési zónával (zone of proximal development), mely a tanuló tényleges fejlettségi szintje és potenciális fejlődési szintje között helyezkedik el. A kettő közötti szakadékot mediációval, azaz közvetítői segítséggel lehet áthidalni. Ez a

feladat az osztályteremben döntően a tanárra hárul. Poehner és Lantolf (2005) kiemeli, hogy a dinamikus értékelés során az értékelés és a tanítás nem válik szét: a tanulóval folytatott interakcióba beágyazódik a tanári mediáció, melynek legfőbb célja a tanuló fejlődésének a támogatása. Ez úgy valósulhat meg, hogy a tanár diagnosztizálja (értékeli) a tanuló aktuális nyelvi problémáját és egyidejűleg kezeli is: a tanuló számára irányított kérdést tesz fel, vagy sugalmaz valamit a nyelvi probléma leküzdéséhez. Ez a jellemző különbözteti meg a dinamikus értékelést a visszacsatolástól, amelynek nem feltétele az interakcióba ágyazottság. A dinamikus értékelés a tanuló fejlődését kis lépésekben támogatja és evolúciós természetűnek mondható, mivel a tanuló fejlődési folyamatában visszalépések is előfordulnak. Hosszabb távon, ahogy a tanuló egyre jobban fejlődik, illetve önszabályozó képessége megerősödik, a dinamikus értékelés szerepe csökkenhet.

A dinamikus értékelés nem egy értékelési eszköz vagy módszer, hanem egy olyan elméleti keretrendszer, melyben értelmezni lehet a tanítás és az értékelés integrált folyamatait, azon belül a tanuló fejlődését támogató tanári mediációt. A dinamikus értékelésre és a legközelebbi fejlődési zóna vizsgálatára irányuló kutatást (Davin, 2016; Lanfolf és Poehner, 2011; Poehner, 2009) nehezíti az a tény, hogy a vizsgálat tárgyát képező tanár-diák (azaz kétszereplős) interakció igen korlátozott az osztálytermi nyelvóra keretei között, hiszen a tanítás csoportban történik. A nehézségek ellenére Poehner (2009) kiemeli, a nyelvtanulás és -tanítás folyamatának megértéséhez elengedhetetlen, hogy megértsük, hogyan alakul, fejlődik a tanuló idegennyelv-tudása, és a tanulás eredménye helyett a tanulás folyamatát kell elemeznünk. A dinamikus értékelés kutatása ezen célkitűzés miatt sok közös vonást mutat a második nyelv elsajátítása területén végzett kutatásokkal, például a szóbeli korrekciós visszacsatolásra (oral corrective feedback) irányuló vizsgálatokkal. A második nyelv elsajátításával foglalkozó kutatások azt vizsgálják, hogy az implicit vagy explicit visszacsatolás hatásosabb-e a nyelvelsajátítás eredményességét tekintve (pl. Lyster és Ranta, 1997; Lyster és Saito, 2010; Nassaji, 2009).

5. A tanulás-orientált értékelést

A tanulás-orientált értékelés (learning-oriented assessment) megnevezést először Carless (2007) használta egy olyan osztálytermi értékelési formát jelölve meg vele, amelyben az értékeléshez használt feladatok is tanulási célt szolgálnak. Valójában a tanuló fejlődésének a lehetősége fontosabb, mint az értékelés maga. Továbbá a tanulók önértékelést és társértékelést végeznek, és a visszacsatolás legfontosabb funkciója az, hogy a tanulónak utat mutasson a továbblépéshez (feedforward). Az előbbi célok megvalósítása három pilléren nyugszik (Carless, 2007). Először is a feladat megtervezésén: az értékeléshez használt feladatot a tanulás céljának kell alárendelni. Másodsorban a tanulók értékelői kompetenciáját ön- és társértékelés keretében kell fejleszteni, hogy a kitűzött tanulási célokat jobban megértsék, az elvárt szint minőségi

mutatóival tisztában legyenek. Harmadsorban a tanulónak jól időzített visszacsatolást kell adni, mely cselevésre készteti és ténylegesen kihat a fejlődésére, vagyis a visszacsatolást adó személy számára is jól beazonosítható az eredmény. A tanulás-orientált értékelés nemcsak a fejlesztő, de a minősítő értékelést is szolgálhatja, azaz a két értékelési forma között Carless igyekszik megtalálni az egyensúlyt, nem pedig azt hangoztatja, hogy az egyik előbbre való, mint a másik. A tanulás-orientált értékelés megvalósítását Carless a felsőoktatás tágabb kontextusában vizsgálta, nyelvtanulásra irányuló kutatást nem végzett.

A tanulás-orientált értékelésnek azonban létezik egy másik értelmezése is, mely Turner és Purpura (2015) nevéhez fűződik. A fogalmat ők célzottan a nyelvtanulásra vonatkoztatva vizsgálták. Szerintük az osztálytermi értékelést komplexen kell vizsgálni, és ennek megfelelően a tanulás-orientált értékelés egy olyan tanulás- és tanuló-központú megközelítés, mely arra törekszik, hogy a leghatékonyabban támogassa a tanuló nyelvi fejlődését az értékelés különböző formái alapján nyert információk segítségével, mint például tesztek, megfigyelések, megbeszélések, ön- és társértékelések, projektek, portfóliók, osztálytermi szóbeli diskurzus értékelési mozzanatai. Turner és Purpura azonban túllép a minősítő és fejlesztő értékelés, illetve a tanulás eredmény-orientált értékelése és a tanulást támogató értékelés dichotómiáján. Értelmezésük szerint a tanulás-orientált értékelés elismeri a tanítás, a tanulás és az értékelés közötti bonyolult kölcsönhatásokat, és közülük hét, a tanuló fejlődését meghatározó, úgynevezett kritikus dimenziót különböztet meg:

- a kontextus mint dimenzió (a tanulás társadalmi, kulturális vagy oktatási kontextusa),
- az előhívási dimenzió (a teljesítmény kiváltására használt módszer),
- a nyelvtudás szintje mint dimenzió (az elérni kívánt nyelvtudás szint és annak nyomon követése),
- a kognitív vagy tanulási dimenzió (a nyelvi performanciát és tanulást meghatározó szociokognitív jellemzők),
- az affektív dimenzió (a nyelvi performancia és tanulás során aktivált szemléleti és érzelmi beállítottság),
- az interakciós dimenzió (az értékelés során létrejövő kommunikáció interakciós jellemzői, pl. beszélőváltás),
- és a tanári dimenzió (az oktató tárgyi tudása, pedagógiai ismeretei és értékelési műveltsége).

Carless (2007), illetve Turner és Purpura (2015) fogalomértelmezésében az a közös vonás, hogy az osztálytermi értékelést mindkettő egységes keretben képzeli el, és elveti

a dichotóm értékelési formák közötti választást. Továbbá Turner és Purpura az osztálytermi értékelést külső és belső, makro és mikro tényezők relációjában értelmezi, míg Carless döntően a tanulók aktív bevonását hangsúlyozza.

Az osztálytermi értékelés általunk bemutatott felfogásainak – a tanulást támogató értékelésnek, a dinamikus értékelésnek és a tanulás orientált értékelésnek – közös vonása, hogy az értékelés nem különül el a tanítástól, annak szerves részét képezi. A koncepciók közötti különbségek abban érhetők tetten, hogy mit helyeznek az értékelés fókuszába. A tanulást támogató értékelés egyrészt a tanuló fejlődését lépésekre lebontott konstruktív visszacsatolással kívánja elérni, másrészt azt tartja fontosnak, hogy a tanulók is aktívan részt vegyenek saját és társaik teljesítményének az értékelésében. Az előbbi eljárások osztálytermi alkalmazása hosszabb távon pozitívan hathat a tanulók célorientációjára, tanulási motivációjára és önszabályozó képességére. A dinamikus értékelés ezzel szemben a tanár és tanuló között létrejövő párbeszéd kontextusában a visszacsatoláson túl arra helyezi a hangsúlyt, hogy a tanár kérdező technikái milyen módon képesek a tanuló fejlődését támogatni. Értékelés lényegében itt a tanár részéről történik, akinek azt kell tudni felmérni, hogy a tanuló mire áll készen, mi tartozik a legközelebbi fejlődési zónájába, hiszen a tanuló fejlődését csak célzott és megfelelő szintű (nyelvi) támogatás képes elősegíteni. A tanulás-orientált értékelés Turner és Purpura (2015) nevéhez köthető értelmezése pedig a legtágabb kontextusban vizsgálja az osztálytermi értékelést, hiszen külső és belső tényezők meghatározó szerepét egyidejűleg igyekszik feltárni.

6. A magyarországi (részleges) helyzetkép

Az osztálytermi értékelés magyarországi empirikus vizsgálatai közül két tanulmányt szeretnénk kiemelni: egyrészt szeretnénk egy példával illusztrálni a tanulást támogató értékelés sikeres gyakorlati megvalósítását, másrészt rá kívánunk világítani a tanári visszacsatolás angolórákon leggyakrabban alkalmazott formáira. A reformpedagógiai kísérlet azt bizonyítja, hogy a tanulóközpontú osztálytermi értékelés a sikeres tanulás katalizátorává válhat. A leggyakoribb tanári visszacsatolási formák alapján kibontakozó helyzetkép pedig a szemléletváltás szükségességét támasztja alá.

A reformpedagógiai kezdeményezés – Lépésről lépésre (Step by Step) – eredményességét Becze (2012) vizsgálta. A 90-es években indult program fenntartható módon kívánta biztosítani a hátrányos helyzetből induló, kudarcokat elszenvedett tanulók felzárkóztatását. Az Észak-Alföld régió 64 közoktatási intézményében végzett vizsgálat megerősítette, hogy a program során bevezetett módszertani megújulás innovatív értékelési eljárások alkalmazásával párosult. Ez azt jelentette, hogy a hagyományos osztályozási formával szemben az egyéni különbségeket figyelembe vevő, tanulókhoz igazított, fejlődést segítő értékelési eljárásokat helyezték előtérbe az órákon. Az osztálytermi értékelés során a tanulót önmagához viszonyító visszacsatolás, a saját fejlődési folyamatára reflektáló visszajelzés játszotta a legnagyobb szerepet. A

programban mindenki értékelt, aki részese volt a tanulásnak, így a tanulók saját és társaik munkáját, elért eredményeiket egyaránt értékelték. A tanulást támogató értékelés gyakorlati megvalósítása sikeresnek bizonyult a Lépésről lépésre reformpedagógiai kezdeményezés eredményeképpen.

A helyzetfeltáró céllal készült másik tanulmány azt világítja meg, hogy mi jellemzi az osztálytermi gyakorlatot a nyelvtudásmérésre és az értékelésre vonatkozóan több európai ország viszonylatában, köztük Magyarországon (Csépes, 2019). A kutatás a „Teachers' Assessment Literacy Enhancement" (TALE) [Tanárok nyelvtudásmérési műveltségének a fejlesztése] elnevezésű projekt keretében valósult meg, melyben 230 magyarországi angoltanár és tanárjelölt vett részt. A 2016-ban végzett kérdőíves felmérés külön kitért az osztálytermi visszajelzési/visszacsatolási formák vizsgálatára. A kapott eredmények alapján az a tendencia figyelhető meg, hogy a válaszadó tanárok döntően érdemjegyet és rövid szöveges megjegyzést használnak az angolórákon (93% és 59,3%). A tanulást támogató, fejlesztő célú visszacsatolási formák – a részletes értékelés vagy a diáknak szánt egyéni útmutatás – lényegesen kevésbé használt formák minden vizsgált országban, de különösen Magyarországon alacsony ezen eljárások gyakorisága (23,6% és 56,6%). A szerző szerint a jelenség magyarázatául az szolgálhat, hogy a válaszadók nem részesültek megfelelő képzésben, hogy a részletes visszajelzést kezelni tudják, valamint nincs kellő rálátásuk az adott visszacsatolási formák tanulást támogat szerepére.

7. Konklúzió

Az eredményes (nyelv)tanulás az oktatás minden szereplőjének érdeke. Tanulmányunkban arra mutattunk rá, hogy az osztálytermi értékelés hogyan támogathatja az eredményes tanulást a fejlesztő értékelés segítségével. A fejlesztő értékelés különböző elméleti megközelítéseit – a tanulást támogató értékelést, a dinamikus értékelést és a tanulás-orientált értékelést – azért vetettük össze, hogy felhívjuk a figyelmet az osztálytermi értékelés eltérő értelmezéseire és a megvalósítás lehetséges formáira. A tanulmányunkban bemutatott értékelési megközelítések támpontot nyújthatnak a tanárok számára jelenlegi értékelési szemléletük átgondolásához és megváltoztatásához, több teret biztosítva a fejlesztő értékelésnek. A változtatás szükségességét a TALE projekt kutatási eredményei is alátámasztják (Csépes, 2019). Hogy a magyar közoktatás színterein egyensúlyba tud-e kerülni a tanulás eredmény-orientált értékelése és a tanulást támogató értékelés, feltehetően számos kontextuális tényező befolyásától függ, mint például a társadalmi elvárások, vagy a helyi oktatási környezet (iskola) sajátosságai. Ezen változók vizsgálata különösen indokolt lenne a bevezetőben vázolt nyelvtanulási sikertelenség miatt. Earl (2006) szerint egy új pedagógiai szemlélet elfogadása eleve kihívást jelent a tanároknak, hiszen sokszor megszokott, régi beidegződéseket kell feladniuk új eljárások bevezetése miatt. Az osztálytermi értékelés főszereplőinek – a tanulóknak – azonban az az érdeke,

hogy minél eredményesebbek legyenek, és senki se érezze magát vesztesnek. Az adott cél elérésében a tanárra igen fontos szerep hárul: neki kell ‘ablakot nyitni a legsötétebb helyzetben’ is, utat mutatni a diákok számára a továbbfejlődéshez. A tanulás eredmény-orientált értékelése mellett ezért elengedhetetlen, hogy a tanár mindenkit egyéni képességeihez mérten is értékeljen és támogasson, mivel a tanulók önszabályozó képessége ezáltal teljesedhet ki.

English title and abstract

How to promote (language) learning through formative assessment?

The paper is intended to provide a review of formative assessment with a special focus on language learning. We examine how the concept has evolved over the past 30 years and why it appears to receive increasing attention nowadays. In our view, assessment should be seen as an integral part of the language classroom. It can considerably impact on learners’ motivation and self-confidence, which in turn may boost student achievement. The review highlights three approaches to formative assessment: assessment for learning, dynamic assessment and learning-oriented assessment. These differ in certain respects but all of them view teaching, learning and assessment as interconnected and inseparable. The paper also gives a brief outlook on research on formative assessment in the Hungarian context. According to some findings on classroom-based assessment in English lessons, there is a need for change in teachers’ perceptions with regard to formative assessment.

Keywords: classroom-based assessment, formative assessment, assessment for learning, differentiated assessment, language assessment literacy

Irodalom

Assessment Reform Group. 2002. Assessment for learning: 10 principles. https://www.aaia.org.uk/news/article/assessment-for-learning-10-principles (Letöltés: 2020.12.11.)

Becze, Orsolya. (2012). A külső vezérlésű innovációs kezdeményezések szerepe a közoktatás reformjában. Új pedagógiai szemle, 62(9-10), 92–134. https://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00035/00154/pdf/EPA00035_upsz_2012_09-10_092-134.pdf (Letöltés: 2021.02.23.)

Bennett, Randy Elliot. 2011. Formative assessment: a critical review. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18(1): 5–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2010.513678

Birenbaum, Menucha. 1996. Assessment 2000: Towards a Pluralistic Approach to Assessment. In: Menucha Birenbaum és Filip Dochy (szerk.) Alternatives in Assessment of Achievements, Learning Processes and Prior Knowledge. Boston: Kluwer. 3–29.

Black, Paul. 2010. Formative Assessment. In: Penelope Peterson, Eva Baker és Barry McGaw (szerk.) International Encyclopedia of Education, 3rd ed. Oxford: Academic Press. 359–364. https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/formative-assessment(25c8ab73-e935-472d-8d5c-679ec2d9740f)/export.html (Letöltés: 2020.10.06.)

Black, Paul és Dylan Wiliam. 1998. Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment, Phi Delta Kappan International. http://edci770.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/48124468/BlackWiliam_1998.pdf (Letöltés: 2020.12.27)

Black, Paul, Christine Harrison, Clare Lee, Bethan Marshall, és Dylan Wiliam. 2004. Working Inside the Black Box: Assessment for Learning in the Classroom. Phi Delta Kappan, 86(1): 8–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170408600105

Bognár, Mária. 2006. A fejlesztő értékelés osztálytermi gyakorlata. Új pedagógiai szemle, 56(3): 19–26. http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00035/00101/2006-03-ko-Bognar-Fejleszto.html (Letöltés: 2020.01.30.)

Brassói, Sándor, Hunya Márta és Vass Vilmos. 2005. A fejlesztő értékelés: az iskolai tanulás minőségének javítása. Új pedagógiai szemle, 55(7–8): 4–17. https://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00035/00094/2005-07-ta-Tobbek-Fejleszto.html (Letöltés: 2020.02.10.)

Broadfoot, Patricia és Paul Black. 2004. Redefining assessment? The first ten years of Assessment in Education. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 11(1): 7–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594042000208976

Broadfoot, Patricia, Richard Daugherty, John Gardner, Caroline Gipps, Wynne Harlen, Mary James és Gordon Stobart. 1999. Assessment for Learning: Beyond the Black Box. Nuffield Foundation and University of Cambridge. http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/files/beyond_blackbox.pdf (Letöltés: 2020.09.15)

Carless, David. 2007. Learning-oriented assessment: conceptual bases and practical implications. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44(1): 57–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290601081332

Csépes, Ildikó. 2019. Hogyan fejleszthető a tanárok nyelvtudásmérési és értékelési műveltsége? Az Erasmus+ TALE projekt. Modern Nyelvoktatás, 25(3-4): 136–155.

Davin, Kristin J. 2016. Classroom Dynamic Assessment: A Critical Examination of Constructs and Practices. The Modern Language Journal, 100(4): 813–829. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12352

Earl, Lorna M. és Steven Katz. 2005. Rethinking classroom assessment with purpose in mind. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Western Northern Canadian Protocol. https://digitalcollection.gov.mb.ca/awweb/pdfopener?smd=1&did=12503&md=1 (Letöltés: 2020.11.30)

Einhorn, Ágnes. 2015. Pedagógiai kultúraváltás az idegennyelv-tanításban? Vitaindító. Modern Nyelvoktatás, 21(4): 48–58.

Europeans and their Languages. 2006. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/ebs/ebs_243_en.pdf (Letöltés: 2020. 10. 28.)

Europeans and their Languages. Report. 2012. Special Eurobarometer 386. European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf (Letöltés: 2020. 10. 28.)

Gipps, Caroline. 1994. Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment. London: Falmer Press.

Golnhofer, Erzsébet. 2001. Új értékelési kultúra kibontakozása. Iskolakultúra, 11(9): 78–82. http://real.mtak.hu/61024/1/EPA00011_iskolakultura_2001_09_078-082.pdf (Letöltés: 2020.05.10.)

Green, Anthony. 2014. Exploring Language Assessment and Testing. Oxon: Routledge.

Harlen, Wynne. 2005. Teachers' summative practices and assessment for learning – tensions and synergies. Curriculum Journal, 16(2): 207–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170500136093

Inbar-Lourie, Ofra. 2008. Language Assessment Culture. In: Elena Shohamy and Nancy H. Hornberger (szerk.) Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd ed., Volume 7: Language Testing and Assessment. New York: Springer Science+Business Media. 285–299.

Katona, Nóra, Konrád Ágnes, Perlusz Andrea, Polányi Viktória, Porogi András és Sisa Péterné. 2020. A tanulás és tanítás súlypontjai. Eger: Eszterházy Károly Egyetem. https://www.oktatas2030.hu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/a-tanulas-s-tanitas-sulypontjai.pdf (Letöltés: 2021.02.23.)

Lantolf, James P. és Matthew E. Poehner. 2008. Dynamic Assessment. In: Elena Shohamy and Nancy H. Hornberger (szerk.) Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd ed., Volume 7: Language Testing and Assessment. New York: Springer Science+Business Media. 273–284.

Lantolf, James P. és Matthew E. Poehner. 2011. Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. Language Teaching Research, 15(1): 11–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810383328

Lyster, Roy és Leila Ranta. 1997. Corrective feedback and learner uptake. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19, 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034

Lyster, Roy és Kazuya Saito. 2010. Oral feedback in classroom SLA. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 265–302. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263109990520

Lau, Alice Man Sze. 2016. 'Formative good, summative bad?' – A review of the dichotomy in assessment literature. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 40(4): 509–525. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2014.984600

Nassaji, Hossein. 2009. Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. Language Learning, 59(2), 411–452. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00511.x

Poehner, Matthew E. 2009. Group Dynamic Assessment: Mediation for the L2 Classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 43(3): 471–491. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00245.x

Poehner, Matthew E. és James P. Lantolf. 2005. Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. Language Teaching Research 9(3): 233–265. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr166oa

Purpura, James E. 2016. Second and Foreign Language Assessment. The Modern Language Journal, 100(S1): 190–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12308

Rea-Dickins, Pauline és Sheena Gardner. 2000. Snares and silver bullets: disentangling the construct of formative assessment. Language Testing, 17(2): 215–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553220101800407

Sadler, D. Royce. 1998. Formative assessment: Revisiting the territory. Assessment in Education, 5(1): 77–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050104

Scriven, Michael. 1967. The Methodology of Evaluation. In: Ralph W. Tyler, Robert M. Gagné és Michael Scriven (szerk.) Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, 1. Chicago: Rand McNally. 39–83.

Stiggins, Richard J. 2002. Assessment Crisis: The Absence of Assessment for Learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 83(10): 758–765. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170208301010

Stiggins, Richard J. 2007. Five Assessment Myths and Their Consequences. Education Week, 27(8): 28–29. https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-five-assessment-myths-and-their-consequences/2007/10 (Letöltés: 2020.11.23.)

Taras, Maddalena. 2009. Summative assessment: the missing link for formative assessment. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 33(1): 57–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770802638671

Turner, Carolyn E. és James E. Purpura. 2015. Learning-oriented assessment in second and foreign language classrooms. In: Dina Tsagari & Jayante Banerjee (szerk.), Handbook of second language assessment. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 255–272.

Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

SZEMLE
BOOK REVIEWS

Book Review

Ildikó Vančo, Rudolf Muhr, István Kozmács & Máté Huber (Eds.), *Hungarian as a pluricentric language in language and literature*

(Österreichisches Deutsch - Sprache der Gegenwart 22). Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020, pp. 288.[1]

DOI: 10.14232/edulingua.2020.1.6

The volume is an extensive overview of Hungarian as a pluricentric language, focusing on the language use of the autochthonous Hungarian minority groups in the countries neighboring Hungary. Due to the Treaty of Trianon in 1920, one third of Hungary's population became citizens of the neighboring states, and thus the Hungarian language developed multiple norm-setting centers. To this day, there are substantial autochthonous Hungarian minority groups in the neighboring countries, and understandably, the language use of these speech communities differs from the Hungary Hungarian standard.

One of the points of departure for the contributions to the volume is the heated debate between purist, prescriptivist language cultivators vs. sociolinguists. Prescriptivists believe that the homogeneity of the Hungarian language is what maintains national unity and togetherness, and therefore the hegemony of the Hungary Hungarian standard should not be disrupted. Their views are standard-centered and monocentric. Sociolinguists, however, highlight that the differences between the dominant Hungary Hungarian variety and the non-dominant varieties (Transylvania [Romania] Hungarian, Vojvodina [Serbia] Hungarian, Transcarpathia [Ukraine] Hungarian, Slovakia Hungarian, Slovenia Hungarian, Croatia Hungarian, Austria Hungarian) are natural, as the political borders form a barrier between these varieties, which inevitably results in divergent development. The latter approach is what the authors and editors of the volume support. They accept and encourage the pluricentricity of the Hungarian language, and understand that criticizing and invalidating non-dominant varieties will not lead to national unity, but rather to the acceleration of assimilation and language shift in non-Hungary Hungarian communities.

[1] Author's e-mail: gyongyi.puski@gmail.com

The volume contains 19 contributions, grouped in five sections of the book, all describing and explaining different aspects of the pluricentricity of Hungarian. The first section is titled *Hungarian as a pluricentric language*, which contains three introductory entries describing the present situation of the Hungarian language, giving evidence for its pluricentricity, linking language rights to human rights, and highlighting the role of language use in identity formation.

The first contributor, Máté Huber gives a concise historical overview of the pluricentric development of Hungarian, and describes the approaches to this diversity. He argues that the prescriptivist approach is counterproductive, as it does not support language maintenance in non-Hungary Hungarian communities. In most regions outside Hungary where Hungarian is spoken as a minority language, it does not have a proper official recognition, e.g. as a regional official language. He believes that this situation might be resolved through an acceptance of pluricentricity, as the neighboring countries might be more willing to grant linguistic rights to varieties that are separate from the Hungary Hungarian standard, because that way they do not have to fear territorial claims on Hungary's part. His approach presents a new trajectory for supporting Hungarian speech communities in the neighboring countries.

Miklós Kontra focuses on the concept of linguistic human rights, that is, linguistic rights that are necessary for one's mere survival and well-being. One such right is learning one's mother tongue. The frequent unavailability of Hungarian mother tongue education in the neighboring countries on the secondary and tertiary level, and the processes of forced assimilation and forced language shift violate minority Hungarians' linguistic human rights. Based on previous works concerning minority language education, and the 1948 criteria of the United Nations, Kontra warns that present day practices often fulfill the criteria for linguistic genocide.

Ildikó Vančo discusses the identity forming nature of language use. She draws on the understanding that, while in Western Europe, people tend to define their national identities based on their citizenship, people in Eastern Europe tend to consider language as the most important element in their national identity construction. That is the reason why language shift should be avoided in Hungarian communities in the neighboring countries, as language shift is very likely to lead to assimilation and the loss of these speakers' Hungarian identity. Vančo carried out her research among Slovakia Hungarian university students, who, as she notes, have the potential to become the future Slovakia Hungarian learned elite. Their responses show that they primarily conceptualize themselves as Slovakia Hungarians, and they do not consider Hungary their 'native land'. Actually, they seem to have multiple affiliations, with Hungary being the last in the list of places that the respondents consider their 'native land', preceded even by Europe. This does not mean, however, that the Hungarian identity is of lesser importance to the respondents. The majority of the participants find it important that their future children learn Hungarian, and they also agree that minority affiliation can be a conscious decision. Emotional aspects of 'being Hungarian' were

emphasized by the participants, and they even stated that knowing Hungarian culture was more important than speaking the language. Using Hungarian in multiple domains, and having access to Hungarian language media were highlighted as vital aspects. Contrary to previous studies, Vančo's respondents did not rate their vernacular negatively, and the majority preferred using their vernacular to the Hungary Hungarian standard. However, the researcher notes, the respondents might have given idealized answers that may be different from their real, everyday experiences and practices. Vančo stresses in her conclusion that the acceptance of one's own vernacular can lead to language maintenance, while negative opinions about the variety (in schools, in textbooks, or in the society in general) might lead to alienation and language shift.

The second section, titled *The effects of pluricentricity on administrative terminology, toponyms, and family names*, consists of five papers, and gives a detailed description of everyday language use issues of non-Hungary Hungarian speech communities. Réka Máté and István Csernicskó address the issue of the use of family names in Transcarpathia, Ukraine, with a special focus on women's married names. Patronymics are used in Ukraine, unlike in Hungary, which means that people have a third name in addition to their given and family names, which is formed by adding a gender-specific suffix to the father's given name. In addition, Ukrainian names follow the given name, family name order, whereas Hungarian names use the family name first. The most common married name option for women in Hungary is the addition of the *–né* [wife of] suffix to their husband's full name, but this option is not available in Ukraine. This causes conflicts between Ukraine Hungarians and prescriptivist Hungarian language cultivators, who believe that the Ukrainian use of women's married names is too foreign and un-Hungarian, not taking into consideration the fact that Hungarian forms are not legally possible options in Ukraine. Name use in official documents is another important issue in Ukraine. In official documents, such as ID cards or international passports, people have some of the following name forms indicated: the Ukrainian Cyrillic form, the Russian Cyrillic form, and the English transliteration of the Ukrainian form, which distort the original Hungarian spelling of the name considerably. Their Hungarian-style names typically do not appear in official documents.

János Bauko's paper continues the topic of personal names in non-Hungary Hungarian communities, but this time the focus is on Slovakia Hungarians. He explains that Slovakia Hungarians typically have two different name forms: a Hungarian and a Slovak (e.g. *Czigle Tamás* and *Tomáš Czigle, Gőgh Jázmin* and *Jázmin Gőghová*, respectively), and both tend to be important for their identity construction. They use the two forms in different situations with different interlocutors, depending on factors such as the linguistic proficiency of their interlocutors, the formality of the situation, or the desired effect of their choice. In certain situations, they might even use hybrid forms, where the Slovak first name is followed by the family name and the Hungarian first name, such as in *Ernest Kocsis Ernő* and *Juraj Mészáros György*. It is common for

exogamous families to give both a Hungarian and a Slovak given name to their children to signal their dual ethnic background (e.g. *Hajnalka Zlatica* and *Balázs Imrich*). Code-switching in the use of personal names can also be observed, e.g in referring to a woman as *Zuzana Nagyová* [Slovak official name form] first, and later calling her *Zsuzsa* [Hungarian nickname]. Slovakia Hungarian nicknames, although predominantly Hungarian, often show contact phenomena, which sometimes stem from translations, such as in the case of the Hungarian family name *Csontos* [bony], where the person was given the nickname *Koszty*, as the Slovak word for bone is *kost'*.

The controversies surrounding Hungarian toponyms (place names) in Slovakia are highlighted in Gizella Szabómihály's contribution. She discusses the multiple different forms of toponyms that are in use due to multiple standardizations on both the Slovak and the Hungarian part. These, in many cases, resulted in several versions of the name of the same municipality with Hungarian inhabitants. It is common that multiple Hungarian allonyms and differences between the Hungarian and Slovak names exist, and these forms are often in use simultaneously, causing confusion. For example, the toponyms *Ipolybalog*, *Balog*, *Blh nad Ipl'om*, and *Balog nad Ipl'om* designate the same village near the river Ipoly/Ipel'.When official documents, encyclopedias, and maps, for instance, do not use the names uniformly, the reader might not realize that two sources using different names refer to the same municipality. For travelers, it can be difficult to find the target settlement on a map if they are not familiar with the history of toponym standardizations in both Hungary and Slovakia. This way, "the identifying function of toponyms [is] weakened", which "leads to uncertainty in the system of Hungarian toponyms in Slovakia" (p. 104). Szabómihály also stresses the significance of having bilingual place name plates in Slovakia Hungarian settlements, for both clarity- and identity-related reasons.

Attila Benő raises the reader's awareness of the importance of terminology planning and specialized language planning in Transylvania, Romania. He considers the field of specialized language planning a public affair, as items of specialized languages often become part of everyday speech (e.g. medical, legal or commercial terms). According to the author, the most important feature of specialized terminology is that their meaning is uniform, and, therefore, professional information can be transmitted without the uncertainty of meaning. As specialized languages do not tend to be standardized in non-Hungary Hungarian speech communities, often multiple terms exist with the same meaning, contact phenomena can be observed, and there are meanings that can only be expressed in the majority language due to the limited use of Hungarian in high functions or the lack of referent in Hungary. For this reason, Benő proposes that schools should be the primary venues of specialized language instruction, and the compilation of Hungarian technical textbooks for Romania Hungarians is necessary. He presents standardized Hungarian terminology for the new Romanian police ranks, as proposed by the Szabó T. Attila Linguistic Institute. One of the proposed terms is *főrendőrügynök*, stemming from the Romanian *agent principal de poliție*, which does

not have a Hungary Hungarian counterpart. The consistent use of one standardized term is necessary to avoid miscommunication and to encourage the use of a Hungarian term instead of the Romanian one in order to preserve more functions of the Hungarian language in Transylvania. For specialized language planning to be successful, both the standardization of existing terminology and the creation of new terms are important.

Károly Presinszky describes the language of local self-government documents in a Slovakia Hungarian setting. The language of administration is generally expected to be the standard variety, but the Hungarian language experiences a loss of functions in Slovakia, especially in the professional registers, which are increasingly taken over by the Slovak language. In the examined data, spoken utterances contain more features of the regional variety, such as *akkó* [then] instead of the standard form *akkor*, and *vini* [to carry] for *vinni*. Written official texts primarily follow the rules of standard Hungary Hungarian, but some features of the regional variety (e.g. *lakósság* [population] for standard *lakosság*) and some contact phenomena (e.g. *mobilkamerák* as a literal translation of the Slovak term *mobilné kamery* instead of the Hungary Hungarian standard term *térfigyelő kamerák* [CCTV cameras]) also occur. In written documents, one-word code-switches into Slovak can be observed to facilitate the readers' understanding of professional terminology, which tends to be more readily available for Slovakia Hungarians in Slovak. The influence of the Slovak language is the greatest in administrative terminology, and for this reason, the author, similarly to Benő, calls for professional lexicon planning to preserve the professional functions of Hungarian in Slovakia.

The third section, *Contact phenomena and the use of features of regional varieties in the national varieties of Hungarian*, is a collection of four papers focusing on various regional varieties of Hungarian outside Hungary. Anna Kolláth describes the situation of the Hungarian language in Slovenia's northeastern Prekmurje region, where Hungarians have traditionally lived. She laments that while the language enjoys a high level of legal protection as a regional official language, and positive discrimination, assimilation is still increasingly present, and the number of people who identify with the Hungarian minority is shrinking. The majority language enjoys a considerably higher prestige, which results in more and more domains of language use being taken over by Slovene in the lives of Hungarian–Slovene bilinguals. Although the current bilingual education model is uniquely supportive, as both those students whose mother tongue is Hungarian and those whose mother tongue is Slovene go to Hungarian–Slovene bilingual schools in the bilingual Prekmurje region, this tends to lead to functional bilingualism only in the case of Hungarian students, for whom a high level of Slovene proficiency is inevitable. Slovene students typically only learn to understand Hungarian, but rarely become competent speakers of Hungarian. The bilingual education model in Slovenia's Prekmurje region is a visionary one, as the reciprocity of language learning has the potential to enhance the status of the minority language, but it needs further development to become more effective in terms of language maintenance.

Réka Sólyom examines Hungarian language use in a daily paper in Vojvodina, Serbia, titled *Magyar Szó*, and the related Facebook comments. She explains that differences from the Hungary Hungarian standard can be observed at multiple levels, e.g. lexicon, morphology, and structures. However, the most stigmatized linguistic phenomena only appear in the Facebook comments, while the language use of the daily paper, which is a more formal medium, remains closer to the Hungary Hungarian standard. For instance, the phenomenon of *suksükölés*, that is, substituting the declarative verbal suffix for the imperative suffix, which results in highly stigmatized non-standard forms, only appeared in the Facebook comments but not in the articles of *Magyar Szó*.

The language use of the Nitra/Nyitra language island of Slovakia receives central attention in Anna Sándor's paper. Sándor explains that the northernmost continuous Hungarian speaking speech community has developed in isolation for centuries, and thus contains numerous archaisms and contact phenomena. Even though the vernacular is the community's link to its rich folklore and is part of their identity, it is now being threatened by stigmatization, advanced assimilation, and the hegemony of standard Hungary Hungarian and Slovak in (not exclusively) formal settings. Many speakers in the Nitra/Nyitra region are not bidialectal in standard Hungary Hungarian and their vernacular, but speak only the regional variety of Hungarian. When people do not use the standard in those situations which call for it, they risk being stigmatized and considered less competent language users. Sándor highlights that when speakers experience stigmatization due to their vernacular, they might feel compelled not to learn Hungarian at all. In very disadvantaged settlements from the perspective of language maintenance, it is common to hear grandchildren answering in Slovak to their Hungarian-speaking grandparents. Sándor argues that the overemphasizing and forced teaching of the Hungary Hungarian standard leads to the stigmatization of the local varieties, which is counterproductive, as instead of promoting the use of the Hungary Hungarian standard, it hinders Hungarian language maintenance altogether and accelerates the displacement of the Hungarian language in these speakers' lives.

Szilvia Rási investigates language attitudes towards the Eastern Palóc variety of Hungrian in Včelince/Méhi, Slovakia. She stresses the vital connection between language attitudes and language maintenance: if the speakers connect favorable attitudes to their variety, they will find it worthy of imitation; whereas if they attach stigma to the variety, its use will decrease. Her study shows that more respondents have been made to feel ashamed of their language use by others than who are actually ashamed of it themselves, which is a partially positive finding. However, 71% of the respondents consider the Hungary Hungarian standard more beautiful than their own vernacular, which entails that the majority of the respondents seems not to consider their own vernacular worthy of imitation, which will probably have negative consequences for language maintenance there.

The fourth section, *Pluricentricity in Hungarian language education*, contains three papers and concentrates on teaching Hungarian as a mother tongue in non-Hungary Hungarian speech communities. Edith Kádár's paper is a very strong critique of the standard-centered nature of teaching Hungarian as a mother tongue in schools in Romania. She examined 27 textbooks that are used for this purpose, and her results show that dialectal features almost never appear in them, and when they do, they are presented as bad examples or mistakes that need to be corrected (*deviance model*). She argues that "being 'exposed' to other varieties could enhance tolerance" (p. 201) and expand the students' linguistic repertoire.

István Jánk presents his application of his own modification of the verbal guise technique for language attitude research. Teachers of Hungarian were given a text, and then listened to students' recorded retellings of the information given in the text. In the recordings, Jánk contolled for the variety (standard or regional [Eastern Palóc]), mode of language use (elaborated or restricted code) and the percentage of the vitally important information that was retained (100% or 60 %) Based on an investigation with the participation of 550 teachers and teacher trainees of Hungarian from Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Subcarpathia, he has established that oral student performances of the same content receive, on average, an evaluation which is lower by one grade if the speaker uses their regional variety. This tendency, in the long run, becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, as non-standard speakers will stop trying to be high achievers if teachers evaluate them based on their language use and not how well-prepared they are.

István Kozmács and Ildikó Vančo examine the presence of the notion of the pluricentricity of Hungarian in textbooks published in Hungary which are used in the Hungarian public education system. Their investigations show that, in the examined grammar textbooks designed for primary school students, language change and variation is first discussed in eighth grade, with only one chapter (five pages) being dedicated to the topic. This means the span of only one class designated to ideas of pluricentricity throughout the students' eight years of primary school education. Although the 12th grade grammar school textbook the authors examined has a 40-page-long chapter on the topic of 'language and society', the chapter only discusses that regional standards differ from the Hungary Hungarian standard, but it fails to include information on the social stratification of these non-dominant varieties, such as the influencing potential of the speakers' socio-economic status or profession, and differences in the use of slang. The authors conclude that the information on the Hungarian language presented in these textbooks is monocentric rather than pluricentric, non-dominant varieties are scarcely mentioned, and the social stratification of these varieties is completely ignored.

The final section in the volume, entitled *Pluricentricity in Hungarian literature*, explores the use of non-dominant varieties for literary purposes through four papers. Zoltán Németh offers a theoretical categorization of the three levels of representation of the pluricentricity of Hungarian in literary works. The first level involves self-reflective

awareness, which means an understanding of the position of the non-dominant variety, and the difficulties its speakers face. The second level concerns the inclusion of the characteristics of the non-dominant variety in the standard literary language, for the intensification of meaning or a more dramatic effect. The third level is reached when the use of the non-dominant variety in the literary work surpasses the stylistic function and becomes an integral part of the hybrid text, resulting in a loss of meaning for those who are not from the same speech community. The third level of inclusion has the potential for exploring infinite poetic possibilities and rearranging the hegemonic standard language. Therefore, it has a transforming force by challenging standard-centered views of what counts as literature and what is conceptualized as 'proper' literary language.

Gabriella Mádi explores language contact phenomena in a Trascarpathia Hungarian novel by Éva Berniczky, titled *Méhe nélkül a bába* [The midwife without her womb]. Mádi explains that the language of the novel is predominantly Hungarian, but the use of Slavic (Ukranian and Russian) words can also be observed, typically in the case of the names of the characters, specific referents which do not have a Hungary Hungarian equivalent, or Slavic expressions that have a special layer of meaning which is not available in Hungarian. Although the novel is mainly directed at a bilingual audience, explanations are offered for the monolingual Hungarian reader as well. There are a lot of direct borrowings in the novel, for which Berniczky offers explanations in the glossary, and other guiding information is provided throughout the novel which involves more than mere translations of the unknown words, as the readers need more complex guidance to be able to interpret the unknown, multicultural world in which the story unfolds. Mádi supports the publication of minority language novels, as they can capture and present the linguistic reality of the speech community. She argues that in a multilingual and multicultural setting, homogenized standard language use cannot offer a powerful and true representation of the linguistic and cultural behavior of the speech community. The main challenge is to preserve the authenticity of the linguistic experience of the speakers depicted, and still make the novel comprehensible and enjoyable for Hungarian audiences who belong to other speech communities.

Anikó N. Tóth's paper is the first contribution to the volume which specifically focuses on the topic of diglossia, although the idea appears throughout the volume without being termed as such. In situations of diglossia, there is a functional distribution of languages or varieties, where one is not used for fulfilling functions typically carried out in the other. The high variety, the Hungary Hungarian standard in our case, has official, formal functions, while the low (regional) variety is used in private, everyday communication, but neither is used in the function of the other. N. Tóth examines the language use of a Slovakia Hungarian novel, *Klára*, by György Norbert. *Klára*, similarly to the previously discussed novel by Berniczky, disrupts the expectation of using only the high variety in literary works. The regional variety and hybrid language use are often employed in the novel, in spite of the fact that contact varieties are often viewed as inaccurate, distorted or foreign-like even by the speakers of these varieties.

Slovak words appear in the text with Hungarian suffixes, and Slovak borrowings are often phonetically spelt, which indicates that the speech community has made these words their own, and now they use them as Hungarian words. N. Tóth explains that the hierarchy of Hungarian and Slovak is presented in the novel through the example of one of the main characters, Ikrek, whose first language is Hungarian. He becomes a ticket inspector, which indicates a metaphorical position of power; however, the language of power in Slovakia is Slovak, which causes insecurity in Ikrek. Interestingly, English borrowings also appear in the novel, phonetically spelt and complemented with Hungarian suffixes, which indicates the growing importance of the global lingua franca in the everyday experiences of Slovakia Hungarian youth. N. Tóth highlights that the novel "draws attention to the series of cultural and linguistic crossings" (p. 265) that happen in the daily lives of Slovakia Hungarians, and argues that the language use of the novel "can be considered as a specific Hungarian language self-representation in Slovakia" (p. 265).

The last contributor to the volume, Gabriella Petres Csizmadia, also analyzes language use in a Slovakia Hungarian literary work, Pál Száz's phytolegendry titled *Fűje sarjad mezőknek* [Grass grows on meadows]. The name of the genre 'phytolegendry' was coined by Pál Száz as Petres Csizmadia explains in the footnotes, and refers to "a collection of readings about plants" (p. 269). The analyzed work is highly multilingual, and very specific to the linguistic environment of its creation. Slovak, Czech, Russian, English, German, Romani and Latin elements are sewn into the Hungarian text, which reflects the cohabitation of several nations and the ease of code-switching. Petres Csizmadia argues that the dialectal and foreign language elements increase the authenticity of the work, and using the non-dominant variety for literary purposes raises the status of the variety. The spelling of the text reflects live speech and dialectal accent, such as in the expression *istentuggyahun* [God knows where, standard: Isten tudja hol]. In this example, a complete thought is merged into one expression reflecting speech pace, and the phonetic spelling of the expression reveals a non-standard accent. The story of the phytolegendry highlights the feeling of linguistic inferiority on the non-standard speakers' part, as their language use is stigmatized by many Hungary Hungarians, because they experience the Slovakia Hungarian variety as a threat to the unity of their nation.

The volume is a unique contribution to the research on Hungarian as a pluricentric language. It is also a multidisciplinary endeavor, as the topics covered by the 19 papers contain elements of research on bilingualism, language contact, language attitudes, linguistic discrimination, first language acquisition and education, identity studies, discourse analysis, literary studies, etc. The publication of this volume is an important step in Hungarian linguistics, as it highlights the importance of a pluricentric approach for Hungarian language maintenance outside Hungary. As English, the global lingua franca, is also a pluricentric language, the findings presented in this volume can have implications for studying English as a pluricentric language as well. If more researchers

come to accept non-dominant varieties of Hungarian, English, and other pluricentric languages as valid and legitimate varieties, it can have a profound impact on the lives of the speakers of these varieties. More positive language attitudes, more diversity in course books, acceptance of students' vernaculars, grading academic content and not the 'standardness' of language use, and other benefits will follow from the single decision of allowing more space for pluricentric approaches.

Gyöngyi Püski

University of Szeged

List of contributors

Ildikó Csépes is a senior assistant professor at the Institute of English and American Studies, University of Debrecen. Currently she is the head of Department of English Language Pedagogy. She received her PhD in language testing in 2003. Between 2004 and 2014 she was a member, and for the last six years, the chair of the Hungarian Accreditation Board for Foreign Language Exams, an expert committee working for the Hungarian Educational Authority. Between 2015 and 2018 she was the Hungarian partner in the TALE project (Teachers' Assessment Literacy Enhancement) funded by Erasmus+. The project was awarded the Innovation in Assessment Prize 2019 by the British Council (ARAG).

Katalin Doró is associate professor at the Institute of English and American Studies of the University of Szeged, Hungary. She has earned her PhD and her habilitation degree in Applied Linguistics. Her research interests include language learning strategies, L2 vocabulary use of English learners, English for academic and research publication purposes and language teacher identity formation.

József Horváth is associate professor at the University of Pécs, Hungary. Most of his research focuses on student writing, both quantitatively and qualitatively. His work on the JPU Corpus has been regarded as an important contribution to learner corpus research.

Donald W. Peckham is an associate professor at the University of Szeged. He earned his PhD in linguistics with a focus on applied linguistics at the University of Pittsburgh. His teaching and research interests are in second language acquisition and language teaching, specifically in cognitive approaches to language learning and teaching, informal language learning, and English as a lingua franca.

Gyöngyi Püski is a doctoral student at the English Applied Linguistics PhD program, Doctoral School in Linguistics, University of Szeged. Her research interests include language attitudes, bilingualism, foreign language teaching and foreign language pronunciation learning.

Fatiha Sadouki is a doctoral student at the English Applied Linguistics PhD program, Doctoral School in Linguistics, University of Szeged. Her research interests include third language acquisition (TLA), language transfer, and cross-linguistic influence.