

Perspectives

English as a Lingua Franca and Its Implications for English Language Teaching

Chit Cheung Matthew Sung
Lancaster University

In recent years, the use of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) worldwide has given rise to the question of whether English as a Native Language (ENL) norms should continue to be used in the English Language Teaching (ELT) classroom. In this paper I explore the controversial issues surrounding the implications of ELF for ELT by considering the practicalities of language teaching and learning. I argue that ELF should not be seen as in competition with ENL or as a replacement of ENL for pedagogical purposes. Instead, ENL and ELF can play different but complementary roles in ELT. Although ENL may remain as the primary model for pedagogy as a point of reference, there is a need for teachers to raise students' awareness of ELF use in reality, including the notion of language variation in ELF and the role of English in today's world.

英語がリンガフランカとして世界中で使用されるに至り、ここにひとつの疑問が浮かび上がる。それは、母語としての英語（以下ENL）使用の基準が教室で英語を教える際に使われ続けてもいいのかどうか、という疑問である。本稿では、言語指導そして言語学習における実用性を念頭に、英語というリンガフランカ（以下ELF）の基準を英語教育（以下ELT）の指導に適用することをめぐる問題について考察する。筆者の考えでは、ELFをENLと競争関係にあるもの、あるいは指導を目的としたENLの代用として見なすべきではない。そうではなく、ENLとELFはそれぞれに異なった働きが、しかもELTの場で互いを補い合う働きがある。ENLは指導のための第一義的な参照対象であり続けると思われるが、その一方で、ELFの言語的多様性に対する考え方、そして現代社会における英語の役割を含めたELFの現実そのものを学習者が認識するよう、教師は努める必要がある。

For many years, two dominant varieties of English, namely British and American English, have been upheld as the most widely acceptable models for English Language Teaching (ELT) in many parts of the world. However, the widespread use of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) has given rise to the controversial issue of whether English as a Native Language (ENL) norms should continue to be taught in the ELT classroom, especially in Expanding Circle countries (Kachru, 1985), such as Japan and China. As a result, the default adoption of these two major varieties of ENL in ELT has been called into question. In the last decade or so, in an attempt to challenge the appropriateness of the use of ENL models in ELT, several ELF researchers have advocated a reorientation of English away from the deference to ENL use in the ELT classroom and have emphasized the legitimacy of variations displayed by ELF users (Jenkins, 2000, 2007; Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2007, 2010; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2004; Sung, 2010, 2011, 2012). Alptekin (2002), for example, called for a new pedagogical model to accommodate the rise of English as a means of international and intercultural communication, arguing that the strict adherence to ENL norms is inappropriate for acquisition of English as an international language for cross-cultural settings. Kirkpatrick (2007) also argued against the use of an ENL model in the ELT classroom, as such a practice is seen to be advantageous for only a very small percentage of the total population of teachers and learners worldwide. In light of the controversies surrounding these challenges to the traditional pedagogical practice of placing priority upon ENL norms, it is worth examining the implications of ELF for ELT. In this paper, I shall explore the issue by considering how ELF has an impact on language teaching and learning. I will conclude by making some recommendations on how both ELF and ENL can make a useful contribution to ELT practice.

ELF: The New Paradigm

As Graddol (2006) noted, ELF is “probably the most radical and controversial approach to emerge in recent years” (p. 87). According to the ELF perspective, ENL does not represent a valid model for learners of English, as nonnative speakers of English are more likely to use English with other nonnative speakers than with native speakers of English for intercultural communication. As Jenkins (2000) pointed out, “a native-like accent is not necessary for intelligibility” in ELF interactions (p. 207). McKay (2009) also argued that “reliance on a native speaker model as the pedagogical target must be set aside” (p. 239). Similarly, Seidlhofer (2001) saw ENL as the “straightjacket” that discourages the pursuit of an alternative that may more

accurately reflect the changes in the use of English worldwide. Seidlhofer also noted that

uncoupling the language from its native speakers and probing into the nature of ELF for pedagogical purposes holds the exciting, if uncomfortable, prospect of bringing up for reappraisal just about *every* issue and tenet in language teaching which the profession has been traditionally concerned with. (p. 151)

Indeed, the notion of “native speaker” has been challenged by a number of researchers. For example, Davies (2003) argued that the notion of native speaker is a myth. Modiano (1999) suggested that the primary criterion for classifying different speakers of English should be language competence, rather than nativeness, as language competence should not be something owned solely by native speakers. Similarly, Rampton (1996) pointed out that native-speaker competence has often become conflated with notions of ethnicity and race, and therefore, there is a need to differentiate between expertise and affiliation or inheritance. Although the former is achievable for second language (L2) learners, the idea that some people are *born* as native speakers of a language implies that L2 learners can never achieve the same status, regardless of their effort. Rampton therefore suggested the replacement of the terms *native speaker* and *nonnative speaker* with *expert* and *novice* respectively, with the intention of placing emphasis on language expertise rather than nativeness in conceptualization of language competence.

Furthermore, among ELF researchers, it is considered problematic to pass native-speaker judgments on appropriate usage in ELF contexts (Seidlhofer, 2004). One reason is that what may be perceived as odd if judged against the standards of ENL could be perfectly intelligible to ELF users (Seidlhofer, 2001). It is therefore argued that such instances should not be treated as errors but as characteristics of ELF usage, and as such, should not necessitate explicit remediation in language pedagogy. In a similar vein, Jenkins (2000) suggested that “there really is no justification for doggedly persisting in referring to an item as ‘an error’ if the vast majority of the world’s L2 English speakers produce and understand it” (p. 160).

As a result, several ELF scholars have looked into the possibility of developing and promoting an alternative to ENL pedagogical models in ELT (Jenkins, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2007). They have claimed that a new pedagogical model, an alternative to ENL, is necessary and could be more relevant for L2 users in international communication. In particular, ELF scholars have made suggestions about the implications of the descriptions of ELF for language

pedagogy and have called for the recognition of the pedagogical relevance of the ELF paradigm. Specifically, Jenkins (2007) referred to “ELF as a potential provider of norms for English language teaching” (p. xii). Previously, Seidlhofer (2001) had argued that the description of ELF “could serve as a potential basis for formulating a curriculum for the teaching of ELF” (p. 141). In other words, a description and codification of ELF is seen to provide “a feasible, acceptable and respected alternative to ENL in appropriate contexts of use” (p. 150). Seidlhofer also envisaged that

the conceptualization of ELF as an alternative to ENL would open up an additional repertoire of options for appropriating “English” [and] of using ELF as a possible first step for learners in building up a basis from which they can then pursue their own learning in directions (ELF or ENL). (p. 151)

It should be noted that much of ELF research has been concerned with spoken communication, rather than written forms of communication. One reason is that greater leeway is often given for the use of variant forms in spoken communication than in written communication (Horner, 2011). Most variation in ELF is found in spoken communication, where the negotiation of meaning and the use of interactive patterns in spoken English are left to the interactants, with little monitoring (Mauranen, 2003). What seems to matter most in ELF spoken communication is intelligibility among the interactants, rather than formal correctness. On the other hand, the written language is more stable than its spoken counterpart as a result of the availability of printed materials in Standard English in many parts of the world. As a result, there is less room for variability in written English for ELF purposes, particularly in genres such as academic English.

In exploring the implications of ELF for ELT in this paper, I shall now focus on the teaching of English for spoken communication in particular and consider the issue from several perspectives relating to the practicalities of language teaching and learning, including (a) the problems of ELF as a pedagogical model, (b) the distinctions between language learning and language use, (c) learners’ needs, and (d) teachers’ perspectives.

Problems of ELF as a Pedagogical Model

In view of ELF scholars’ recommendations to reconsider the dominant role of ENL in the ELT classroom, several issues contradict the acceptance of ELF as a pedagogical model. One major issue is that ELF refers to a context of

use, rather than a variety (or a set of varieties) of English. Although corpus-based research on spoken interaction (e.g., Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2004) has identified a number of regularly occurring lexico-grammatical features of ELF, it is doubtful whether these features are sufficient to justify the claim that ELF is a distinctive variety (Ferguson, 2009). Indeed, ELF is characterized by variability, and “variation from the norm in lingua franca communication is itself likely to be the ‘norm’” (Rubdy & Saraceni, 2006, p. 12). ELF is thus best seen as a process or a communicative activity.

Another issue with conceptualizing ELF as a variety of English is that there does not seem to be a stable community of ELF users. Instead, the community of ELF users is characterized by heterogeneity, with different constellations of speakers of diverse first-language backgrounds in every interaction (Maley, 2010; Meiercord, 2004). And given the variable, dynamic, and fluid nature of ELF use, any attempts at codifying ELF as a variety of English may be unrealistic. For these reasons, ELF is inoperable as a pedagogical model, and it is highly uncertain whether ELF could provide alternative norms or an alternative set of norms to which learners might orient (Timmis, 2012).

Instead, learners should be provided with a model (or a specific variety of English) as a starting point so that they can develop and use their own version of English (see Hartle, 2010). Depending on the particular context of use, learners may adapt the features of the model and make accommodation and modifications accordingly. In other words, it is also worth examining the distinctions between the two different contexts of language learning and language use (see Swan, 2012), a point to which I shall now turn.

Distinctions Between Language Learning and Language Use

ELF research is primarily concerned with language use, rather than language learning. For example, several prominent lexico-grammatical features in ELF spoken interactions are identified in the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English project (VOICE; Seidlhofer, 2004), the aim of which is to redress the balance in relation to a perceived overemphasis on ENL corpora:

- dropping the third person present tense *-s*;
- confusing the relative pronouns *who* and *which*;
- omitting definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in ENL and inserting them where they do not occur in ENL;
- failing to use correct forms in tag questions (e.g., *isn't it* or *no?* instead of *shouldn't they?*);
- inserting redundant prepositions as in *We have to study about . . .*;

- overusing certain verbs of high semantic generality, such as *do, have, make, put, take*;
- replacing infinitive-constructions with that-clauses, as in *I want that*; and
- overdoing explicitness (e.g., *black color* rather than just *black*). (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 220)

The above lexico-grammatical features of ELF should be seen as an end product of language use and should not be used as a starting point in second language teaching and learning. It is therefore problematic to adopt the end product of ELF use as the starting point or the pedagogical model. It is equally problematic to assume that comprehensibility is all English learners need (Kuo, 2007).

Indeed, a restricted focus on features crucial to intelligibility might result in an impoverished syllabus in ELT (Kuo, 2006; Timmis, 2012). As Saraceni (2008) pointed out, “nobody needs a model of English construed and constructed in academia for them, no matter how much it is based on empirical research” (p. 25). Although descriptive work on ELF use may be used in awareness-raising activities, teachers should not restrict themselves to the teaching of ELF features. Such an approach would be rather reductive and miss the point that these features are applied and appropriated by language users regularly and flexibly for effective communication (Hartle, 2010).

Rather, it is crucial to provide learners with a codified pedagogical model as a point of reference in order to prepare them for international communication. Essentially, a pedagogical model is an idealized or simplified language system that attempts to capture the language that is commonly used among educated speakers of the language (Petzold, 2002). In other words, it does not necessarily reflect the rich variety of individual differences or recent innovations among speakers of the language. Although learners are likely to encounter variability in language use, they need “clear and consistent learning models” (Swan, 2012, p. 384) so that they can develop competence in a standard variety of English. Despite being exposed to different nonstandard ELF features in the real world, learners need to be presented with basic information about core constituents of the language in the classroom and these constituents are very likely to be drawn from common elements of the major standard varieties of English. ELF features, however, even those found in learners’ own localities, are unlikely to constitute a proper model in second language pedagogy. One reason is that some of the ELF features may simply be dialectal idiosyncrasies that may or may not be shared by other ELF speakers (Gorlach, 2002).

It is also worth acknowledging the distinction between what is taught and what is learnt. As Sowden (2012) pointed out,

it is less crucial that the model presented for teaching can be precisely reproduced, since it will not usually be completely mastered, than that it serves as a clear marker for the classroom and, with more ambitious students, for the wider world beyond. (p. 5)

In other words, the chosen model should not be seen as a target, but rather as a convenient point of reference in the ELT classroom (Kuo, 2007). Although I do not deny the possibility of learners achieving native-like competence, the majority of learners tend to reach only a moderate level of competency and rarely achieve full proficiency (Sowden, 2012). Van den Doel (2010) also made the similar point that the adoption of an ENL model in the classroom does not necessarily imply the attainment of a native-speaker target.

Learners' Needs

It is also worthwhile to consider learners' needs and preferences when pedagogical decisions are made. As Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994) noted, "giving learners what they want may not always be possible or desirable, but it is obvious that their attitudes should be taken into account in pronunciation, as in other aspects of language" (p. 8). Baumgardner and Brown (2003) also pointed out that "the choice of a pedagogical model [should] come from the users and potential users of English themselves" (p. 249). As a great deal of research shows, there is a clear preference for native-speaker norms in ELT among learners (e.g., Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenboeck, & Smit, 1997; He & Li, 2009; Scales, Wennerstrom, Richard, & Wu, 2006; Timmis, 2002). It is indeed understandable that most learners are likely to strive for what they perceive to be the best they can achieve, even though they may or may not be able to do so ultimately (Maley, 2010).

Indeed, most learners tend to see the standard model as a convenient starting point in the classroom so that they can develop their own variety of English as L2 speakers. Learners of English usually conform to ENL norms in some respects but not necessarily in others (Swan, 2012). In addition, many learners are "unconcerned about emulating native-speaker norms of correctness except in so far as these are likely to serve their communicative purposes and are perfectly satisfied with approximations that are transparent and effective" (Swan, 2012, p. 381). In other words, an ENL model serves

only as a point of reference for learners; it is up to individual learners to decide to what extent they want to approximate to such a model.

Teachers' Perspectives

Apart from learners' needs, teachers' perspectives need to be taken into account. According to previous research (e.g., Murray, 2003; Sifakis & Sougari, 2005; Timmis, 2002; Tsui & Bunton, 2000), there is a tendency for non-native teachers of English to look for an exonormative, native-speaker model for teaching purposes. In other words, many nonnative teachers of English seem to hold a norm-bound view and emphasize the teaching of standard ENL models in their current pedagogical practices (Sifakis & Sougari, 2005). One reason for these teachers' preference for the ENL model is that they seem reluctant to discredit their prior and ongoing efforts and investment into developing their competence in ENL (Murray, 2003).

However, and more important, most teachers of English, both native and nonnative, usually simply try to teach the forms of English that will allow learners to function effectively in most situations, regardless of whether these forms are regarded as ELF or ENL. In particular, they are often committed to "providing learners with a repertoire of well selected vocabulary, sentence patterns and grammar, as well as a stock of communication strategies" (Richards, 2006, p. 22). As for assessment, for example, most teachers pay attention to how successful communication is achieved as well as the range and appropriateness of language use, rather than simply whether or not the language produced by the learners conforms to a certain standard (Hartle, 2010; Taylor, 2006).

Although some researchers make a claim about the conservatism of language teaching (see Sewell, 2013), I would argue that language teaching is not necessarily conservative, but is primarily pragmatic in orientation. As some recent research studies (Goh, 2009; Timmis, 2002) show, many non-native teachers of English also report that they do not necessarily insist on strict conformity to ENL norms unless certain nonstandard features impede communication. Similarly, Young and Walsh (2010) found that most non-native teachers of English claimed to teach a standard based as closely as possible on ENL. It was also found that these teachers held a practical perspective on ELF, emphasizing the need for a standard form of the language, even if it may not necessarily correspond to the reality of the current global use of English.

It is undeniably important to understand teachers' views, as it is ultimately teachers, not researchers, who decide to what degree descriptions of ELF are

relevant to classroom teaching. As Jenkins (2012) admitted, ELF researchers “do not see it as their role to encroach any further on to teacher territory” (p. 492). It is also unrealistic for ELF researchers to decide what learners of English should learn in order to communicate with one another. As Maley (2009) pointed out, there tends to be a discrepancy between the concerns of teachers and those of researchers, since “most teachers of English are sublimely unaware of the ELF debate, which for the most part takes place among a very small group of researchers” (p. 196). Maley went on to suggest:

Even those who are aware of it, even if they sympathise, live in a very different reality from that of the researchers. Teachers are committed to promoting effective learning among their students. The world of theory and research has rarely had much direct impact on what teachers do in classrooms, and it is unrealistic to suppose it should. (p. 196)

It is also important to be aware of the danger of imposing the features of ELF use on ELT, as Tomlinson (2006) pointed out:

Are we not being rather arrogant in assuming it is we as applied linguists, language planners, curriculum designers, teachers, and materials developers who will determine the characteristics of a World Standard English? Is it not the users of English as a global language who will determine these characteristics as a result of negotiating interaction with each other? (p. 146)

Thus, although it is desirable that teachers’ awareness of the lingua franca role of English and the linguistic features in most ELF interactions be raised by researchers, it is crucial to understand teachers’ perspectives on how best to implement an ELF approach in classroom practice. In so doing, teachers themselves should, in turn, take careful account of learners’ opinions about the kind of English they would like to learn in the classroom, especially in light of the importance currently attached to a learner-centered approach to language teaching.

A Way Forward: ENL and ELF in ELT

I shall now turn to making recommendations as to how both ENL and ELF can contribute to ELT practices. I would argue that ELF should not be seen as a competitor with or a replacement for ENL for language teaching purposes. As Sewell (2013) pointed out, there seems to be a tendency for

ELF researchers to essentialize and exaggerate the differences between ELF and ENL, thereby creating a false dichotomy. Rather, ENL and ELF can play different but complementary roles in ELT. Specifically, my argument is that although ENL may remain as the primary pedagogical model or point of reference in the classroom, there is a need for teachers to raise students' awareness of ELF use in reality, including the notion of language variation and change in ELF and the role of English in today's world.

There is a need for a model of some kind for pedagogical purposes, that is, a model that learners can orient to. Ideally, such a model should be codified and be internationally intelligible and acceptable. It would be useful for learners to learn the forms of a given model of English before they develop their own version of English. However, L2 learners' own form of English is not always or necessarily the product of a conscious decision, but tends to evolve naturally due to the impact of their first language. This is particularly true of pronunciation, and the same could be said of lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic features of English, albeit to a lesser extent.

The choice of a pedagogical model may or may not match an ENL variety, but an ENL model can serve as a convenient point of reference in understanding the diversity of English varieties in ELF communication (Kuo, 2007). As Shibata (2010) noted, "without understanding [the] linguistic features of the standard form, learners cannot be aware of the uniqueness of the English they use" (p. 132). In other words, standard ENL can serve as a useful and convenient point for reference so that learners can recognize how their local variety of English is different from standard English and how different local varieties of English differ from one another.

When an ENL model is adopted as a useful point of reference in the ELT classroom, it is essential that it not be promoted as the only correct, or standard, model of English or as an object of undue deference (Timmis, 2002). Teachers should also make learners aware that although they are learning a standard variety of ENL, there are other varieties of English around the world that they are likely to encounter in their lives (Maley, 2010). Where possible, learners should understand that "it is the needs of the local context and not the alleged superiority of the model that should inform their pedagogical choices" (Baumgardner & Brown, 2003, p. 249), as the choice of a pedagogical model is often made with reference to specific local contexts in which the teaching of English takes place, and issues such as attitudes towards different models, the models' perceived acceptability and prestige, and the availability of teaching materials are taken into consideration (Petzold, 2002).

It is also important to distinguish between seeing the chosen model as a *target* and as a *point of reference* (Hewings, 2004). A target is some standard to which the students aspire or that the teacher chooses as a goal for students. As a point of reference, on the other hand, a model is presented as a guide, and any intelligible variation from the model is considered acceptable. For example, an appropriate and reasonable goal of pronunciation is to achieve an English pronunciation that is understandable in international communication, although it is acceptable (and one might add, for most learners, inevitable) that some unobtrusive features of a nonnative English accent will be retained (Hewings, 2004). Prodromou (2009) also made a similar point that “models are not targets” (p. 80). Many learners do not expect that they will be able to sound like native speakers of English, but they still display a desire to orient to an ENL model of English as a reference point. As Prodromou pointed out, “learners are selective in their turn, taking from these partial models the elements they choose to, and are able to, assimilate” (p. 80). Indeed, it is inevitable that the majority of L2 users would not be able to attain native-speaker pronunciation, but

necessarily end up with their own individual varieties of English. They need to conform to NS [native-speaker] norms sufficiently to permit effective communication, but they may differ considerably from NS English and from each other (depending on learners’ mother tongues and other factors). (Prodromou, 2009, p. 81)

In other words, the use of an ENL model will, in any case, tend to result in forms of English similar to those that characterize ELF.

I shall now turn to considering the pedagogical implications of ELF use for ELT. One implication is that there is scope for an enhanced awareness of language variation among learners of English (Seidlhofer, 2011). As Dewey (2012) pointed out, ELF involves “a reorientation of thinking about language in the curriculum, of moving beyond the singularity that typifies current approaches in order to better encapsulate the diversity and plurality of communication” (p. 163). With the availability of different corpora of ELF use (e.g., VOICE; Seidlhofer, 2004), it is possible for teachers to raise learners’ awareness of language variation in ELF interactions. It would be advantageous to expose learners to a range of native and nonnative varieties of English, rather than a single or a restricted range of Englishes in the ELT classroom (McKenzie, 2010). In doing so, teachers can provide learners with critical awareness of language variation at the appropriate stage, so that they are capable of entering into a range of discourse communities (Sewell, 2013).

One possibility of introducing language variation is an awareness-raising approach, whereby little emphasis is placed on production. Such an approach would involve exposing learners to different varieties of English in comprehension mode whenever possible and training learners' receptive ability in understanding different variants of English in ELF contexts. In doing so, learners may increase their comprehensibility and tolerance of different nonstandard features in ELF interactions.

On a practical level, it is crucial to consider carefully how language variation should be introduced in the classroom. Should different L1 and L2 varieties of English be presented? If so, which varieties of English and what kinds of variants should be selected? A careful and systematic approach to introducing language variation must be in place before any attempts to incorporate language variation are made. In particular, teachers should consider a number of issues, for example, which native-speaker or L2 accents should be included, whether only highly-intelligible accents or a full range of accents should be used, how much exposure would be needed in the ELT classroom, and when learners would be ready for language variation (Sung, 2013b). Tentatively, it is suggested that in pedagogical terms, exposure to different accents of English could be implemented after it is felt that sufficient time has elapsed for the main pronunciation model to become properly established, thereby minimising the risk of confusion.

Furthermore, learners should be made aware of the fluidity of language, of the complex relationship between the abstract level of language model and the actual language use as enacted in communication (Dewey & Leung, 2010). In particular, a *polycentric model* perspective should be encouraged that involves a respect for local variation and a willingness to engage in the shared pursuit of intelligibility and comprehensibility, so that it allows individual variations in ELF use and the expression of local identity, while at the same time enabling the existence of a model or standard (Maley, 2009). Meanwhile, teachers should provide students with an accurate picture concerning the global role of English and the use of ELF worldwide. Teachers should also introduce learners to the ELF view that English is no longer the exclusive property of its native speakers and that the ownership of English is shared by both L1 and L2 users of English (see Matsuda, 2006). It is hoped that, in so doing, learners will develop a tolerant and open-minded attitude about the diversity of English and ELF use around the world.

In addition, ELF is not only concerned with awareness, but also with choice (see Cogo, 2012). What ELF offers learners is the choice to appropriate features of the language flexibly, depending on the contexts in which

they find themselves. As Cogo (2012) points out, “they can choose to speak like native speakers when and if they want to, but they may want to speak ELF, and in certain situations, this may even be more appropriate” (p. 104). It should be up to learners to decide what kind of English they would like to learn, given that learners’ choice of a model may be closely tied up with their preferred identities and personal aspirations (Sung, 2013a).

Finally, there is a need for teachers to put more emphasis on the process of using the language, rather than exclusively on the teaching of the language model and the linguistic features associated with it. As Dewey (2012) aptly noted, “ELF is relevant not so much in terms of identifying alternative sets of norms, but more in terms of enabling us to move beyond normativity” (p. 166). As the use of ELF inevitably involves strategies and processes, an awareness of communicative competence and processes in ELF use is important. In such a way, learners would be aware of “the diversity among users and the multiplicity of uses to which English is put worldwide and think in terms of varied processes of interaction rather than a single prescriptive model” (Seidlhofer, 2006, p. 40).

Apart from developing learners’ awareness of the variability in ELF use, teachers should also try to inculcate the importance of communicative strategies in dealing with the variability and fluidity inherent in ELF use. For example, teachers can focus on helping learners develop fluency and strategic competence to manage miscommunication or incomprehension. Particular emphasis should be placed on the training of interpersonal and negotiation skills that allow people to achieve intelligibility and communicative success in ELF interactions. In particular, accommodation skills should be seen as a part of assessing learners’ communicative competence in ELT, given the importance of a speaker’s flexibility to accommodate in ensuring effective communication. As Jenkins (2000) pointed out, “intelligibility is dynamically negotiable between speaker and listener, rather than statically inherent in a speaker’s linguistic forms” (p. 79). It is therefore essential to develop learners’ strategic skills for accommodation and collaborative negotiation of meaning, for example, strategies of repair and clarification as well as paralinguistic strategies.

Conclusion

This paper has examined the implications of ELF for ELT by considering the practicalities of language teaching and learning. I have argued that both ELF and ENL can play different but complementary roles in ELT. Although it

is true that descriptions of ELF use can be instrumental in raising learners' awareness of language variation in ELF communication, they cannot by any means be seen as the sole factor in determining the kinds of linguistic input that may be best for pedagogical purposes, as ELT is concerned primarily with attempting to meet language learning needs rather than simply presenting models of language use. ELF use, as Sewell (2013) notes, is inevitably "variable, emergent, contextual, and subject to hybridity and change" (p. 3). For pedagogical purposes, there is a need for a model to which learners can orient. Rather than attempting to search for a substitute for an ENL model for pedagogical purposes, it would be useful to find ways to engender changes in perspective and attitudes towards ELF use and the linguistic features associated with it among teachers and learners. Meanwhile, there is a need for "a shift in focus away from a set of predetermined linguistic norms and towards a focus on items of lexis and grammar that are most often used by accomplished ELF speakers" (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 176).

It is also important that teachers help empower learners to make choices about the language they use so that they can become fully competent speakers of English who are capable of presenting themselves in whatever way they would like (see Ushioda, 2009). As Saraceni (2009) noted, "seeking to devise an appropriate model of English involves a will to make choices that are the exclusive right of each individual user of English" (p. 25). Regardless of whether learners choose to speak ENL or ELF, the teaching of English should provide learners with the greatest sense of self-agency in interactions involving English as a lingua franca.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Alan Waters for his valuable comments on an earlier version of the article. I would also like to thank Miho Yorozu for her help in providing the Japanese abstract for the article.

Chit Cheung Matthew Sung holds a PhD in Linguistics from Lancaster University, UK. His research interests are in the areas of English as a lingua franca, discourse analysis, language and identity, and second language education. He has published in international refereed journals, including *Changing English*, *English Today*, *ELT Journal*, *English Text Construction*, *Brno Studies in English*, *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *Journal of Gender Studies*, and *The Language Teacher*.

References

- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56, 57-64. doi:10.1093/elt/56.1.57
- Baumgardner, R. J., & Brown, K. (2003). World Englishes: Ethics and pedagogy. *World Englishes*, 22, 245-251. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00294
- Cogo, A. (2012). English as a lingua franca: Concepts, use, and implications. *ELT Journal*, 66, 97-105. doi:10.1093/elt/ccr069
- Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analyzing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. London: Continuum.
- Dalton, C., & Seidlhofer, B. (1994). *Pronunciation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Kaltenboeck, G., & Smit, U. (1997). Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria. *World Englishes*, 16, 115-128. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00052
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1, 141-170. doi:10.1515/jelf-2012-0007
- Dewey, M., & Leung, C. (2010). English in English language teaching: Shifting values and assumptions in changing circumstances. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 25, 1-15.
- Ferguson, G. (2009). Issues in researching English as a lingua franca: A conceptual enquiry. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 119-135. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00225.x
- Goh, C. (2009). Perspectives on spoken grammar. *ELT Journal*, 63, 303-312. doi:10.1093/elt/ccp004
- Gorlach, M. (2002). *Still more Englishes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of English as a foreign language*. London: British Council.
- Hartle, S. (2010). Teaching English at the heart of the Expanding Circle. In C. Gagliardi & A. Maley (Eds.), *EIL, ELF, Global English: Teaching and learning issues* (pp. 93-104). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
- He, D., & Li, D. (2009). Language attitudes and linguistic features in the 'China English' debate. *World Englishes*, 28, 70-89. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2008.01570.x
- Hewings, M. (2004). *Pronunciation practice activities: A resource book for teaching English pronunciation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horner, B. (2011). Writing English as a lingua franca. In A. Archibald, A. Cogo, & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Latest trends in ELF research* (pp. 299-311). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca from classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66, 486-494. doi:10.1093/elt/ccs040
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44, 381-315. doi:10.1017/S0261444811000115
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kuo, I. C. (2006). Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 60, 213-221. doi:10.1093/elt/ccl001
- Kuo, I. C. (2007). A response to Cem Alptekin. *ELT Journal*, 61, 269-271. doi:10.1093/elt/ccm035
- Maley, A. (2009). ELF: A teacher's perspective. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9, 187-200. doi:10.1080/14708470902748848
- Maley, A. (2010). The reality of EIL and the myth of ELF. In C. Gagliardi & A. Maley (Eds.), *EIL, ELF, Global English: Teaching and learning issues* (pp. 25-44). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Matsuda, A. (2006). Negotiating ELT assumptions in EIL classrooms. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)Locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 158-170). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 513-527. doi:10.2307/3588402
- McKay, S. (2009). Pragmatics and EIL pedagogy. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language* (pp. 227-253). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- McKenzie, R. (2010). *The social psychology of English as a global language: Attitudes, awareness and identity in the Japanese context*. Dordrecht, Germany: Springer.
- Meiercord, C. (2004). Syntactic variation in interactions across international Englishes. *English World-Wide*, 25, 109-132. doi:10.1075/eww.25.1.06mei

- Modiano, M. (1999). Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today*, 15(4), 3-13. doi:10.1017/S0266078400011196
- Murray, H. (2003). Swiss English teachers and Euro-English: Attitudes to a non-native variety. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée*, 77, 147-165.
- Petzold, R. (2002). Toward a pedagogical model for ELT. *World Englishes*, 21, 422-426. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00259
- Prodromou, L. (2009). Review of English as a lingua franca: A corpus-based analysis. *ELT Journal*, 63, 78-81. doi:10.1093/elt/ccn064
- Rampton, B. (1996). Displacing the "native speaker": Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. In T. Hedge & N. Whitney (Eds.), *Power, pedagogy and practice* (pp. 9-22). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. (2006). Materials development and research: Making the connection. *RELC Journal*, 37, 5-26. doi:10.1177/0033688206063470
- Rubdy, R., & Saraceni, M. (2006). Introduction. In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 5-16). London: Continuum.
- Saraceni, M. (2008). English as a lingua franca: Between form and function. *English Today*, 24, 20-26. doi:10.1017/S0266078408000163
- Saraceni, M. (2009). Relocating English: Towards a new paradigm for English in the world. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9, 175-186. doi:10.1080/14708470902748830
- Scales, J., Wennerstrom, A., Richard, D., & Wu, S. H. (2006). Language learners' perceptions of accent. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 715-737. doi:10.2307/40264305
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 133-158.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 200-239. doi:10.1111/1473-4192.00011
- Seidlhofer, B. (2006). English as a lingua franca in the expanding circle: What it isn't. In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 40-50). London: Continuum.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sewell, A. (2013). English as a lingua franca: Ontology and ideology. *ELT Journal*, 67, 3-10. doi:10.1093/elt/ccs061
- Shibata, M. (2010). How Japanese teachers of English perceive non-native assistant English teachers. *System*, 38, 124-133. doi:10.1016/j.system.2009.12.011
- Sifakis, N., & Sougari, A.-M. (2005). Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 467-488. doi:10.2307/3588490

- Sowden, C. (2012). ELF on a mushroom: The overnight growth in English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 66, 89-96. doi:10.1093/elt/ccr024
- Sung, C. C. M. (2010). Being a purist in Hong Kong: To use or not to use mixed code. *Changing English*, 17, 411-19. doi:10.1080/1358684X.2010.528875
- Sung, C. C. M. (2011). Race and native speakers in ELT: Parents' perspectives in Hong Kong. *English Today*, 27(3), 25-29. doi:10.1017/S0266078411000344
- Sung, C. C. M. (2012). Non-native speaker teachers of English: Challenges and prospects. An interview with George Braine. *The Language Teacher*, 36(2), 23-26.
- Sung, C. C. M. (2013a). 'I would like to sound like Heidi Klum': What do non-native speakers say about who they want to sound like? *English Today*, 29(2), 17-21. doi:10.1017/S0266078413000102
- Sung, C. C. M. (2013b). English as a lingua franca and English language teaching: A way forward. *ELT Journal*, 67, 350-353. doi:10.1093/elt/cct015
- Swan, M. (2012). ELF and EFL: Are they really different? *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1, 379-389. doi:10.1515/jelf-2012-0025
- Taylor, L. (2006). The changing landscape of English: Implications for language assessment. *ELT Journal*, 60, 51-60. doi:10.1093/elt/ccj081
- Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: A classroom view. *ELT Journal*, 56, 240-249. doi:10.1093/elt/56.3.240
- Timmis, I. (2012). Spoken language research and ELT: Where are we now? *ELT Journal*, 66, 514-522. doi:10.1093/elt/ccs042
- Tomlinson, B. (2006). A multi-dimensional approach to teaching English for the world. In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 130-150). London: Continuum.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Bunton, D. (2000). The discourse and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong. *World Englishes*, 19, 287-303. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00180
- Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 215-228). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Van den Doel, R. (2010). Native and non-native models in ELT: Advantages, disadvantages, and the implications of accent parallelism. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 46, 349-365. doi:10.2478/v10010-010-0018-2
- Young, T., & Walsh, S. (2010). Which English? Whose English?: An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23, 123-137. doi:10.1080/07908311003797627