Judit BORSZÉKI

THE PRINCIPLES OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING REPRESENTED IN AN EU TRAINING TOOL FOR BORDER GUARDS II.

A MODERN NYELVPEDAGÓGIA ELVEINEK MEGJELENÉSE EGY UNIÓS HATÁRRENDÉSZETI TANANYAGBAN II.

In the first part of the paper we gave an overview of the basic concepts and models related to contemporary theories on communication, language teaching and specific purpose language use, underlying the practices of teaching languages for special purposes (LSP) as discussed in the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and the works of prominent linguists. We identified the general competences language users need to develop for successful communication, the various factors figuring in language interaction, the types of language activities and the key differences between languages for general and specific purposes. The second part focuses on how the aforementioned concepts of teaching languages for specific purposes are manifested in the new e-learning tool for teaching the special language of border policing and tries to map the sociolects of English for Border Policing and whether they appear in the tool. It also suggests ways in which the tool can be used in Hungary.

A cikk első részében a szerző vázolta a kommunikációval, a nyelvoktatással és a szakmai nyelvhasználattal kapcsolatos, a szakmai nyelvoktatás gyakorlatában megjelenő, a Közös Európai Referenciakeretben (KER) és a legjelentősebb nyelvészek munkáiban szereplő modern elméleteket és modelleket. Meghatározta a nyelvhasználók esetében fejlesztendő, a sikeres kommunikációhoz szükséges kompetenciákat, a nyelvi interakció különféle tényezőit, a nyelvi tevékenységek típusait, valamint az általános és a szakmai nyelv között fellelhető fő különbségeket. A tanulmány második része azt vizsgálja, hogy a szakmai nyelv oktatásában szerepet játszó fenti fogalmak hogyan jelennek meg egy, a határrendészeti szaknyelvet oktató új elektronikus tananyagban. Kísérletet tesz az angol határrendészeti szaknyelv változatainak definiálására, megpróbálja meghatározni, hogy ezek fellelhetőek-e az anyagban, végül javaslatot tesz az oktatóeszköz magyarországi felhasználásának módjaira.

INTRODUCTION

In the first part of the paper we gave an overview of the basic concepts and models related to contemporary theories on communication, language teaching and specific purpose language use, underlying the practices of teaching languages for special purposes (LSP) as discussed in the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and the works of prominent linguists. We identified the general competences language users need to develop for successful communication, the various factors figuring in language interaction, the types of language activities and the key differences between languages for general and specific purposes.

In the second part of this paper we will focus on three issues; 1. How are the aforementioned concepts of teaching languages for specific purposes manifested in the new e-learning tool for teaching the special language of border policing? 2. How can we define the sociolects of English for Border Policing? 3 Does this tool represent them?

BASIC ENGLISH FOR BORDER GUARDS AT AIRPORTS

By creating this tool, Frontex wanted to give the opportunity for border guarding staff at airports to develop their skills in English for Border Policing by self-access learning. [1] The interactive CD was meant for those having a basic knowledge of English. The project for its development was launched in 2010 and was led by Training Project Officer Mr Riccardo Proverbio of the Frontex Training Unit and involved experts from 24 EU and Schengen member states and 6 third countries. Hungary was represented by Police Captain Ágnes Markó of the Analysis and Evaluation Department of the Airport Police Directorate, National Police Headquarters. Following several workshops for content and material development and for IT fine tuning, and a year's intensive work [2], the CD was made accessible in the EU and the Schengen area, exclusively for the law enforcement staff.

A guide is available for users in several languages [3], which is very favourable as it makes it possible to avoid cognitive overload often present in e-learning tools, i.e. when mastering the use of the tool itself takes too much time and energy, hindering academic achievement. The material on the CD includes 235 lexical items, 127 phrases, 17 audio (MP3) texts and 24 video clips with and without subtitles and with scripts available. It also offers 5 different types of tasks, 85 in all, with key. The material is divided into four units: *Border Check, Giving Information, Personal Presentation* and *Security Control*. The units are based on the main domains of language activity border guards conduct at airports and on the dialogues reflecting the wide range of situations occurring during border checks carried out according to the principles of Integrated Border Management (minimum checks of bona fide travellers and those having the right to free movement, suspicions and problems leading to thorough checks etc.) Each unit has the same five sections: *Vocabulary, Phrases, Listening texts, Videos* and *Exercises*. Students can check their overall progress by doing revision exercises in the *Assessment* unit.

The *Users' Guide* on the CD suggests that learners first choose a unit and study the related vocabulary (they can read the translation of the phrases and listen to the pronunciation of the English phrase) and memorise it. Then they should listen/ watch the audio/video sequences of dialogues, first trying to understand as much as possible, then proceed to read the scripts or subtitles and look up new words in the glossary if necessary. After memorising the dialogues the learners can test their knowledge with the 'open dialogue' technique, i.e. stopping the recording at a certain point and playing the border guard's role and then comparing their production with the correct solution in the original recording. Finally, they can apply their knowledge in new contexts using various exercises (crosswords, gap-filling, matching, mixed sentences, multiple choice exercises, etc.) with qualitative and quantitative feedback on their performance. Listening and doing the exercises should be regularly repeated to improve the learners' English language skills.

Let us now examine how the recommendations of the CEFR, the aforementioned principles and concepts of applied linguistics and ESP methodology appear in this particular learning tool.

THE LEARNING MATERIAL AND THE CONCEPTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CEFR

The electronic tool aims to develop English language skills necessary for the interactive oral activities most frequently occurring in the work of the given target group of border guards. The discourse featured in the material represents texts whose number in real life is potentially endless but whose content can nevertheless be defined. The dialogues were constructed using the many years' empirical experience border guards gain in their work on a day-to-day basis and were modelled according to the typical domains of language use, focusing on a limited range of border policing vocabulary, i.e. phrases related to activities at airports. Therefore we will consider these dialogues as models that the learners should be

able to produce without help at the end of the learning process and will compare them with the definitions and level descriptions of the CEFR.

Spoken interaction is defined in the CEFR as follows: "In interactive activities the language user acts alternately as speaker and listener with one or more interlocutors so as to construct conjointly, through the negotiation of meaning following the co-operative principle, conversational discourse. Reception and production strategies are employed constantly during interaction." [4] The spoken interactive activities in the CEFR are listed below. We have highlighted the ones that can be found in the e-learning material in question and have defined the situation in which the dialogue takes place:

— *transactions*; (passport and security checks and special situations involved in them: absent/ invalid visa, asylum seeker, traveller without funds, forged passport, prohibited item in luggage etc.)

— *casual conversation;* (two border guards talk about their work)

— informal discussion

— formal discussion

— debate

— *interview*; (interviewing an impostor, border guard giving personal details for studies abroad)

— negotiation

— co-planning

— *practical goal-oriented co-operation* (asking travellers to cooperate in an emergency etc.)

We are going to present three typical dialogues from the CD that, in our opinion, also illustrate the language level, the typical communicative situations and functions of the other audio and video recordings:

DIALOGUE 1

BG = Border Guard   PAX = Passenger

BG: Good Morning!

PAX: Good Morning!

BG: Your passport please!

PAX: Here you are.

BG: Are you here for business or pleasure?

PAX: Pleasure. I'm here for skiing.

BG: How long will you stay?

PAX: About a week.

BG: May I see your hotel reservation please?

PAX: Here you are. I'm staying at the Holiday Inn.

BG: How much money do you have with you?

PAX: € 500.

BG: Show it to me please. OK, thank you. But I can't find a visa in your passport.

PAX: Oh, I'm sorry. It's in my old passport.

BG: I need to see it.

PAX: Just a second.

BG: I see that you have only eight days left on this visa, so please show me your return ticket.

PAX: I have only E-ticket. Here is the copy.

BG: Thank you. Enjoy your stay.

DIALOGUE 2

PAX:	Good morning.
BG:	Good morning. Your passport, please.
PAX:	Here you are.
BG:	May I see your boarding pass and flight ticket?
PAX:	Yes, of course, but I am in a hurry. Could you check it faster?
BG:	The person in this passport doesn't look like you. It says you are 185 cm but you are shorter.
PAX:	Yes, because I was seriously ill.
BG:	When were you born?
PAX:	I was born on... The 1st of May 1980.
BG:	Where were you born?
PAX:	I was born in Krakow, in Poland.
BG:	What are you planning to do in London?
PAX:	I want to find a better job there.
BG:	How old are you?
PAX:	I am 29.
BG:	Are you sure?
PAX:	Yes, I am. I know how old I am.
BG:	You told me that you were born on the 1st of May 1980, it means that you are 30 and not 29. I think that something is wrong with your passport. Please wait here. Someone will come and see you shortly.

DIALOGUE 3

PAX:	Good morning.
BG:	Good morning. Your passport, please.
PAX:	Here you are.
BG:	Your visa expired two weeks ago. It's not valid any more. Do you have any other visa or resident permit?
PAX:	No, I have only this visa.
BG:	I am sorry, but you are not allowed to enter our country without a valid visa. Please wait here. Someone will come and see you shortly.
PAX:	OK.

For the purposes of examining the dialogue models in the tool, the relevant CEFR scales are the ones defining skills needed for overall spoken interaction, goal-oriented co-operation transactions to obtain goods and services, information exchange, interviewing and being interviewed[1] and those related to linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences. [5] The scales are in Appendix 1. The language level of the tool was not defined according to the CEFR categories but we suppose that the term 'Basic English' in the title corresponds to levels A2, B1, and, perhaps in certain

---

[1] [3] Ibid. pp. 74-82

cases to B2. The definitions most relevant for the learning tool have been highlighted. Comparison of the dialogues in the tool (that can be considered as typical representations of discourse produced by border guards at airports) with the CEFR scales brings us to the conclusion that the skills and competences needed in these situations are defined by the CEFR scales and the language proficiency levels needed for the linguistic activity corresponding to the models that represent the linguistic outcome the learners are to achieve mainly correspond to the definitions for levels A2 and B1. (It is important to note that, according to the principles of the level descriptions, the higher levels always include the skills already listed for the lower ones.) It should also be mentioned that, as the dialogues in the learning tool are merely models based on real speech activity, i.e. they were written by the authors of the tool, one of the most characteristic aspects of real spoken interaction, the unexpected, unpredictable element is missing from them. This is also the reason why there are no examples of the use of the related pragmatic and strategic competences (so typical of real communication these models are based on) in them.

By working with the tool and following the user's guide, the learners will mainly develop their receptive competences (reading and listening comprehension), and by doing the exercises they will reproduce parts of the language material. Looking at the descriptors for reception[2], we can clearly ascertain that the users of the e-learning tool mainly need to have competences defined at levels A2 and B1.The illustrative scales with the relevant sections highlighted can be found in Appendix 2.

It is also important to compare the approach reflected in the above mentioned exercises and in the selection of learning material with that of the CEFR, as described in Chapter 6 (Language learning and teaching).[3] Many of the options listed in section 6.2 (The processes of language learning) apply to the tasks helping the users of the tool to acquire knowledge needed to communicate; First of all, the CD ROM is an example of instructional media that users apply in an individual self-instructional mode, by (guided) self-study, pursuing negotiated self-directed objectives, by a combination of presentation, explanations, (drill) exercises and exploitation activities. Learning is facilitated by a combination of conscious learning and sufficient practice to reduce the conscious attention paid to low-level physical skills of speaking and writing. Learners have a direct exposure to authentic use of the target language, to specially selected spoken utterances and written texts ('intelligible input') and by direct participation in specially devised and constructed tasks ('comprehensible output'). As for the role of texts, learners are expected to learn from spoken and written texts by simple exposure, ensuring that new material is intelligible by inference from verbal context, with comprehension monitored and ensured by exercises. Learners also produce texts; reproduce spoken utterances, do written exercises, partial dictations; Learners are expected or required to learn from by simple participation in tasks and activities planned as to goals, input and outcomes. Teaching lexis is of key importance for this tool. Learners are expected to develop their vocabulary in a variety of ways, also listed in the CEFR, such as simple exposure to words and fixed expressions used in authentic spoken and written texts, through inclusion in context and thematic (bilingual) word lists, recycling in exercises and exploitation activities, etc. The authors selected key words and phrases in thematic areas required for the achievement of communicative tasks relevant to learner needs and also (authentic) spoken texts to teach the terminology they contain. Learners may develop their *grammatical competence* inductively, by exposure to grammatical material in authentic texts as encountered. F*ormal exercises* are used, as mentioned in section 6.4.7.8 of the CEFR: gap-filling, sentence construction, as well as filling in crossword puzzles, i.e. giving words and phrases corresponding to definitions, matching phrases and multiple choice answers. Pronunciation skills are developed by exposure to and imitation of authentic spoken utterances of audio and video-recorded speakers. (It should be noted that the speakers are non-native speakers of English in most cases, which helps the learners practise a real-life skill they

---

[2] [5] Ibid. pp. 133, 134, 143
[3] [3] Ibid. pp. 131-156

need, i.e. understanding various foreign accents in English.) Learners' orthography is developed by exposure to written texts (the transcripts of the dialogues and the lists of words and phrases) and through the exercises where they need to type in their answers. The development of the learner's *sociolinguistic competence* is assumed to be transferable from the learner's experience by exposure to authentic language used appropriately in its social setting and by analysing and explaining errors. Incidentally, errors and mistakes are considered as a natural phenomenon, an integral part of this type of self-access tool. Detailed feedback after each set of exercises helps the learner analyse and correct them.

In summary, we could say that, as mentioned earlier, the CEFR does not consider its task to promote any particular language teaching methodology but the exercises reflect the options corresponding to the communicative approach to language acquisition.

The question may arise why the development of grammatical competence does not appear explicitly in the learning material. One reason for that could be that the users must already have the necessary grammar knowledge to be able to reproduce the dialogues. The other reason could be that it is not the main aim of this particular learning process but it will inevitably appear during vocabulary practice, because the knowledge of syntax, verb structures, etc. is essential to solve certain tasks. Also, the range of grammatical phenomena in the dialogues is limited, and certain language teaching approaches would consider a great part of these structures as lexical items. In many cases, they are needed to enable the speaker to produce polite phrases and are related to the development of sociolinguistic competence. These grammatical structures are also typical of certain speech situations, which the tool develops by not accepting grammatically correct answers in certain exercises if they are not right from a sociolinguistic aspect and by explaining in the detailed feedback to the learner why the answer is not appropriate stylistically.

The fact that it mainly develops receptive and reproductive skills is not the fault of the learning material. This type of self-study tool has its limitations. We like to call it interactive, but by this we can only mean that the learners are not merely passive spectators of the material; they conduct an interaction with the tool. Generally speaking, they respond to questions provided by the programme, i.e. react to stimuli after understanding and memorising a certain amount of input.

The communicative approach to (e.g. teacher-assisted) classroom language learning defines three phases of the teaching-learning process, called:

PRESENTATION
PRACTICE
PRODUCTION

The users of such e-learning tools will cover the first two phases. During practice they can solve what we call pre-communicative, structured tasks, i.e. conduct an activity also called scaffolding. In our case, the exercises involved in this phase focus on helping the learners memorise the special vocabulary for border policing and are very efficient for this purpose. They, however, do not provide an opportunity for the learners to finish the process within the framework of the tool, i.e. to use the acquired 'passive' knowledge independently, in a real interaction.

SPECIAL PURPOSE COMMUNICATION IN THE E-LEARNING TOOL

Comparing the language material with the descriptions of various levels of linguistic competence might be made difficult by the fact that, as mentioned earlier, the CEFR does not provide scales for professional language use.

As stated in the summary of the first part of this paper, emphasizing that it will need to be proved, following extensive and thorough research and discourse analysis, we can assume – based on empirical experience – that English for Law Enforcement and within it English for Border Policing (EBP) do exist as languages for special purposes. Border guards and other officials involved in border policing activities constitute a discourse community of EBP, which shows distributional differences in terminology, communicative functions and other language elements as compared to standard English.

Based on the criteria presented by Heltai [6] and already referred to in the first part of this paper, we can outline prototypical and peripheral communication in the language for law enforcement (border policing). We should consider that prototypical communication in this field is conducted between professional people (border policing experts), in a language for specific purposes (LSP), whereas the interaction taking place in the models that the dialogues in the FRONTEX e-learning tool are based on is usually conducted between a professional and a non-professional, in a language that is only partly for specific purposes, representing another sociolect as defined by Heltai:

Sender (of message)	Receiver	Topic	Language
professional	professional	professional	LSP
professional	non-professional	professional	LSP
professional	non-professional	professional	partly LSP
non-professional	professional or non-professional	professional	not LSP

Table 1. Possible combinations of factors in the varieties of the use of LSP. (Translated by Judit Borszéki).[4]

An example of the former could be a scientific paper published in a law enforcement periodical as follows:

Prototypical communication in a language for specific purposes (LSP): written communication, e.g. in English for law enforcement/ border policing

— Sender of message: law enforcement (e.g. border guarding) professional
— Receiver of message: law enforcement (e.g. border guarding) professional
— Topic of message: a problem related to police science
— Function of message: referential; cognition
— Mode of message: written
— Style of message: formal
— Language of message:
   o Grammar: significant distributional (e.g. syntactic) differences as compared to standard language
   o Vocabulary: specifically defined law enforcement (border policing) and possibly legal terminology and general academic vocabulary
   o Phraseology: typical, stereotypical academic expressions

The amount of corpora presented in the e-learning tool is, of course, not sufficient to define a particular type of communicating in an LSP but if we take the real-life situations they are meant to resemble, the experts who created them and the potential users of the tool as a basis, we can suppose that the language activities of border guards who conduct

---

[4] [5] Ibid. p. 39

e.g. border checks and communicate with passengers crossing state borders can be considered as communication in a peripheral LSP, which can be outlined as follows:

Peripheral special purpose communication: oral communication in EBP

— Sender of message: border guard
— Receiver of message: passenger
— Topic of message: professional (entry clearance)
— Function of message: directive (conative) and referential elements
— Mode of message: spoken
— Style of message: formal
— Language of message:
  o Grammar: standard language with a few distributional differences
  o Vocabulary: partly EBP, only a few items of terminology
  o Phraseology: bound collocations

The dialogues in the e-learning tool seem to sustain the remark mentioned in the first part of this paper that in this type of peripheral communication in EBP the use of the directive function is more frequent than in standard oral communication. A larger ratio of the phatic and referential functions can also be observed.

The situations that are closely related to their work and thus contain language for specific purposes (LSP) for border guards, represent a general-purpose language context for the passengers and can be found in any elementary-level EFL textbook in units related to topics like 'Travel' and 'Services' or language functions such as 'Asking for information, directions or help'. These situations also contain a kind of professional vocabulary which, thanks to international travelling becoming more and more widespread, is understood by non-professionals, too, but which — although it can also be found in other contexts — is of lower occurrence in standard language. The differences between distributional ratios are also manifest in the fact that an average speaker does not frequently use these words and expressions in spoken production at A2 or B1 levels of language proficiency. In the dialogues in the e-learning tool, too, it is usually the border guard who says them, whereas the passenger only needs to understand them.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper examined the models used in the Frontex e-learning tool *Basic English for Border Guards at Airports* from two viewpoints; On the one hand, as a collection of corpora representing a type of peripheral usage of English for Law Enforcement and for Border Policing, with the help of which we can investigate the characteristics of this sociolect and the needs of professionals conducting communication in the speech acts they represent. On the other hand, we looked at them as language learning material and established that reproducing these texts requires various competences corresponding to the communication domains and skills descriptors of the A2 and B1 levels as defined by the CEFR.

We also examined what these competences are and whether the e-learning tool is suitable for developing them. We established that (among the competences needed in real communication and also represented in the model-situations) its users will practice listening comprehension skills and the sociolinguistic, pragmatic and strategic competences involved in them, whereas, by repeating sentences in the listening exercises they will develop their orthoepic competence and by memorising the words and expressions needed in the modelled situations they will expand their lexical competence, which is the main focus of the tool. Also, while doing the exercises, they will use skills not necessary in the modelled speech acts, such as reading comprehension skills and, by writing (typing) the lexical items to be learnt several times, their orthographic competence.

If we examine the content of the tool, it is obvious that the authors conducted an appropriate, very thorough needs analysis, which is essential for teaching LSP. It is a great advantage that the material was compiled by border guards with extensive knowledge of the subject matter. The dialogues are not recorded examples from real-life encounters but were written for learning purposes. Still, they can be considered as textbook-versions of authentic conversations that have been stripped of the redundancies of 'live' language and present the most frequent expressions that occur in real situations.

The features of this type of learning tool make it a ubiquitous medium which can be used any time. The learners can move ahead at their own pace, in their own learning style. As the programme gives instant feedback, they can easily monitor their own progress. Motivation is increased by the material being comprehensive, varied, its structure obvious and clear, the user platform aesthetic and easily manageable. The tool also comprises features (word search, video clips with and without subtitles, opening several windows at the same time) that printed books do not have.

The exercises correspond to the best practices of contemporary language teaching methodology. They are varied and efficient, although with respect to the recommended order of working with them we need to note that, according to the communicative approach to language teaching, it is not advised to study glossaries, lists of words before reading or listening to the texts in which they occur; lexical items should be presented in a context, even at beginner level.

As mentioned earlier, the tasks in the learning tool are structured, pre-communicative ones that give good opportunity for the learners to practise the target vocabulary but this should be followed by the next phase, i.e. the independent use of what has been learnt. Fortunately, the border guards that constitute the target group of the tool can make this happen during their everyday work. In their case, it is the achievements in real-life communication (i.e. whether they reach their pragmatic and other purposes) that will show whether they have really managed to develop their language skills. These achievements may have a very strong motivational force and, the feeling that they can cooperate with passengers more easily and efficiently will lead to the learners' more confident professional presence. However, proper linguistic feedback and the professional correction of mistakes can only be provided by an English teacher, in simulations resembling real-life situations that also involve the essential unexpected elements, as mentioned earlier.

Thus, the Frontex e-learning language tool should, by all means, be applied in training border guards, including the Hungarian police staff carrying out border policing duties but should be supplemented by oral practice conducted with the help of a teacher of EBP, e.g. at short, intensive 'classroom' or blended (classroom + online) courses. The CD can easily be adapted to be used by those working at land border crossing points, too. It could be implemented in the English section of the common basic module of the new curriculum introduced at the Hungarian National University of Public Service as of September 2013 and it could be a model for a similar electronic tool for the teaching/ learning of English for Law Enforcement.

According to the intention of its authors, the Frontex Basic English Language Tool was also meant to serve as the starting point for a device covering the next language proficiency level. In 2012, using experience gained from the basic tool, the intermediate English language tool was created and it was implemented in the second semester of 2013, following a pilot phase and the training of national multipliers. Also, the Basic English Language Tool for air and maritime crews was developed in 2012 and 2013. [5]

The EBP training of border guards who are or will be involved in international cooperation is still of major importance. In order to create suitable learning tools and training models, conducting needs analysis related to their education is as essential as the corpus-based, detailed and comprehensive analysis and investigation of the LSP and terminology used in border policing.

---

[5] [2] Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] *Basic English for Border Guards at Airports, Introduction.* – Warsaw: Frontex Training Unit, 2011. (electronic teaching material on CD)

[2] *Training in English communication for BG*
http://aula.frontex.europa.eu/?act=projects&act2=show&project_id=4332 (Downloaded 07.10. 2013)

[3] *Frontex alapszintű angol nyelvképzési CD eszköz határrendészek részére, Használati utasítás.* –Warsaw: Frontex Training Unit, 2011. (electronic file)

[4] *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* –Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, 2001. p.73
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_en.pdf (Downloaded 27.07. 2013)

[5] *Manual for relating Language Examinations to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.* – Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, 2009.
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/ManualRevision-proofread-FINAL_en.pdf (Downloaded 07.10. 2013)

[6] HELTAI, P.: *Szakmai kommunikáció és szaknyelv.* –In. Dr. SILYE, M. (ed.): PORTA LINGUA - Utak és perspektívák a hazai szaknyelvoktatásban és kutatásban, -Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem, 2006. -p. 40 –ISSN 1785-2420

APPENDIX 1: DESCRIPTION OF COMPETENCES NEEDED FOR SPOKEN INTERACTION ACCORDING TO THE CEFR

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. –Strasbourg.: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, 2001. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_en.pdf

OVERALL SPOKEN INTERACTION (p.74)

B2	Can use the language fluently, accurately and effectively on a wide range of general, academic, vocational or leisure topics, marking clearly the relationships between ideas. Can communicate spontaneously with good grammatical control without much sign of having to restrict what he/she wants to say, adopting a level of formality appropriate to the circumstances. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction, and sustained relationships with native speakers quite possible without imposing strain on either party. Can highlight the personal significance of events and experiences, account for and sustain views clearly by providing relevant explanations and arguments.

AZ NKE HHK TUDOMÁNYOS FOLYÓIRATA

TÁRSADALOMTUDOMÁNY

HADTUDOMÁNYI SZEMLE

Judit **BORSZÉKI**

Budapest, 2014.
7. évfolyam 2. szám

B1	*Can communicate with some confidence on familiar routine and non-routine matters related to his/her interests and professional field. Can exchange, check and confirm information, deal with less routine situations and explain why something is a problem.* Can express thoughts on more abstract, cultural topics such as films, books, music etc. Can exploit a wide range of simple language to deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling. *Can* enter unprepared into conversation on familiar topics, express personal opinions and *exchange information on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life* (e.g. family, hobbies, *work, travel* and current events).
A2	*Can interact with reasonable ease in structured situations and short conversations*, provided the other person helps if necessary. *Can manage simple, routine exchanges without undue effort; can ask and answer questions and exchange ideas and information on familiar topics in predictable everyday situations. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters to do with work* and free time. Can handle very short social exchanges but is rarely able to understand enough to keep conversation going of his/her own accord.

GOAL-ORIENTED CO-OPERATION (p.79)

B2	Can understand detailed instructions reliably. Can help along the progress of the work by inviting others to join in, say what they think, etc. *Can outline an issue or a problem clearly, speculating about causes or consequences, and weighing advantages and disadvantages of different approaches.*
B1	*Can follow what is said, though he/she may occasionally have to ask for repetition or clarification if the other people's talk is rapid or extended. Can explain why something is a problem, discuss what to do next, compare and contrast alternatives. Can give brief comments on the views of others. Can generally follow what is said and, when necessary, can repeat back part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding. Can make his/her opinions and reactions understood as regards possible solutions or the question of what to do next, giving brief reasons and explanations.* Can invite others to give their views on how to proceed.
A2	*Can understand enough to manage simple, routine tasks without undue effort,* asking very simply for repetition when he/she does not understand. Can discuss what to do next*, making and responding to suggestions, asking for and giving directions.* Can indicate when he/she is following and can be made to understand what is necessary, if the speaker takes the trouble. *Can communicate in simple and routine tasks using simple phrases to ask for and provide things, to get simple information and to discuss what to do next.*

Judit BORSZÉKI

TRANSACTIONS TO OBTAIN GOODS AND SERVICES (p. 80)

B2	Can cope linguistically to negotiate a solution to a dispute like an undeserved traffic ticket, financial responsibility for damage in a flat, for blame regarding an accident. Can outline a case for compensation, using persuasive language to demand satisfaction and state clearly the limits to any concession he/she is prepared to make. *Can explain a problem which has arisen and make it clear that the provider of the service/customer must make a concession.*
B1	*Can deal with most transactions likely to arise whilst travelling,* arranging travel or accommodation, or dealing with authorities during a foreign visit. Can cope with less routine situations in shops, post offices, banks, e.g. returning an unsatisfactory purchase. Can make a complaint. Can deal with most situations likely to arise when making travel arrangements through an agent or when actually travelling, e.g. asking passenger where to get off for an unfamiliar destination.
A2	*Can deal with common aspects of everyday living such as travel,* lodgings, eating and shopping. Can get all the information needed from a tourist office, as long as it is of a straightforward, non-specialised nature. Can ask for and provide everyday goods and services. A2 Can get simple information about travel, use public transport: buses, trains, and taxis, ask and give directions, and buy tickets. Can ask about things and make simple transactions in shops, post offices or banks. *Can give and receive information about quantities, numbers,* prices, etc. Can make simple purchases by stating what is wanted and asking the price. Can order a meal.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE (p.81)

B2	Can understand and exchange complex information and advice on the full range of matters related to his/her occupational role. Can pass on detailed information reliably. Can give a clear, detailed description of how to carry out a procedure. Can synthesise and report information and arguments from a number of sources.
B1	*Can exchange, check and confirm accumulated factual information on familiar routine and non-routine matters within his/her field with some confidence. Can describe how to do something, giving detailed instructions.* Can summarise and give his or her opinion about a short story, article, talk, discussion, interview, or documentary and answer further questions of detail. *Can find out and pass on straightforward factual information. Can ask for and follow detailed directions. Can obtain more detailed information.*
A2	*Can understand enough to manage simple, routine exchanges without undue effort. Can deal with practical everyday demands: finding out and passing on straightforward factual information. Can ask and answer questions about habits and routines. Can ask and answer questions about pastimes and past activities. Can give and follow simple directions and instructions, e.g. explain how to get somewhere. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information. Can exchange limited information on familiar and routine operational matters. Can ask and answer questions about what they do at work* and in free time**.** *Can ask for and give directions referring to a map or plan. Can ask for and provide personal information.*

INTERVIEWING AND BEING INTERVIEWED (p.82)

B2	Can carry out an effective, fluent interview, departing spontaneously from prepared questions, following up and probing interesting replies. Can take initiatives in an interview, expand and develop ideas with little help or prodding from an interviewer.
B1	*Can provide concrete information required in an interview*/consultation (e.g. describe symptoms to a doctor) *but does so with limited precision. Can carry out a prepared interview, checking and confirming information, though he/she may occasionally have to ask for repetition if the other person's response is rapid or extended. Can take some initiatives in an interview/consultation (e.g. to bring up a new subject)* but is very dependent on interviewer in the interaction. Can use a prepared questionnaire to carry out a structured interview, with some spontaneous follow up questions.
A2	*Can make him/herself understood in an interview and communicate ideas and information on familiar topics,* provided he/she can ask for clarification occasionally, and is given some help to express what he/she wants to. *Can answer simple questions and respond to simple statements in an interview.*

Relating Language Examinations to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. -Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, 2006.
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Manuel1_EN.asp#Manual

CONVERSATION (p. 76)

B2	Can engage in extended conversation on most general topics in a clearly participatory fashion, even in a noisy environment. *Can sustain relationships with native speakers without unintentionally amusing or irritating them or requiring them to behave other than they would with a native speaker.* Can convey degrees of emotion and highlight the personal significance of events and experiences.
B1	*Can enter unprepared into conversations on familiar topics.* Can follow clearly articulated speech directed at him/her in everyday conversation, though will sometimes have to ask for repetition of particular words and phrases. *Can maintain a conversation or discussion* but may sometimes be difficult to follow when trying to say exactly what he/she would like to. Can express and respond to feelings such as surprise, happiness, sadness, interest and indifference.
A2	*Can establish social contact: greetings and farewells; introductions; giving thanks. Can generally understand clear, standard speech on familiar matters directed at him/her,* provided he/she can ask for repetition or reformulation from time to time. *Can participate in short conversations in routine contexts on topics of interest.* Can express how he/she feels in simple terms, and express thanks.

LINGUISTIC RANGE (p. 148)

B2	Has a sufficient range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints on most general topics, without much conspicuous searching for words, using some complex sentence forms to do so.
B1	*Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel, and current events.*
A2	*Uses basic sentence patterns with memorised phrases, groups of a few words and formulae in order to communicate limited information in simple everyday situations.*

LINGUISTIC ACCURACY (p. 148)

B2	Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. *Does not make errors which cause misunderstanding, and can correct most of his/her mistakes.*
B1	*Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used "routines" and patterns associated with more predictable situations.*
A2	Uses some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC APPROPRIATENESS (p. 148)

B2	Can with some effort keep up with and contribute to group discussions even when speech is fast and colloquial. Can sustain relationships with native speakers without unintentionally amusing or irritating them or requiring them to behave other than they would with a native speaker.
B1	*Can perform and respond to basic language functions, such as information exchange and requests* and express opinions and attitudes in a simple way. *Is aware of the salient politeness conventions and acts appropriately.*
A2	*Can handle very short social exchanges, using everyday polite forms of greeting and address. Can make and respond to invitations, apologies etc.*

PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE: Fluency, flexibility (p. 148)

B2	Can adjust to the changes of direction, style and emphasis normally found in conversation. *Can produce stretches of language with a fairly even tempo;* although he/she can be hesitant as he or she searches for patterns and expressions, there are few noticeably long pauses.
B1	*Can exploit a wide range of simple language flexibly to express much of what he/she wants. Can keep going comprehensibly,* even though pausing for grammatical and lexical planning and repair is very evident, especially in longer stretches of free production.
A2	*Can make him/herself understood in very short utterances,* even though pauses, false starts and reformulation are very evident. *Can expand learned phrases through simple recombinations of their elements.*

INTERACTION: Turn taking, Cooperating, Asking for Clarification (p. 148)

B2	*Can initiate discourse, take his/her turn when appropriate and end conversation when he/she needs to, though he/she may not always do this elegantly. Can help the discussion along on familiar ground* confirming comprehension, inviting others in, etc.
B1	*Can initiate, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest. Can repeat back part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding.*
A2	*Can indicate when he/she is following* but is rarely able to understand enough to keep conversation going of his/her own accord. *Can ask for attention.*

APPENDIX 2: COMPETENCES NEEDED FOR RECEPTION (LISTENING AND READING), ACCORDING TO THE CEFR

Manual for Relating Language Examinations to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. - Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, 2009. pp. 133, 134, 143.
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/ManualRevision-proofread-FINAL_en.pdf

OVERALL LISTENING COMPREHENSION

B2	Can understand standard spoken language, live or broadcast, on both familiar and unfamiliar topics normally encountered in personal, social, academic or vocational life. Only extreme background noise, inadequate discourse structure and/or idiomatic usage influences the ability to understand. *Can understand the main ideas* of propositionally and linguistically complex speech *on* both *concrete* and abstract *topics delivered in a standard dialect, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation.* Can follow extended speech and complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar, and the direction of the talk is sign-posted by explicit markers.

B1	*Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided speech is clearly articulated in a generally familiar accent. Can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work,* school, leisure etc., including short narratives.
A2	*Can understand enough to be able to meet needs of a concrete type provided speech is clearly and slowly articulated. Can understand phrases and expressions related to areas of most immediate priority* (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment) provided speech is clearly and slowly articulated.

OVERALL READING COMPREHENSION

B2	Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. *Has a broad active reading vocabulary,* but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms.
B1	*Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension.*
A2	*Can understand short, simple texts on familiar matters of a concrete type which consist of high frequency everyday or job-related language. Can understand short, simple texts containing the highest frequency vocabulary, including a proportion of shared international vocabulary items.*

RELEVANT QUALITATIVE FACTORS FOR RECEPTION

LINGUISTIC (General Linguistic Range; Vocabulary Range)

B2	*Has a sufficient range of language to be able to understand descriptions, viewpoints and arguments on most topics pertinent to his everyday life such as* family, hobbies and interests, *work, travel,* and current events.
B1	*Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to understand most texts on topics such as* family, hobbies and interests, *work, travel,* and current events.
A2	*Has a sufficient vocabulary for coping with everyday situations with predictable content* and simple survival needs.

SOCIO-LINGUISTIC (Socio-linguistic Appropriateness)

B2	Can with some effort keep up with fast and colloquial discussions.
B1	*Can respond to a wide range of language functions, using their most common exponents in a neutral register. Can recognise salient politeness conventions. Is aware of, and looks out for signs of, the most significant differences between the customs, usages, attitudes, values and beliefs prevalent in the community concerned and those of his or her own.*
A2	*Can handle very short social exchanges, using everyday polite forms of greeting and address. Can make and respond to invitations, apologies etc.*

PRAGMATIC (Thematic Development and Propositional Precision)

B2	*Can understand description or narrative, identifying main points* from relevant supporting detail and examples. Can understand detailed information reliably.
B1	*Can reasonably accurately understand a straightforward narrative or description that is a linear sequence of points. Can understand the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision.*
A2	Can understand a simple story or description that is a list of points. *Can understand a simple and direct exchange of limited information on familiar and routine matters.*

STRATEGIC (Identifying Cues and Inferring)

B2	Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including listening for main points; checking comprehension by using contextual clues.
B1	*Can identify unfamiliar words from the context on topics related to his/her field and interests. Can extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words from the context and deduce sentence meaning provided the topic discussed is familiar.*
A2	*Can use an idea of the overall meaning of short texts and utterances on everyday topics of a concrete type to derive the probable meaning of unknown words from the context.*