

Joachim Grzega ▪ Marion Schöner

**Basic Global English (BGE) as a Way for Children
to Acquire Global Communicative Competence
Report on an Elementary School Project***

Abstract

With English as a global vernacular, it has been suggested to base teaching of English not on a native English, but on successful non-native/non-native discourse. The authors have therefore tested Basic Global English (*BGE*) as a way to achieve global communicative competence. Taking into account scientific findings on learning in general and learning English at elementary schools, the authors created 12 lessons of *BGE*, in any one of which every learner should have a chance to use English actively and creatively. This material was then tried out with two German groups of students aged 7-9. After these 12 lessons learners had acquired about 140 words and were able to give information about themselves and their family (name, age, birthday, hobbies, predilections), to say what they have in their schoolbags and classrooms, and to count up to 39.

Sommaire

Avec le développement de l'anglais en langue internationale, on a proposé de baser l'enseignement de la langue anglaise non sur un anglais natif, mais sur les formes fonctionnelles utilisées parmi des locuteurs non-natifs. Les auteurs ont donc testé Basic Global English (*BGE*) comme méthode d'acquérir de la compétence communicative globale. Prenant en considération des études scientifiques relatives à l'apprentissage en général et à l'apprentissage de l'anglais à l'école élémentaire, les auteurs ont créé 12 leçons de *BGE*; chacune de ces leçons devrait donner aux élèves l'occasion d'utiliser l'anglais de manière active et créative. Ce matériel a puis été mis à l'épreuve dans deux groupes d'élèves allemands de 7 à 9 ans. Après ces 12 leçons, les élèves avaient acquis à peu près 140 mots et étaient capables de donner des informations sur eux-mêmes et sur leur famille (nom, âge, anniversaire, hobbies, prédilections), de dire ce qu'ils avaient dans leurs cartables et ce qu'il y avait dans leurs salles de classe, et de compter jusqu'à 39.

Zusammenfassung

Aufgrund der Entwicklung des Englischen zur globalen Verkehrssprache ist vorgeschlagen worden, Englisch nicht auf der Grundlage eines muttersprachlichen Englisch zu unterrichten, sondern auf der Grundlage erfolgreicher Konversationen zwischen Nichtmuttersprachlern. Die Autoren haben daher Basic Global English (*BGE*) als Weg zu einer globalen Kommunikationskompetenz erprobt. Ausgehend von Forschungsergebnissen zu Lernen im Allgemeinen und zu Englischlernen in der Grundschule haben die Autoren 12 Lektionen *BGE* erstellt. In jeder einzelnen von ihnen sollten die Lerner Gelegenheit zum aktiven und kreativen Gebrauch der Sprache bekommen. Diese 12 Lektionen wurden dann in zwei Gruppen deutscher Schüler der Altersgruppe 7 bis 9 getestet. Nach diesen 12 Lektionen beherrschten die Lerner ca. 140 Wörter und waren im Stande, Informationen über sich selbst und ihre Familie zu geben (Namen, Alter, Geburtstag, Hobbys, Vorlieben), zu sagen, was sie in ihrer Schultasche hätten und was im Klassenzimmer wäre, und bis 39 zu zählen.

1. Background

In order to master the communicative challenges of modern information and knowledge societies, successful members of these societies seem to need at least the following competences: their native tongue, a foreign language of individual choice (in order to get to delve into a second culture to see how things can be dealt with and categorized differently) and a sufficient competence in the internationally most important vernacular. English has

* We thank Alexander Schöner for technical assistance and Katja Weber for useful discussions.

become the *de facto* global vernacular. If we want to prepare people all over the world for this *status quo*, we need to find an efficient way to provide them with the necessary communicative competence in this global language. Although English might frequently just be a working tool, the use of English in information and knowledge societies does not only mean acquiring and possessing linguistic competence, but it also refers to social and methodological competences, such as

- communicating empathically in an atmosphere of understanding, trusting, cooperation and efficiency
- being able to ask questions
- finding and evaluating information in various sources
- transferring information into applicable knowledge
- translating expert knowledge into generally intelligible language

(On the importance of these social and methodological competences cf., e.g., von Krogh/Wicki 2002, Rifkin 2004, Händeler 2005, Spiegel 2005).

Although several books argue for integrating observations on English as a Lingua Franca in English teaching and learning (cf., e.g., McKay 2002, Holliday 2005), to our knowledge, nobody has, as of yet, done so on an overall practical level. What instructors and curricula of English as a Foreign Language still take as an orientation for their teaching is a native model of English, mostly British English or American English, and the corresponding national culture behind it, though there have been some attempts in the form of “global textbooks” in Britain (cf., e.g. Kubanek 1999, Crawford 2001). Although there may be a high level of error tolerance in primary English classes, errors are not evaluated systematically with view to successful global communication. In this article we will present a model that puts the goal of *global* communicative competence in English and the ways to it into practice.¹

Based on a number of empirical studies on non-native/non-native communication in English (cf. below), Joachim Grzega has developed the system of Basic Global English (*BGE*). The basic idea of teaching *BGE* is to get students as quickly as possible to the level of global communicative competence in English (in its internationally functional form). *BGE* evolved from the conception of English as a communication tool between people with different mother tongues. *BGE* is created from successful linguistic forms between non-natives:

- In *BGE* only those non-standard pronunciations are penalized that have been proven to endanger communicative success between non-natives (e.g. James 1998, Jenkins 2003, Seidlhofer 2004).
- *BGE* lists only 20 elementary grammar rules; the classification as elementary is based on personal and others’ observations (e.g. James 1998, Seidlhofer 2004).
- *BGE* comprehends a basic vocabulary of 750 words, whose selection is based—in contrast to other “simplified” Englishes—on both actual word frequencies and on culture-independent conceptual frequencies as accepted by many fundamental vocabularies.
- In addition, learners are requested from the very start of the learning process to create, autonomously, an individual vocabulary of at least another 250 words related to their own needs and wants (e.g. related to hobbies, profession, family members, or their culture).
- Additional word-formation patterns provide the learner with the means to coin much more than 1,000 words.
- Furthermore, *BGE* includes internationally functional phrases (on this see also Varonis/Gass 1985, Yule 1990, Wagner/Firth 1997, James 1998, House 1999, House 2002, Meierkord/Knapp 2002, Lesnyák 2004) for the most basic and frequent communicative

¹ The threefold minimum model of “native tongue + Global English + 3rd language of choice” has been substantiated as the model of “global triglossia” elsewhere—also from a socioeconomic point of view (cf. Grzega 2005a).

situations, including solutions for situations of communicative breakdown. Another important aspect is that *BGE* is not a closed system, but allows variation and offers learners to fine-tune their command of an internationally functional English according to their own desires. The entire system is presented on <http://www.basicglobalenglish.com>. On this website the reader also has access to published articles that provide the linguistic as well as the socioeconomic argumentation for *BGE* (e.g. Grzega 2005a, 2005b, 2006).

2. *BGE* Project at Two Elementary Schools

After the system was set up, the next step was the didactic formatting of *BGE*. Since a schools inspector, Brigitte Tremel, and the principal of an elementary school (Goldkronach, Germany), Wolfgang Fischer, who had initiated a European school project, were the first to show interest in *BGE*, we began to create a specific version for elementary school classes (age group 7 to 8, i.e. 2nd grade). We created 12 lessons (30 to 45 min. each) based on the findings from learning psychology, biology and education

- (i) with respect to learning in general, i.e. the possibility for self-fulfillment (sense in life), affective attachment toward contents, the experience of flow effects, an active exposure to the contents (“grasping” their meaning), the presentation of contents in a familiar “language” (in a familiar register), the presentation of contents through intelligible metaphors and analogies, autonomy in content selection, recurrent scrutinizing of knowledge, learning in a community (cf., e.g., Frankl 1946, Maslow 1954, Csikszentmihalyi 1990, Lakoff/Johnson 1999, Mißler/Multhaup 1999, Ryan/Deci 2000, Spitzer 2002, Hunfeld 2004) and
- (ii) with respect to learning English at elementary school level (cf., e.g., Kubanek 1999, Mißler/Multhaup 1999, Klippel 2000, Schmid-Schönbein 2001, Spitzer 2002, Mindt/Schlüter 2003, Böttger 2005, Pienemann 2005, Pienemann/Keßler/Roos 2006).

The principles that guided these lessons were the following:

- (1) Every child should have the chance for active, not just reactive and reproductive, use of the language in every lesson.
- (2) Every lesson should include a section where the learners were asked to use English in a creative way (thus producing authentic lingua franca texts).
- (3) Some parts of the course should be led by mini-teachers according to the concept “learning by teaching” (see <http://www.ldl.de> and Martin 1985, Martin 1994, Teuchert-Noodt et al. 2003, Grzega 2006) (this was the case in Lessons 6 and 8). This implies the following elements:
 - (a) Teachers regard their students as learning partners and as valuable sources of already existing knowledge (i.e. students are given time to find solutions for a problem or the answers to a problem by themselves).
 - (b) Students are given as many teaching tasks as possible (these teaching tasks, however, should again activate the other class members; it is not the task of the **mini-teachers** to just give a lecture). As a consequence, there are sections with mini-teachers for which students have to get special material in advance. In addition, parts of revision sections, particularly general revision sections, can be delegated to mini-teachers in advance. Many students should be given the chance to be mini-teachers. This way they also get to acquire didactic skills in a gradual way. In these mini-teacher sections the task of the teacher is the following:

Only interfere if the dialog stops or if the mini-teachers ask for your help. Use your time to observe your students. Are they able to follow the lesson? Be sure to create a positive and polite atmosphere. Take a minute at the end to talk about constant violations of *BGE* forms, e.g. expressions that can’t be used even in an international communication. Point out well-done aspects.

Besides, in many exercises, it is possible that the teacher only starts asking a student, but that this role of asking is delegated to the student who has answered, and then from this student who now asks to the student who has now answered etc. etc. We will call this **teacher-role rotation (TRR)**.

- (c) Students should always give reasons when they suggest a solution for a problem (and they are given time to give these).
 - (d) The teacher has the function of a learning assistant (in class and in preparatory phases in which the teacher must give guidelines for the contents and the methods).
 - (e) The teacher also takes care of a good atmosphere in class and guarantees that the contents, after a phase of interaction and potential insecurities, are brought into structure and linearity (in the form of a summary).
- (4) None of the lessons should compare German to an English-speaking speech community without including a non-English-speaking culture. The learners should have their share in selecting the countries they want to hear and talk about.
 - (5) The lessons should consist of situations that the learners could naturally find themselves in (cf. also Mindt/Schlüter 2003: 37ff., Böttger 2005: 65ff.).
 - (6) No rhyme, game or song should be included if it were just for the sake of rhyming, playing or singing. Games should be included if they help train communicative skills (such as explaining words through pantomiming) or playing that game because it is internationally known.
 - (7) Error evaluation should be strictly oriented toward the empirical findings on English non-native/non-native discourses.
 - (8) No learner should be compelled to answer in (unnatural) complete sentences.

Principle (7) meant, for instance, that the pronunciation of *John* as “*Chon*” [tʃɔn] is penalized for its voiceless initial², but not for the vowel which is closer than the present-day BrE [ɒ] and the AmE [ɑ:], but perfectly intelligible in international discourse. This does not mean that any input is possible; the teacher may well offer a native (or near-native) model apart from authentic non-native input. This does not mean either that the same pronunciation treatment holds true for exercises concentrating specifically on pronunciation. Here, the teacher may want to point out any form that is not native-like³. Principle (8) provoked, e.g., that the question *What is your name?* could be answered by *Mark*, not obligatorily by *My name is Mark*. To exercise other possessive pronouns, we had the children bring family photos to the class and then ask *Who is this?* A possible answer would then be: *This is my mom*.

In sum, while the methodological principles listed so far could also be applied to the acquisition of any kind of language model, the contents of a *BGE* class can be clearly contrasted with many English classes at elementary schools in Germany (and, not improbably, elsewhere).

² Cf. the second student that the mini-teacher addresses in the video-file of the last lesson (*JELiX* Supporting Online Material #5)

³ Mindt/Schlüter (2003: 53) and Böttger (2005: 106 and 163) correctly say that a progressive approach to pronunciation is not possible; therefore, they underline that if teachers do not take enough care of learners’ pronunciation “erroneous” pronunciation may soon get fossilized. In our opinion, this view is too pessimistic: many learner biographies (even among our students) show that non-native or problematic pronunciations can be levelled out even at a later stage of learning if learners are made aware of them and want to achieve a more native-like competence. Giving young learners (near-)native phonetic input is totally fine, but this element may not necessarily be reserved the vast space of teaching that some suggest. Authentic and functional non-native pronunciation can also be justified with respect to intercultural competences.

English lessons at the beginner's level at elementary school according to a still current model	BGE lessons
target question: "How does a British or American child of the same age live?" (cultural knowledge)	target question: "How can I communicate with a child of the same age that doesn't speak the same mother tongue?" (transcultural competence)
Learners are confronted with customs of American and British children of the same age.	Learners are to acquire transcultural, or general intercultural, competence. Teachers are encouraged to present their learners both internationally wide-spread customs as well as specific differences between specific countries (of the students' choice).
The class sticks to the contents of the manual or the teacher.	The class participates in the selection of the contents (in the revision and exercise sections and the cultural studies sections) and also creates their own authentic texts.
Non-standard, non-American and non-British pronunciation and grammar forms are classified as slight or serious errors on the basis of the teacher's subjective view.	Non-standard, non-American and non-British pronunciation and grammar forms are classified as slight or serious errors on the basis of their empirically proven functionality in intercultural dialogs.
Some curricula include words whose communicative benefit is at least doubtful (e.g. all kinds of animal names) ⁴ .	<i>BGE</i> includes frequent words and words for frequent things. Additionally, learners are encouraged to select and acquire words that they need themselves or that they want to know.
Songs, rhymes and games are often taught without taking into account their communicative benefit.	Songs and rhymes are taught to support the acquisition of vocabulary and grammar (ideally internationally known songs and rhymes). Games are included frequently, but consciously to support the learning process or the practice of certain skills (e.g. pantomiming is practised as a method to explain unknown words).
Children often reproduce, but do not communicate actively. ⁵	Children learn and train (over a large part of the lessons) active and creative talking about themselves and other people and active and creative talking to other people. They produce their own and therefore authentic texts. Working on individual differences serves as preliminaries for seeing and accepting cultural differences. In addition, learners practice teaching.

⁴ Mindt/Schlüter (2003) have set up a list of words that British children between 6 and 12 use. The BGE vocabulary they get to know is larger in number and independent of any age group.

⁵ Even Mindt/Schlüter (2003: 18), although they pursue a result-oriented, communicative approach, say that in their first year, learners need only be able to make utterances in a reproductive way.

The 12 lessons we created covered an optional course for roughly half a school year (October 2006 through February 2007). For each of these 12 lessons we asked the teacher to give us feedback concerning the practicability of our lessons, the development of the learners' listening, reading, writing and speaking skills as well as the learners' and the teacher's motivation. Despite the optionality of the course, which implied that no homework was to be given, the 12 lessons turned out successful so that the principal from Goldkronach decided to implement *BGE* as a compulsory optional subject at his school starting in September 2007. Nevertheless, there were some aspects that needed improving.

We therefore composed a revised version of the 12 lessons to be tried out at another elementary school (Eichstätt, Germany) for age group 7 to 8 years (2nd grade)⁶. These lessons were held by Joachim Grzega and videotaped and observed by Marion Schöner (April 2007 through July 2007). What was clear to us from the very start was that we wanted to carry out action research—a term coined by Lewin (1946)—, i.e. we did not want to just keep strictly to our lessons, but tried to solve any problem whenever it occurred in reality. 31 students had signed up for our optional course, most of them with a German family background, but a few of them also with a non-German background; some were from Eichstätt itself (a town of about 10,000 inhabitants) and some from the neighboring village of Landershofen. Since more children than registered attended the course (38 instead of 31) we had to cope with a shortage of classroom space. This resulted in some disciplinary problems at the beginning, i.e. we had problems in keeping the learners' attention drawn to the relevant classroom activity. Beside the size, also the fact that the overhead projector was malfunctioning, that learners came from two different classes and that the course was optional (which, again, disallowed us to give any homework) might have been responsible for the lack of discipline among the learners at first. After a while the class size was reduced to 28 learners (basically because I requested the students who would leave the class 10 minutes early to attend a choir class to either fully attend or leave the English class as they would always distract the rest of the class). The reduced number also allowed me to form a large semi-circle and a small inside of it (so that everybody could still look at the board). We were also equipped with a newer overhead projector. The course then continued without any major disciplinary obstacles. Nonetheless, sometimes too much side noise occurred. This noise could be contained by spontaneous questions into the group, which brought the attention back to the teacher. If not, learners were requested, without any resentment, to go to the neighboring room and play something there if they could not show enough interest or enough respect for those who wanted to pay attention—this had been set as a rule by all participants beforehand. Nevertheless, the single section of the 30-minute lessons took much longer than anticipated; this was mainly due to the still large size of the class:

- some students were more easily distracted than others, thus also distracting several other students and thus forcing the teacher to regain attention before continuing,
- we tried to give every learner the chance to say something in each lesson (which took a lot of time since we also wanted to give them the time they needed to formulate their utterances),
- we wanted to give learners enough time to reflect on questions asked (and this could take quite a while if we didn't simply want to take the first person who raised their finger).

As a consequence the 45 minutes of a regular lesson were fully needed and used. Some parts of the lesson were in English, some in German, and it was attempted to gradually enlarge the English part.

A particular problem in the first test course had been the pronunciation-spelling discrepancy

⁶ Cf. *JELiX* Supporting Online Material #1.

in English. Since we believe that seeing the typeface normally promotes the memorizability of words⁷, we used the “brick-word” method (cf. Waas 2003). In the brick-word method words are introduced in the following steps:

- (1) presentation of pronunciation with student repetition
- (2) presentation of those letters that equal their pronunciation symbol one-to-one and a space symbol for the other letters
- (3) once more presentation of pronunciation with student repetition after a short backpedalling break
- (4) presentation of the rest of the letters. Already in the second lesson the learners could be asked to make suggestions for the missing letters themselves and to provide arguments for their suggestions.

Already in Lesson 2 one of the students made the suggestion that the still missing letter in *cornfl_kes* may be an *a* remembering that *favorite sport* also had an *a* for the respective pronunciation⁸.

It also took some time before the children got accustomed to speaking in English. They understood the teacher’s English question, but answered in German. It was also hard (and of course unnatural) for them to speak with each other in English when they had to do partner work. After one or two turns in English, the students had a tendency to switch into English. Of course, some managed to produce utterances in English whenever requested better than others.

The feedback that we got after five lessons from two teachers and some parents who had told the headteacher about their children’s reports at home were positive; the parents were especially pleased that their children actually learned to talk and not just to reproduce song texts, rhymes or single words. In Lesson 4, for instance, they could already answer questions on their family photos they were asked to bring to class: the questions that they had first learned to refer to themselves were now applied to the family members, which also enabled to introduce the rest of the possessive pronouns beside *my*⁹.

After the 5th lesson there were two weeks of school vacation so that we had to face the problem that in the 6th lesson many learners had forgotten quite a few things. We realized that, from time to time, we needed some general revision sections and have decided to insert revision sections in smaller intervals when the course gets more advanced. For the final version of the textbook we have therefore decided to distinguish between lessons with new contents, revision lessons of recent contents, general revision lessons on all contents learned up to that lesson; the more the class advanced, the more lesson revisions and general revisions will be inserted.

The mini-teachers who were responsible for leading the first part of Lesson 6, however, did a very good job: they first had to lead an interview with their partner, selecting 3 questions from a questionnaire and then presenting the partner to the class; the same was then required from their classmates. The mini-teachers proved that they were well prepared and also that they were spontaneously able to guide their classmates through their task¹⁰. The second sequence with mini-teachers (Lesson 8) was only in part positive. This part was on presenting prepositions: the mini-teachers were to introduce these words with the help of a book and a box: *the book is on the box, the book is in the box, the book is under the box* etc. One of the

⁷ Also Mindt/Schlüter (2003: 45f.) recommend not to ignore spelling, at least not completely, since learners would have to face international English words anyway.

⁸ Cf. *JELiX* Supporting Online Material #2 (the first few seconds are a little distorted).

⁹ Cf. *JELiX* Supporting Online Material #3.

¹⁰ Cf. *JELiX* Supporting Online Material #4.

mini-teachers can be said to be a little hyperactive, because he wanted to include too much fun and played the clown too exaggeratedly, which distracted the classmates from the topic. (This means that, if not yet accustomed to it, students have to be especially prepared for this didactic method. This has, of course, nothing to do with the value of *BGE* itself.)

Regarding didactic methods, we could also observe that students also needed time to get accustomed to working in groups of 4, since in the vocabulary play in Lesson 7, where one person had to ask for a word and the other had to point to the respective object on the sheet, the one asking tried to help the neighbor and move the sheet rather away from the others. (Again, this has, of course, nothing to do with the value of *BGE* itself.)

Another important observation that we could make in Lesson 8, the second lesson with the mini-teachers, was that for the remaining members of the class the topic of prepositions turned out to be cognitively very, or too, demanding—this was especially when we used the Bingo game to practice the prepositions (*Show me [a card with] a window over a chair, show me [a card with] a juice on a table, show me [a card with] a juice under a table*). In addition, the children seemed to recognize objects, but had tremendous difficulties in remembering the prepositions (also in the intensive exercises that covered almost all of the following lesson). One of the headteachers told us that describing spatial relationships is also very difficult for them in their native tongues at that age. We have therefore decided to postpone the chapter of prepositions in the final version of our textbook.

The color terms, which had to be postponed from Lesson 9 to Lesson 10, were mastered much quicker than I had thought (which was also due to the fact that some of the students had already learned the color terms in kindergarten). This saved us some time so that with Lessons 11 and 12 we could provide the learners with the competences that we had promised them to have at the end.

3. Remarks on Grammar and Vocabulary Teaching

In general, it seems only useful for a small amount of students to give grammatical rules, except for very simple ones, such as the plural-formation with *s* and the “genitive” formation with *'s*. Possessive pronouns and questions still seem to be stored in the mind as single items. We tried to give some rules for forming questions in Lesson 7, being well aware that certain types of questions should only be expected at such an early state of language learning, namely intonation questions (cf. Pienemann 2005, Pienemann/Keßler/Roos 2006). Nonetheless, this remains largely ineffective if this is done in too short an amount of time and if you are not allowed to give homework. We have decided to exclude this grammar chapter from the first dozen of units in the final version of the textbook.

Concerning vocabulary acquisition, the general principle of presenting picture word-lists with the relevant *BGE* words and internationalisms and then leaving a blank for individual words worked well. According to the curriculum of the state of Bavaria, Germany, which our two partner schools belong to, learners should be able to use 301 words actively after their usual two years of English in grade 3 and 4 (with two 45-minute lessons per week)¹¹. In our *BGE* experiment (with one 45-minute lesson per week) students were potentially able to use 141 *BGE* words (which partly differ from the Bavarian curriculum, though) actively in communication already after 12 lessons, plus, potentially, a number of individual words for

¹¹ The Bavarian curriculum for English at elementary school can be accessed under <http://www.isb.bayern.de/isb/download.aspx?DownloadFileID=4159f7a343dd6a53884a1448d5929de9>.

their favorite sport, food, drink and hobby¹².

4. Summary and Outlook

All in all, at the end, no matter what single problems had occurred and needed to be solved during single sequences of the course, most of our learners have proven (by way of our video) to be able, after only 12 lessons, to

- answer questions regarding their name, age, birthday, favorite food, favorite drink, favorite, sport, hobby, phone number
- ask questions regarding addressee's name, age, birthday, favorite food, favorite drink, favorite, sport, hobby, phone number
- count from 1 to 31
- denote things they carry in their school bag
- denote things in their classroom

In the last lesson, every learner was allowed to say what they liked best about the class and what they would improve next time. Most evaluations were produced as a general statement on the course and they were all positive. Specific likes that were mentioned by single students were being a mini-teacher, playing bingo, and presenting their own classroom (not just the English classroom) on a video.

By now, we have composed a manual for a whole school year (with two 45-minute lessons per week). In this final version, intercultural aspects, i.e. comparison of nations, are integrated from Lesson 15 onward. The nations are not be prescribed and need not be the US or the UK or any other country with English as an official language. The selection shall be based on the needs and wants of the class. The distribution of contents looks like this:

unit	contents/ competencies	vocabulary	communication structures	grammar
prep.	Latin script			
1	greeting telling one's name favorite sport internationalisms leave-taking	name, football, soccer, basketball, volleyball, karate, badminton, tennis, ping-pong, skiing, gymnastics, jogging, inline-skating, horse-riding	What is your name? What is your favorite sport?	
2	favorite food and drink	pizza, cornflakes, hot dog, hamburger, sandwich, steak, fish, soup, cheese, ice-cream, juice, milk, water, tea	What is your favorite food/drink?	plural
3	my family	family, father (dad, daddy), mother (mum, mummy), brother, sister	Who is this?, Where is...?, What is his/her...?, I have no idea.	possessive pronouns, possessive case
4a	numbers 1-10, age	numbers 1-10, plus, minus, friend	What is your phone number?, What is...?	personal pronouns
4b	numbers 11-31	numbers: 11-31		

¹² Cf. *JELiX* Supporting Online Material #5.

unit	contents/ competencies	vocabulary	communication structures	grammar
4c	revision: numbers 1-31			personal pronouns
5a	age months, birthday	months, year, old, birthday	How old are you?	
5b	revision: numbers, months, age birthday		When is your birthday?, My birthday is on...	
6a	hobbies, writing letters	revision of unit, dancing, reading, playing the piano, helping parents, cooking	What is your hobby?	
6b	revision: hobbies			
7	general revision			
8a	days of the week	Monday-Sunday	What day is it today?, When do you...?, On Mondays ...	
8b	revision: days of the week			
9a	school subjects	counting, reading, writing, drawing, singing, sport, break, schedule	What is your favorite subject?, What do you have at school?, On Mondays we have ...	
9b	revision: school subjects			
10a	my classroom	teacher, student, door, window, corner, wall, table, chair, board		plural, possessive pronouns
10b	revision: my classroom			
11	school things	school bag, pen, pencil, scissors, book, exercise book, paper, toys, map, globe, dictionary	What do you have in your school bag?	
12	colors, revision: school things	black, white, blue, green, yellow, orange, red, gray, brown	What color is...?, What do you have in your school bag?	
13a	animals at home	animal, fish, bird, dog, cat	Do you have an animal?, What is your favorite animal?	
13b	revision: animals at home			
14	general revision			

unit	contents/ competencies	vocabulary	communication structures	grammar
15a	countries	country, flag	Where are you from?, I am from ..., Where do you want to go?, I want to go to ...	
15b	revision: countries			
16a	making friends, explaining games	play, game, hide and seek, jump rope, tug-of-war, catch, count, run, jump, catch, pull, rope, friend	Do you speak English?, Let's play a game.	
16b	revision: games			(questions)
17	past tense			past tense
18a	making friends, writing letters	letter, address	Can you give me your address?	past tense
18b	revision: letter			
19	general revision			
20a	my home	room, house, home, bed, mirror, box, toys, closet, shelf, key, eat, drink, cook, wash hands, sleep, play	What do you have in your home?, What rooms do you have in your home? What is your favorite room?	
20b	revision: my home			
21a	contrasts	good, bad, big, tall, small, old, young, new, easy, difficult, heavy, light, beautiful, ugly, right, wrong		comparative, negation
21b	revision: contrasts			
22a	my city	shop, bank, post office, hospital, pharmacy, school, supermarket, train station, bus stop, hotel	I live in..., I live on..., In my city we have...	
22b	revision: my city	flower, bush, tree, river, grass, lake, mountain		
23a	outside my city		Where is/are...?	Prepositions: in, on, under, behind, next to, in front of, at, over, between
23b	revision: outside my city			
24a	directions / getting around, means of transportation	left, right, straight, turn, train, bus, car, bike, walk	Excuse me, where is...?, How do you get to school?, I go by... .Do you know the way to...?	

unit	contents/ competencies	vocabulary	communication structures	grammar
24b	revision: directions / getting around			
25	general revision			
26a	body parts	body, head, neck, back, hand, arm, finger, leg, knee, foot/feet, hair, eye, nose, ear, face, mouth		plural
26b	body parts		My hair is My eyes are	
27a	feelings	cold, thirsty, hungry, happy, sad, tired, hot, afraid, angry	How do you feel?, I am..., I feel..., Why?	
27b	revision: feelings		I am sorry	
28	asking for help	help, toilet, police, fire, hurt, doctor	Excuse me..., Can you help me please?, Where is a doctor?, My ... hurts, Where is a toilet?, Where is the police?, Help!, Fire!	
29a	working with a dictionary		What is ... in English?	
29b	revision: working with a dictionary			
30	general revision			
31a	being invited to someone's home	Unit 2; bread, egg, cake, fruit, vegetable, glass, spoon, cup, plate, need	How can I help you?, Can I have ... please?, Thank you, I need	
31b	revision: being invited to someone's home			
32	numbers 31-100, telling the time	numbers 31-100, o'clock, hours, day, night, morning, evening, noon, afternoon	What is the time?	
33a	shopping and buying	Shop, money, buy, price	Can I have ..., please? How much is it? You are welcome.	
33b	revision: shopping and buying			
34	writing about events			simple vs. progressive, past tense
35	general revision			

The materials are tested again in Goldkronach (near Bayreuth)¹³. The feedback that we have

¹³ Since so many students wanted to attend *BGE.*, the principal decided to have two groups with each of them

gotten from the teacher so far is, save exceptionally, again very positive. After the completion of more lessons, we will publish another report.

In conclusion, if teachers are flexible enough to get empathically connected to the learners, if they give them the time they need to produce utterances, if they allow them to tell something about themselves and if teachers are familiar with the empirically based requirements of successful lingua franca talk, if error tolerance is based on the lingua franca core, our preliminary studies show that *BGE* seems to be an effective and efficient way to teach children global communicative competence¹⁴.

Joachim Grzega
Philosophische Fakultät
Nordhäuser Straße 63
99089 Erfurt, Germany
 or:
Sprach- und Literaturwiss. Fakultät
Universitätsallee 1
Katholische Univ. Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
85072 Eichstätt, Germany
joachim.grzega@ku-eichstaett.de
www.grzega.de

Marion Schöner
Sprach- und Literaturwiss. Fakultät
Universitätsallee 1
Katholische Univ. Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
85072 Eichstätt, Germany
marion_schoener@yahoo.de
www.marionmatschi.de

References

- Böttger, Heiner (2005), *Englisch lernen in der Grundschule*, Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinckhardt.
- Crawford, Jane C. (2001), "Teacher perceptions of the primary English language program in Taiwan: From the outside looking in", *Proceedings Applied Linguistic Association of Australia Annual Conference*, Canberra, 2001. (http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00000510/01/crawford_teacher.PDF)
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihalyi (1990), *Flow = The Psychology of Optimal Experience*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Frankl, Viktor E. (1946), *Man's Search for Meaning: An Introduction to Logotherapy*, Boston: Beacon.
- Grzega, Joachim (2005a), "Socioeconomic Linguistics (or Linguistic Socioeconomics—a New Field of European and Global Research and Teaching)", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 2: 19-43.
- Grzega, Joachim (2005b), "Towards Global English via Basic Global English (BGE): Socioeconomic and Pedagogic Ideas for a European and Global Language (with Didactic Examples for Native Speakers of German)", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 2: 65-164.
- Grzega, Joachim (2006), "Developing More than Just Linguistic Competence: The Model LdL for Teaching Foreign Languages (with a Note on Basic Global English)", *Humanising Language Teaching* 8.5 (<http://www.hltnmag.co.uk>)
- Händeler, Erik (2005), *Kondratieffs Welt: Wohlstand nach der Industriegesellschaft*, Moers: Brendow.
- Holliday, A. (2005), *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- House, Juliane (1999), "Misunderstanding in Intercultural Communication: Interaction in English as a Lingua Franca and the Myth of Mutual Intelligibility", in: Gnutzmann, Claus (ed.) (1999), *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language*, 73-89, Tübingen: Stauffenberg.
- House, Juliane (2002), "Developing Pragmatic Competence in English as a Lingua Franca", in: Knapp/Meierkord 2002: 245-267.
- Hunfeld, Hans (2004), *Fremdheit als Lernimpuls: Skeptische Hermeneutik, Normalität des Fremden, Fremdsprache Literatur*, Meran: Alpha Beta.
- James, Carl (1998), *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*, Harlow: Pearson Education.

being taught 45 min. of *BGE* per week.

¹⁴ Apart from composing a textbook for 2nd grades at elementary schools, we are also completing a *BGE* textbook for adult learners.

- Jenkins, Jennifer (2003), *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*, London: Routledge.
- Klippel, Friederike (2000), *Englisch in der Grundschule: Handbuch für einen kindgemäßen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Knapp, Karlfried / Meierkord, Christiane (eds.) (2002), *Lingua Franca Communication*, Frankfurt (Main): Lang.
- Krogh, Georg von / Wicki, Yvonne (2002), "Wissensgenerierung ermöglichen – Enabling Knowledge Creation", in: Bleicher, Knut / Berthel, Jürgen (eds.), *Auf dem Weg in die Wissensgesellschaft: Veränderte Strategien, Strukturen und Kulturen*, 132-148, Frankfurt (Main): Frankfurter Allgemeine.
- Kubanek, Angelika (1999), "Frühes Fremdsprachenlernen in Europa", in: Hermann-Brennecke, Gisela (ed.), *Frühes schulisches Fremdsprachenlernen zwischen Theorie und Empirie*, [Hallenser Studien zur Anglistik und Amerikanistik 5], 156-176, Münster: LIT.
- Lakoff, George / Johnson, Mark (1999), *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*, New York: Basic Books.
- Lesznyák, Ágnes (2004), *Communication in English as an International Lingua Franca: An Exploratory Case Study*, Norderstedt: Books on Demand.
- Lewin, Kurt (1946), "Action research and minority problems", *Journal of Social Issues* 2.4: 34-46.
- Martin, Jean-Pol (1985), *Zum Aufbau didaktischer Teilkompetenzen beim Schüler: Fremdsprachenunterricht auf der lerntheoretischen Basis des Informationsverarbeitungsansatzes*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Martin, Jean-Pol (1994), *Vorschlag eines anthropologisch begründeten Curriculums für den Fremdsprachenunterricht*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Maslow, Abraham H. (1954), *Motivation and Personality*, New York: Harper & Row.
- McKay, Sandra (2002), *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meierkord, Christiane / Knapp, Karlfried (2002), "Approaching Lingua Franca Communication", in: Knapp/Meierkord 2002: 9-28.
- Mindt, Dieter / Schlüter, Norbert (2003), *Englisch in den Klassen 3 und 4: Grundlagen für einen ergebnisorientierten Unterricht*, Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Mißler, Bettina / Multhaupt, Uwe (eds.) (1999), *The Construction of Knowledge, Learner Autonomy and Related Issues in Foreign Language Learning*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Pienemann, Manfred (2005), *Cross-Linguistic Aspects of Processability Theory*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pienemann, Manfred / Keßler, Jörg-U. / Roos, Eckhard (2006), *Englischerwerb in der Grundschule: Ein Studien- und Arbeitsbuch*, Paderborn etc.: Schöningh.
- Rifkin, Jeremy (2004), *The European Dream: How Europe's Vision of the Future Is Quietly Eclipsing the American Dream*, New York: Tarcher/Penguin.
- Ryan, Richard M. / Deci, Edward L. (2000), "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being", *American Psychologist* 55: 68-78. (http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/documents/2000_RyanDeci_SDT.pdf)
- Schmid-Schönbein, Gisela (2001), *Didaktik: Grundschulenglisch*, Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara (2004), "Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209-239.
- Spiegel, Peter (2005), *Faktor Mensch: Ein humanes Weltwirtschaftswunder ist möglich -- Ein Report an die Global Marshall Plan Initiative*, Stuttgart: Horizonte.
- Spitzer, Manfred (2002), *Lernen: Gehirnforschung und die Schule des Lebens*, Heidelberg/Berlin: Spektrum.
- Teuchert-Noodt, Gertraud et al. (2003), *Lernen durch Lehren: Physiologische Grundlagen des Lernens*, Göttingen: IWF.
- Varonis, Evangeline / Gass Susan (1985), "Non-Native/Non-Native Conversations: A Model for Negotiation of Meaning", *Applied Linguistics* 6: 71-90.
- Waas, Ludwig (2003), "Brickwords: Wörter, die das Klangbild nicht stören", *Grundschulmagazin Englisch* 5/2003: 17-19.
- Wagner, Johannes / Firth, Alan (1997), "Communication Strategies at Work", in: Kasper, Gabriele / Kellerman, Eric (eds.), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 323-344, London: Longman.
- Yule, George (1990), "Interactive Conflict Resolution in English", *World Englishes* 9.1: 53-62.