

Common Issues of Using English as a Lingua Franca

Maksym Cheremisin, Jan Długosz University in Częstochowa, Poland

ORCID: 0000-0002-8508-2302

Abstract: This article examines the historical, geopolitical, and sociolinguistic factors that have shaped the global rise of English as a lingua franca (ELF). It outlines the colonial and postcolonial trajectories of English, its consolidation through American economic and cultural dominance, and its further acceleration in the age of globalization and digital technologies. Drawing on works by Crystal (2003), Graddol (1997, 2006), Jenkins (2014), Seidlhofer (2004, 2005, 2006), and Mackenzie (2014), and others, the article provides an overview of key definitions and conceptual debates surrounding ELF. Particular attention is paid to the question of whether ELF constitutes a distinct variety of English, to the benefits and disadvantages of its global spread, and to the practical issues it raises in intercultural communication. Empirical perspectives are included through reference to corpus-based research (e.g., VOICE, Cogo & Dewey), which suggest that ELF interaction is neither a “reduced” form of English nor chaotic, but often relies on creativity, accommodation strategies, and collaborative meaning making. At the same time, the article highlights concerns about fairness, linguistic inequality, and domain loss in the humanities and social sciences, where reliance on English may disadvantage non-native speakers and marginalize research in other languages. The discussion concludes by suggesting that ELF pedagogy should prioritize intelligibility, accommodation, and multilingual awareness over prescriptive adherence to native-speaker norms. The article also outlines concrete implications for syllabus design and assessment in ELF-informed classrooms. Furthermore, it emphasizes the necessity of shifting traditional assessment paradigms to better reflect the fluid and dynamic nature of modern global communication. By integrating translanguaging practices and acknowledging the multilingual repertoires of learners, educators can foster a more inclusive and equitable environment. Ultimately, embracing ELF as a legitimate communicative resource rather than a deviation from standard norms is essential for preparing individuals to navigate an increasingly interconnected world.

Keywords: English as a lingua franca; globalization; multilingualism; sociolinguistics; language policy

Introduction

Globalization, together with the rapid expansion of digital communication technologies, has significantly accelerated the global spread of English. Never before has a language been acquired and used as a second language by such a vast proportion of the world's population. The term *lingua franca* derives from the Arabic *lisan al-farang* and originally referred to a contact language used for communication among speakers of different native languages (Goebl et al. 1996). In the contemporary world, English has come to occupy this role on an unprecedented scale.

Today, non-native speakers of English vastly outnumber native speakers. Crystal (2003) observes that native speakers account for less than a quarter of English users worldwide, which means that most interactions in English now take place in intercultural contexts, either among non-native speakers themselves or in mixed encounters with native speakers. This shift has given rise to extensive scholarly interest in English as a *Lingua Franca* (ELF) as a mode of communication shaped by multilingual realities rather than by traditional native-speaker norms.

This article adopts the view that ELF can be understood not as a deficient or transitional form of English, but as a functional and adaptive mode of communication, as widely argued in the ELF literature. While the article draws on established scholarship, it also adopts a critical perspective on ongoing debates surrounding the status of ELF, particularly the question of whether it constitutes a distinct variety of English.

Against this background, the article is guided by the following thematic questions:

- How the global rise of English can be understood from historical and sociolinguistic perspectives;
- How ELF has been defined and conceptualized in the literature;
- What major benefits and disadvantages have been identified in relation to ELF;
- What recurrent issues have been observed in ELF communication, particularly in interactions involving native and non-native speakers.

For background, Crystal's (2003) influential volume *English as a Global Language* and Graddol's (1997, 2006) British Council reports on the future of English provide valuable context for the present discussion.

The present article is conceived as a narrative review of selected scholarship on ELF, rather than as an empirical study. Its aim is not to provide a systematic review of all available literature, but to synthesize key theoretical, historical, and sociolinguistic perspectives relevant to four interrelated questions: the global rise of English, the definition and status of ELF, its major benefits and disadvantages, and selected recurrent issues in ELF communication. The discussion is organized thematically and draws on both foundational contributions to ELF research and representative corpus-based and pedagogical studies in order to provide a coherent overview of the field.

1. The historical rise of English as a global language

The international prominence of English has deep historical roots, beginning in the seventeenth century when England transformed into a major colonial power with a dominant navy and extensive overseas territories. English spread globally through colonial administration, trade and later US-led media/technology. At the time, England's priority was to secure trading networks. In such circumstances, the language of the dominant, economically advanced nation often displaced local tongues. As in many empires, political and economic dominance determined which language gained precedence. In the eighteenth century, English became firmly associated with commerce, reinforcing Britain's role in shaping the global economy and international exchange.

Even when the colonized countries gained independence, trade relations with Great Britain continued to develop, and English remained in use. One reason is that, in some contexts, local languages lacked established terminology for new administrative and commercial domains. Another reason is that English has already taken root in this area and the locals knew it well. In many cases, participation in trade required communication in English.

Another important factor in the emergence of English as an international language was the colonization of North America. The British were not the only settlers. In addition to English, there were also French, Spanish, German, Dutch spoken in America. At the beginning of the 20th century, the question of national unity arose sharply: something was supposed to unite the country and the people who lived in it. In this context, English functioned as a unifying medium of communication.

In the second half of the 20th century, England faded into the background, the era of America began. In the aftermath of World War II, the major powers focused primarily on reconstruction and national recovery. In turn, the United States suffered less than the rest and continued to develop in all directions: economic, diplomatic, political and military. The country was especially active in developing economic relations. America made the right choice, continuing the English tradition. US products dominated many markets. Naturally, a common language is needed to carry out an economic transaction, and again that language has become English. This can be explained by the same underlying mechanism observed in the 17th century, namely the role of geopolitical and economic dominance in language spread.

US influence has intensified over time. But it is not enough just to win the championship, it is important to maintain it. If trade played a key role in England in the 18th century, then America occupied its niche in history for other reasons:

a. The advent of the computer and the Internet

For any nation, having its language achieve international status is a strategic advantage. As one of the leading global powers, the United States actively fostered the worldwide spread of English, aligning its cultural and political influence with linguistic expansion. A key factor was the rise of personal computing and the Internet, largely driven by US industry, which further amplified the global reach of English. These instant messaging tools have greatly contributed to the globalization of the English language.

b. American lifestyle

In the second half of the 20th century, against the background of post-war and dilapidated countries, the United States looked very attractive. The “American Dream” seemed to be an ideal, and people from different countries sought to at least get closer to this ideal, and language is one way to get closer. Films, music, youth movements came to us from across the ocean and brought with them an English-language culture.

Language	Ethnologue Native speakers (1)	Ethnologue Total speakers (2)	MT Native speakers (3)	MT Total speakers (4)
Chinese ^a	1,197	>1,197	1,161	1,165
English ^b	335	>765	357	1,123
Spanish	406	466	401	479
Hindi/Urdu ^b	324	>387	—	—
Arabic ^a	206	246	244	272
Russian	162	272	184	267
French	68	118	69	260
Bengali	193	250	—	—
Portuguese	202	217	209	222
German	84	112	89	168
Malay ^b	23	>163	22	158
Japanese	122	123	126	126
Turkish/Azerbaijani/Turkmen ^b	83	>83	91	102
Italian ^b	61	>61	64	77
Dutch/Afrikaans ^b	28	>28	22	37

Table 1. Worldwide speakers (millions)

2. The status of English as a global language

No single factor creates a lingua franca. It is rather a combination of causes and the number of its non-native speakers that determines the fate of a spreading

language. The contributions of many authors make up a long list of factors responsible for language spread, which is by no means complete due to the changeable nature of the phenomenon (see e.g. Ammon 1989, 257).

The table above shows two sets of estimates, one from *Ethnologue languages of the world* (*Ethnologue*) and the other from Melitz and Toubal (2014) (hereafter MT), the source of the data for the relevant study of language learning.

Ethnologue classifies Chinese and Arabic as “macrolanguages,” grouping together varieties that are not always mutually intelligible. Such classifications partly explain differences between sources in estimating total speaker numbers. Therefore, as we can see there are more native speakers of Chinese than any other language by far. However, based on Table 1, English is on par with Chinese as world leader in total speakers and all other languages lag far behind. Most important of all, English is way ahead of all other languages as a learned language by non-native speakers, and it is the only one to be well represented in all five continents. In terms of geographical dispersion, only French comes anywhere close to English but is still far behind.

Roughly speaking, every fourth user of English is a native speaker of English, which means that most ELF interactions are controlled by non-native speakers of English (Crystal 2003, 76; Seidlhofer 2005, 339).

3. English as a lingua franca, definition.

Jenkins (2013) points out that while English has long functioned as a lingua franca in former British colonies, what distinguishes the current era is the unprecedented breadth of its global reach. Spheres of usage of ELF may be as follows:

a ELF in Politics and Other Global Matters

ELF functions not only in informal tourism contexts but also in high-stakes domains such as diplomacy, law, business, media, higher education and research. Kachru and Smith (2008, 3) describe this as ELF’s “mathetic function.” As Mackenzie (2014) points out, ELF diverges from English as a native language: spoken ELF shows considerable variation and non-standard features, while written ELF tends to remain closer to standard ENL norms.

b. ELF in Local and International Settings

According to Kirkpatrick (2007), ELF operates across different scales — from local to international. The more localised the interaction, the more variation it usually displays, reflecting identity markers such as code-switching and localised norms. In contrast, in international contexts, speakers deliberately avoid these features in favour of more neutral forms. Within this discussion, two related questions are particularly important:

c. Is ELF a Variety of English?

One of the most debated issues in ELF research concerns its status as a potential variety of English. While many scholars agree that ELF constitutes a legitimate mode of international communication, its classification remains contested. From a prescriptive perspective, ELF is sometimes dismissed as a simplified or deficient form of English, often labelled as “bad English.” Such views, however, fail to account for the communicative effectiveness and systematic patterns observed in ELF interaction.

Barbara Seidlhofer (2006) cautions against treating ELF as a fully fledged variety of English, arguing that such classification would be premature without more extensive empirical description. This position reflects a concern that codifying ELF too early may obscure its fluid and context-dependent nature. At the same time, an exclusively cautious approach risks defining ELF only in negative terms, that is, by what it is not in relation to native-speaker English. From a usage-based perspective, it may be more productive to view ELF not as a codified variety comparable to national or regional Englishes, but as an emergent communicative phenomenon shaped by multilingual practices. Rather than adhering to pre-established norms, ELF users negotiate intelligibility, accommodate to their interlocutors, and prioritize communicative success over formal correctness. In this sense, ELF can be understood as a functional category whose norms arise from use rather than prescription.

d. Who Is English a Lingua Franca for?

The question of who ELF is for further illustrates its conceptual complexity. Modiano (2009) distinguishes between two broad perspectives. The first treats ELF as a foreign language primarily intended for non-native speakers, to be learned and assessed in a manner similar to other school subjects. The second, more closely

aligned with the World Englishes paradigm, conceptualizes ELF as a flexible communicative resource used in multilingual and multicultural settings.

Modiano himself advocates an inclusive understanding of ELF that recognizes its role as a practical means of international communication rather than a deviation from inner-circle norms. From this perspective, ELF is not owned by any single group of speakers but is co-constructed by its users in specific communicative contexts. This view aligns with the broader argument advanced in this article: that ELF should be evaluated in terms of its functionality and adaptability rather than its conformity to native-speaker standards.

4. Benefits and disadvantages of ELF

This section outlines the major benefits and drawbacks associated with ELF, as discussed in the literature. Perhaps the immediate benefit of ELF is mutual intelligibility, which is usually achieved when speakers adjust their speech to accommodate one another. There are areas of international encounter where the welfare benefits of a lingua franca are evident. For example, a lingua franca is of mutual benefit to everyone in travel and inside the world industry of news diffusion. The growth of multinational corporations has also reinforced the need for a shared language of communication. The political influence of the United States may be important in explaining the convergence on English as the preferred choice of lingua franca in these cases. But by and large, no other choice would bring the world population as much benefit. Van Parijs (2011) highlights distributional issues: native English speakers benefit from having their mother tongue adopted globally but may also be disadvantaged by reduced incentives to learn additional languages. By contrast, multilingual individuals from smaller nations often develop broader repertoires, which can be seen as an advantage.

The British Chambers of Commerce (2003–2004) and some other British organizations, like the Nuffield Foundation (see the Nuffield Foundation Report, 2000), can be understood to lean towards such a view since they deplore the lower possession of foreign languages and the lower attention to foreign languages in school curricula in the UK than most elsewhere in the EU. It is widely acknowledged, however, that the advantages of native English speakers receive the most attention.

If English is adopted as the lingua franca in an international assembly or conference room, native speakers of this language are typically in a better position

than those for whom English is an inferior choice. In this respect, considerations of fairness will occasionally suggest improvements in the operating rules of organisations. Pool (1991), for example, suggests that it is possible to reconcile efficiency and fairness in the distribution of the costs of translation in international organizations. There could also be derogations to the use of English (or any lingua franca, for that matter) based on axioms of fairness as a function of the circumstances (e.g., who the principal interested parties are).

What about the normative aspects of the dominance of English in science and the academic world? In 2006 a group organized by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) to report on the translation of social science texts issued “A plea for social scientists to write in their own languages” at the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies (see Tymowski 2006; Allen 2007). The group sees no harm if mathematicians and natural scientists worldwide write in English, but does so if social scientists do the same. The idea, therefore, is that the content of social science investigation can only be fully stated in the investigator’s language. If that is the case, the widespread shift to English in the social sciences represents a collective cost and leaves the field unusually dependent on multilingual scholars and professional translators. Yet the only evidence is a reference to the early nineteenth-century writing of about the relation of language to empirical perception.

In embracing the same position, Hamel (2006) refers to the earlier and related philosophical writing of Herder. This position would benefit from stronger empirical support that the social sciences are more reliant on the diversity of languages in the world in communicating their work than the natural sciences and that the strong personal inducements social scientists face to express themselves in English impoverish their contributions to knowledge. In a communication to the same Congress to which Truchot (1996) addressed his paper on the political pressures facing French natural scientists to write in French, Walter (1996) notably points out that the tendency of scientists to veer towards a single language in writing traces back more than two millennia with the language of choice shifting from Sumerian to Greek to Arabic to Latin. From this angle, the twentieth-century predominance of English appears to continue a longer trajectory, while the nineteenth-century coexistence of German, French and English looks more like a historical exception. Perhaps the return to the longer time trend is for the better: information travels faster.

This is not to deny the possible uneven impact of the central role of English on the welfare of scientists and scholars in the humanities. How far do native English scientists and scholars in the humanities have an advantage over the rest

(despite their smaller incentives to learn a second language, to their possible regret outside of their professional life and maybe inside of it too)? A study by Sandelin and Sarafoglou (2004) has some indirect bearing on the subject. The authors assess if native-English-speaking countries generate a higher per capita output of professional publications than other nations in a 30-country sample, considering separately the social sciences, the arts and humanities, and the natural sciences.

They also control for world size of the principal home language (total world native Spanish population in the case of Spain, for example) and GDP. The results show that the native English countries do indeed host a larger number of papers in professional publications by resident scientists and scholars per capita (i.e., in relation to the total national population) than other countries. Interestingly, however, this is true for publications in the natural sciences as well as the social sciences and the arts and the humanities. The coefficient for the natural sciences is around a third as high as for the other two areas, but it is still statistically significantly different from zero at the 95% confidence level. On this evidence, the native English status of a country favours a higher ratio of home-produced publications to the national population in the natural sciences as well as in the social sciences (quite apart from the world population of native speakers of the home language), if only to a lesser extent. This would suggest, without implying it, that the difference in the welfare advantage of the prominence of English to a native English scientist or scholar in the three different spheres is only a matter of degree. To the best of current knowledge, there is limited direct empirical evidence addressing this question. Let us next return to the areas where multilingualism, interpreters and translations are able to overcome the problem of Babel and English is simply “the first among equals,” so to speak. The discussion here has emphasized that the scope is very broad, spanning the press, broadcasting, the Internet, publishing (with translation posing particular challenges), and commerce, aside from three exceptions that will be noted later. In these areas, the evidence would show that, broadly speaking, while English is in the lead, it faces sharp limits and all other major languages are safe.

The evidence concerning language learning is supportive. If English truly endangered other major languages across such domains, one would anticipate that applying the same learning model to the next eight or ten largest languages would yield very poor results. Yet the model does fine. Does any general welfare problem arise from the eminent position of English in these cases? It would seem that the answer is negative. From the standpoint of welfare, there is no

clear basis for advocating any special international effort to promote or demote English in the press, television, the Internet, publishing and trade.

In defence of this view, it can be argued that encouraging foreign language learning in general may be beneficial for wages, trade, and culture. But the place of English relative to other languages is a separate topic. Learning English comes at the expense of learning other languages. For example, the hypothetical argument (which does not seem exactly alien) that everyone should learn English as a second language is quite dubious. The argument would imply that some of the time that is currently spent on learning other second languages by people who do not know English would be better spent on learning English. Yet no one has yet made the case. Invoking coordination failures is not persuasive here, because such failures could equally justify the promotion of several other languages that are also used across vast regions of the world. In addition, the principle of diminishing returns interferes.

Even if English is now the most useful language to learn in one's homeland and occupation, once enough others learn it, the best language to acquire may well become another. Ginsburgh and Prieto (2011) offer labour market support. Interpreters and translations should also be kept in mind. Translation renders much of learning inefficiently costly (mercifully so), which may also argue against learning English (as well as other second languages). The cultural domains of English dominance may provide the strongest basis for the argument that there can be such a thing as 'too much English'. Let us assume a general preference for the use of one's native language in private contexts, in the sense that individuals, even when proficient in a second language, tend to favour their first language in everyday life. The evidence is overwhelming: it comes from the newspapers people read (even if they know a second language), the television they watch, the Internet they use, and many of the facts about edition and trade. Interestingly too, the supporting evidence covers the film and the best-seller as well if only we remember that non-native English people mostly view English-language films that are dubbed or, in the case of the majority only when there is no choice, subtitled, and they mostly read foreign-language best-sellers in translation. The question then is how it can possibly enhance welfare for English to dominate music, film, and popular literature to the extent that it does.

The argument that it is welfare-improving must be that, somehow, foreign-language speakers obtain compensation for their sacrifice of home-language benefits either through higher quality in other regards or else through

lower social costs. Another explanation is market specialization: with comparative advantage and economies of scale, nations tend to narrow their productive focus. In this light, English-speaking countries have carved out a specialization in cultural production. Overall, while ELF facilitates communication and reduces transaction costs across many domains, in science and the humanities it can also create inequalities by privileging native speakers and marginalizing research produced in other languages.

The argument has merit with respect to film where, in fact, the dominance is specifically American as such, and the British film industry is just as dominated by Hollywood as the French one. Hollywood also rose to world prominence under the silent film, before “talkies”. Thus, one can even make a case that Hollywood is the fundamental factor, not English, although such an interpretation remains open to debate because of the contribution of the French, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian, Spanish and Swedish film in the history of the cinema (see also Francois and van Ypersele 2002). But in the case of the song and the best-seller, the argument seems wobbly. Where is the benefit in quality or the reduction in social costs? One particular ground for suspicion is that in other related cultural areas, like music without words, photography, painting, sculpture and architecture, the native English contribution is closer to what we would expect on the basis of relative population size, income, wealth and tradition.

There appears to be a distinct dynamic at work in cultural markets where language is concerned. It can be argued that there is a possible long-term danger. Suppose that the budding author and popular singer of talent feel under the same pressure as the scientist and scholar in the humanities

to make his/her name in English. Assume also, as seems to be true
in science, that the outstanding

talents are especially likely to succumb to this temptation. Their odds of success are higher but the lure is at least the same. In fact, we know of several cases of authors in the hall of literary fame who dropped their native language in favour of others with a larger and more impressive literary tradition (with few, if any, well-known examples in the opposite direction since the move away from Latin and the printing press): Conrad, Kafka and Ionesco, to mention three. Gogol evidently seriously hesitated between his native Ukrainian and Russian. This is crucially relevant. The real concern is not that creative writing in other

languages will disappear altogether, but that the highest-quality works may increasingly be produced in English. If this trend is already unfolding, it could shed light on the paradox mentioned earlier. In the case of science, where such a tendency is manifest, there is no harm and indeed even a benefit. In literature, however, we cannot reason the same. Literature is an area where language as such is a source of pleasures and enjoyment, an end in itself, rather than a mere instrument for conveying information, or as an outstanding economic contribution by Church and King (1993) has it, a “communication technology.” Under the previous scenario, English might continue to evolve and to discover new literary veins. But how much comfort is that? If everyone wrote music for the violin, likewise music might still thrive and we might even hear new echoes of the viola and the guitar and who knows what else issuing from violin strings. Still, what about the keyboard, the winds and the percussion? It does not seem plausible to argue that there would be no loss. Overall, the impact of ELF appears to be context-dependent, involving both communicative advantages and structural inequalities. Against this background, it is possible to identify a number of recurrent issues in ELF communication.

5. Common problems of ELF usage

Researchers set about identifying features that appeared to be specific to individual ELF ‘varieties’ along with features that seemed to be shared across many of these ‘varieties’, just as features had earlier been identified both within and across outer circle English varieties. And perhaps unremarkably, many of the shared expanding circle features thus identified were found to be shared also with outer circle Englishes.

Typical ELF patterns include pluralizing normally uncountable nouns (e.g. *staffs*, *feedbacks*), omitting the third-person -s (*she think*), or inserting extra prepositions (*discuss about*). In a much-quoted article drawing on several projects conducted on VOICE data, Seidlhofer (2004, 220) presents a number of “regularities” that had been observed across ELF users from different first languages and which, although typical errors in native English, were not found to impede success in ELF communication. These potential features of ELF were as follows:

- a. ‘Dropping’ the third person present tense -s
- b. ‘Confusing’ the relative pronouns *who* and *which*

- c. 'Omitting' definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in ENL, and inserting them where they do not occur in ENL
- d. 'Failing' to use correct forms in tag questions (e.g., isn't it? or no? instead of shouldn't they?)
- e. 'Inserting' redundant prepositions, as in We have to study about...
- f. 'Overusing' certain verbs of high semantic generality, such as do, have, make, put, take
- g. 'Replacing' infinitive-constructions with that-clauses, as in I want that
- h. 'Overdoing' explicitness (e.g. black color rather than just black)

Previous corpus-based research drawing on datasets such as VOICE (Vien-na-Oxford International Corpus of English) and studies by Cogo and Dewey (2012) suggests that ELF communication often relies on collaborative strategies such as completing utterances, negotiation of forms, and backchanneling. These features suggest that ELF interaction should not be viewed as a "reduced" form of English, but rather as a dynamic process of co-constructing meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries. These findings challenge deficit-oriented views of non-native English use by demonstrating that communicative success in ELF settings depends less on formal accuracy than on speakers' pragmatic competence and willingness to cooperate. Rather than treating such features as deviations, ELF corpus research suggests that they constitute systematic and interactionally meaningful patterns.

Conclusion

This article has examined the historical, geopolitical and sociolinguistic forces behind the rise of ELF, outlined the main conceptual approaches to ELF, and critically reviewed debates concerning its benefits and drawbacks. It has argued, in line with previous research, that ELF communication, far from being a "reduced" or deficient form of English, relies on collaborative strategies such as accommodation, creativity and the co-construction of meaning, which enable speakers to manage linguistic diversity with considerable effectiveness.

Historically, the expansion of English was driven first by colonial trade, later by US geopolitical dominance, and most recently by the digital revolution. Sociolinguistically, this expansion has resulted in a communicative landscape in which non-native speakers vastly outnumber native ones, contributing to the

emergence of new norms of intelligibility and interaction. From a pedagogical perspective, these developments suggest that English language teaching should move beyond prescriptive native-speaker models and place greater emphasis on learners' ability to negotiate meaning, adapt to diverse interlocutors, and draw on multilingual resources.

At the same time, important caveats remain. The dominance of English in science and the humanities raises persistent questions of equity and the risk of domain loss for other languages. While empirical research indicates that ELF does not hinder communication, it does generate structural asymmetries between those who participate in global networks with English as a first language and those who invest substantial time and effort in acquiring it. These issues are particularly acute in disciplines where language itself plays a central role in knowledge production and cultural expression.

Future research should therefore build on existing corpus-based work, such as studies drawing on the VOICE corpus, while extending the analytical scope beyond European and academic contexts to include digital communication, workplace interaction and cultural production in a wider range of world regions. Comparative research is especially needed to assess whether ELF practices systematically disadvantage particular language communities or, alternatively, create new opportunities for multilingual engagement.

In practical terms, an ELF-informed pedagogical approach should prioritize intelligibility and accommodation, foster awareness of linguistic diversity, and encourage translanguaging as a communicative resource rather than an obstacle. Ultimately, the central question is not whether English will continue to function as the world's lingua franca — it is highly likely to do so — but how it can be used in ways that promote inclusion, fairness and creativity across global communicative contexts.

Works Cited

- Allen, Esther. 2007. "Translation, Globalization and English." In *To Be Translated or Not to Be*, edited by Esther Allen, 17–33. Barcelona: Institut Ramon Llull.
- Ammon, Ulrich. 1989. "Schwierigkeiten der Deutschen Sprachgemeinschaft Aufgrund der Dominanz der Englischen Sprache." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 8 (2): 257–272.
- Church, Jeffrey, and Ian King. 1993. "Bilingualism and Network Externalities." *Canadian Journal of Economics* 26 (2): 337–345. <https://doi.org/10.2307/135911>

- Cogo, Alessia. 2010. "Strategic Use and Perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca." *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 46 (3): 295–312. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10010-010-0013-7>
- Cogo, Alessia, and Martin Dewey. 2012. *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-Driven Investigation*. London: Continuum.
- Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a Global Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999>
- Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig, eds. 2020. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. 23rd ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- François, Patrick, and Tanguy van Ypersele. 2002. "On the Protection of Cultural Goods." *Journal of International Economics* 56 (2): 359–369. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996\(01\)00119-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996(01)00119-2)
- Ginsburgh, Victor, and Juan Prieto. 2011. "Returns to Foreign Languages of Native Workers in the European Union." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 64: 599–618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001979391106400309>
- Goebel, Hans, Peter H. Nelde, Zdeněk Starý, and Wolfgang Wölck, eds. 1996. *Kontaktlinguistik – Contact Linguistics – Linguistique de contact*. 2 vols. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Graddol, David. 1997. *The Future of English*. London: British Council.
- Graddol, David. 2006. *English Next*. London: British Council.
- Hamel, Rainer Enrique. 2006. "The Dominance of English in the International Scientific Periodical Literature and the Future of Language Use in Science." *AILA Review* 20: 53–71. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.20.06ham>
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2009. "'We Don't Take the Right Way. We Just Take the Way That We Think You Will Understand': The Shifting Relationship Between Correctness and Effectiveness in ELF." In *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, edited by Anna Mauranen and Elina Ranta, 323–347. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ishikawa, Tomoko. 2016. "World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca: Conceptualising the Legitimacy of Asian People's English." *Asian Englishes* 18 (2): 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1171672>
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2013. *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203798157>
- Kachru, Braj B., and Larry E. Smith. 2008. *Contexts, Corporate Identities, and Alternative Englishes*. London: Routledge.

- Kirkpatrick, Andy. 2007. *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackenzie, Ian. 2014. *English as a Lingua Franca: Theorizing and Teaching English*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315890081>
- Melitz, Jacques. 2007. "The Impact of English Dominance on Literature and Welfare." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 64: 193–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2006.10.003>
- Melitz, Jacques. 2008. "Language and Foreign Trade." *European Economic Review* 52: 667–699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2007.05.002>
- Melitz, Jacques. 2016. "English as a Global Language." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Economics and Language*, edited by Victor Ginsburgh and Shlomo Weber, 583–615. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-32505-1_21
- Melitz, Jacques, and Farid Toubal. 2014. "Native Language, Spoken Language, Translation and Foreign Trade." *Journal of International Economics* 93: 351–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2014.04.004>
- Modiano, Marko. 2009. "EIL, Native-Speakerism and the Failure of European ELT." In *English as an International Language: Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues*, edited by Farzad Sharifian, 58–77. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691231-007>
- Nuffield Foundation. 2000. *Languages: The Next Generation; The Final Report and Recommendations of the Nuffield Languages Inquiry*. Retrieved from http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/languages_finalreport.pdf (Accessed September 15, 2025).
- Pitzl, Marie-Luise. 2009. "We Should Not Wake Up Any Dogs: Idiom and Metaphor in ELF." In *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, edited by Anna Mauranen and Elina Ranta, 298–322. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pool, Jonathan. 1991. "The Official Language Problem." *American Political Science Review* 85: 495–514. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1963171>
- Sandelin, Bo, and Nikias Sarafoglou. 2004. "Language and Scientific Publication Statistics." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 28: 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.28.1.02san>
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2004. "Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209–239. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190504000145>

- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005. "English as a Lingua Franca." *ELT Journal* 59: 339–341. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci064>.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2006. "English as a Lingua Franca in the Expanding Circle: What It Isn't." In *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*, edited by Rani Rubdy and Mario Saraceni, 40–50. London: Continuum.
- Sowden, Colin. 2007. "Culture and the "Good Teacher" in the English Language Classroom" *ELT Journal* 61 (4): 304–310. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm049>
- Truchot, Claude. 1996. "La langue française en sciences: Un cas de figure. La situation linguistique des langues en France." In *Le français et les langues scientifiques de demain: Colloque Université de Québec, 19–21 mars 1996*. Québec: Université de Québec.
- Tymowski, Adam. 2006. "Guidelines for the Translation of Social Science Texts." Appendix I to *Annual Meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Van Parijs, Philippe. 2011. *Linguistic Justice for Europe and the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199208876.001.0001>
- VOICE Project. 2007–2013. *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE): Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings*. University of Vienna. <http://voice.univie.ac.at> (Accessed September 15, 2025).
- Walter, Henriette. 1996. "L'évolution des langues de la communication scientifique." In *Le français et les langues scientifiques de demain: Colloque Université de Québec, 19–21 mars 1996*. Québec: Université de Québec.



© by the author, licensee *Polish Journal of English Studies*. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 (creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Received: 2025-09-26; reviewed 2026-02-03; accepted 2026-04-26

DOI: doi.org/10.64867/pjes.25435981.26.121.0906
