

Magdalena Steciąg

Uniwersytet Zielonogórski
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6360-2987>
m.steciag@ifp.uz.zgora.pl

Urszula Majdańska-Wachowicz

Uniwersytet Zielonogórski
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3004-0826>
ula.maj@wp.pl

The use of Polish and Czech as a lingua receptiva in comparison with English as a lingua franca – some remarks on multilingual modes of communication with reference to CSS and ICC¹

Abstract

The present study aims to investigate the use of Polish and Czech as a *lingua receptiva* (LaRa) in comparison with English as a *lingua franca* (ELF) between Polish and Czech students when making semi-spontaneous dialogues. With this aim in mind, the notion of intelligibility together with communication strategies (CSs) and intercultural communicative competence (ICC) are discussed. The study is inspired by Bula-tović's et al. (2019) who investigated the effectiveness of LaRa and ELF between Croatians and Slovenes. The study investigated listening skills and showed that the mean of intelligibility was high irrespective of the mode. The study in question aims to expand prior research with reference

¹ The study in question is part of a research project: *Lingua receptiva czy lingua franca? Praktyki językowe na pograniczu polsko-czeskim w obliczu dominacji angielszczyzny (ujęcie ekolingwistyczne)* – the English title: *Lingua receptiva or lingua franca? The linguistic practices in the border area between Poland and the Czech Republic in the face of English language domination (ecolinguistic approach)* funded by National Science Centre, Poland (UMO-2017/26/E/HS2/00039).

to spoken interactions between Polish and Czech speakers. In particular, it examines the role of communication strategies and intercultural communicative competence in achieving intelligibility in two multilingual modes. The results of the study show that the level of intelligibility is high irrespective of the mode. In LaRa and ELF sessions intelligibility and negotiation strategies are determined by careful language choices, certain communication strategies, and intercultural communicative competence (intercultural attitude towards the partner and modes of communication).

Keywords: lingua receptiva (LaRa), English as a lingua franca (ELF), communication strategies (CSs), intercultural communicative competence (ICC), intelligibility

Słowa kluczowe: lingua receptiva (LaRa), język angielski jako lingua franca (ELF), strategie komunikacyjne, interkulturowa kompetencja komunikacyjna, zrozumiałość komunikatu

1. Introduction

Communication between speakers of different first languages usually encompasses one of three modes: 1) using a *lingua franca* such as English (ELF), 2) using the mother tongue of one of the speakers, 3) exchanging messages in a multilingual constellation referred to as *receptive multilingualism* or *lingua receptiva* (LaRa), meaning the interlocutors speak in their respective L1 (Bulatović et al., 2019). It seems that speakers of unrelated languages often opt for the first and second modes, whereas the speakers of closely related languages may as well incorporate LaRa in their intercultural interactions. Historically speaking, the idea of LaRa comes from the Baltic region and is connected with the emergence of the Hanseatic League. It was in the Middle Ages when this mode of communication between people speaking different languages developed. A number of pieces of research on LaRa in Europe still focus on this geographic area. However, the interest in LaRa is increasing more and more, especially when the Council of the European Union announced the resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism (2008). It presented a new insight into European multilingualism and suggested carrying out research that would promote: 1) interlingual communication, 2) identification of communication strategies, 3) receptive competence that enables inter-comprehension when interlocutors speak different languages without knowing them. The report and its proposals have led to the dissemination of the concept of LaRa throughout the continent (Braunmüller, 2008, Sloboda & Nábělková, 2013, Steciąg, 2020).

2. The aim of the study

The objective of the present study is to investigate the use of Polish and Czech as a *lingua receptiva* in comparison with English as a *lingua franca* between Polish and Czech students when making semi-spontaneous dialogues. Specifically, the study examines communication strategies and intercultural communicative competence in achieving intelligibility (in the two modes) when given a spoken task aimed at negotiation. The study is inspired by Bulatović's et al. (2019) study on closely related languages. The research team investigated the effectiveness of LaRa and ELF between Croatians and Slovenes when the latter were exposed to different listening tasks narrated by the former in Croatian and English. The mean of intelligibility was high irrespective of the mode (92.4 % ELF, 84.2% LaRa). The findings were based on cloze tests. The study in question aims to expand prior research in relation to oral interactions, however, between Polish and Czech students.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1. English as a *lingua franca* (ELF) and *lingua receptiva* (LaRa)

The evolution of ELF as a communication mode cannot be narrowed down to the reductive notion of a restricted language used simply for the transactional exchange of information. ELF can be perceived as a multilingual mode of communication functioning in transient, diversified, and complex social and linguistic configurations (Jenkins, 2009). ELF, defined as "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (Seidlhofer, 2011: 7), nowadays, seems to be a vibrant phenomenon that is part of linguistic repertoires utilized daily by a large number of plurilingual individuals in Europe (Hülmbauer, et al., 2008). One of the most significant advantages of ELF is its tolerance of deviation and linguistic flexibility. Also, the omnipresence of global language in today's mediated communication environment contributes to better mutual understanding between ELF users, regardless of their proficiency in English.

Lingua receptiva (LaRa) is understood as "the ensemble of those linguistic, mental, interactional as well as intercultural competencies which are creatively activated when interlocutors listen to linguistic actions in their 'passive' language or variety" (Rehbein et al., 2012: 249). The hearer and the speaker employ different competences to achieve a communicative purpose. The hearer's components consist of verbal and non-verbal signals, prosodic elements expressing agreement or disagreement, formulaic expressions (for

example, 'I don't understand', 'What do you mean?', 'What?'), echo questions and other linguistic elements. The speaker, on the other hand, uses strategies such as reformulations, repairs, recapitulations, rephrasings, and other types of meta-discourse elements (Rehbein et al., 2012: 250).

Researchers indicate that LaRa has many advantages. It supports efforts to understand other cultures by extending their common platform of communication, and improving social cohesion (Krysztofowicz, 2017). Also, it corresponds to many official declarations of language policy and guidelines regarding foreign language teaching. According to Nicole Marx (2012), since the beginning of the 1990s numerous practical activities have been carried out regarding LaRa in teaching contexts, for example, projects such as EuroComRom, EuRom4, Galatea, and Galanet. They are based on the assumption that knowledge of one language enables easier comprehension of another related language, particularly when receptive skills are concerned. The results indicate that within the Romance family 30 to 50 hours of training sessions are enough to achieve sufficient intelligibility for successful receptive communication. In the Slavic family of languages, the techniques of how to recognise cognate words (sharing common etymology, corresponding morphemes, and syntactic similarities) were tested. Jelena Golubović notes that even a 4-hour training session (not necessarily focusing on teaching the related language) contributes to quality improvement in inter-comprehension in language pairs with a low degree of mutual intelligibility, for example, Czech and Croatian (Golubović, 2016).

When comparing the effectiveness of ELF and LaRa, it must be stressed out that the major goal of both modes is successful intercultural interaction (Hülmbauer, 2014). This way, they can be recognised as vehicular communication modes useful for participants with diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds. According to Steciąg (2019), the major difference between ELF and LaRa is the high prestige of the former. Consequently, it may lead to neglecting the potential of LaRa.

3.2. Overview of research into mutual intelligibility

The beginning of research into intelligibility can be traced back to the United States in the middle of the twentieth century when Charles F. Voegelin and Zellig S. Harris (1951: 322–329) introduced the concept of intelligibility of various related languages and a new method to test inter-comprehension. Instead of collecting ethnographic data or acquiring data by means of a survey (asking respondents about their ability to understand another language and its restrictions), Voegelin and Harris suggested testing these skills in natural or artificially produced conditions of real verbal communication, recording them for further analysis using a tape recorder. This method was criticised by anthropologists

who indicated that the efficiency of interlinguistic communication depends, to a large extent, on such factors as preferences of participants and attitudes to other cultures, political and cultural dominance as well as the degree of bilingualism in a specific communication environment (Bahtina-Jantsikene, 2013: 20).

A different perspective was presented by Einar Haugen (1966: 280–297) as part of his research dedicated to inter-linguistic contacts between Scandinavians. According to the scholar, systematic research on inter-comprehension needed to take into account both linguistic (typological, structural, lexical similarity) and non-linguistic factors (social, psychological, and cognitive). This is the direction the extensive research being carried out today is heading as part of the 'Mutual intelligibility of closely related languages' project (<http://www.let.rug.nl/gooskens/project/?p=home>) for families of languages present on the European continent. The results of the research show that the mere fact that closely related languages have foundations in common, and have numerous structural similarities does not account for success or failure in receptive communication.

In the light of these statements, LaRa and ELF are viewed not so much as 'languages in use', i.e. update of different abstract systems, but more as language practices implemented by multilingual interlocutors in frequent conversations. The conversations are based on participants' experience and socially developed conventions. In numerous studies dedicated to different historical, social, situational, or discursive conditions in a multilingual context, pragmatic factors seem to play the most important role (Steciąg, 2020: 492–495). The studies in question focus on observation of interactive strategies employed by interlocutors to achieve intelligibility. These include, for example, the changes in transmitting/receiving roles, the level of engagement in the interaction, the verbal and non-verbal character of action and reaction, etc. Another strategy is the use of conversational-discursive mechanisms, such as repetitions and echo effects, reformulations and paraphrases, cognitive prophylactic reformulation (this is avoidance of idiomatic words and phrases that could be unclear for the interlocutor or misleading false friends). Also used is flagged-term strategy which is the intended use of keywords (in the pragmatic sense) in speaking, and, possibly tag-switching and code-switching (Beerens, 2010). Thus, pragmatic aspects are taken into account in this study, in particular communication strategies (CSs), extended by the notion of intercultural communicative competence (ICC).

3.3. The notion of communication strategies (CSs) and intercultural communicative competence (ICC)

By definition, communication strategies are the ways and means people employ when they experience a problem in communication, either because they

are not able to say what they want to say or because they do not understand what is being said to them (Mariani, 2010: 10). A combination of the original taxonomies of communication strategies proposed by Tarone (1981), Faerch and Kasper (1984), and Willems (1987) was created by Hua et al. (2012: 835–836). They consist of 1) avoidance or reduction strategies (e.g. *message abandonment, topic avoidance*); 2) achievement or compensatory strategies (e.g. *literal translation, borrowing or code-switching, foreignizing, approximation or generalization, circumlocution, the use of all-purpose words, self-repair, appeal for assistance, time-gaining strategies – unfilled pauses, fillers, sound lengthening, repetition, self-repetition*). Some of the strategies above are divided according to different criteria such as 1) meaning-expression strategies (e.g. *approximation, the use of all-purpose words, generalization, circumlocution, paraphrasing, self-correcting, rephrasing*), 2) meaning-negotiation strategies (e.g. *appeal for assistance, code-switching, repetition*), 3) conversation management strategies (e.g. *unfilled pauses, fillers, repetition, self-repetition, topic avoidance, backchannelling*), 4) para- and extra-linguistic strategies (e.g. *non-verbal language, intonation, mime, gestures, facial expressions, smiling*) (more details in: Mariani, 2010: 39–44).

Since the study investigates intercultural communication, it refers to components of intercultural communicative competence. As stated by Byram (1997), the model for intercultural communicative competence includes different dimensions. The scholar asserts that the most important foundation of intercultural communicative competence is the intercultural attitude towards people perceived as different: openness, self-awareness and critical awareness; knowledge about social groups, their cultures, and processes of interactions at different social levels; skills of interpretation the message, the relationships between interlocutors. For this reason, this dimension of ICC is included in this research.

4. Research questions

The current study aimed to investigate the use of Polish and Czech as LaRa and ELF between Polish and Czech students. To do so, the researchers prepared a task called *Let's negotiate!* and a checklist to investigate the results of the task. The checklist examines if students: 1) discuss given options to choose from, 2) understand each other's arguments, 3) negotiate the options, 4) solve the task, and 5) justify their final decision². The research questions are as follows: 1) Is intelligibility

² The task forced spontaneous speaking. This is why the checklist focuses on certain key activities inspired by speaking Matura task part 3 (see more: Informatory – CKE, *Język angielski* accessed on 12.02.2021).

achieved in study sessions (LaRa and ELF) with reference to the checklist?, 2) What types of communication strategies are employed to establish intelligibility in study sessions (LaRa and ELF)?, 3) What negotiation strategies are used in study sessions (LaRa and ELF)? 4) What is the intercultural attitude as a component of ICC in study sessions (LaRa and ELF)?

4.1. Method

To collect data with which to answer the RQs, participants were asked to complete two communicative negotiation tasks that featured semi-free speech. In part one (LaRa), students had to decide where to spend the afternoon (museum or cinema). Students were given hints and instructions in their mother tongues. They were informed that they needed to discuss the options together and pick the one that would be satisfactory for both parties. In part two (ELF), the same students were supposed to decide what places were worth visiting during their stay in Britain (London, Brighton, or Stratford-upon-Avon). This time hints and instructions were given in English. The time frame for each task was up to 5 minutes. Participants were video-recorded while performing their negotiation tasks and the recordings were later transcribed. The tasks were scored with reference to the checklist statements. Additionally, CSs and ICC components were taken into consideration by the research team when observing the video recordings and preparing transcripts. After the study session, participants were asked to provide retrospective comments on the video recordings. The comments were oral and the conversation took place in a focus group. They were elicited by the researchers who asked participants to give feedback and share their opinions about their attitudes towards LaRa and ELF. The sessions took place in a professional recording studio.

A total of six volunteer students (3 from the University of Zielona Góra Poland, and 3 from the University of Hradec Králové, Czech Republic) took part in the study³. None of them had ever lived in an English-speaking country. None of them could speak the first language of their partner. The participants were divided into three random pairs (Pair 1, Pair 2, Pair 3). The pairs were composed of a Polish speaker (PL) and a Czech speaker (CZ). As far as their level of English was concerned, they assessed it as B1 level (according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) given the level of their university language courses.

³ This is a pilot study carried out to test procedures, methods, etc. before the study proper.

4.2. Findings – the LaRa session

The section includes: 1) the intelligibility checklist, 2) communication strategies, 3) negotiation strategies and ICC. The examination of the findings is based on the transcripts⁴ and the video recordings.

As seen in the table below, all the participants successfully did the task in the LaRa session. Intelligibility was achieved without too much difficulty. Despite the fact there was one problem regarding understanding key information (Pair 2: speakers confused the time of meeting), it did not badly affect the final score.

CHECKLIST LaRa	TOTAL
S1 and S2 discuss the options	3/3
S1 and S2 understand each other's arguments	3/3
S1 and S2 negotiate the options	3/3
S1 and S2 solve the task	3/3
S1 and S2 justify their final decision	3/3

Table 1: Checklist: LaRa.

To achieve mutual intelligibility in the LaRa session, participants employed different communication strategies. Firstly, *the non-verbal components* played an important role in every conversation, e.g. keeping eye contact with each other, smiling, pointing in certain directions, leaning forward, facial expressions like gestures or frowning, nodding one's head in approval, etc. Some of them created a positive atmosphere (smiling), whereas others were signs of cooperation (nodding). Also, they enhanced the verbal code (pointing). Secondly, *fillers* (e.g. *hm*), *unfilled pauses*, or *sound lengthening* (e.g. *yyy*) were used by all participants to show the process of thinking or hesitation. Thirdly, *backchanneling* (e.g. *uhm*, *aha*) was frequent to indicate a willingness to cooperate,

⁴ The transcripts in the Czech language were prepared by a researcher engaged in the project: PH dr. Lukáš Zábranský from the University of Hradec Králové (Czech Republic). The transcripts in Polish and English were prepared by the present authors. The translation was prepared by the present authors, occasionally with help from MT. The transcription conventions included representing spoken as written discourse. Therefore, capitalization and punctuation marks were arbitrarily introduced by the research team on the basis of the video recordings and general punctuation rules (proper names, beginning and ending of the utterance, linking words). Body language and paralinguistic means are put in the brackets. Three dots stand for longer unfilled pauses. When it comes to grammar, no changes were introduced by the researchers. The transcripts are included in the appendix.

understanding, or agreeing. Lastly, *repetition* was used to confirm understanding (Pair 3: *dětský koutek* – „dziecki kątek” > *dziecięcy kącik* – *children’s corner*), or for expressive purposes (Pair 2: PL2: *Ale mně bolí nogy* – *But my legs hurt*, CZ2: *Nohy!?* – *legs*). Speakers employed *appeal for assistance* (Pair 1: PL1: *A inaczej?* – *How to say it differently?*), or self-repetition to emphasise their approval of the solution (Pair 3: CZ3: *No, no, no, no* – *yes*).

The aim of the task was to negotiate and choose the option which suited both parties. This is why participants employed various negotiation strategies. The beginning of the conversation involved direct questions about the preference of the interlocutor (Pair 1: PL1: *I gdzie byś chciała pójść?* – *Where would you like to go?*). This could be treated as a sign of respect and kindness towards the partner of the interaction. Another way to start the dialogue was an open question (Pair 3: PL3: *To gdzie się wybierzemy tego wieczora?* – *Where are we going tonight?*) as a direct invitation to discuss the options given. Finally, one possibility was directly suggested (probably the one preferred by the person who started the conversation as in Pair 2: PL2: *Yyy, może pojedziemy do kina dzisiaj?* – *Shall we go to the cinema tonight?*). Speakers verbalised the advantages of the option they liked (Pair 1: PL1: (...) *ta galeria poniekąd pokazałyby nam część Zielonej Góry, co jest w Zielonej Górze, jaki, jaka jest sztuka w Zielonej Górze* – *If we went to the gallery, we could see part of Zielona Gora and its art*). All speakers interacted with each other by means of additional questions about particular places (Pair 1: CZ1: *A do které galerie?* – *Which gallery?*). They supported their stand (Pair 3: CZ3: (...) *a člověk by měl něco o těch obrazech vědět, trochu intelektuálně pracovat a na to jsem unavená, takže já bych radši šla do kina* – *You should know something about those paintings, work a little intellectually and I’m tired of it, so I’d rather go to the cinema*). Besides this, participants used arguments counter to the preference of their interlocutor. To do so, they employed parallel structures to verbalise disagreement (Pair 3: PL3: *A může tam za duzo ljudi, za głośno* – *Maybe it’s too crowded, too noisy*), or loaded language to express negative evaluation (Pair 3: PL 3: *sztuczny hollywoodzki produkt* – *fake Hollywood product*), or, finally, the reason why they rejected another option (Pair 2: PL2: *Ale mně bolí nogy* – *But my legs hurt*). Negotiation strategies were mostly based on tentative types of persuasion (without pressurising the partner into a certain solution), such as conditional structures, modal verbs, open questions, suggestions in the form of questions. Speakers did not use imperative forms. A compromise seemed the main way of solving the task (Pair 2: CZ2: *OK, tak bychom mohly být v pět v galerii, potom bychom šly do kina* – *OK, we could go to the art gallery at five, then we could go to the cinema*). Sometimes speakers emphasised their mutual agreement by emotive language (Pair

1: CZ1: *Bezva – great // cool*, Pair 2: CZ2: *Jo, to by bylo parádní – That would be great*) or emotional intonation. It must be underlined that the video recordings showed that participants listened to each other carefully, respected each other's preferences, and did not interrupt when their interlocutor was speaking. This is not shown so well in the transcript. Their intercultural attitude was positive as they were engaged in the task and open to mutual interaction.

4.3. Findings – the ELF session

The section includes: 1) the intelligibility checklist, 2) communication strategies, 3) negotiation strategies and ICC. The examination of the findings is based on the transcripts and the video recordings.

The findings show that the task was done very well in the ELF session as indicated in the table. Intelligibility was achieved without too much difficulty.

CHECKLIST ELF	TOTAL
S1 and S2 discuss the options	3/3
S1 and S2 understand each other's arguments	3/3
S1 and S2 negotiate the options	3/3
S1 and S2 solve the task	3/3
S1 and S2 give reasons to justify their final decision	3/3

Table 2: Checklist: ELF.

Similar to the LaRa session, all participants employed some communication strategies to enhance mutual intelligibility in the ELF part. The choice of CSs was comparable. For instance, *the non-verbal components* played a significant role in every dialogue like nodding one's head in approval, shaking one's head in disapproval, making eye contact, or making gestures. Some gestures were culturally determined (e.g. Pair 2: CZ2: used a gesture that stands for the adjective *expensive*), while others substituted for lexis (e.g. Pair 1: pointing to images instead of using proper names). *Fillers* showing understanding (*yes*) were common, and so was *backchannelling* (*Uh-huh, yeah, OK*). *Repetition* was employed to indicate agreement (Pair 2: PL2: *very short*, CZ2: *very short*). In the ELF session, there was an example of *code-switching* (Pair 1: PL1: the word *centrum* instead of *centre*), *self-repair* (Pair 3: CZ3: *at the beach in beach, I don't know*), and *the use of all-purpose words* (Pair 1: the use of deictic expressions such as *this*). Unlike the LaRa session, *unfilled pauses* and *sound lengthening* were not a common feature of the ELF session.

As in the LaRa session, negotiation strategies encompassed tentative means of persuasion, e.g. modals, suggestions in the form of questions, possibility words

such as *maybe* or the conjunction *but* to introduce an additional statement. Participants started conversations by asking about the preference of their interlocutor (Pair 3: PL3: *Which place would you like to visit?*). They asked yes/no questions (Pair 2: PL2: *Do you think we can go to London (...)?*), sometimes preceded by an introduction to the task (Pair 1: CZ1: *OK, we have here three places (...) which we can visit and have you ever been there?*). Just as in the LaRa session, participants underlined the advantages of their choices (Pair 2: PL2: *But we can see the Shakespeare's theatre in London, yeah? The Globe*) and enumerated the advantages of the places (Pair 1, CZ1: a short description of the places). They justified why they opted for certain options (Pair 3: CZ3: *I want rather to rest and to go to beach*). A compromise seemed vital to solve the task (Pair 3: CZ3: *OK, so we can go to London, but we can spend few days at the beach in beach I don't know, um, for example, two or three days on the beach and the rest of the week we can spend in London*). Even if one speaker was asked to make the final decision, she took her interlocutor's preference into consideration (Pair 1: CZ1: *Recommend? Aaa, OK, would you like to walk more, or relax more?*). Rejecting the option was conveyed through polite expressions (Pair 2: CZ2: *I think it's really good but maybe also can we visit Shakespeare's house? It's close? I don't know*), or wordplay (Pair 3: PL3: *In Great Britain a small place? (...). That's a concept!*). To indicate mutual agreement, speakers used various linguistic means such as direct informal suggestion (Pair 2: PL2: *Yeah, So, let's go to London*), the modal verb *should*, and repetition of *OK* (Pair 1: CZ1: *OK, so then I think we should go there*, PL1: *OK*, CZ1: *OK*).

Similar to the LaRa session, all participants listened to each other carefully, did not interrupt when their interlocutor was speaking, and were polite to each other. Their attitude was positive as they were open to mutual interaction. Again, their engagement in the task was noticeable.

5. Discussion

The results of the study show that the level of intelligibility was high irrespective of the mode. In the LaRa session and the ELF session, participants solved the negotiation task, discussed the options, interacted with each other, and understood each other's arguments. This may have been connected with the fact that the topics chosen in the course of the research were not very demanding since they related to leisure activities. Negotiation based on expert knowledge or specific topics might have given slightly different results. Intelligibility and negotiation strategies were determined by careful language choices, certain communication strategies, and intercultural communicative competence. Communication strategies were similar in the two sessions. Most

commonly used were *non-verbal strategies*, *backchannelling*, *repetition*, and *fillers*. *Unfilled pauses*, and *appeal for assistance* were present in the LaRa session. In the ELF session, *code-switching* was used. *Non-verbal components* created a positive atmosphere (eye contact, smiling, etc.). In retrospective comments, speakers said that sitting face-to-face, facial expressions, and gestures helped them do the task successfully. ICC was vital in the decision-making process since values such as politeness, openness, and respect played a major role. The positive attitude of the speakers and their awareness of intelligibility were contributory factors in reaching a compromise in both modes.

The study expands Bulatović's et al. (2019) research on LaRa and ELF. This earlier study showed that the mean of intelligibility between Slovenes listening to Croatian speakers was significantly high in both modes. This research found similar results, but with reference to different nationalities and different skills. It indicates that in oral communication the level of intelligibility between Polish and Czech students was high irrespective of the mode. Firstly, this could have been caused by the interactive nature of the task which forced participants to speak. In addition, intelligibility in the LaRa session may have been caused by proximity of the two languages, whereas high scores in the ELF session resulted from the fact that English is taught at schools and universities. Finally, CSs and ICC played an important role in achieving intelligibility as they fostered successful interaction and contributed to creating a positive setting.

6. Conclusion

The aim of the study was to examine the effectiveness of Polish and Czech as a *lingua receptiva* (LaRa) in comparison with English as a *lingua franca* (ELF) between Polish and Czech students when preparing semi-spontaneous dialogues. As this was a pilot study with only six students the results should be treated with caution and more detailed investigation is required. The findings do however show that the level of intelligibility in oral communication was high in both modes. The results show that CSs as well as the positive attitude towards partners, and towards both modes of communication contributed to effective negotiation. The role of CSs and ICC should not be underestimated when communicating in intercultural environments and employing various multilingual modes. Awareness of CSs and ICC ought to be given more attention in language education as it might be useful in intercultural contexts, especially when facing the challenge of negotiation, decision-making, problem-solving, etc.

This study addressed the question of multilingual modes. The use of LaRa (in addition to ELF) is advocated by the European Commission and the LaRa training is promoted (ten Thije et al., 2017). Courses could focus on differences

and similarities between language combinations, and should teach how to apply interactive devices for successful interaction, such as explicit negotiation about the language mode, or repair patterns (Blees & ten Thije, 2015:11). In some countries, LaRa courses exist⁵. They are run in different languages and focus on linguistics, literature, and language acquisition. This pilot study suggests that implementing Polish, Czech LaRa courses may be of use. Additionally, in retrospective comments some participants admitted that they felt more comfortable and at ease in the LaRa session than in the ELF session. Therefore, it might be assumed that taking advantage of various multilingual modes could foster effective intercultural communication in multilingual Europe, enhance the pragmatic awareness of language users, and their positive attitude towards intercultural interactions. As claimed by ten Thije (2014: 125) "the challenge of multilingualism in Europe today is to look beyond the mastery of more languages at a (near) native level and search for solutions that enable multilingual understanding by making use of all the communicative modes and linguistic competencies available in a given situation".

REFERENCES

- Bahtina-Jantsikene D. (2013), *Mind Your Languages: Lingua Receptiva in Estonian-Russian Communication*. Utrecht: Utrecht University Repository.
- Beerkens R. (2010), *Receptive Multilingualism as a Language Mode in the Dutch-German Border Area*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.
- Blees G., ten Thije, J. D. (2015), *Receptive multilingualism and awareness*, (in:) J. Cenoz et al. (eds.), *Language Awareness and Multilingualism*. Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, pp.1–13.
- Braunmüller K. (2008), *On the Relevance of Receptive Multilingualism in a Globalised World: Theory, History and Evidence from Today's Scandinavia*. Hamburg: SBF.
- Bulatović S., Schüppert A., Gooskens Ch. (2019), *Receptive multilingualism versus ELF: How well do Slovenes understand Croatian compared to Croatian speakers' English?* "JELF", 8 (1), pp. 37–65.
- Byram M. (1997), *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Canale M., Swain M. (1980), *Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing*. "Applied Linguistics", 1, pp. 1–47.

⁵ Such a course can be found in here: <https://students.uu.nl/en/hum/lingua-receptiva> (accessed on 29.11.2020).

- Færch C., Kasper G. (1984), *Two ways of defining communication strategies*. "Language Learning. A Journal of Research in Language Studies", 34 (1), pp. 45–63.
- Golubović J. (2016), *Mutual intelligibility in the Slavic language area*. Groningen. University of Groningen.
- Gooskens Ch., van Heuven V.J., Golubović J., Schüppert A., Swarte F., Voigt S. (2017), *Mutual intelligibility between closely related languages in Europe*. "International Journal of Multilingualism", 15 (2), pp. 1–25.
- Haugen E. (1966), *Semicommunication: the language gap in Scandinavia*. "Sociological Inquiry", 36 (2), pp. 280–297.
- Hua T.K., Nor N.F.M., Jaradat M.N. (2012), *Communication Strategies Among EFL Students - An Examination Of Frequency Of Use And Types Of Strategies Used*. "GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies", 12 (3), pp. 831–848.
- Hülmbauer C., Böhringer H., Seidlhofer B. (2008), *Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication*. "Synergies. Europe", 3, pp. 25–36.
- Hülmbauer C. (2014), *A matter of reception: ELF and LaRa compared*. "Applied Linguistics Review", 5 (1), pp. 273–295.
- Jenkins J. (2009), *English as a Lingua Franca: interpretations and attitudes*. "World Englishes", 28 (2), pp. 200–207.
- Jenkins J. (2011), *Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university*. "Journal of Pragmatics", 43 (4), pp. 926–936.
- Krysztofowicz D. (2017), *Lingua receptiva – pojęcie oraz perspektywy dla komunikacji interkulturowej* (in.) V. Kamas et al. (eds.), *Język w Poznaniu 7*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys, pp. 89–98.
- Mariani L. (2010), *Communication strategies – Learning and teaching how to manage oral interaction*. Italy: Learning Paths.
- Marx N. (2012), *Reading across the Germanic languages: Is equal access just wishful thinking?* "International Journal of Bilingualism", 16 (4), pp. 463–483.
- Rehbein J., ten Thije J. D., Verschik A. (2012), *Lingua receptiva (LaRa) – remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism*. "International Journal of Bilingualism", 16 (3), pp. 248–264.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011), *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sloboda M., Nábělková M. (2013), *Receptive multilingualism in 'monolingual' media: managing the presence of Slovak on Czech websites*. "International Journal of Multilingualism", 10 (2), pp. 196–213.
- Steciąg M. (2019), *"What is the best language for Eastern Europe?" Lingua receptiva as a new approach in Slavic intercommunication research*. "Slavia Centralis", 2, pp. 85–95.

- Steciąg M. (2020), *Lingua Receptiva: the Map and the Territory*. "Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski", XI (2), pp. 487–497.
- ten Thije J. D. (2014), *The effectiveness of Lingua Receptiva (LaRa) in multilingual communication – Editorial*. "Applied Linguistics Review", 5 (1), pp. 125–129.
- ten Thije J. D., Gooskens Ch., Daems F., Cornips L., Smits M., (2017), *Lingua Receptiva. Position paper on the European Commission's Skills Agenda*. "European Journal of Applied Linguistics", 5 (1), pp. 141–146.
- Tarone E. (1981), *Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy*. "TESOL Quarterly", 15 (3), pp. 285–295.
- Voegelin Ch. F., Harris Z. S. (1951), *Methods for determining intelligibility among dialects of national languages*. "Proceedings of the American Philological Society", 95 (3), pp. 322– 329.
- Willems G. M. (1987), *Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching*. "System", 15 (3), pp. 351–364.

NETOGRAPHY:

- Bulatović S. (2014), *Lingua franca vs. lingua receptiva. Does English always work better?* retrieved from: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/LINGUA-FRANCA-VS-.LINGUA-RECEPTIVA-%3A-DOES-ENGLISH-Bulatovi%C4%87/bfe024bc5078c48666675c4d2c00bf4e71cf01f4> [Accessed on 19.12.2019]
- Council Resolution of 21 November 2008 on a European strategy for multilingualism c_32020081216en00010003.pdf (europa.eu) [Accessed on 12.02.2021]
- Informatory – CKE: *język angielski* [Accessed on 12.02.2021]
- LARA course (Utrecht University) <https://students.uu.nl/en/hum/lingua-receptiva> [Accessed on 19.03.2020]
- MICRela: <http://www.let.rug.nl/gooskens/project/?p=home> [Accessed on 12.02.2021]
- New Matura Success Pre-Intermediate (Pearson) http://pm.malopolska.pl/joomla/pliki/1112/zestawy_maturalne_success_pre-inter.pdf [Accessed on 11.11.2019]
- Official site of the research project: <https://ecolapra.eu> [Accessed on 14.06.2020]

Received: 03.12.2020

Revised: 09.05.2021

ACRONYMS:

CSs – COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

CZ1, CZ2, CZ3 – CZECH 1, CZECH 2, CZECH 3

ELF – ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA

ICC – INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

LaRa – LINGUA RECEPTIVA

PL1, PL2, PL3 – POLISH 1, POLISH 2, POLISH 3,

S1 – SPEAKER 1

S2 – SPEAKER 2

APPENDIX:

TRANSCRIPTS – LARA

Pair 1	
PL1	Hm, czyli mamy do wyboru kino, albo galerię... I gdzie byś chciała pójść?
CZ1	Já bych byla pro kino, a ty?
PL1	To ja bym chciała pójść do galerii...
CZ1	Aha. A do které galerie?
PL1	Hmm do naszej zielonogórskiej, żeby ją pokazać.
CZ1	Uhm. Dobře. Aha.
PL1	A do kina na jaki film?
CZ1	Mě by zajímalo v kině, nějaký polský film.
PL1	Hmm...czy poleciałabym jakiś polski film?
CZ1	Uhm. Nějaký polský film s nějakou známou herečkou.
PL1	Hmm, hmm i teraz film, który jest grany w kinie, teraz obecnie...? Polski...?
CZ1	Uhm, uhm, uhm...
PL1	To ja bym chyba wolała pójść na film zagraniczny.
CZ1	Aha. Dobře. Tak myslíš, že bysme šly do kina, nebo jakou tady galerii? Je to spíš modern galerie nebo spíš klasický nějaký...
PL1	Myslę, że za galerią przemawia to, że gdybyśmy poszły w Zielonej Górze... [gestures], to ta galeria poniekąd pokazałyby nam część Zielonej Góry, co jest w Zielonej Górze, jaki, jaka jest sztuka w Zielonej Górze. Za to... myslę, że w kinie bawilibyśmy się równie dobrze [CZ1 nods].Yyy, aaa jaki film byśmy wybrały?
CZ1	No, tak může být i anglický, pokud chceš.
PL1	Tak..., może być.
CZ1	A anglický dabovaný, nebo s titulky?
PL1	Czy z yyy napisami yyyy czy yyy z dubbingiem?
CZ1	S dabingem?
PL1	Obojętnie [CZ1 uhm], bez różnicy [CZ1 uhm], nie ma to znaczenia.
CZ1	A šly bychom odpoledne nebo?
PL1	A inaczej?
CZ1	Po obědě nebo večer?
PL1	Aaa [nods] rozumiem, wieczorem, myslę, że wieczorem.
CZ1	Večer. A to nebudou mít asi otevřeno.
PL1	Nie, galerie nie są tak długo otwarte. Zgadza się, czyli kino jest lepszym pomysłem.
CZ1	Uhm, Dobře, tak půjdeme do kina?
PL1	Dobrze!
CZ1	Bezva.

Table 3: Transcript: Pair 1, LaRa.

The use of Polish and Czech as a lingua receptiva in comparison with English as...

Pair 2	
PL2	Yyy, może pójdziemy do kina dzisiaj?
CZ2	Do kina!? Do Kina? [face expression – unhappy] Já mám radši umění [shakes her head].
PL2	Dlaczego? [frowns].
CZ2	No to je historické víc. A kino je vždycky moderní, to je...
PL2	Hm...
CZ2	Nebo na co bychom šly do toho kina?
PL2	Yyy na jakís film animowany.
CZ2	Já radši do muzea bych šla.
PL2	Do muzeum? [CZ2 uhm]. Ale mnie bołą nogi.
CZ2	Nohy!? Anebo bychom šly nejdřív do kina a potom do muzea [uses gestures].
PL2	...Wciąż mnie będą boleć nogi.
CZ2	Aha, budou tě bolet nohy... Mě zas oči [points to her eyes], já mám brýle, tak mě budou... Nevím.
PL2	Może usiądziemy w pierwszym rzędzie?
CZ2	A v kolik bys šla?
PL2	...
CZ2	V kolik hodin, do toho kina?
PL2	W kolik?
CZ2	Hodin.
PL2	Chodzi?
CZ2	V pět nebo v šest? [points to her hand].
PL2	O godzinie? o godzinie której?
CZ2	Uhm.
PL2	Wieczorem.
CZ2	To znamená? V sedm, v osm?
PL2	Hmm, o siódmej?
CZ2	V osm? To by možná šlo, ale nechceš se mnou nejdřív jít do té galerie? Je tam krásná výstava. Renoir.
PL1	Aaa, aaa, ty przyjechałaś do Polski, chciałyś zobaczyć coś ...polskiego.
CZ2	Renoir.
PL2	Renoir.
CZ2	Renoir.
PL2	Dobrze [both laugh], OK [head towards CZ2].
CZ2	OK, tak bychom mohly být [points to her watch] v pět v galerii, potom bychom šly do kina [gestures].
PL2	[...gives an approving look].
CZ2	Na ten animovaný?
PL2	OK, żeby odpoczęły nam nogi [smiles].
CZ2	Jo, to by bylo parádní.
PL2	OK, Super.

Table 4: Transcript: Pair 2, LaRa.

Pair 3	
PL3	To gdzie się wybierzemy tego wieczora [smiles]?
CZ3	Já bych šla do kina, protože jsem unavená, tam si člověk sedne a jenom kouká na film. Je to nenáročné, takže kino.
PL3	Kino? A może tam za dużo ludzi, za głośno. Može byśmy skorzystały z oferty muzeum? Trochę się wyciszymy.
CZ3	Tak možná trochu jo, ale zase tam je málo lidí a člověk by měl něco o těch obrazech vědět, trochu intelektuálně pracovat a na to jsem unavená, takže já bych radši šla do kina.

PL3	Ale w muzeum są też interaktywne kody QR [CZ3 aha], możemy przeczytać w swoich językach opis obrazów, przypomnieć sobie, spotkać się tak na żywo ze sztuką, a nie z takim sztucznym, hollywoodzkim produktem.
CZ3	Aha, A je tam taky dětský koutek? [PL hm], Můžeme si tam hrát?
PL3	Yyy, „dziecki kątek“???
CZ3	V dětském koutku.
PL3	Dziecięcy kącik?
CZ3	Aha! Kde bychom mohly dělat něco z modelíny [gestures], nebo malovat [gestures, painting]?
PL3	My będziemy z modelíny w muzeum?
CZ3	No! [face expression showing enthusiasm].
PL3	To by cię przekonało?
CZ3	No [nods], no, no, no.
PL3	Możemy poszukać takiego kącika [both laugh] w muzeum.
CZ3	Dobře!
PL3	Czyli zgadasz się, tak?
CZ3	Dobře [nods excitedly], tak můžeme jít do muzea.
PL3	No to super.

Table 5: Transcript: Pair 3, LaRa.

TRANSCRIPTS – ELF

Pair 1	
CZ1	OK, we have here three places [points to places].
PL1	Yes.
CZ1	Which we can visit and have you ever been there? [looks at PL1].
PL1	No, [shakes her head].
CZ1	Do you know the places? Any of the place [points to the places].
PL1	I know but I don't be there, I haven't.
CZ1	Aha, OK.
PL1	I heard.
CZ1	A, OK, I have been to all the places, I know them [smiles].
PL1	Wow! [looks at CZ1 and smiles].
CZ1	Are you interested in any?
PL1	This place [points].
CZ1	Seaside?
PL1	This place is nice.
CZ1	Uh-huh.
PL1	Sunny [points to the place].
CZ1	Yeah, It's really [gestures] for fun, for relaxing.
PL1	Where is this [gestures]?
CZ1	It's a seaside and it's to the south of England. It's Plymouth and all these, it's a seaside, but a sea is very cold, so [gestures with her right hand indicating direction].
PL1	It is centrum [points with her right hand], yes?
CZ1	Yes, this is London and the Houses of Parliament and Big Ben and the River Thames, and also some bridges and this is very typical English architecture, I think it's a countryside, English countryside Um [left hand's gesture]. This is expensive place to go [points], this one is not that expensive [points], but it's more relaxing, it's nothing all about history [gestures], this one, that would be a really getting know some kind of English history, architecture, so depending what you are interested in.

The use of Polish and Czech as a lingua receptiva in comparison with English as...

PL1	[touches her face with her right hand, thinking] I think this one [pointing] is interesting [CZ1 nods and says um] or this one, so please [points at CZ1 with her left hand], decide.
CZ1	Recommend? Aaa, OK, would you like to walk more, or relax more?
PL1	Relax more [smiling].
CZ1	OK, so then I think we should go there [laughs].
PL1	OK [laughs].
CZ1	OK.

Table 6: Transcript: Pair 1, ELF.

Pair 2	
PL2	Do you think we can go to London [CZ2 to London?] for our English trip? [looks at the speaker, smiles, makes eye contact].
CZ2	I think it's good, I never been there, I think it's really good but maybe also can we visit Shakespeare's house? It's close? I don't know.
PL2	But we can see Shakespeare's theatre [points to the picture] in London, yeah? The Globe.
CZ2	It's better maybe, what else can we see in London?
PL2	The Thames, the River Thames.
CZ2	Yees [nods], maybe Big Ben.
PL2	British Gallery.
CZ2	The British Gallery, yes, I love, I'd like to go [laughs] there.
PL2	The Tower of London, OK I pick the best place. Well, the Shakespeare's house sounds very good.
CZ2	Maybe it will be interesting, maybe because of, you know, culture and literature, but I will prefer London
PL2	Yeah, but, yes [smiles, approves].
CZ2	I think it's the most, maybe the food there is a little bit expensive [a gesture showing <i>expensive</i>] but, maybe...
PL2	Yeah, and the trip will be very expensive because of the hotels.
CZ2	You think?
PL2	Yes, but.
CZ2	I don't know the price of hotels, so I don't know, but maybe it will be a little bit expensive.
PL2	So, maybe we can make a very short trip, but to London.
CZ2	Very short, like 2-3 days, maybe.
PL2	Yeah, So let's go to London.
CZ2	Yes, I agree.
PL2	OK.

Table 7: Transcript: Pair 2, ELF.

Pair 3	
PL3	We are going to Great Britain. Which place would you like to visit?
CZ3	I would like to visit some small place in Great Britain.
PL3	In Great Britain a small place?
CZ3	Yes.
PL3	That's a concept!
CZ3	This is small place, for example, place on the beach, maybe just we two.
PL3	Aha, huh, huh, huh I think that beach there is also in Poland and we have here such places, maybe something more cultural, like the city of great writer, Homer, for example, or maybe London.
CZ3	Aha, London, um, so OK [hesitating, rocking on the chair].
PL3	You'd rather rest, yes?

CZ3	I want rather to rest and to go to beach, but we can do just a trip to London, because for me London is a bit the city of many tourists and many things to do and we can't rest.
PL3	We can't rest there?
CZ3	There [confirms] yes, [nodding].
PL3	We could look for more, more quite places there in London, maybe park, there is great beautiful park there, so I suggest maybe [laughs] London is a better choice, it's the best known place in Great Britain, coming to Great Britain without seeing London it's not good idea, I think.
CZ3	OK, so we can go to London, but we can spend few days at the beach in beach I don't know, um, for example two or three days on the beach and the rest of the week we can spend in London.
PL3	Yes I think, don't know how long our trip will be but if it's weekend.
CZ3	10, 10 days.
PL3	OK, great, great idea, 10 days we can go to each place, choosing in the exercise.

Table 8: Transcript: Pair 3, ELF.

PICTURES



Figure 1: Pictures – LaRa.⁶

⁶ Images retrieved from New Matura Success Pre-Intermediate (Pearson) http://pm.malopolska.pl/joomla/pliki/1112/zestawy_maturalne_success_pre-inter.pdf (accessed on 11.11.2019).



Figure 2: Pictures – ELF.⁷

⁷ Images retrieved from New Matura Success Pre-Intermediate (Pearson) http://pm.malopolska.pl/joomla/pliki/1112/zestawy_maturalne_success_pre-inter.pdf (accessed on 11.11.2019).