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Abstract

This research investigated the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) in the context of China-ASEAN communication, where the ELF speakers are mainly bilinguals or multilinguals, using English as non-native speakers. The focus of the study was on the lexicogrammatical features of ELF, especially L1 Chinese ELF users, the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users in this defined context and the implications of ELF for local language teaching. This research reviewed the key findings of previous research in other ELF contexts and Chinese English as references and adapted an ELF communicative competence model to analyse the linguistic features and pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users.

Corpus-based methods were applied in this research, utilising the Asian Corpus of English (ACE), which comprises one million words of naturally occurring ELF interactions. The Chinese subset of ACE formed the primary data of this research, including 18 recordings of naturally occurring ELF interactions. The total length of the recordings was seven and a half hours, involving 45 speakers of 13 different first languages. The data used in this study mainly comprised English talk shows on Chinese TV stations and websites, with topics covering politics, economics, diplomacy, sports, fashion, and popstars. The background information of most speakers and communication contexts were acquired for discourse analysis.

In terms of non-standard forms of lexicogrammar of ELF by Chinese users, there are nine lexicogrammatical features identified and their frequencies were noted. They were lexical and phrasal innovation, non-standard use of prepositions, grammatical disagreement, non-standard omission, subject pronoun copying (SPC), tag questions, self-repetitions, response to general questions and the use of adjacent default tense (ADT). The findings
indicate that Chinese ELF users are creative and flexible in using the language to meet their communicative needs. Furthermore, there was no evidence to show these non-standard forms necessarily caused misunderstanding or communication breakdowns in these China-ASEAN contexts. Mutual intelligibility appears more important than conforming to native speaker’s norms when communicating with other Asian multilingual ELF speakers.

The pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users in China-ASEAN contexts were examined in terms of strategic competence, sociocultural competence and discourse competence. Asian ELF users in this data were found to be active and flexible in using various communicative strategies to overcome problems or to facilitate their communication. The common strategies used by the ELF speakers included the use of lexical suggestion, paraphrasing, code-switching, asking for clarification and avoiding the use of local idioms. In addition, Asian ELF speakers were able to demonstrate a certain degree of sensitivity and flexibility in dealing with cultural differences and changes. It is worth noting that in emergent and dynamic ELF intercultural communication, Asian ELF speakers can move beyond cultural stereotypes. Moreover, the study of discourse competence indicates that Asian ELF speakers collaborate with and support each other by frequently using backchannels and echoing.

These findings are of significance in local English language teaching. It is suggested that the ELF approach is feasible and practical for language teaching for English majors in Guangxi, where there is increasing communication with people from ASEAN countries. The ELF communicative competence that has been described in this research, including linguistic competence, strategic competence, discourse competence and sociocultural competence, can be integrated into the pedagogical practice for English majors in Guangxi, with guidance of the five principles of ELF approach.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 General Development of English Language

It is remarkable today that English is used as an additional language by so many people around the world. Non-native English speakers now outnumber native English speakers. Even though English does not have the highest number of native speakers (Chinese does), it enjoys a “special” and “unrivalled position” as “a means of international communication” (Svartvik & Leech, 2006, p. 1). According to Crystal’s estimation (2003, p. 69), “one in four of the world’s population are now capable of communicating to a useful level in English” and there is “a grand total of 1.5 billion speakers”, including 750 million first and second English speakers and another 750 million speakers of English as a foreign language. Svartvik and Leech (2006) vividly demonstrate the development of English in the shape of a mushroom with a slim base and a huge cap (see Figure 1.1). The base is the longitudinal development of English history as a separate language starting about 500 AD, while the cap shows the astonishing global phenomenon of horizontal development of English in the last two centuries. What makes English unique today is not only the number of its speakers, but also the constitution of its speakers. There is no other language in the world where its non-native speakers outnumber its native speakers. Moreover, the communicative channels of English have gone beyond national borders. The new phenomenon of English development is labeled as “a language complex” (McArthur, 2003, p. 56). The spread of English, the function of English and the way to learn English in today’s social reality deserve careful investigation from new approaches and perspectives.
The popularity of English is not due to “its linguistic merits” (Svartvik & Leech, 2006, p. 6) but “the power of its people” Crystal (2003, p. 9) and the political and economic powers it represents. The reasons for the rapid spread of English can be summarized as the result of three major causes. First, the expedition and colonial expansion of English since the sixteenth century caused English to be adopted as an official language by many newly independent states. Second, the rise of the United States of America as a leading economic and scientific power in the twentieth century promoted the use of English. Third, the increasing need for international communication for the purpose of business, travel, academic information, or entertainment stimulated the growth of English.

Scholars have described the development of English in today’s world and examples include Stevens’s world map of English (1992), McArthur’s Circle of World English (1998), Kachru’s three-circle model (1988, 1992b) and Modiano’s centripetal Circle Model (1999). Kachru’s model is the most accepted and influential in the study of World Englishes (WE) and has been used in this research (see Figure 1.2 below), although gaps in his model have been discussed. Kachru (1988) divides World Englishes into three concentric circles. The Inner Circle includes countries such as UK and USA where
English as native language (ENL), with an estimated 320-380 million speakers. The Outer Circle comprises post-colonial countries where English is used as a second language (ESL) or an institutionalized additional language such as India and Malaysia, with an estimated number of speakers of 300-500 million. The Expanding Circle includes countries where English is used primarily as a foreign language (EFL), such as China and Japan, with an estimated number of speakers of 500-1000 million. The three circles “represent the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition, and the functional allocation of English in diverse cultural context” (Kachru, 1992b, p. 356). The English varieties in the Inner Circle are considered to be “norm-providing”, including grammars and textbooks; those in the Inner Circle are “norm-developing” as they are making efforts to develop their own standards with official status; and those in the Expanding Circle are “norm-dependent” as they rely on the standards set by the native speakers in the Inner Circle. The distinction between the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle also lies at the functional level. In the Outer Circle, English is used in various domains such as government, law, business, education and by people at different levels of society, ranging from the elites of business to taxi drivers (Bolton, 2009). As will be seen, the roles of English in many Expanding Circle countries have increased exponentially since Kachru’s original formulation. Bolton (2008, p. 9) suggests “there are interesting issues concerning the status, functions and features of English across a swathe of lesser-researched (Expanding Circle) societies, including Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, etc.” Berns (2005) also advocates systematic research into English users in the Expanding Circle.

When English is used as a lingua franca (ELF) for international communication, it means it will be used within and across the three circles, between native speakers and non-native speakers as well as between non-native speakers. Seidlhofer (2011, p. 7) defines ELF as “any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom
English is the communicative medium of choice”. She stresses that ELF interactions take place across Kachru’s three circles, that is, among people from different first language backgrounds, including those from the Inner and Outer Circles, and across lingua cultural boundaries. In fact, English is used more often among non-native speakers when no native speaker is present. The use of English among those who have learned it as an additional language is significant since English has reached a “historical phase in which the vast majority of English speakers belong to bilingual speech communities” (Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p. ix).

1.2 The New Role(s) of English as a Lingua Franca in Asia

The reality of English used by multilingual or bilingual speakers can be well witnessed in Asian context. The status of English in Asia is growing due to its wide use in commerce, trade and international relations. As Schneider (2014, p. 249) asserts, Asia “is the world region where the number of speakers of English is increasing most rapidly, and dynamic developments are more pronounced than anywhere else on the globe.” Bolton (2008) estimates that there are some 812 million English users in South Asia, Southeast Asia and East Asia. He points out that “the major spread of English in the region occurred not in the colonial period, but in the latter half of the twentieth century, as Asia’s developing education systems began using and teaching English within mass education systems” (Bolton, 2008, p. 7). It is believed that Asia will be a key influence in the future evolution of World Englishes (Kirkpatrick & Sussex, 2012).

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which consists of ten Southeast Asian countries, has adopted English as the sole working language of the group with the signing of the ASEAN Charter in 2009 (Kirkpatrick, 2008). This gives English privileged status within the ASEAN community. The extended group ASEAN+3 includes
the ten ASEAN members, namely Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Brunei, Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar and Cambodia plus three East Asian countries, namely, China, Japan and the South Korea. There is an approximate total of 448 million English speakers in the extended group based on the statistics provided by Bolton (2008). Figure 1.2 below shows the estimated English speaking population around the world in Kachru’s three circles. The Inner and Outer Circles consist of 75 territories, where English holds a “special place” (Crystal, 2003, p. 60). Figure 1.3 is an Asian version of Figure 1.2 and is based on Bolton’s (2008) estimation of the number of English speakers in the ASEAN+3 region. According to Kachru’s classification, there are no Inner Circle countries in this region. It is shown the total number of English users in ASEAN+3 has reached 470 million. The number in the Expanding Circle alone (390 million) is larger than the total number of native speakers (see Figure 1.2) and has continued to grow.

![Figure 1.2. Kachru’s three circles with Crystal’s estimation around the world (Crystal, 2003, p.61).](image-url)
The use of English in the ASEAN+3 region has attracted scholars’ interest in recent years. Kirkpatrick (2010a) has provided detailed account of the development and roles of English in the ASEAN countries. According to Kirkpatrick’s description, technically, Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore can be classified as the Outer Circle countries due to their British or American colonial histories and because English plays an institutional role. The rest fall into Kachru’s Expanding Circle due to the different levels and roles of English, and because English is taught as a foreign language. There is a special case of Myanmar in this region. Although Myanmar was a British colony, the institutional role of English in this country was lost when it became a military dictatorship in 1962. Only recently it began to promote the use of English but “with little success” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 10). In a recent article, Schneider (2014) argued that the status and role of English in Asian societies is gradually changing and there is a need to reclassify their categories in WE. He claimed that Singapore is on its way to becoming a native English speaking country (the Inner Circle) with more than half of the younger generation using English at home. He also believes that the Expanding Circle countries in ASEAN

Figure 1.3. Kachru’s three circles in the ASEAN+3 region with Bolton’s estimation (Bolton, 2008, p. 6).
where English has official status can become the Outer Circle. In addition, the three East Asian countries, China, Japan and Korea, which emphasise English in the educational systems, can be classified as having “EFL-plus” status (Schneider, 2014, p. 251). In China, learning English in school has been an official policy since the opening of China in the late 1970s. Mastering English is considered by both government and society as an important skill to meet the needs of internationalization and modernization. The usefulness of English is widely recognized among most Chinese people. “The value of English to individuals lies in its being an unstated qualification for employment, further education and an imperative for career development” (Pan & Block, 2011, p. 398). According to a national survey of language situation in Mainland China in 2000, the overwhelming majority (93.8%) of foreign-language learners had studied English in school (Wei & Su, 2012, p. 11). That is to say, more than 390 million, which is around one third of the national population, have learned some English and this figure would be much higher now since the survey was conducted 17 years ago. English as a lingua franca is therefore learnt not only for the purpose of communication with the Inner and Outer Circle countries, but to communicate with fellow multi-linguals across the region. Given the new role of English in the ASEAN+3 region Asia, there is a need for systematic and comprehensive research on the spread, features, function, acquisition and attitudes towards English in this context.

1.3 ASEAN-China Communication in Guangxi

In 2010, the China-ASEAN Free Trade Area (CAFTA) was established and became the most populous free trade area in the world, with a total of 1.8 billion consumers. CAFTA is The bilateral trade between China and ASEAN reached USD$480 billion in 2014 (Ma, 2015, Jan 30). The previous ten-year period (2004-2013) was termed the
“Golden 10 Years”, and the next ten-year period (2014-2023) has been termed the “Diamond 10 Years”, due to the collaboration between China and ASEAN. Wang Yi, Chinese Foreign Minister, points out that “China and ASEAN countries have become a community of highly-intertwined interests, forming a landscape of interwoven interests and interdependent development” ("China-ASEAN FM meeting," 2016, June 14). Guangxi, a southern province in China, has played an important role in connecting China and ASEAN countries due to its geographical situation. Guangxi, sharing border with Vietnam, becomes the most convenient pathway for South China and East China going to ASEAN countries in Indo-China Peninsula. In recent years, Guangxi has witnessed the increasing economic and cultural exchanges between China and ASEAN. ASEAN has been the most important trading partner of Guangxi for 13 consecutive years. The trade volume between Guangxi and ASEAN jumped from USD 1 billion in 2004 to USD 27.7 billion in 2015. In March 2015, Chinese President Xi Jinping said “Guangxi should become an international pathway to ASEAN countries, a new strategic pivot in Southwest and Central China’s opening up strategy, and a dynamic portal connecting the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road and the Silk Road Economic Belt” ("Guangxi-ASEAN," 2016 May 30).

At the 7th ASEAN-China (10+1) Leaders’ Summit in 2003, Nanning, the capital city of Guangxi, was proposed as the permanent venue for the annual China-ASEAN Exposition (CAEXPO). Since 2004, CAEXPO, which is sponsored by China’s Ministry of Commerce and related departments of ASEAN nations, has been held in Nanning annually. Dozens of sub-forums are also held in the same period in Nanning and nearby cities. These forums concern finance, trade, legal issues, transport, agriculture, medicine, environment, tourism, culture and education. CAEXPO was among the top ten exhibitions in China in 2012. In addition to CAEXPO, other ASEAN related events held
in Nanning include the ASEAN-China Business and Investment Summit, the Pan-Beibu Gulf Economic Cooperation Forum, and the ASEAN-China Folk Song Arts Festival. From 2004 to 2015, hundreds of high-level international conferences and forums concerning ASEAN issues have been held in Nanning and nearby cities, and over 519,000 participants have attended the ASEAN-China Exposition ("China-ASEAN statistics," 2017 Aug). Overseas participants come from ASEAN countries as well as from Japan, Korea, India, Australia, New Zealand and France. English is the main working language for participants in most meetings. In addition to these formal occasions, more informal communication and exchanges between the peoples of China and ASEAN take place. English is playing an important role in the communication between China and ASEAN in various aspects.

Even though English is the sole working language of ASEAN, both Chinese and English are working languages in the conferences and meetings held in China. Therefore, translators and interpreters are greatly in need on such occasions. For example, it is estimated that over 200 translators and interpreters are needed during the exposition each year. For high-level conference meetings, interpreting services are provided by official departments such as national, provincial and city foreign affairs offices, the Commerce Department, and China-ASEAN Expo Affairs Bureau. College English teachers with translation skills and freelance translators are also engaged for translation and interpretation work during the exposition season. Document translation, consecutive and simultaneous interpreting are all involved at different conferences and forums. Furthermore, dozens of undergraduate and postgraduate foreign language major students work as liaison interpreters or receptionists each year during exposition season. Translators and interpreters thus play an essential role in China-ASEAN communication.

Local governments and universities realize the importance of translation and
interpretation to the success of China-ASEAN exchange and communication. The first China-ASEAN Translation Forum in 2013 aimed at exploring how translators can better serve the economic, trade and cultural development between China and ASEAN and enhance the international influence of China. Translation is regarded as an indispensable cornerstone in the exchange between China and ASEAN (http://www.caexpo.org). The Guangxi government has had dozens of potential interpreters trained at overseas translation centers as well as some well-known universities in China. An English translation-training base has been also set up in Guangxi University to offer regular training for local interpreters. In the last two years, Guangxi University has established new programs such as the Bachelor of Translation and Interpretation and the Master of Translation and Interpretation. However, at present, the language teaching and interpreting training in local universities follows traditional methods, which are based on native English speaker norms. It can be argued, given the new uses and roles of English, a more appropriate model based on ELF usage in the context of China-ASEAN communication needs to be developed in local universities. The universities in China, especially in Guangxi, need to produce high quality bilinguals who are able to satisfy the needs of regional economic and cultural exchange, where English, as used by Asian multilinguals, is the primary medium of communication.

1.4 ELF Research to Date

ELF research has developed into one of the most prominent fields of linguistic study since the mid of 1990s. There have been a large number of published academic articles and books, three large-sized ELF corpora completed, that is, the corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA), the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE), and the Asian Corpus of English (ACE) and an annual international
conference devoted to ELF. This research is reviewed extensively in the literature review section and some key studies are mentioned in this section.

ELF scholars have attempted to summarise the nature and characteristics of ELF and are interested in identifying features of ELF that differ from English as a native language but do not appear to cause misunderstandings or communication breakdown in ELF contexts (Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011). In other words, ELF research aims to examine how ELF speakers exploit the language in an innovative and diversified way to achieve successful communication. To date, ELF corpus research has become widely established and some ELF scholars have described and analyzed the features and nature of ELF based on the empirical study of corpora. For example, Seidlhofer’s research into ELF in European context shows a number of shared linguistic features of ELF speakers based on studies using VOICE. VOICE is a computer corpus of audio recordings and transcriptions, primarily in European contexts, of spoken ELF interactions. The ACE is a complementary resource to the VOICE corpus, comprising of naturally occurring spoken English as used as a lingua franca between Asian multi-linguals (Kirkpatrick, 2010b). Some scholars, using parts of the ACE corpus, have shown that the ELF of ASEAN speakers shares certain linguistic features (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2008). In addition, there are a number of smaller corpus-based studies of ELF around the world.

For ELF scholars, English is no longer viewed as being owned by NS, whose number accounts for only one fourth of the total English users in the world (as mentioned in 1.1). In contrast, it is argued that L2 users of English have the right to use the language creatively in their own ways to achieve communicative goals in real contexts. What Seidlhofer (2001, 2005, 2011) terms as a “conceptual gap” is the realization that the global role of English has moved beyond the traditional concept of English. She (2011, p. x) argues that “English as a lingua franca needs to be understood as an entirely ‘ordinary’
and unsurprising, sociolinguistic phenomenon” because the resistance to understand ELF or to recognize ELF still exist among all kinds of people, even ELF speakers and sociolinguists.

The special reality of English as a lingua franca also brings new perspectives on how to teach the language. The implication of ELF for language teaching represents a debated issue as it challenges well-established principles and practices in English language teaching. ELF scholars agree that native English norms should not be the only goal of English language teaching. Many scholars explore the pedagogical implications of ELF, concerning teaching principles and models, teacher education, teacher’s and learner’s attitude towards ELF, curriculum design, materials, classroom activities and assessment (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015; Jenkins, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2014, in press; Kohn, in press; Seidlhofer, 1999, 2015).

With regard to the relations of ELF to translation, House (2013) is optimistic on the demand of translation alongside the worldwide use of ELF. She believes that ELF, as a useful tool for communication, would not present a threat to multilingualism and translation. Cook (2012) also argues that translation studies are relevant to ELF. Both translation and ELF share common ground as they are branches of applied linguistics; they share a common interest as both are concerned with communication across language barriers; and they can also make common cause by “seeking to influence both the world outside academia and ideas within it” (Cook, 2012, p. 256). In recent years, some scholars have begun to pay attention to the impact of ELF in interpreting professions and translator and interpreter training (Albl-Mikasa, 2010, 2014; Taviano, 2013). This is beneficial to the language situation in China-ASEAN communication context and English language education in Guangxi, where English is used as a lingua and English translation is conducted between non-native speakers from other Asian countries.
Compared with the study of World Englishes (WE), ELF research is in its infant period. However, the most recent development and findings of ELF research in fact has posed challenges for Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching. As argued by Seidlhofer (2015), there is a need to question the NS norms and reconsider how English is actually put to communicative use and how teachers can act upon the understanding of these communicative processes. In ELF communication practice, ELF speakers continue to move beyond the traditional linguistic frontiers of English (Widdowson, 2015) and therefore it is worthwhile to further explore the dynamic and complex reality of ELF.

1.5 Research Aims and Overview of the Study

This study used data of English as a spoken lingua franca by Asian multilinguals retrieved from the Asian Corpus of English (ACE) to investigate how English is being used in the context of China-ASEAN communication. What is clear is that the greatest number of English users in the data is non-native speakers. In Asian contexts, these non-native speakers are using English in non-Anglo-American cultural contexts. This research explores the linguistic features and pragmatic competence of the ELF users in China-ASEAN communication contexts using the Chinese component of ACE. More specifically, it investigates the linguistic features of Chinese and other Asian ELF speakers in ELF communication contexts with relevance to lexicogrammar, communicative strategies, discourse and sociocultural competence. This study examines the non-standard forms of lexicogrammar occurred in ELF interactions by observing their frequency in use and whether these non-standard forms cause communication breakdowns in China-ASEAN communication. The study also investigates the pragmatic competence demonstrated by Asian ELF users in these defined contexts. Taking these linguistic and pragmatic competences of ELF user into consideration, the thesis discusses
the potential implications for English language teaching in local universities in relevant contexts. It is hoped that the findings from this research will serve as complementary evidence to the existing findings related to the linguistic features, communicative strategies, teaching models in Asian ELF contexts and contribute to the description of the dynamic and fluid reality of ELF communication.

This research aims to address the following research questions:

1. How is English being used in the context of China-ASEAN communication?

   1.1 What, if any, are the characteristic and distinctive lexicogrammatical features of ELF in the context of China-ASEAN communication, especially L1 Chinese users of ELF, with regard to:

      - Lexis: lexical innovation
      - Non-standard use of prepositions
      - Grammatical disagreement
      - Omission of subject, object, copula, prepositions and others
      - Subject pronoun copying (SPC)
      - Tag questions
      - Self-repetitions
      - Response to general questions
      - Adjacent default tense (ADT)

   1.2 Do non-standard forms in lexicogrammar necessarily cause problems in China-ASEAN communication or not?

2. What pragmatic competence do Asian ELF users demonstrate in China-ASEAN interactions?

   2.1 What communicative strategies do speakers employ to repair communication breakdowns or to facilitate communication?
- lexical suggestion
- paraphrasing
- code-switching
- meaning negotiation
- avoidance strategy

2.2 What sociocultural competence do Asian ELF users have?
- terms of address
- how to disagree
- cross-cultural awareness

2.3 What discourse competence do Asian ELF users have?
- topic management
- backchannel
- echoing
- referencing

3. What are the implications of the findings for English language teaching in China?

3.1 How can these features and competence identified be integrated into English language teaching in local universities?

3.2 How to implement ELF approach in local language teaching which is oriented to the situations where multilingual speakers from ASEAN and China communicate in English?
- teachers
- practical environment
- teaching resources
- ELF-aware assessment
1.6 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into seven chapters. Chapter One, Introduction, has provided a brief introduction of the history of English language development and its new role as a lingua franca in the Asian region. The key concerns and findings of recent ELF research which has focused on the ELF communication between China and ASEAN countries was outlined to provide the research background and support for this research. Chapter Two, the Literature Review, provides an extensive review of previous ELF research concerning the concept of ELF, the linguistic features of ELF, the study of Chinese English, communicative competence of ELF users and ELF-aware language teaching. First, the concept of ELF is discussed in relation to World Englishes (WE), English as an International Language (EIL), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Some related concepts such as variety, community, and Standard English are also clarified. Second, Chapter Two also reviews the linguistic features of ELF, mainly the lexicogrammatical and pragmatic features in both European contexts and Asian contexts. Some common features are identified and the fluid nature of ELF interaction brings a new perspective in understanding communicative competence. Third, the features of Chinese English are summarized and compared with the ELF used by Chinese users in China-ASEAN communication context. Fourth, based on the traditional model of communicative competence, a modified communicative competence, which provides a new focus on linguistic innovation and intercultural awareness, is discussed in terms of how it relates to ELF users. The communicative competence model serves as the framework for the data analysis and teaching implications in the later chapters. The last part of the Literature Review discusses the pedagogical implication for English language teaching concerning teaching principles, goals, teacher’s education and teaching contents.

Chapter Three is the Research Methodology and Data, which covers the use of
corpus in previous ELF research and the details of corpus subset for this research, including the information of speakers and recordings, transcription conventions and tools. Chapter Four, The Lexicogrammatical Features of ELF by Chinese Users in China-ASEAN Contexts, reports the findings of the non-standard forms of lexicogrammar by Chinese ELF users. It covers nine aspects: lexical and phrasal innovation, non-standard use of prepositions, grammatical disagreement, non-standard omission, subject pronoun copying, tag question, self-repetitions, response to general questions and adjacent default tense. This chapter examines if the non-standard forms in ELF contexts necessarily cause communication problems. Chapter Five, Pragmatic Competence of Asian ELF users reports findings of the strategic competence, sociocultural competence and discourse competence of Asian ELF users. This chapter describes how Asian ELF users achieve communication success by applying various strategies and exploiting their language resources. The competence demonstrated by the Asian ELF users in this chapter can serve as appropriate practice examples in language teaching. Chapter Six, The Implications of ELF for Language Teaching in China, proposes a feasible and practical ELF-approach for language teaching in Guangxi University, where the students are facing increasing communication with people from ASEAN countries. It is hoped that the pedagogical implications can be applied in similar English teaching contexts in the ASEAN+3 region. The last chapter is the Conclusion, which summarizes the major findings of this research and proposes the potential research direction in the future.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This chapter examines current literature related to this research to provide a background and rationale for this research. There are five sections in this chapter. First, the concept of ELF, which is the basis of this research, is discussed in relation to World English (WE) and English as an International Language (EIL). It is argued that ELF exists in its own right and should be explored in a new research paradigm. Second, the linguistic features of ELF in various contexts are summarized in the aspects of phonology, lexicogrammar and pragmatics and serve as references for the linguistic analysis in this research. Third, the features of Chinese English (CE) are described as they are considered important when comparing the linguistic features of the ELF by Chinese users. Fourth, a framework of communicative competence is elaborated and adopted as a guideline to demonstrate the various competences of Asian ELF users in this specific context. The last section reviews the ELF implications for English language teaching regarding teaching principles, ELF teachers and teaching materials. The evaluation and discussion of the relevant literature in this chapter provide a theoretical base for this research and help determine the focus of this research, aiming at filling the research gap and making a contribution to the knowledge in the academic field of ELF.

2.1 The Concept of ELF

The origin of the term *lingua franca* stems from the 5th century when Germanic Francks adopted the local language in Gaul (Kirkpatrick, 2011). The term also refers to other expressions such like *contact language, auxiliary language, trade language,*
international language during different periods for different purposes (Meierkord & Knapp, 2002). Meierkord & Knapp (2002) label the term lingua franca as “a variety that was spoken along the South-Eastern coast of the Mediterranean between approximately the 15th and the 19th century” (p. 9). Throughout human history, many languages have performed the function of a lingua franca, for example, Greek and Latin in Europe, Chinese and Malay in East and South-East Asia and Swahili in East Africa (Ostler, 2005). English has served as a lingua franca ever since the countries of Kachru’s Outer Circle were first colonized from the late sixteenth century (Jenkins et al., 2011).

However, research into ELF is relatively new, dating back to the mid 1990’s (Firth, 1996; House, 1999; Jenkins, 1998). During the last decade, ELF has attracted greater attention, with dedicated journal issues, book-length discussions (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Deterding, 2013; Jenkins, 2007; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Mauranen, 2011; Seidlhofer, 2011), a dedicated ELF conference series (since 2008) and a dedicated journal, the Journal of English as a Lingua France (since 2011). ELF has begun “to establish itself as a distinct area of systematic empirical work with a more coherent set of theoretical assumptions and methodological practice” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 6). ELF researchers argue that the innovative uses of English in ELF contexts are communicatively effective rather than “errors”. ELF needs to be understood exists in its own right and should be explored in a new research paradigm. However, since it became a serious topic of academic research, controversies over ELF (see discussion below) in terms of its nature and legitimacy have existed among linguists, English language teaching professionals, learners, native speakers and even members of the Expanding Circle. Therefore, what Seidlhofer (2011, p. 69) terms as a “conceptual gap” (as mentioned in Section 1.4) in today’s ELF situation is: “an awareness of the existence of ELF on the one hand, and a denial of its legitimacy as a use of language and therefore as a worthy object of linguistic study on the other hand”.
2.1.1 Defining ELF.

The definition of English as a lingua franca (ELF) has been given by some scholars as follows:

*When linguists these days talk about English as a lingua franca, they are typically focusing on the use of English as an intermediary between people with different native languages, none of them English.* (Svartvik & Leech, 2006, p. 232)

*[ELF is] a ‘contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication* (Firth, 1996, p. 240)

*ELF interactions are defined as interactions between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue.* (House, 1999, p. 74)

*“English as a lingua franca”, in using this term I am referring to a specific communication context: English being used as a lingua franca, the common language of choice, among speakers who come from different linguacultural backgrounds.* (Jenkins, 2009, p. 200)

*ELF is any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option.* (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7)

The major difference between the first three and the last two definitions is whether to include native speakers of English. The first three definitions agree that ELF speakers use English as a “foreign language” or not as a “mother tongue”. Jenkins (2007, p. 2) explained the English in Firth’s definition at that time was a “foreign language” rather
than what ELF has been conceived today, that is, “as an emerging English that exists in its own right”. As ELF is developing in its infancy, there has been some ambiguity and confusion over its conception. In order to explain the concept theoretically, Seidlhofer (2011), in her book *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*, lays out a detailed conceptual and theoretical framework. She clearly points out that ELF users include native speakers of English and ELF interactions take place across and within Kachru’s three circles (as mentioned in Section 1.1), that is, among people from different first language backgrounds, including those from the Inner and Outer Circles. This perspective is also shared by most ELF researchers today (Jenkins et al., 2011). When using English as a lingua franca in formal settings such as conferences, business and political meetings as well as informal settings such as shopping and touring, it is reasonable that interactions would involve native speakers and non-native speakers. Sharing a similar view with Seidlhofer, Cogo and Dewey (2012) define ELF from three perspectives: settings (as contexts in which English is used as a contact language), functions (as a means of communication) and research paradigm (as the empirical study of innovative uses of English). They emphasize ELF interaction can “involve speakers from all of Kachru’s three circles” and “is not so much the geographic location of a communicative event, but rather the linguacultural makeup of its participants” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 12).

Another important framework is conceptualised by Mauranen (2012, 2017), who draws a theoretical ELF framework from three perspectives: the macrosocial, the microsocial and the cognitive. First, the macrosocial perspective focuses on contact-induced linguistic change. Mauranen terms ELF from macrosocial perspective as “second-order language contact” (2012, p. 29) and “a hybrid of similects” (2012, p. 30). ELF speakers communicate with each other with their own varieties (which is referred as similects by Mauranen) instead of their L1. It is suggested that simplification and
levelling are the consequence of contact-induced change. Second, the interactive or microsocial perspective focuses on how ELF speakers manage spoken interaction to achieve mutual understanding through accommodation and adaptation. Third, the individual’s cognitive perspective attends to evidence on language processing and it is informed that approximation strategies used by ELF speakers can contribute to communicative success by mitigating processing pressures.

The purpose of ELF research is not to describe or document a set of shared surface-level features but to analyze the processes and consequences of the variation. As Jenkins (2009, p. 201) pointed out, no matter which circle of use we come from, we all need to “adjust our local English variety for the benefit of our interlocutors”. ELF is not about the norms of a particular group of English speakers, but of mutual negotiation from all parties. It can be seen that ELF scholars are more concerned about the language use and its specific communication contexts. Therefore, an ideological shift from traditional EFL is important as ELF researchers regard the non-conformity to norms of native speakers as evidence of flexible use of language to achieve communicative needs rather than as errors (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011).

In practice, ELF is taken for granted by many professionals working across different countries and cultures. By contrast, negative responses to ELF mainly come from the academic field. These controversial issues regarding ELF have been addressed by Seidlhofer (2006) in the following five misconceptions (pp. 42-48):

Misconception 1: “ELF research ignores the polymorphous nature of the English language worldwide.” Seidlhofer argues that corpus-based (VOICE) research enables scholars to observe and analyze the diversified use of language. English in the Expanding Circle is an important part of this diversity, but not accepted as having its own validity.
Misconception 2: “ELF work denies tolerance for diversity and appropriacy of use in specific sociolinguistic contexts.” In this section, Seidlhofer clearly explains the finding of core and non-core features in terms of intelligibility enhances rather than denies tolerance of diversity. ELF corpora provide evidence to illustrate the strategies ELF speakers adopt to better understand each other.

Misconception 3: “The ELF description aims to at the accurate application of a set of prescribed rules.” Here, Seidlhofer argues that it is prescription in language teaching that ELF research is actually challenging. The findings of ELF corpora could offer an alternative in language teaching rather than imposing inappropriate norms.

Misconception 4: “ELF researchers are suggesting that there should be one monolithic variety.” Seidlhofer claims she does not adhere to such a monolithic view, as ELF, like any other natural language, will change over time. ELF is considered as a function rather than a variety in the view of most ELF scholars. In her book (2011), Seidlhofer gives further detailed analysis of the notions of community and variety, which will be explained in next section.

Misconception 5: “ELF researchers suggest that ELF should be taught to all L2 non-native speakers.” Seidlhofer explains that it is precisely because of the different conceptualizations between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and ELF that it would be ridiculous to suggest teaching ELF to all L2 learners. She suggests, however, that all English users should be aware of the global roles of English and make efforts to achieve global communication.

These misconceptions may disappear with the development of ELF research. The recent article of Jenkins (2015) argues that there is a need of further retheorisation of ELF in respect of multilingualism. She summarises the three phases of ELF research focus.
Phase one (“ELF 1”: from late 1980s to 2008), which was influenced by WE research, mainly focused on forms, especially pronunciation and lexicogrammatical features of ELF. Phase two (“ELF 2”: from 2008 till now), focuses on ELF variability. The functions of the variable use of forms by ELF speakers attracted scholars’ interest. Phase three (“ELF 3”), as suggested by Jenkins, is reconceptualised as “English as a Multilingual Franca”, with emphasis on multilingual communicative settings. In this phase, Jenkins views ELF “within a framework of multilingualism” (2015, p. 75) rather than multilingualism as an aspect of ELF. In fact, many scholars (Canagarajah, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Makoni & Pennycook, 2012) who have studied ELF have drawn attention to its inherently multilingual and complex nature.

In this research, the author uses Seidlhofer’s definition and conceptual framework of ELF as the basic theoretical framework for the study of ELF in contexts of China-ASEAN communication. Nevertheless, the majority of participant data used in this study come from Chinese and ASEAN multilinguals for whom English is an additional language.

2.1.2 ELF vs. WE and EIL: community and variety.

World Englishes (WE) is a well-established paradigm promoted by Kachru (1988) (see Section 1.1). In general, Kachru divides WE into three concentric circles, that is, the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle, which represent, respectively, the English used as a native language (ENL), English used as a second or official language (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL). Even though the model has its own limitations and needs to be modified, it was used in this study for no other alternative model has gained such popularity and acceptance in academic circles. As mentioned by Jenkins et al. (2011), the comparison with the well-established WE paradigm can
complement ELF. Many scholars (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Jenkins et al., 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2011; Pakir, 2009; Pennycook, 2009; Pitzl, 2016; Seidlhofer, 2011) are trying to illustrate the similarities and differences between ELF, WE and English as an International language (EIL) and International English (IE).

Seidlhofer (2011, p. 3) puts ELF under the big umbrella of EIL, which “is usually understood as covering uses of English within and across Kachru’s Circles, for intranational as well as international communication”. It is interesting that she describes WE as being “exported” to many regions through colonization while ELF is “imported” by people who learn it as a useful language. The post-colonial varieties with their independent identities have become WE, or “localised EILs” according to Seidlhofer (2011, p. 4), for example, Singapore English and Indian English. ELF, in contrast, can be seen as a globalized EIL variety. She points out that Kachru’s model cannot distinguish globalized EIL from localized EIL. Seidlhofer (2011) also argues that the WE paradigm and ELF research both share the central issues, such as variation and change, the potential variability of linguistics norms, ownership of language, and the expression of social identities. Therefore, “ELF research can also offer fresh perspectives on several theoretical constructs central to WE” (Seidlhofer, 2009a, p. 236), even though there is a great difference between ELF and post-colonial Englishes. This idea is shared by Pennycook (2009, p. 195) by saying “the ELF focus is trying to address precisely that gap left by the holes in the WE model”.

To be specific, in the WE paradigm, language is analyzed as being part of a “distinct speech community” and its primary aim is to “investigate the distinctive nature of particular outer circle Englishes for the legitimization of these as varieties in their own right”, and the “speech patterns serve as markers of identity and group membership” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 8). However, ELF research goes beyond the traditional clearly-
defined notions of community. ELF interactions give rise to a reconsideration of the relationship between the concepts of “community” and “variety”. As Seidlhofer (2011) explains, the latest technology enables people to communicate beyond traditional concepts of “community” which sees a variety based on shared physical space. Therefore, “our sense of what constitutes a legitimate community and a legitimate linguistic variety has to change, too” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 88). Therefore, if the traditional notion of local speech community has no relevance to ELF communication, the question whether ELF is “a variety” is meaningless too. The focus of ELF is to see how appropriate the language is for “new and different communicative and communal purposes” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 88). Most scholars now agree that ELF is not a variety. It is rather a function of the way English is used across dynamic global discourse communities. ELF users have to accommodate to other speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and cope with the diverse encounters of today’s world, constantly negotiating meaning with their interlocutors.

A more recent notion community of practice, which is characterized by Wenger (1998) as having three dimensions is more appropriate for ELF interaction: 1) mutual engagement in shared practices; 2) taking part in jointly negotiated enterprises and 3) making use of members’ shared repertoire. House (2003, p. 537) claims that the activity-based concept of community of practice fits well with ELF interactions because ELF users are “involved in the construction of event-specific, interactional styles and frameworks.” This concept makes a distinction from community of speech. However, some scholars (Dewey, 2009; Ehrenreich, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2011) suggest that, in general, the concept of community of practice cannot be adopted in ELF communication as ELF is considered a dynamic and fluid process. Pitzl (2017) has offered a sketch of how the social dimension of ELF might be conceptualized and operationalized in her talk at the 10th conference of
ELF, proposing that *Transient International Groups*, rather than communities of multilingual speakers, are more appropriately applied to ELF transient and dynamic contexts.

In addition to the theoretical or ideological discussion of WE and ELF mentioned above, Kirkpatrick (2011) gives a detailed comparison between WE and ELF at different linguistic levels in Asian contexts. He lists the differences between WE and ELF in pronunciation, where WE show more distinct features while ELF has more shared features, such as a tendency towards syllable timing; in vocabulary, where WE users tend to use more culturally-specific items, while ELF users try to avoid *unilateral idiomaticity* (Seidlhofer, 2002); in cultural and pragmatic norms, where WE reflect local culture and express identity, while ELF is more concerned with communication.

From the perspective of language contact theory, Pitzl (2016) explores the different creativities of idioms in ELF and WE with two parameters: time, and language users. She argues that language contact is “an essential property of ELF” (2016, p. 295). In ELF contexts, language contact may be “temporary and transient”, whereas contact may be “long-term and extensive” in WE, especially in postcolonial contexts (Pitzl, 2016, p. 295). For example, code-switching or code-mixing can be potential triggers to cause linguistic change. Her analysis of non-English idioms in ELF interactions demonstrates the multilingual creativity of individual ELF speakers and its social groups. Pitzl (2016) also provides an interesting potential of looking at the interrelationship of language contact and the creativity between ELF and WE. Therefore, WE and ELF are both within the EIL ideology and framework and are complementary rather than contradictory, even though they have different focuses.
2.1.3 ELF vs. EFL: ownership and attitude.

ELF researchers regard ELF as a totally different phenomenon from English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Jenkins gives a detailed comparison of ELF vs. EFL (Jenkins, 2006a, 2009; Jenkins et al., 2011), which can be summarized as follows. Firstly, ELF is part of the EIL paradigm, as defined in the preceding section (Section 2.1.2), with speakers from the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle as well as the Expanding Circle. All English varieties including native and non-native are accepted. By contrast, EFL is part of the foreign language paradigm. The learning goal of non-native speakers is to use English like a native speaker. Secondly, the non-conformities with native speakers’ norms are viewed as variations or differences from the perspective of ELF. However, in the EFL view, such differences are signs of errors, defined as deviations from the native speaker norm and thus, which need to be avoided. Thirdly, ELF is based on theories of language contact and evolution (Mufwene, 2001) while EFL is based on theories of first language interference and fossilization (Selinker, 1972). Therefore, code-switching is seen positively as a bilingual resource to promote speaker identity in ELF contexts but is seen negatively from the EFL viewpoint as an attempt to compensate for gaps in a non-native speaker’s knowledge of English. To sum up, a Standard English ideology differentiates the two paradigms. From the EFL perspective, native English or Standard English provides the only acceptable norms for successful communication and they serve as goals for non-native English learners. By contrast, from the ELF perspective, non-native English speakers are no longer simply learners of English but highly skilled communicators who make use of their multilingual resources to achieve successful communication.

Seidlhofer (2011, p. 41) gives evidence to show that today there is still a “deep-seated assumption” shared by all kinds of people, including linguistic laypersons,
linguists and governmental institutions, that the only proper English is the English of its native speakers, which is assumed to be not only the norm but also represents the model of learning. Jenkins reinforces (2006b) this point of view in the following statement:

....the claim for (so-called) native Englishes is that they have a single identifiable 'parent' and an 'ordinary', 'uncontaminated' development down the centuries, whereas the claim for (so-called) 'new' Englishes and English creoles is that they have been infected (my word) by large-scale contact with other languages and are therefore not entitled to the unmarked name 'English'... influence from an Expanding Circle speaker’s L1 is labelled ‘L1 transfer’ or even ‘L1 interference’, and its product is ‘error’ to be eliminated. (Jenkins, 2006b, p. 34)

The assumption of native-speaker authority is held from a static view that the language remains unchanged in different communities and contexts of communication. In fact, the use of a language changes not only chronically, for example, the inflectional system of English has gradually become less complex over time (Kirkpatrick, 2010a), but also across different communities and settings. Seidlhofer argues that “‘English’ does not simply transfer intact from one context to another---the ‘E’ in English as a Native Language is bound to be something different in kind from ‘E’ in English as a Lingua Franca” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 40). For most ELF scholars, English is no longer owned by native speakers, whose number accounts for the minority of total English users in the world. “The very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it. To grant such custody over the language is necessarily to arrest its development and so undermine its international status” (Widdowson, 1994, p. 389). In other words, the native speakers cannot own and control the language while, at the same time, its status as an international language should be acknowledged.
Another term which needs to be clarified is Standard English. Quirk (1990) defines SE and its relationship with other varieties. According to Quirk, Standard English does not refer to the language of all native speakers. Native varieties are divided into institutionalized and non-institutionalized varieties and Standard English is an institutionalized variety. Only a small part of native speakers conform to Standard English norms. Seidlhofer (2011) criticizes Quirk’s view, which suggests that the standard ensures effective communication. She claims that “Standard English is a linguistic object---something that is described in grammars and dictionaries, but it is also itself an ideological construct” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 47). However, this deep-rooted attitude still prevails, especially in Expanding Circle countries. A comprehensive questionnaire study of non-native speaker’s attitude towards English accents showed that native speaker or Standard English model remains firmly established among the Expanding Circle countries, even though they do not use English primarily to communicate with English native speakers (Jenkins, 2007).

The new role of English in the world and its widespread use as a lingua franca in Asia, where there are no Inner Circle countries, calls for a reconsideration of how the language can be perceived and taught. Although the current situation may favour native-speaker custody, Seidlhofer (2011, p. 66) suggests that non-native speakers of English have the right “to question the dominance of native speakers of English”. In addition, L2 users of English have the right to use the language creatively in their own ways to achieve communicative purpose in their actual contexts. Widdowson (2012, p. 22) further elaborates such creativity is natural as the learners “filter out linguistic features that are surplus to communicative requirement” and “develop their own functional grammar” and this kind of creativity “represents success, not failure”.
2.2 Linguistic Features of ELF

Driven by corpus techniques, more empirical studies of variation in English have been conducted in the last few decades. A considerable amount of descriptive work has recently been undertaken not only on Inner Circle but also on Outer Circle varieties of English within the framework of International Corpus of English (ICE), which has collected data from countries in which English is the first language or a second official language. This descriptive research has made it possible to examine many different forms and varieties of the English language which are developing, and has enabled researchers to notice and acknowledge their diversity. ELF researchers likewise take advantage of corpus in their empirical studies. One of the most important methodologies within ELF research is the use of naturally occurring data. Some well-documented ELF corpora, like English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA), The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) and The Asian Corpus of English (ACE), contain one million words each in size, which enable researchers to conduct systematic empirical studies of English in lingua franca communication. Recent ELF research shows common distinctive linguistic features in phonology, lexicogrammar and pragmatics based on naturally occurring data. In addition, the focus of ELF research has shifted from description of language forms and features of ELF interaction to an interest in the process or motives underlying and determining the choice of features used in ELF interactions (Jenkins et al., 2011).

2.2.1 Phonology.

The study of the pronunciation features of ELF is mainly concerned with the issue of intelligibility and its implications for language teaching. Jenkins’s (2000) research into the phonology of international English provides the notion of a lingua franca core (LFC)
and the non-crucial “non-core”. LFC refers to certain English pronunciation features, for example, certain consonant sounds, initial consonant clusters, vowel length distinctions and nuclear stress, which significantly contributed to intelligibility in ELF interactions. And the “non-core” refers to some other features which did not seem to contribute to intelligibility, such as weak forms, elisions and assimilations. Jenkins (2000) suggests that LFC be applied in language teaching and this would make the goals of an ELF-based pronunciation more attainable than that of native-speaking pronunciation. Some other ELF scholars (Deterding, 2010, 2013, 2017; Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006) have identified shared features of non-standard pronunciation in Asian ELF interactions, such as the reduction of consonant clusters, the pronunciation dental fricative /θ/ as [t], lack of reduced vowels, heavy end-stress and syllable-timed patterns. It is, for example, suggested that a syllable-timed pattern, found in many Asian languages, can be encouraged in language teaching since it is more intelligible internationally than stress-timed patterns (Kirkpatrick, 2010a). Based on the Brunei component of ACE and the recordings of students in Guangxi, Deterding (2013, 2017) studied the features of pronunciation that cause misunderstandings in Southeast Asian ELF contexts and argues that teachers should focus on the features that give rise to misunderstandings, and that many aspects of local pronunciation can be retained as they would not be problems of intelligibility. Teaching phonological accommodation skills are also encouraged by many scholars as they enable speakers to adapt their speech to listeners’ needs in real contexts.

Another issue related to ELF phonology is the relationship between accent and identity. Many surveys indicate that the majority of bilingual speakers prefer native-like accents (Timmis, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002; Li, 2009). Li’s study (2009), based on the survey of university-educated Chinese, showed that about 80% of participants preferred to speak English with a native-speaker-based accent, while the remaining 20%
were ready to speak English with a localized accent to project their Chinese identity. However, the latter group were concerned their localized accent may lead to unintelligibility. This indicates a tension between speaker’s cultural identity and intelligibility where a localized English accent is assumed to cause intelligibility problems. Li (D. C. S. Li, 2009, pp. 108-109) summarized three factors attributed to such a dilemma: the dominance of native-speaker-based pedagogic models in English curriculum, the lack of familiarity with other varieties of English and the lack of awareness of the legitimacy of non-native varieties of English.

As far as this research is concerned, phonological features of ELF are not the major consideration. This is because the data used in this research are mainly the annotated transcription of ACE without officially uploaded audio files. Therefore, the study focused mainly on lexicogrammatical and pragmatic features of Asian ELF users in China-ASEAN communication contexts.

2.2.2 Lexicogrammar: forms and functions.

The availability of large-sized corpora makes it possible to conduct systematic studies at the lexicogrammar level. The VOICE, ACE and ELFA projects have begun to provide corpus data for this type of enquiry. Research in the emerging patterns of lexical and grammatical forms in ELF interactions demonstrates how ELF users exploit linguistic resources in an innovative way. Seidlhofer (2004) and other scholars’ empirical research into ELF in a European context shows a number of shared linguistic features. The following list of lexicogrammatical characteristics put forward by Seidlhofer (2004) as potential non-standard features of ELF has stimulated follow-up research in this area (Cogo & Dewey, 2012).

- dropping the third person present tense -s
- confusing the relative pronouns who and which

- omitting definite and indefinite articles where they 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

- overdoing explicitness (e.g. black colour rather than just black)

Based on their analysis of corpus data, Cogo and Dewey (2012) observed that the use of the 3rd person zero was not restricted by the nature of the ELF setting or the linguistic background of the speakers. They further concluded that the presence of ENL speakers in an interaction could increase the use of -s form for 3rd person by ELF speakers (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). In addition to syntactical non-conformity, lexical innovations are also identified in the VOICE corpus. ELF users create a new word where they feel one is needed. It is interesting to find “verb forms have been ‘regularized’ by applying a regular morphological convention in unconventional ways” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 102). For example, a coinage approvement was created by L1 speakers of Polish, Finnish and Portuguese in VOICE (Seidlhofer, 2011). Seidlhofer (2011) claims that ELF users explore the alternative encoding possibilities inherent in the language to achieve communicative effectiveness and the underlying encoding possibilities that speakers make use of is termed “virtual language” (p. 111). Therefore, ELF users are creative when producing actual language that does not fully conform to the regulative conventions in native English grammar and usage.
With a large number of examples of innovative patterns in ELF use, “the crucial challenge has been to move from the surface description of particular features, however interesting they may be in themselves, to an explanation of the underlying significance of the forms...what functions they are symptomatic of” (Seidlhofer, 2009b, p. 241). In terms of the relation between form and function in ELF, Seidlhofer (2011) claims that non-conformity to the standard code and native-speaker idiomatic usage can be seen “as resulting from ELF users making effective strategic use of the language as communicative resource” (p. 148). The formal features of ELF are motivated by the functions they are required to serve. Her assumption is that language development is “self-regulating and that the formal adaptations that are made can naturally enhance functional effectiveness” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 148). Cogo and Dewey (2012), through studying the other salient aspects of lexis and grammar including prepositions, articles and collocations, aimed to identify the interrelationship of pragmatics and lexicogrammar and the various motives and underlying causes that contribute to the emergence of new forms in ELF, which they concluded illustrated “redundancy, regularization, prominence, explicitness and semantics” (p. 112).

Translanguaging has become a favoured term referring to the ways bi- and multilingual speakers creatively use their linguistic resources. “A translanguaging lens posits that bilinguals have one linguistic repertoire from which they select features strategically to communicate effectively” (Garcia & Wei Li, 2014, p. 22). Li Wei (2016, p.3) argues that “both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner” in translanguaging to make meaning and shape experience. Translanguaging is not simply a process that goes between languages (code switching, crossing) but beyond languages and enables creativity in language users. This is evident in the ways Chinese speakers adapt English when using ELF. Examples of code switching and the creative use of
English are presented in 5.2.3 and 4.2.1 respectively.

In Asian contexts, there have been comparatively few studies of ELF. An exception is Kirkpatrick (2010a) who provides a preliminary description of linguistic features of English as a lingua franca within ASEAN contexts. These include phonological, lexical, and grammatical features as well as the pragmatic norms and communicative strategies adopted by ASEAN speakers of ELF. At the lexicogrammar level, the non-standard features of ASEAN ELF include the marking or non-marking of plurals, frequent use of the present simple verb form, preference for modal form *would* over *will* and the frequent use of the preposition *about*. Kirkpatrick claims that non-standard use in these contexts represents natural language development (Kirkpatrick, 2010a). Scholars, using the ACE corpus, have shown that the ELF of ASEAN speakers shares certain linguistic features (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2008; Kirkpatrick & Subhan, 2014).

In a recent article (Kirkpatrick & Subhan, 2014), the authors reviewed the possible motivations for the presence of non-standard forms in the L2 varieties of English. One is the notion of “angloversals” (Kortmann & Szmrecsanyi, 2004), which argues there is evidence for shared features across varieties of English; and the other is “substrate influence” (Ansaldo, 2009; Lim & Gisborne, 2009; Sharma, 2009), which argues that the distinctive linguistic features of a L2 variety are determined by L1 substrate influence, especially when these substrates share certain typological features, as is the case with the Malay and Chinese languages operating as substrates for Singaporean English. After studying the use or non-use of tense marking in a sub-set of ACE, Kirkpatrick and Subhan (2014) conclude that the substrate influence is not as important as previously thought in explaining the marking of tenses for L1 speakers of Malay, as L1 speakers of Malay routinely mark for tense, even though Malay itself is not a tensed language. In the complex situation of language change and variation, however, especially in the fluidity
of ELF, we need to bear in mind Thomason’s (2010, p. 31) advice that “in most cases, no cause can be firmly established and because of the real possibility that multiple causes are responsible for a particular change.”

With research findings coming from different contexts, it is interesting to note that some of the ELF features are shared by ELF users in Asian as well as in European contexts. For example, the non-marking of plurals or the plural marking of uncountable nouns, different use of prepositions, and uniform question tags have been identified in both VOICE and ACE (Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Seidlhofer, 2001). Although non-standard forms occur frequently in ELF contexts, misunderstandings are actually quite rare (Deterding, 2013; Kaur, 2009; Mauranen, 2006). Mauranen (2015) investigated how ELF users managed to communicate so successfully, despite the frequent non-standard forms, through studying ELFA dialogues. She claims that the approximation strategy of speakers may not pose much difficulty for a hearer to construct the meaning. The approximation strategy can be applied at word level, for example, using *potentional* instead of *potential*, and at multi-word unit level, for example, using *to put the end on it* instead of *to put an end to it*. Mauranen (2015, p. 43) concludes that “articles and prepositions can become dispensable” as long as the key vocabulary items are the same in the multi-word units. This contributes to understanding why the non-standard forms and innovative expressions in ELF interactions do not cause any communicative breakdowns.

**2.2.3 Pragmatics: identity and intelligibility.**

The nature of English as a lingua franca, as discussed in section 2.1, makes it different from English as a foreign language or interlanguage. Therefore, it is not proper to measure ELF against an ideal native speaker norm in terms of lexicogrammar or pragmatics and a new kind of interactive pragmatics approach has been applied in ELF.
study. The two features of this new research paradigm in ELF study summarized by House (2009) are that first, the research has focused on interactions in real-life settings, rather than in the classroom; and second is the use of corpora in pragmatics research. Research in the pragmatics of ELF has been fruitful in Europe and Asian contexts, with various data ranging from business related telephone conversations to face-to-face conversations in academic settings and international conferences. The study of ELF pragmatics mainly concerns (1) the misunderstanding or non-understanding and strategies applied to solve the problem; (2) discourse interaction, such as the turn-taking system and back-channels; and (3) intercultural awareness and speech act realization, such as politeness conventions and refusals. These three aspects correspond to the communicative competences, namely strategic competence, discourse competence and sociocultural competence, which are important for ELF users (this will be elaborated in detail in section 2.3).

Similar results have been found in both Europe and Asian on the common strategies applied to responding to misunderstanding or non-understanding, including repetition, paraphrasing, clarification, self-repair, let it pass and topic change in order to ensure mutual intelligibility and the flow of conversation (Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Deterding, 2013; Firth, 1996; House, 1999; Kaur, 2009, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Mauranen, 2006; Meierkord, 2002; Watterson, 2008). For example, early research in ELF pragmatics by Firth (1996) illustrated strategies of “let it pass” and “make it normal” to make ELF conversation “robust” and “normal” or “ordinary”. Later corpus research also reported various negotiation strategies to avoid miscommunication. Mauranen (2006) and Kaur (2011) examined self-repair practices employed in ELF as common and effective strategies to raise explicitness and prevent misunderstanding. Cogo and Dewey (2012) explored the interactional strategies used by ELF speakers, such as backchannels, simultaneous talks in ELF as a way to show interlocutors’ support and involvement. Their
data suggest that the general tendency of overlapping talk is “to avoid delivering new information” but show “engagement in conversation” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 150). These strategies may “serve a rapport-building function” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 139). It is agreed that ELF speakers exhibit a high degree of pragmatic competence in making their speech more intelligible by adopting suitable communicative strategies rather than adhering to native speaker norms. The willingness of ELF users to achieve successful communicative outcomes can overcome their linguistic limitations. Mutual cooperation is considered as the major characteristic of ELF communication (Jenkins et al., 2011). Therefore, most research has found ELF interactions are usually rather successful.

In the Asian context and using ACE data, Kirkpatrick (2010a) illustrated Asian pragmatic norms in terms of request, address, compliments and turn-taking, and indicated the significance of Asian pragmatic norms in successful cross-cultural communication. He also summarises fifteen communicative strategies of Asian ELF speakers to ensure smooth communication, eleven of which are adopted by listeners and four by speakers. He concludes that multilingual English speakers are effective in cross-cultural communication and have high pragmatic competence. In order to facilitate mutual understanding, ELF speakers tend to avoid using lexis or idioms of local cultures with people from different speech communities. This finding may provide evidence for what Seidlhofer terms as *unilateral idiomaticity*, which is a sense of lack of concern for one’s interlocutor and a neglect of the need for accommodation (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 134). A recent study by Kirkpatrick, Subhan and Walkinshaw (2016), which investigated the use of ELF in ASEAN contexts, suggested that the fluent English speakers, especially native speakers needed to be sensitive to the first language culture and norms of the non-native speakers in their interactions, and that native speakers’ own variety may cause misunderstanding or non-understanding in diplomatic ELF interactions. They claim that
ELF users are more supportive to achieve successful communication but become more hard-edged when the stakes are high. Based on the Brunei component of ACE, Deterding (2013) analyzed the misunderstandings in terms of pronunciation, lexicogrammar and code-switching in ELF interactions in Southeast Asia. He concluded that lexical issues caused most of the misunderstanding while grammar rarely did, and code-switching generally achieved accommodation between the speakers. His data also showed that silence and minimal back-channels were the most common means of dealing with misunderstandings.

This raises the question of the necessity and practicability of an ELF speaker reflecting the local culture or the identity of speaker in ELF interactions and the conflict between identity and intelligibility. Some argue that ELF has no native speakers and thus, no proper culture of its own to speak of (Alptekin, 2010), and some claim that ELF is culture and identity neutral (House, 2003; Meierkord, 2002). However, some scholars argue that cultural influences exist in ELF contexts. Kirkpatrick and Baker share the same view regarding this aspect. “It is inevitable and desirable that speakers will transfer some of the pragmatic norms of their L1 to lingua franca English” (Kirkpatrick, 2006, p. 80). In ELF settings, “each participant brings with them their own unique cultural history which results in particular communicative behaviours and expectations” (W. Baker, 2009, p. 588). However, “the flow of cultural influences is multidirectional and its consequences hard to predict” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 119). How to cope with such rich and complex cultural practices has been addressed by some ELF scholars (see below). However, more research is needed on how pragmatic norms are adopted into lingua franca communication.

Kirkpatrick (2007, 2010a) has proposed the identity-communication continuum (I-CC), which demonstrates two major functions of language: language for communication
and language to establish identity. ELF users can adjust the degree of local culture involvement in their speech according to their communication settings. “The more localized the use of English as a lingua franca, the more variation it is likely to display. Conversely the more international its use, the less variation it is likely to display” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 140). For example, code-switching in Asian multilingual settings becomes an identity marker and a creative communication strategy (Kirkpatrick & Sussex, 2012). People need training to avoid cultural stereotypes and to recognize how cultural values may be reflected in the English of ELF speakers. Therefore, for learners of English as a lingua franca, the ability to negotiate and adapt to emerging communicative practices is as important as the knowledge of language (W. Baker, 2009).

In line with the I-CC proposed by Kirkpatrick, Seidlhofer (2009a) illustrates how ELF users co-construct expressions or idioms for their purposes so as to cooperate in communication, with the aim of increasing intelligibility while also to sharing a kind of territorial space. She uses the terms cooperative imperative and territorial imperative proposed by Widdowson in ELF communication and claims that ELF users “have to strike a balance between cooperative and territorial considerations” (Seidlhofer, 2009a, p. 210). It can be seen that for ELF users, one end is communication or cooperative imperative and the other is identity or territorial imperative. How to keep the balance and where to stand between these two ends is discovered by ELF users during interactions with reference to the settings and their interlocutors. Therefore, it is necessary to cultivate ELF learners’ cultural awareness and accommodation skills for intercultural communication through ELF.

The research on the negotiation of cultural identities in intercultural contexts has been further explored by some scholars. Baker (2009) argues that culture and identity can be expressed through ELF. In ELF communication, culture is viewed as “dynamic,
complex, and negotiated” rather than “neutral” (W. Baker, 2009, 2015a). Due to the hybrid and emergent cultural resources in ELF interactions, ELF users not only represent their local cultural identities, for example through code-switching (Klimpfinger, 2009), but also negotiate and co-construct their multilingual and multicultural identities in ELF interactions, such as the adoption of creative idioms (Pitzl, 2012). Research investigating language teachers and students shows that English is used to construct dynamic, changing and multiple identities (Kalocsai, 2014; Phan, 2008). Baker (2015b) stresses that cultural identity is not linked with a fixed culture or national culture. The stereotyped and simplified view of conceptualisations of culture is not accepted by most scholars (Canagarajah, 2007; Cogo, 2012; Holliday, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Meierkord, 2002; Pennycook, 2007; Zhu, 2014). However, the importance of national cultural identities cannot be ignored. As Baker has suggested (2015b), cultural identities can be constructed at various levels, from the local, to the national and to the global. In such construction processes, Pennycook (2007, p. 6) believes that there is a tension between fluid and fixed cultural expressions and “cultural forms move, change and are reused to fashion new identities in diverse contexts”.

Nonetheless, Baker argues that the participants of ELF communication are not free to construct any identity they wish. Both Baker and Zhu highlight the negotiated nature of cultural identity (W. Baker, 2015b; Zhu, 2015). They propose that an interculturality paradigm as an effective approach to study how and what participants do with their cultural identities. For example, participants can make their cultural identities relevant and irrelevant to interactions in intercultural communication. Zhu (2014) has provided a framework to investigate the process of cultural identity negotiation for speakers from different backgrounds. According to her framework, when a self-oriented identity does not match the identity ascribed by others, there is a need for negotiation. Speakers can
“accept, avow, display, ignore, reject or disavow cultural memberships assigned to them by others” (Zhu, 2015, p. 73). Interculturality offers a productive way to understand the cultural identity of speakers in ELF contexts by taking into account the fluidity and complexity of cultural identities. Based on data from VOICE, Zhu (2015) demonstrates how participants make use of their resources to negotiate cultural frames of references and cultural identities. Her findings suggest that even participants from the same cultural background might not share the same cultural frame of reference. Therefore, interculturality serves to create common ground among friends or colleagues, to negotiate social relationships among different generations and establish common territories for unacquainted participants (Zhu, 2015). The negotiation of cultural identity between Chinese and ASEAN ELF users is examined in Chapter Five.

2.3 The Study of Chinese English

Since the linguistic features of Chinese ELF are a major consideration of this research, a brief overview of Chinese English (CE) study is presented here. CE has been studied since the end of 1970s by a number of scholars in China and abroad. The large English learning population in China and the increasing use of English for intra- and international communication by Chinese means CE has deserved attention from academics and the public. Kirkpatrick (2007) has predicted that CE is likely to become the most commonly spoken variety of English in Asia. The main issues related to CE study include how it should be named and defined; what features of CE and how it functions; whether CE is accepted as a variety; and what implications it has for English language teaching in China (Z. Xu, He, & Deterding, 2017).

2.3.1 The definition of CE.

The terms related to the English used by L1 Chinese, China English, Chinglish and
Chinese English, are discussed and clarified in this section. The first definition of China English comes from Ge (1980). He uses the term China English (Zhongguo yingyu) to refer to “China-specific things” (Ge, 1980, p. 2), such as the Four Books (Si Shu), the four mordernizations (sige xiandaihua). Ge argues that these translated terms from Chinese are words of China English rather than Chinglish (see definition below). The term China English is accepted by many Chinese scholars (Jia & Xiang, 1997; Jiang, 1995; Wenzhong Li, 1993; Wang, 1991) and is generally agreed to be defined as English based on Standard English but with Chinese characteristics, and reflecting Chinese culture. China English is distinguished from Chinglish, which is an “incorrect use of English with Chinese grammar, syntax and tone” (A. Zhang, 1997, p. 40) or an “awkward mixture of Chinese and English” (Jiang, 2002, p. 6) or “an inferior form of English used by the uncivilized and uneducated” (Wei Li, 2016, p. 10). Chinglish is also considered “bad English” and “abnormal English” (Wenzhong Li, 1993, p. 19). For example, I very like that book and your body is very healthy are labelled as Chinglish, as they are word-for-word translations of Chinese which follow the Chinese word order. Among Chinese academics in the 1990s, there were many discussions and debates about the differences between China English and Chinglish (Jiang, 1995; Wenzhong Li, 1993; Z. Xie, 1995; A. Zhang, 1997).

A recent study by Li Wei (2016), from the perspective of translanguaging, proposed the term new Chinglish and explored its functions in Chinese society. According to Li Wei, new Chinglish is created by a new generation of Chinese speakers of English in the last ten years through new media. For example, 3Q in digital communication means thank you as the Chinese pronunciation 3Q sounds similar to thank you. Another example Z-turn is the English translation of Chinese 折腾 (zhe teng), meaning troublesome, with similar sounds and semantics to its source language. Li Wei views the developments of
New Chinglish positively and argues that this emerging language variety “shows the creators’ sociopolitical sense and sensitivities” (Wei Li, 2016, p. 20). Nevertheless, the examples of New Chinglish can be understood by Chinese-English bilinguals who know the Chinese society well.

Some scholars such as Todd and Hancock (1986), Kachru (1993), Bolton (2002), Xu (2010) prefer the term Chinese English. In fact, it is hard to make a clear-cut distinction between China English and Chinglish, both of which are influenced by Chinese linguistic and cultural norms or ideology. A typical example is “long time no see”, a literal translation of the Chinese term which was originally seen as Pidgin English or Chinglish, but is now accepted as Standard English. In this study, the term Chinese English (CE) is adopted using Xu’s definition (2010, p. 1).

*A developing variety of English, which is subject to ongoing codification and normalization processes. It is based largely on the two major varieties of English, namely British and American English. It is characterized by the transfer of Chinese linguistic and cultural norms at varying levels of language, and it is used primarily by Chinese for intra- and international communication.*

**2.3.2 The features of CE.**

A number of scholars have studied and identified CE features at various linguistic levels (Cheng, 1992; Du & Jiang, 2001; He & Li, 2009; Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002; Wenzhong Li, 1993; Z. Xu, 2010; Yan, 2002; J. Yang, 2005). A recently published book “Researching Chinese English: the State of the Art” (Z. Xu et al., 2017) reports research on the phonology, lexis, grammar, pragmatics, pedagogic implication, cultural linguistics and research scholarships related to Chinese English and provides new perspectives for future research.
At the lexical level, the focus is on the study of neologisms and Chinese borrowings. Chinese culture-loaded words are considered an important feature of CE and serve as a channel to promote Chinese culture. Such words or terms include “fengshui”, “maotai”, “kung fu”, “chow mein”. These borrowings are accepted as CE and Chinese students are encouraged to learn these words in English class in order to share Chinese culture with foreigners in their communication. The study of syntactic features of CE has also attracted academic interest. A recent corpus-based study identified some collocational patterns and lexical features which were recognized as innovative collocations in CE (Liang & Li, 2017). So far, there are not many comprehensive studies of syntax of CE and different scholars have focused on different syntactic features. Furthermore, most studies have not made a clear distinction between spoken and written forms when discussing the syntactic features of CE. A summary of the syntactic features of CE is shown in Table 2.1. These are taken from studies by Yan (2002) and Xu (2010) for the following reasons: Yan’s findings are a summary of four scholars (Jiang, 1995; D. Li, 1995; Wenzhong Li, 1993; Todd & Hancock, 1986) and Xu’s study is the most comprehensive because it includes spoken data and written data. While this study is concerned with only the spoken features of Chinese ELF, the syntactic features of spoken CE summarized by Xu are listed as reference. Three of the features in Table 2.1 (in bold) are similar features reported by both Yan and Xu.
Table 2.1.

A Summary of Syntactic Features of CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no response</td>
<td>Yes/no response (Y/NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid using passive voice</td>
<td>Null subject/object (NS/O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without concordance of tenses and aspects</td>
<td>Adjacent default tense (ADT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of adverbs and adjectives</td>
<td>Co-occurrence of connective pairs (CCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd singular zero</td>
<td>Unmarked Object-Subject-Verb (OSV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use few articles</td>
<td>Subject pronoun copying (SPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use subjunctive mood</td>
<td>Topic comment (TC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inversion in subordinate finite wh-clause (ISC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use tag question</td>
<td>Tag question strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study of CE discourse mainly focuses on the description of a written model with respect to the Chinese way of thinking (Jiang, 2002; Zhuang, 2000). Kirkpatrick and Xu (2002) find the transfer of the “frame-main” sequence into CE at both spoken and written levels. “Frame-main” sequence means that Chinese prefer a sequence that proceeds from the subordinate clause to the main clause. For example, “yinwei (because)…suoyi (therefore)…” is a typical Chinese sentence structure. Yinwei (because) is used as a forward pointing marker in CE, which is different from its unmarked normal role in British English where it most frequently refers back and is used anaphorically. Kirkpatrick and Xu (2002, p. 274) suggest that “frame-main” sequence is appropriate when CE is used as a means of communication with non-native speakers in the Asian region as this sequencing pattern is also preferred in many other Asian languages. However, most of the discourse and pragmatic studies of CE use written data, such as letters, emails, academic writing and news stories. The pragmatic study of spoken CE is, however, nearly
untouched. A rare example is an investigation of cross-cultural communication between Chinese and native English-speaking students in Beijing. Feng (2000) found typical Chinese ways of talking in English were mostly accepted, rather than rejected as communicative incompetence, by native speakers of English. As the native English-speaking students in his research were learning Chinese on a Chinese campus, it could be assumed that the native English-speaking students might have been more tolerant and cooperative as they knew something about Chinese culture.

2.3.3 The discussion of CE as a variety.

Jiang (2002) presents an overview of the study of CE and summarizes the characteristics of CE with respect to phonology, lexicon and discourse and claims that “China English is a new member of the large family of the English language” (2002, p. 18). Some Chinese scholars argue that CE is not mature enough yet to be defined as one of the English varieties (Lin, 2001; Sun, 1989; Z. Xie, 1995). Some worry that the proposal that CE represents a variety of English may have adverse effects on language teaching and stimulate the spread of interlanguage (Qiu, Ning, & Gong, 2002). However, the increasing use of English in China deserves comprehensive study, as it is of linguistic and practical significance. The problem of defining CE as a variety by Chinese scholars is due to the lack of criteria. Intelligibility and acceptability are proposed by some scholars (Jiang, 2002; Sun, 1989; Z. Xie, 1995) as the main factors to be taken into account when defining CE as a variety. However, there has been no clear discussion of the degree and the target of intelligibility and acceptability. Early studies believe that native English speakers were the target and professionals working with Chinese English (like teachers or translators) needed to work hard to make CE acceptable to native English speakers (Sun, 1989; A. Zhang, 1997). This is understandable as English was not so widely used
as a lingua franca in China at that time and they would not have realized that English was used much more among non-native English speakers in the world. Later Jiang (2002, pp. 9-10) mentions that if a speaker can be understood with “incorrect” English, according to British or American standards, then the English used can be accepted as “English”.

Concerning how to accept an “English” as a variety, Butler’s (1997) five criteria were taken into consideration in this research. These five criteria are: 1) a standard and recognisable pronunciation; 2) particular words and phrases that express key features of the physical and social environment; 3) history of the language community; 4) literature written in that variety and 5) the existence of references works. In the context of China, the researcher has taken Kirkpatrick and Xu’s view of CE, which is that it is a “developing variety” (Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002, p. 270), but not established yet.

CE has possibly met at least three of these criteria. Firstly, due to the different Chinese dialects in China, the pronunciation criterion may not be applicable to Chinese English (Kirkpatrick, 2007). However, some major characteristics of English pronunciation by Chinese speakers have been summarized by some scholars (Deterding, 2006; Jiang, 2002; D. Li, 1995; Todd & Hancock, 1986; Yan, 2002). For example, there is no distinction between long and short vowels. Chinese people tend to pronounce them with the same length. The sounds /θ/, /ð/ and /v/ are likely to be replaced by /s/, /z/ and /w/. In addition, L1 Chinese frequently speak English within a very narrow intonation band as they find it hard to follow English intonation. CE is more or less syllable-timed rather than stress-timed and lacks weakening, liaison, assimilation and juncture. Moreover, L1 Chinese speakers tend to emphasize sentence-final pronouns. Deterding (2006, p. 175) suggests that some of the salient features of Chinese English speakers “may become established as part of a unique variety of English that is emerging in China”.
Secondly, quite a number of discussions on CE lexicon especially in cultural and political terms have contributed to the development of CE. Many China-specific words and phrases have been used in English newspapers, magazines and literature works in China. Based on his spoken and written data, Xu (2010) classifies CE lexis into three distinct categories: Chinese loanwords in English, nativised English words and common English words. The first two categories display “Chineseness” and are “distinctive from usages elsewhere” (Z. Xu, 2010, p. 58). For example, Chinese loanwords include transliterations such as “xiaokang”, “pinyin” or loan translations such as “Spring Festival” or “Cultural revolution”. Nativised Chinese English words are words where the original English meanings have shifted in relation to Chinese contexts. For example, “migrant workers” refers to the peasants who have temporarily migrated from the countryside to cities to work in low-pay sectors. The CE lexis is unique with Chinese characters and can be fully understood by people with knowledge of the Chinese context.

Thirdly, Bolton (2003) gives a comprehensive description of the history of the English language in China, dating back to the 17th century, from the perspective of sociolinguistics, anthropology, history and sociology. The contact of Chinese and English has a history of 370 years (Bolton, 2003, p. iii). Fourth, there are over 100 Chinese American writers writing in English and many have received world-wide recognition. For example, Ha Jin won the Faulkner Award for Fiction, Maxine Hong Kingston won the National Book Award in the U.S., Qiu Xiaolong won the Anthony Award for Best First Novel. Many of the linguistic and sociolinguistic features that are unique to CE can be identified in their works in English (for example Ha Jin’s short stories, see Xu 2010).

The term established varieties are similar to what Kachru termed as institutionalised varieties. According to Kachru (1992a) the non-native uses of English are divided into two broad categories, namely, the performance varieties and the institutionalised varieties.
The performance varieties include essentially those varieties which are used as foreign languages in specific contexts; but only institutionalised varieties have some ontological status. The four main characteristics of an institutionalized variety include 1) being used extendedly in the sociolinguistic context of a nation; 2) having an extended register and style range; 3) having a process of nativisation of the registers and styles and 4) comprising a body of nativised English literature. Kachru (1992a) claims that an institutionalized variety starts as a performance variety and passes three stages: from a non-recognition of the local variety, then the development of varieties within a variety and finally the recognition. CE is not yet an established or institutionalized variety accepted as the norm with reference to the criteria above. At present, CE belongs to the performance variety category and is moving slowly towards the second stage of an institutionalised variety (Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002). However, CE is developing as English plays a more important role between Chinese and other Asians, as well as the rest of the world.

It is important to note that the use of English in China is dynamic and constantly changing. Research into CE lexis and syntax needs to be conducted in a more comprehensive and systematic manner by considering the mode of communication, the context of communication and the register. Chinese scholars (as discussed above) have begun to consider whether CE is a variety as part of WE, and whether it should be studied as part of the WE paradigm. In addition to the research on linguistic features of CE as a variety of English, Kirkpatrick (2017) underlines the importance of further research into the use and functions of CE across China. Compared with the study of CE, there are, to date, few studies of English being used as a lingua franca by L1 Chinese. In this study, the focus is on Chinese ELF, especially the lexical and syntactic features of spoken ELF used by Chinese. Therefore, the characteristics of Chinese spoken English summarized
by Xu (2010) were used as a reference. Based on his spoken data, Xu (2010) lists nine syntactic features of CE, including adjacent default tense, null subject or object, co-occurrence of connective pairs, subject pronoun copying, yes/no response, topic-comment, unmarked OSV, inversion in subordinate wh-clause and tag question strategy. In this research, it was important to determine which features of CE were present and not present by L1 Chinese in ELF context and to examine how the flexibility of Chinese ELF users when they used English in specific communication settings.

2.4 Communicative Competence for ELF Users

The term *communicative competence* stems from Hymes (1967) as a challenge against Chomsky’s notion of *linguistic competence*. Hymes (1967) argued that knowledge of language should include both knowledge of language structure and the knowledge of how to use language appropriately. Canale and Swain (1980) re-examined Hymes’ term and developed a comprehensive communicative competence model consisting of three components: grammatical competence, strategic competence and sociocultural competence. This model clearly elaborates the sociolinguistic dimension of language proficiency. Later Canale (1983) elaborated the model by separating sociolinguistic competence into sociolinguistic competence and discourse competence. The sociolinguistic dimension was narrowed further by Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1995) in their proposed model, which posited five components of communicative competencies: linguistic competence, strategic competence, sociocultural competence, actional competence and discourse competence (see Figure 2.1).
Celce-Murcia et al. view their attempt as a continuation of Canale and Swain’s work.

The differences between Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model and the one put forward by Canale and Swain (1980) is the use of the term “linguistic competence”, rather than “grammatical competence”, and the use of the “sociocultural competence”, rather than “sociolinguistic competence” in order to distinguish sociocultural knowledge from language resources. These models share a similar principle which aims to serve as effective guidelines of communicative approach in language teaching and reliable measurement of second language communicative skills. In this research, the updated model of communicative competence proposed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) was adopted in the analysis of ELF users in China-ASEAN communication settings because
their classification is more detailed and accords to the needs of this study.

First, linguistic competence comprises the sentence patterns, the constituent structure, the morphological inflections, lexical resources and phonological and orthographic systems needed to realize communication (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). Also, it is emphasized that “communicative competence is ... being able to apply the rules to make whatever adjustments are necessary according to contextual standards” and “essentially a matter of adaptation and rules are not generative but regulative and subservient” (Widdowson, 1989, p. 135). This research discusses the non-standard forms of linguistic features in the China-ASEAN context, aiming to examine how Chinese ELF speakers use these non-standard forms of lexis and syntax in Asian ELF context and whether these “adapted” forms are intelligible in China-ASEAN communication. The argument of this research is that linguistic competence is not the extent to which ELF speakers acquire native-like competence in terms of lexis and grammar but how they flexibly make use of their language resources (including Chinese and English) to achieve their communication purposes.

Second, discourse competence concerns the selection, sequencing, and arrangement of words, structures, sentences and utterances to achieve a unified spoken or written text (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). According to Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), discourse competence is the core of communicative competence with many sub-areas, such as cohesion, coherence, generic structure and the conversational structure inherent to the turn-taking system. In China-ASEAN ELF contexts, it is worth studying how ELF speakers collaborate and use backchannels, how they make their discourse coherent and how they take turns to change and manage topics.

Third, actional competence, a new term proposed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), is
defined as “competence in conveying and understanding communicative intent, that is, matching actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force”. This is similar to what Canale (1983, p. 7) referred as “appropriateness of meaning”. For example, “how to greet”, “how to ask for information”, “how to agree and disagree” and “how to persuade” are all in this category. This study in China-ASEAN context, for example, explores how Chinese ELF users disagree with others.

Fourth, sociocultural competence refers to a speaker’s knowledge of how to express messages appropriately within the overall social and cultural context of communication, in accordance with the pragmatic factors related to variation in language use (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). This is what Canale (1983, p. 7) called “appropriateness of form”. The sociocultural competence comprises four factors: social contextual factors (such as status and relations of participants), stylistic appropriateness factors (such as politeness conventions), cultural factors (such as cross-cultural awareness) and non-verbal communicative factors (such as body language) (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). These factors are complex and interrelated. The cross-cultural awareness of ELF speakers as one of the cultural factors and the use of terms of address in China-ASEAN context as one of the stylistic appropriateness factors have been studied.

Fifth, strategic competence refers to communication strategies to compensate for breakdowns in communication and to enhance the effectiveness of communication (Canale, 1983). The framework of Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) has highlighted three functions of strategy use, which aim to avoid troubles, to solve problems and to keep the communication channel open in the face of communication difficulties. Both Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) and Canale (1983) stress the importance of communication strategy training for learners of English. In ELF contexts, many scholars have studied
communication strategies. It is reported that ELF speakers are more willing to communicate or adopt more strategies to achieve their communication purpose, which can compensate for their difficulties in grammatical accuracy. Communicative strategies adopted by Asian ELF speakers are one of the focuses in this study, including paraphrasing, dealing with non-understanding, code-switching and word suggestion.

ELF communication is, of course, a means of communication and shares the nature of communication summarized by Canale (1983). ELF communication can involve a high degree of unpredictability and creativity in form and message; the discourse and sociocultural contexts provide constraints on appropriate language use; the success of communication is judged by its actual outcomes; participants need to evaluate and negotiate meaning during their interactions. Based on the suggestion of Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), detailed components of the five competences for ELF users in the Chinese subset of ACE have been studied and analyzed (see Table 2.2). Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model provides a comprehensive framework to examine linguistic and sociocultural aspects of ELF communication and guidelines to communicative language teaching. The communicative competence can be applied in ELF contexts in general and the components of the communicative competence do not have to be linked to the conformity with native-speaker conventions. As it was impossible to examine all the components in one thesis, only salient features were studied in this research.

Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Components suggested by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)</th>
<th>Components studied in this research</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Components of Communicative Competence Studied in China-ASEAN ELF Contexts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic competence</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Lexical innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse competence</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Genre structure</td>
<td>Conversational structure</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Conversational structure</td>
<td>Self-repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actional competence</td>
<td>Knowledge of language functions</td>
<td>Knowledge of language functions</td>
<td>How to disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of language functions</td>
<td>How to disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural competence</td>
<td>Social contextual factors</td>
<td>Stylistic appropriateness factors</td>
<td>Politeness conventions and strategies</td>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td>Politeness conventions and strategies</td>
<td>Field-specific registers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic competence</td>
<td>Avoidance strategies</td>
<td>Achievement strategies</td>
<td>Idioms avoidance</td>
<td>Stalling strategies</td>
<td>Self-monitoring strategies</td>
<td>Code-switching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-monitoring strategies</td>
<td>Meanings negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement strategies</td>
<td>Achievement strategies</td>
<td>Word coinage</td>
<td>Self-monitoring strategies</td>
<td>Interactional strategies</td>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The components of communicative competence serve as an elaborated list that researchers and teaching practitioners can refer to. However, as claim by Canale (1983, p. 12), “how these components interact with one another has been largely ignored”. In
Asian ELF contexts, it is worth noting that how these components interact with each other. For example, in some Asian countries, the rule of turn-taking is related to social status. Rusdi (1999) has reported that turn-taking is determined by seniority and gender in Indonesian seminars. Therefore, the turn-taking system, in the category of discourse competence, is also part of sociocultural competence. Another example is code-switching, which can be viewed as a strategic competence to achieve better understanding with speakers from similar background, but, at the same time, a presentation of the cultural identity of the speaker.

Another issue which needs to be noted is sociocultural competence. This deserves reconsideration when culture is viewed as “complex, multidimensional, dynamic and irreducible but nonetheless a recognisable ‘whole’” (W. Baker, 2015a, p. 16). The sociocultural components in the early communicative model proposed by Canale and Swain have been expanded and modified by later scholars. For example, Byram’s *intercultural communicative competence* (ICC) (Byram, 1997) expands the conception of communicative competence and proposed *critical cultural awareness* (CA), which is “the ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures and countries” (Byram, 1997, p. 53). The concept of critical cultural awareness emphasizes the need for language users to mediate and take a critical perspective on the relations between different cultures. However, the correlation between the English language and a particular culture and nation in ICC is considered problematic given the complexity and diversity of intercultural communication through ELF (W. Baker, 2012, 2015a). Addressing the fluid and emergent nature of ELF communication, Baker (2011, 2015a, 2015c) proposed *intercultural awareness* (ICA) and its basic characterisation is set out below:

*I.C.A is an understanding of the role culturally based forms, practices and frames of*
reference can have in intercultural communication, and an ability to put these conceptions into practice in a flexible and context specific manner in communication.

(W. Baker, 2015a, p. 20; 2015c)

According to this definition, ICA is not just an “awareness”, but a holistic term as “competence”, which includes knowledge of different communicative practices, attitude towards different values and belief, and skills of employing the knowledge into practice. A similar view is shared by Sharifian (2013) who proposes the importance of metacultural competence in learning EIL, which enables speakers to communicate and negotiate their cultural conceptualisations during intercultural interactions. It can be concluded that the capacity to negotiate and mediate between different emergent sociocultural communication modes and frames of reference is highlighted in intercultural competence.

In this research, the components of communicative competence to be studied in China-ASEAN ELF context (Table 2.2) are based on the framework of Celce-Murcia et al. (1995). This is because the detailed components elaborated in each competence make it convenient, practical and feasible to examine how English is used as a lingua franca in China-ASEAN contexts in a comprehensive and systematic way. However, the updated concepts in terms of intercultural competence, such as the fluid nature of culture, cultural identity and interculturality (see section 2.2.3) were adopted in the analysis of sociocultural and strategic competence and other corresponding components in ELF settings. For example, “strategies for cross-cultural communication” is listed as one of the components of sociocultural competence in Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model. However, their emphasis of “the target speaker community” and “the culture-specific do’s and don’ts” (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p. 25) implies a static rather than a fluid and dynamic view of culture. With the updated conceptualization of culture, intercultural competence is incorporated into the discussion of the use of Asian ELF, focusing on how
ELF users in China-ASEAN contexts negotiate their cultural frames of reference and make their cultural identities relevant in their ELF interactions. In addition, how these components are applied in language teaching still needs further elaboration. As mentioned by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), some components of communicative competence may be more weighted in some teaching situations than in others. Further discussion of ELF in language teaching is presented in the next section.

2.5 ELF and Language Teaching

Implications of ELF for English Language Teaching have been a major concern for ELF scholars since the early stage of ELF (Jenkins, 2000; Seidlhofer, 1999, 2001). The nature and concept of ELF, as discussed in 2.1, is different from the ENL ideology, provokes controversy and challenges in current English Language Teaching (ELT). Although there has been a growth in the number of TESOL journals and books dedicated specifically to the topic on teaching English as an international language (Matsuda, 2012; McKay, 2002; Sharifian, 2009; Vettorel, 2015), Marlina (2014, p. 9) believes that “the discourse on teaching EIL are still not solid and convincing enough.” She also argues it is important to have more writing on the theoretical principles of teaching English as a pluricentric language and more efforts need to be made to “translate the EIL paradigm into practice” (Marlina, 2014, p. 10). The pedagogic implications of teaching ELF, as part of EIL paradigm, mainly include teaching principles, models, curriculum, materials, approaches and teacher training.

2.5.1 The principles, goals and models of ELF language teaching.

Despite the fact that English is used by a diverse range of speakers around the world, most schools and education bodies still insist on teaching Standard English, regardless of the actual communication needs of the L2 learners, and most learners still seem to strive
of the goal of native-like proficiency. In addition, almost all course books sold on the
global market still use a native standard as their models. In Europe, Pitzl (2015) has
examined the term “misunderstanding” in the *Common European Framework of
Reference* (CEFR) (Council of Europe 2001), which has an impact on language teaching,
textbooks and requirements of language skills in professional contexts. She argues that
the explicit native speaker orientation in some CEFR descriptors influences local teaching
practices due to the stereotype in intercultural communication. It is assumed that the
limited language proficiency of non-native language users is the cause of intercultural
communication breakdowns.

In China, which has the largest number of English learners with around 400 million
(Bolton & Graddol, 2012, p. 3), there has been little debate on the role of English as an
International Language (EIL). After analyzing the four official documents issued by
Ministry of Education (MOE) of China regarding English teaching in Mainland China,
Wen (2012) reported none of the documents mentioned teaching English as an
International Language. The pedagogical decisions on what is to be taught and what is to
be achieved in English teaching have not been transparently and explicitly stated. The
native English varieties, such as British English and American English are still “the only
source of learning materials” in China because “there is no clear and feasible answer to
what could be used as a model for L2 learners if the native variety is not” (Wen, 2012, p.
85).

The reasons for using the native-speaker model in English language teaching have
been well summarized by Kirkpatrick (2006). First, native-speaker models have been
codified, which means there are reliable resources for teachers and students to refer to.
Second, the standard varieties based on native speaker norms are assumed to be a
guarantee for mutual intelligibility in the international community. Third, the native-
speaker model represents power and fourth it has historical authority. Kirkpatrick argues that this easy and safe option would not be advantageous for teachers and students in Outer and Expanding Circles as native-speaker model is an impossible goal for students to achieve and can cause local English teachers feel insecure. In addition, the native-speaker model fails to reflect and respect regional cultures.

In their review of the history of English language teaching, Seidlhofer and Widdowson (in press) conclude that although the Structural Approach (SA) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) each have a different focus, SA on linguistic forms while CLT focuses on pragmatic functions, both are essentially based on the old assumption that English is the language of native speakers. Therefore, they (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, in press) argue that “there is no significant paradigm shift” between SA and CLT. Consequently, they assert that the assumption that communication depends on the conformity to native speaker norms is “invalid” as many ELF users are able to communicate effectively without conforming to these norms. Seidlhofer and Widdowson (in press) suggest that the findings of ELF research can indicate that what aspects of language use are of most value in language teaching and can guide learners to develop their communicative capability.

Given the situation of the use of English, it is imperative to examine which goals and principles in English language teaching are appropriate for ELF users. Scholars focusing on the teaching of EIL (Holliday, 2005; Kirkpatrick & Sussex, 2012; Marlina & Giri, 2014; McKay, 2002; Tomlinson, 2006) and ELF (W. Baker, 2015c; Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Kohn, in press; Lopriore & Vettorel, in press; Seidlhofer, 2015) agree that ENL norms should no longer be the goal for language learners in ELF communication. Seidlhofer (2011) clearly states that if English is taught for international communication, it would make sense to examine how it is actually used, which means the
way English functions as a lingua franca in international communication. She (2011, p. 195) emphasizes “that the focus of teaching should not be on the forms of learner language and how far they deviate from NS norms, but on how effectively they function in making meaning.” Therefore, from the ELF perspective, the purpose of English teaching is to develop students’ capability for effective use of the language, which involves exploitation of available linguistic resources (Seidlhofer, 2011). She (2011) argues that what matters for learners is not how much language they acquire but how they make use of the language. Learning and using the language are simultaneous processes for ELF users.

Addressing the major role of English as a lingua franca throughout Asia, Kirkpatrick proposes the lingua franca approach to English language teaching (2012) and elaborates on the principles of this approach (Kirkpatrick, 2014, in press) in terms of linguistic targets, cultural targets, appropriate language teachers, learning environments and assessment. He argues that mutual intelligibility and intercultural competence in relevant cultures rather than native speaker norms and culture are the goals of English teaching in the Asian context. Kirkpatrick (2010a, p. 176) also argues that “learners need to be able to use the language in lingua franca contexts more than they need to be able to replicate the linguistic features of some imported exonormative standard of English”. In fact, the diverse linguistic backgrounds of the ELF speakers represent valuable resources to exploit rather than being the cause of misunderstandings. Most ELF scholars agree that developing the capability of using English in actual situations is the purpose of English teaching. In addition, bilingual or multilingual resources are advantageous for non-native English speakers. However, the aim of the models proposed by ELF researchers is not to replace the traditional native English model, because the traditional model is useful for learners who intend to communicate with native speakers and understand native speaker literature or cultures. As stated by Jenkins et al. (2011, pp. 305-306), “ELF research
provides insights into the heterogeneous nature of English as it is used in contact situations” and language teaching needs to “incorporate a multi-norm, multi-method approach”.

Wen (2012) has proposed a pedagogical model for teaching English as an international language, which based on the Chinese language teaching context, in accordance with the multi-norm approach. Since there was no ready-made pedagogical solution addressing the context of ELF in China, Wen’s three-level model is a practical alternative for college English teaching in China. The model comprises three components: linguistic, cultural and pragmatic components. For the linguistic component, three types of linguistic input, namely native varieties, non-native varieties and localized features are gradually offered to learners in different proportions according to their level of proficiency, thus aiming to develop effective communication skills. For cultural components, students are exposed to three kinds of cultures: target language cultures, the cultures of other non-native speakers and the learner’s own culture or the local culture. The objective of teaching cultures is to acquire intercultural competence. For the pragmatic component, three groups of rules are taught: universal communicative rules, target language communicative rules and non-native communicative rules, in order to develop appropriate strategies for intercultural communication. This model also reflects what McArthur suggested for teaching English with multiple standards, that is, moving “from the known and safe to the unknown and disturbing, until that too becomes safe” (Rubdy & Saraceni, 2006, p. 29).

However, no model is likely to be the best for all learners. Determining which model is appropriate depends on the learner’s needs and the stage of the learning process. The key point is that learners should not have a native-speaker model imposed upon them as the only goal for their learning so that they are less likely to suffer the consequences of a
sense of deficiency and a lack of confidence in their communication.

2.5.2 ELF Teachers.

In most Asian countries, English teachers from native-speaking countries are preferred in language teaching classrooms. In China, foreign teachers only can be an attractive highlight in English teaching advertisements even for preschool children and can attract higher fees. “Foreign teachers”, in both private teaching agencies or universities and public schools, means the same: teachers from native-speaking countries, preferably from the U.S, U.K, Canada or Australia. Teachers from Outer Circle countries are not regarded as “foreign teachers”. Native speakers are often seen as being better teachers to teach their native language than local teachers who can speak both English and the native language of their students, even though students often complain about the teaching quality of foreign teachers, as has been the case at Guangxi University. This is because that native-speaker teachers may not understand their non-native speaker students’ need and difficulties in language learning process as much as local teachers do. However, local English teachers still hold the assumption that NS norms are the model and target of language teaching. According to a recent survey on the language attitudes of college English teachers in China (Wu, 2014), most non-native speaker teachers prefer an ENL-based model of English and adopt a comparatively negative attitude towards the nativization of English in China. The interviewees all agree that Chinese should avoid having a “Chinese accent” when using English even though it is impossible to speak English without a Chinese accent.

English teachers need to be equipped with linguistic understanding of English and their own languages as well as language variation and the role of English in their community. McArthur suggests that an English teacher are required to have knowledge
regarding other varieties and the knowledge of students’ first language (Rubdy & Saraceni, 2006). Kirkpatrick (2010a, 2014) argues that bilingual or multilingual teachers will enjoy more advantages than monolingual native speakers in teaching ELF. First, they have accomplished learning the language and therefore, would have a better understanding of the challenges students face. Second, they could present the most appropriate “linguistic models” for learners. Third, their regional intercultural competence can offer cultural insights for students. Fourth, they can use students’ language to help them learn English. Fifth, the value of multilingualism can be reinforced in the classroom. A similar view is stated by other ELF scholars. For example, “the L2-user teacher is a model to which students can reasonably aspire” (Prodromou, 2008, p. 253). This means the kind of teachers needed for non-native speaker learners are those who are successful bilinguals or multilinguals with intercultural competence.

Even so, teacher education is crucial for ELF teachers. The implications of ELF-related research for teachers have attracted the interests of many scholars (Bayyurt, 2012; Blair, 2015; Dewey, 2012; Jenkins, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2014, in press; Sifakis, 2014). Many ELF scholars agree that language teachers may need to review and change their beliefs about key aspects of English language teaching, such as normativity and the role of native/non-native speakers (Sifakis, 2014). Seidlhofer claims that “knowledge of language and knowledge about language” are equally important (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 205). This means language teachers should not only have knowledge of a language, such as lexis, grammar and literature, but should also understand the nature of language and communication. Both Seidlhofer (2011) and Kirkpatrick (2007) share the same idea that ELF teacher training needs to include two major parts: first, at the macro-level, an understanding of the nature and the roles of English in the world as well as in their community; second, at the micro-level, the knowledge and flexibility to adapt their
teaching styles and methods to suit different contexts and cultures. Bayyurt and Sifakis (2015) propose an ELF-aware teacher education model for in-service teachers of English in Expanding Circle contexts. This model “is intended not only to inform teachers but also make them tangibly and critically aware of key ELF-related concerns” (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015, p. 55). This model provides a practical way for teacher education to involve teachers in reading extensive ELF-related literature, to help them reflect the relevance of ELF in their classroom, and to design their own ELF-aware lessons. However, the model is not supposed to be a better option than the traditional one in every context. Teachers are crucial in making decisions in their classroom teaching and they need to decide whether, and to what extent ELF is relevant to their learners in their context.

2.5.3 ELF-aware teaching contents and materials.

How to incorporate the ELF concept and its fluid and dynamic nature into English syllabus still needs more empirical studies. Kohn (in press) explores the feasibility of implementing five dimensions of ELF-related competence in the classroom: awareness, comprehension, production, communicative interaction and non-native speaker creativity. First, speakers need to develop awareness of the plurilithic nature of the English language by exploring genuine ELF communication and reflective activities with regard to language, communication styles and cultural differences. Seidlhofer (2006) suggests that it is up to learners and users of English to decide which kind of English they need and want, but some awareness of the global roles of English should be achieved by all English users in the Inner, Outer and Expanding Circles alike.

Second, ELF-related comprehension skills require more exposure to genuine ELF communication, which contains unfamiliar pronunciation and sentence structures, unclear utterance meanings regarding lexis, illocution and weak discourse coherence. As for
learners, some may worry that their proficiency would drop if they are exposed to non-standard forms. However, Tomlinson (2006, p. 135) argues that if the learners continue to be exposed to a variety of Englishes to develop receptive competence, then standards would not be lowered, but instead, learners would develop the ability to communicate with native speakers as well as non-native speakers. Seidlhofer (2004) shares the same view by claiming that more exposure to a wide range of English varieties is likely to facilitate the acquisition of communicative abilities.

Third, ELF-related production skills involve helping learners to check their own requirements for successful performance and strengthening their communicative power by focusing on communicative strategies, such as paraphrasing, negotiating meaning and handling misunderstandings. The focus of language teaching needs to be on the communicative practices and strategies used by effective speakers rather than language norms. Deterding (2013, p. 170) demonstrates that one can speak excellent English without imitating native speakers and the crucial factor for intelligibility is the “knowledge about what helps and what hinders intelligibility”. As for pronunciation teaching, Jenkins (2000, p. 212), as noted earlier, advocates the use of a phonological core, the Lingua Franca Core, and argues that pronunciation tests should test how well “speakers are able to adjust their pronunciation appropriately to accommodate their interlocutors”. Communicative strategy training can help learners compensate for breakdowns in communication, enhance mutual intelligibility and build rapport among interlocutors.

Fourth, intercultural communicative interaction involves the “ability to negotiate an intercultural common ground for coping with cognitive, emotional, and behavioural divergences” (Kohn, in press). Baker (2012, 2015c) has explored how intercultural awareness can be implemented in classroom practice and tried to provide opportunities
for students to investigate the relationships between culture, language and communication based on his empirical study of Thai learners of English at a Thai university. His study demonstrated the feasibility of developing ELT materials without focusing on typical Anglophone cultures. With a similar standpoint, Sharifian (2013, p. 10) argues that ELT curricula should aim at developing a level of competence which can achieve successful intercultural communication and proposed *metacultural competence* as a key to communicate and negotiate cultural conceptualisations.

Fifth, non-native speaker creativity is a challenging dimension of ELF competence according to Kohn (in press). “Helping learners to explore and trust their natural non-native speaker creativity is thus of foremost importance in a teaching programme…” (Kohn, in press). Learner’s nonconformities should not be simply taken as evidence of incompetence or errors. Being able to use the language creatively can give speakers confidence, satisfaction and the sense of some ownership of the language (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2009).

Using the five dimensions of ELF competence as a guideline in classroom teaching, there is a need for teachers to critically re-examine the current teaching materials from the perspective of ELF. It is also necessary to integrate StE-based course books with appropriate authentic materials and activities. A general checklist for materials evaluation proposed by Lopriore and Vettorel (in press) is useful for the ELF approach in language teaching: 1) Perspectives on Global Englishes are included; 2) Several varieties are presented in listening activities; 3) ELF contexts/Speakers are presented in listening activities; 4) Culture is presented including different countries and points of view; 5) Intercultural perspectives are included; 6) Reflection activities on the students’ own culture are present. These six aspects of material evaluation have been applied to the current teaching materials for English majors in Guangxi University as a case study in
Chapter Six.

In general, ELF-oriented approach is a shift in mindset and still faces challenges in terms of teaching philosophy, teacher education, curriculum design, and teaching materials. Whatever difficulties are faced, as Seidlhofer (2015, p. 27) claims, “like all true innovation, ELF-informed teaching will take time to percolate into mainstream practice”.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the key recent literatures related to this research concerning the concept of ELF, the linguistic features of ELF, the study of Chinese English, the communicative competence of ELF users and its implications for English language teaching. All these parts are linked and provide a background and foundation for this research. At the beginning of this chapter, the concept of ELF was discussed in relation to WE, EIL and EFL with further elaboration of related topics such as variety, community, Standard English, ownership, and cultural identity. It is argued that there is a gap between the ELF reality and the acceptance of ELF in linguistic study and language teaching. This indicates that this research of ELF by Asian users can make a contribution to the acceptance of ELF in this area. In the next section, the linguistic features of ELF, including phonology, lexicogrammar and pragmatics, were summarized from the perspective of ELF. The non-conformities to native English speakers, creative use of the language and positive communicative strategies have been widely identified in ELF corpus. However, there is little research on the ELF in the specific China-ASEAN communication contexts, where there are an increasing number of ELF speakers. Therefore, it is worth observing the linguistic features and pragmatic competence of Asian ELF speakers in this context when referring to the findings in other ELF contexts. In the third section, the features of CE were summarized as references for the analysis of ELF
by Chinese users in China-ASEAN communication contexts. The linguistic features of
Chinese ELF users are one of the major focuses in this research, and therefore it is
impossible to ignore the features of CE, especially spoken CE, that are also identified in
the ELF context. In the fourth section, a framework of communicative competence was
elaborated and applied to ELF users, however, with modification in linguistic competence
and sociocultural competence. This part provides a basis for the data analysis in this
research and demonstrates how the linguistic features identified in ELF by Asian users
can be taken as effective communicative competence in ELF interaction. The ELF-related
competence also has significant implications for language teaching. The last section of
the review focused on the pedagogical implication of ELF regarding the aspect of
teaching principles and models, ELF teacher and teaching contents and materials. How
to translate the new ELF paradigm and language philosophy into language teaching
practice deserves our continuous efforts, despite the various challenges and difficulties
ahead.

The literature review builds up a basis for this research, which aims at filling the
current research gap, that is, the linguistic features of ELF by Chinese speakers and the
pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users in the specific China-ASEAN communication
contexts as well as its pedagogical implications for ELF in English teaching in China.
The specific research questions (as stated in Chapter One) are designed to fill these
research gaps:

Research question 1: How is English being used in the context of China-ASEAN
communication? What are the distinctive lexicogrammatical features of ELF in this
context, especially with regards to first language Chinese users of ELF? Do non-
standard forms necessarily cause problems in China-ASEAN communication or not?
Research question 2: What pragmatic competence do Asian ELF users demonstrate in China-ASEAN interactions? What communicative strategies do speakers employ to facilitate communication? What sociocultural competence do Asian ELF users demonstrate? What discourse competence do Asian ELF users have?

Research question 3: What are the implications of the findings for English language teaching in China? How to translate the ELF concept into language teaching practice in terms of teaching model, ELF teachers, teaching contents and materials?

I now turn to discuss the methodology adopted in this research.
Chapter Three

Methodology and Data

This chapter describes the methodology and data applied in this research. First, corpus-based methods are found widely used in ELF studies and likewise applied in this research. The naturally occurring data of ELF corpus enable the researcher to investigate the actual use of language in this defined ELF contexts through observing the frequent patterns of linguistic features and analysing ELF discourse. Second, the primary data used in this research are retrieved from the Chinese subset of ACE. The detailed information of the speakers, recordings, transcription tools are listed and explained. There are also examples to demonstrate how to investigate the data in the corpus through concordance software.

3.1 A Corpus-based Study of ELF

“Corpora are generally large, representative samples of a particular type of naturally occurring language, so they can therefore be used as a standard reference with which claims about language can be measured” (P. Baker, 2006, p. 2) Annotated electronic corpora have been effective and valuable tools for linguists to study the actual use of language. Corpus-based methods have been used from as early as the nineteenth century, but it was not until in the 1980s when personal computers were widely available that corpus linguistics became popular (P. Baker, 2006). Corpus linguistics can be applied in dictionary compiling, literary text interpretation, language description, language variation studies and language teaching materials. To date, most corpus-based descriptions of English have been concerned with English as a native language or English as a second language. The widespread and diversified use of English around the globe, especially
among non-native speakers, has made ELF a distinct and special sociolinguistic phenomenon. From early this century, there has been major development in corpus-based investigations into ELF. One of the most important current methods applied in ELF research is the use of naturally occurring data (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 27). A number of corpus-based empirical studies in ELF phonology, lexicogrammar and pragmatics have been carried out (P. Baker, 2006; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Deterding, 2013; Jenkins, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2010b; Mauranen, 2011; Prodromou, 2008; Seidlhofer, 2011). Existing large sized ELF corpora include English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA), headed by Mauranen, Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE), headed by Seidlhofer, and Asian Corpus of English (ACE), headed by Kirkpatrick, with one million words each. These corpora enable scholars to observe and describe the forms and functions of ELF interactions on a new scale. However, compared with the corpus work on English as a Native Language (ENL) and World Englishes (WE), the emerging ELF corpora are still far more limited in size and number (Cogo & Dewey, 2012).

The view put forward by ELF researchers is that the common non-standard features in ELF interactions are not necessarily regarded as errors or deficiencies of speakers, and native English no longer represents the only norms in language teaching. This ideology makes ELF corpora different from English learners’ corpora such as International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) and Chinese Learner English Corpus (CLEC), which aim to identify learner’ errors. Also, ELF corpora are different from the influential International Corpus of English (ICE), which involves research teams in 23 countries and regions with a long term aim to produce up to twenty one million-word corpus. ICE is restricted to Englishes from the Inner and Outer Circles while ELF researchers are also interested in the use of English in the Expanding Circle and across the Circles.

In this research, ACE is the primary source of data for analysing the linguistic
features of Asian ELF speakers. Since ACE is a complementary resource to VOICE, the basic information of these two corpora is summarised as follows. VOICE comprises 120 hours audio-recordings of naturally-occurring, non-scripted, face-to-face interactions, which involves over 1250 individuals from 50 different first language backgrounds using English as a lingua franca primarily in European contexts. The project, headed by Seidlhofer, took eight years and was completed in 2013. The purpose of VOICE is to examine how non-native speakers use English in different contexts in their own right. Another large scale corpus, ACE, available online to researchers around the world in 2014, comprises one million words (equivalent to about 110 hours of recorded data). The majority of participants are Asians, who using English in natural settings. Nine teams in East Asia and Southeast Asia were involved in collecting data for the ACE project. The collected data was transcribed through VoiceScribe, which was developed by the VOICE team. As ACE has adopted the same protocols and transcription software as VOICE, it makes it possible for researchers to compare data from both corpora. According to Kirkpatrick (2013), both corpora illustrate the non-marking of the third person singular, the extended use of common verbs, the use of a uniform question tag, the demonstrative *this* with plural nouns, and the use of “different” prepositions. At the same time, some non-standard forms are found more frequently in one corpus than the other. For example, in ACE, there are more base forms of the verb for past tense, the omission of articles, the omission of the copula *be* and the omission of the plural *s*. Kirkpatrick (2012, p. 133) also points out that the ACE and VOICE corpora are not only valuable for investigating linguistic features and the interlocutors’ communicative strategies, but that the findings have potential implications for language teaching.
3.2 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is a widely-used approach to analyse language and adopted in this research. According to Paltridge’s (2006, p. 1) definition, discourse analysis is “an approach to the analysis of language that looks at patterns of language across texts as well as the social and cultural contexts in which the texts occur”. There are two different views on discourse analysis: one is “textually-oriented view” focusing on the language features of texts and the other is “socially-oriented view” focusing on social and cultural setting of the text (Paltridge, 2006, p. 1). These are equivalent to what Schiffrin (1994, p. 42) termed as “structural definitions” and “functional definitions” of discourse. However, Paltridge (2006, p. 8) argues for “an analysis of discourse that is both linguistic and social in its orientation”. This is because the study of language at the text level cannot be easily separated from the social meanings and functions of the language in use. In fact, the features of the text can be interpreted in terms of their social functions as people use language to achieve certain communicative goals.

Discourse analysis is benefited from the development of corpora. For example, the specialized corpora of ELF, enables ELF scholars to examine ELF discourse in particular kinds of texts (such as tag questions in spoken ELF) or in particular situations (such as ELF in academic settings). The existing large-sized ELF corpora (as mentioned in 3.1) provide rich resources for ELF scholars to analyse discourses in various ELF contexts. Corpus-based techniques have been employed mainly to analyse differences in language usage of ELF users as compared with English native speakers. Baker (2006) has argued that there are advantages of the corpus-based approach to discourse analysis. First, it can reduce researchers’ cognitive biases when they going through hundreds of texts with potential overall patterns emerging. In fact, it is impossible to be truly objective and remove bias completely when reporting research. However, at least with a corpus, “we
are starting (hopefully) from a position whereby the data itself has not been selected in order to confirm existing conscious (or subconscious) biases” (P. Baker, 2006, p. 12). Second, corpora are useful in providing the repetitive frequency of naturally occurring language, thus allowing the researcher to more easily identify whether such a discourse is typical or not. For example, in ELF contexts, the preposition about is found to be used more frequently by ELF users than by native speakers. Third, corpora also demonstrate to the researcher changing discourses over historical periods if the repeated patterns of language use over time are studied. This comparison of corpora in various contexts is also useful in identifying the common or different features of ELF. Finally, corpora can also be used as a reference to support the findings derived from smaller-scale analyses (P. Baker, 2006, p. 16).

There are also some concerns which needed to be taken into account when employing a corpus-based approach to discourse analysis in this research. The background information of each conversation, including the occupation, and social status of the speakers as well as that of the potential listeners, contributed to gaining a better understanding of the discourse contexts. Therefore, the discourse analysis of the conversations considered aspects of production and reception. It is also important to be aware that a corpus-based analysis of language normally focuses on frequently occurring language patterns. However, there are also interpretations of discourses emphasizing the pragmatic use of the language. Therefore, in this research, both a corpus-based quantitative approach and qualitative analyses were used to describe patterns of linguistic features of Chinese ELF users and the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users in China-ASEAN contexts.
3.3 Data Collection

The author is a member of the subset ASEAN-China data collection team of the ACE corpus, and this formed the primary data to be used in this research\(^1\). This study used the Chinese subset of the ACE (see Table 3.1) as data.

Table 3.1.

The Chinese Subset of ACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7H27M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Speakers.

The Chinese component of ACE was collected and transcribed by the Chinese team of ACE project. Among the 45 speakers, 22 spoke Chinese as their first language, 13 were from ASEAN countries and five were from other Asian countries including Japan and Korea. There were also four native speakers from the US and the UK and one L1 German speaker. The research focused on the specific lexicogrammatical features of ELF spoken by the Asian ELF users, especially the Chinese ELF users when they interacted with people from other ASEAN+3 countries. The pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users, including strategic competence, sociocultural competence and discourse competence, is also a major consideration in this research. The conversations in the recordings were all naturally occurring. As noted in Table 3.1 above, the first languages of the speakers included Mandarin, Japanese, Thai, Filipino, Korean, Malay, Maldivian, Vietnamese, and  

---

\(^1\) Some of the data has not been officially uploaded to ACE website.
Indian, German and English. Since all the programs from which the data was collected were publicly broadcast, the background information of the speakers, including their occupations, status and age was also acquired (see Table 3.2). The 45 speakers can be classified into five groups according to their occupational backgrounds. Fourteen were from government organizations or institutions. Most were government officials of high rank, including a prime minister, ambassadors, parliamentarians, minister-counsellors and directors of institutions. Nine of the speakers were from the professional business field, including bankers, buyers, investment strategists and trade commissioners. Seven were from professional academic or research fields, including research fellows, critics and university professors. Seven were celebrity type guests involved in activities such as fashion and singing. Finally, eight of the speakers were talk show anchors. Since most of the talk show hosts were from China, all except one were L1 Chinese speakers. They were able, however, to use English as a lingua franca to ask questions, to debate with guests, to express their points of view, and to manage the interactions. All the speakers in the subset, with the exception of two Chinese participants, have undergraduate degrees or above.

Table 3.2.

Information of the Speakers in the Chinese Subset of ACE

(N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Occupation Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCn 1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Dept. Director of Customs Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>research fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>winner of singing competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>winner of singing competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>winner of singing competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>winner of singing competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Recordings.

The subset of ACE used in this research consisted of 18 recordings, each lasting between 20 minutes to 40 minutes, with a total length of seven hours and 27 minutes. The recordings were taken from live talk shows on the China Central Television Station (CCTV) News channel, government websites and official seminars. All interactions are between Chinese and primarily other Asians discussing, in English, current issues in China and around the world. The recordings included the formal talk shows Dialogue and China Talk, which focuses on political and economic issues and the less formal talk show Crossover, which focus on cross-cultural lifestyle and social topics in China. One of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCn 11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>customer in a fashion shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>honorary Dean of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 14</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>investment strategist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCn 15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>participant in economic forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCn 1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCn 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCn 3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCn 4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>fashion designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCn 5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>fashion buyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCn 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>customer in a fashion shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCn 7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Operations Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJp 1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Director of Int. Energy Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJp 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>former ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPc</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>Minister-counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPh</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>parliamentarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMy 1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Minister-counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMy 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>trade commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMy 3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>university professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMy 4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMy 5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Chairman of institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>winner of singing competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FId</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>former Minister of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKr</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>current affairs critic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTh</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>former President of the National Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSg 1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>former Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSg 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>former Minister of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MId</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>from Ministry of Commerce and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMv</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIn</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>participant in economic forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDe</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>fashion designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUk</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>senior university fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUs 1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>current affairs critic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUs 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUs</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>co-anchor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recordings is a Q&A session at a China-ASEAN official seminar discussing issues associated with China-ASEAN customs duties and clearance. A wide range of topics were covered, such as politics, economics, diplomacy, technology, energy, tourism, sports, women’s issues, fashion and pop stars. Table 3.3 below lists information about the recordings, including the topics, the participants’ L1, broadcast date and the length of the recording.

Table 3.3.

Information of the Recordings in the Chinese Subset of ACE

(N=18; duration: 7H27M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Issue date</th>
<th>Duration (min:sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beijing Olympic Games</td>
<td>MCn1+MMv+MMy1</td>
<td>25/08/2008</td>
<td>33:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>China-ASEAN economic and trade relations seminar</td>
<td>MMy2+MCn2+FVn</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
<td>20:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disaster prevention</td>
<td>FCn1+MPh</td>
<td>24/05/2011</td>
<td>9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Energy development</td>
<td>MCn3+MJp1</td>
<td>30/06/2011</td>
<td>13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Islam and secularization</td>
<td>MCn4+MMy3</td>
<td>24/01/2012</td>
<td>17:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>China-Malaysian Ties</td>
<td>FCn2+MMy4</td>
<td>02/04/2012</td>
<td>22:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Singaporean model</td>
<td>MCn4+MSg1</td>
<td>03/04/2012</td>
<td>23:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South China sea dispute</td>
<td>MCn4+MMy5</td>
<td>15/07/2012</td>
<td>13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muslim and modernization</td>
<td>MMy4+MMy5</td>
<td>12/08/2012</td>
<td>26:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Korea’s first female President</td>
<td>FCn2+MKr+MCn5</td>
<td>25/02/2013</td>
<td>29:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience</td>
<td>MCn4+MKr+MMy5</td>
<td>11/04/2013</td>
<td>28:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sino-Thai ties and diplomacy in Asia</td>
<td>MCn4+MTh+MUs1</td>
<td>11/05/2013</td>
<td>25:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>FCn3+FPh</td>
<td>07/06/2013</td>
<td>10:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Prospects for China-Japan relations</td>
<td>MCn4+MJp2</td>
<td>20/11/2013</td>
<td>16:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Implications of China’s re-emergence</td>
<td>MCn4+MSg2</td>
<td>24/11/2013</td>
<td>25:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>China's next pop stars</td>
<td>MCn6+FU6+MCn7+MCn8+MCn9+FMy+MCn10</td>
<td>07/03/2015</td>
<td>44:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fashion in China</td>
<td>MCn6+FU6+FCn4+FCn5+FDe+FCn6+FCn7+MCn11</td>
<td>28/03/2015</td>
<td>42:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>China's ‘one belt one road’ initiative</td>
<td>MCn4+MCn12+MU5+MCn13+Fi+MCn14+MUk+MCn15+MIn</td>
<td>31/03/2015</td>
<td>44:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed information about the speakers and the context of communication enabled
the researcher to identify specific features of the context, including the mode of communication, the type of discourse and the proficiency level of the speakers, which contributed to a more targeted study. Mahboob and Liang (2014) emphasize that a description of the context and detailed information of the sources of data and participants should be provided and considered. A three-dimensional model of language variation (see Figure 3.1) presented by Mahboob (as cited in Mahboob & Liang, 2014) comprising of three elements: users of English, uses of English and modes of communication, helped identify eight domains of language variation (see Table 3.4).

![Figure 3.1. Three-dimensional model of language variation (Mahboob & Liang, 2014, p. 134).](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local, written, everyday</td>
<td>Friends writing letters to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Local, oral, everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Local, written, specialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Local, oral, specialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Global, written, everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Global, oral, everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Global, written, specialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Global, oral, specialized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the classification of language variation by Mahboob, most of the data used for this research related to Number 6 and Number 8 domains, that is, global oral communication on every day or specialized topics. As the programs were all live TV talk shows, the interactions represented naturally occurring oral communication. However, it is worth noting that the anchors in a talk show, need to prepare or plan specific topics for discussion. The talk shows can be classified as semi-structured conversations with the anchors taking more initiative in turn-taking and coordinating or managing the interactions. Most of the speakers had a high social distance from each other, especially in the formal talk show and the seminar. The anchor may not have known any of the guests personally. Some guests in the informal talk show had met each other on other occasions, which can be seen from their talk, but they did not have close social relationships. Most of the speakers were well-educated and confident about using English as a lingua franca. Therefore, based on Mahboob’s three dimensions of language variation, the mode of the ELF communication in this subset is naturally occurring and semi-structured spoken conversations; the use of English is mostly in specialised discourse; and the users of English have high social distance.

According to Cameron (2001), spoken discourse can be classified as *ordinary talk*, which is casual conversation with family and friends; or *institutional talk*, which occurs
when people are interacting with professionals at work. The interactions in this corpus took place mainly in work-related or institutional settings, as in anchor-political leader dialogue or seminar question-and-answer sessions and thus, have been categorized as institutional talk. Such institutional talk is also naturally occurring as in ordinary talk but there are some differences between them. Drew and Heritage (1992) summarize that institutional talk deviates from ordinary talk in terms of three dimensions. First, institutional interactions are normally informed by goal orientations of a conventional form. Second, institutional interactions may often involve special constraints on the kinds of contributions to the talk. Third, institutional talk may be associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific contexts. In news interviews, for example, the interviewer needs to maintain the role of elicitor and manage the order of the conversation, and at the same time, maintain a formally neutral stance (Greatbatch, 1992). In this study, the role of interviewer was examined in terms of topic management.

3.3.3 Transcription and concordance tools.

The original recordings of the interactions were downloaded directly from official websites of CCTV or published resources and converted into WAV format audio files. Once the data had been collected and converted, they were transcribed using VoiceScribe, a transcription software developed by the VOICE team. VOICE transcription conventions were used in transcribing the ACE data, which is the source of the Chinese subset used for this study. The mark-up conventions of ACE include 24 notations, which were adapted from the ACE manual (Patkin, 2011):

- Speaker IDs: Each speaker appears in sequence with the first being referred to as S1, the next S2 and so on.
- Intonation: When a rising tone is used, a question mark “?” is added immediately after
the word. A full stop is used after a word with a falling tone: “.”.

- Emphasis: Capital letters are used to show emphasis.

- Pauses: A half second pause is marked as a full stop between two brackets “(,)”. One second is expressed as “(1)”, two seconds “(2)” and so on.

- Overlaps: Angled brackets are used to show over one person speaking at the same time. Examples of overlaps can be seen below.

- Other continuation: An “=” symbolises a quick succession by other speaker.

- Lengthening: Lengthened utterances are symbolized with a colon.

- Repetitions: All recorded repetition need to be represented in the corpus.

- Word fragments: A hyphen is used to symbolise uncomplete parts of a word.

- Laughter: It is represented by the “@” symbol. Each @ is the equivalent of one syllable of laughter.

- Uncertain transcription: Uncertain utterances are transcribed within brackets.

- Pronunciation variation and coinages: Words that cannot be found in the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary fall into the pronunciation variations and coinages category, marked as PVC.

- Onomatopoeic noises: Utterances that are represented by sounds other than words to describe something are represented by IPA symbols.

- Non-English speech: Other language utterances are written in the style of the native language followed by an English translation if possible. For example, <L1zh> refers to the speaker’s first language as Chinese.

- Spelling out: If a word is spelt out or is pronounced using individual letters, then it is marked with “spel”.

- Speaking modes: the pace, pitch, tone, style and method of speaking are marked, for example <slow>.
- Breath: Breathing is expressed as “hh”.

- Speaker noises: Documenting speaker noises such as <coughs> are limited to the active speaker.

- Non-verbal feedback: In cases where video is available, non-verbal feedback is included like <shake head>.

- Anonymization: Anonymization of people, places and organizations are applied in order to ensure the privacy of participants. However, in this subset, as all recordings are publicly broadcast, no anonymization is needed in these cases.

- Contextual events: Contextual events are contained in curly brackets.

- Parallel conversation: Similar to contextual events.

- Unintelligible speech: Unintelligible dialogue is represented by an “x”. One “x” is used for every syllable.

- Transcription borders: to mark the start and the end of the transcribed dialogue.

The different notations are marked and shown in symbols of different colours. Deterding (2013) notes that the VOICE mark-up conventions are quite consistent with those adopted in Conversation Analysis. One of the major differences is the use of angled brackets to show overlaps instead of the traditional use of square brackets. The use of angled brackets makes it possible to show multiple overlaps in interactions with several participants. In this research, 10 out of 18 recordings involved at least three speakers. Therefore, the use of angled brackets made it easier to identify who is speaking at the same time and with/to whom. Here is an example with several overlaps where six participants discuss fashion in China. The content between the same number pairs overlap. As shown in the example, “happening at” uttered by S5 overlaps with “the same” by S2; and “China” by S5 overlaps with “that’s right” by S1.
Example of overlapping: (from File No. 17: Fashion design in China)²

S5: I think a fashion capital is where you have runway shows and show rooms at the same time happening at the same place and the show rooms are actually for buyers and press and the show rooms are really for buyers to go and buy and not like it is in china you have in beijing fashion shows that nobody actually knows for whom

S2: the same yeah china yeah

S1: so: that's right do they know

All: @@@=

S4: there's a lot of media about

S2: beijing fashion shows or in shanghai

S1: exactly the runway shows in beijing fashion show has been there for twenty years already and there's one in shanghai right? and there are few others in say in dalian in qingdao i don’t know but there are so many all are happening=

S3: yeah in guangzhou yeah

For the lexicogrammatical study of Asian ELF speakers in this research, more mark-ups were added according to the need of the research, for example, the non-standard use of prepositions, lexical innovation, and omissions. The detailed classification of linguistic features is shown in Section 3.2.4. The extra mark-ups provided a quantitative analysis of the lexicogrammatical phenomena of Asian ELF by making simple frequency counts. The frequency of occurrence is crucial in claiming that any distinctive linguistic feature is a typical feature of Asian ELF. To achieve this purpose, the concordance software available on ACE website and a free concordance software Antconc 3.2.1w was used to examine the common non-standard features of ELF in the data.

When using the ACE web concordancer³, the researcher entered the search string

² All the examples presented in this thesis were retrieved from ACE data subset with original mark-up notations according to the transcription conventions.
³ http://corpus.ied.edu.hk/ace/index.php?m=search&a=index
and chose the associated word anywhere in the string, or on the left or right of keyword. Data can be selected from all or from certain categories including leisure, education, business, organizational, research and science. The researcher obtained the results by clicking “search for concordances”. It is user-friendly, especially when searching for a certain word string throughout the ACE corpus or within a certain category. However, some functions of the online concordancer are still under construction. For example, searching by speaker nationality is not available. Therefore, another user-friendly free concordancing software Antconc 3.2.1w was also employed in this research. First, extra mark-ups were added to the Chinese data subset of ACE. For example, <tq> indicates tag questions; <om> indicates omission; <ag> indicates grammatical disagreement; <pp> indicates non-standard use of preposition. With the extra mark-ups, the specific features of the data could be shown and counted. When all the mark-ups were entered, the text files were imported into Antconc 3.2.1w for further electronic corpus analysis. Search terms can be shown in context (KWIC: key word in context) and the frequency of its collocation. For example, when searching ASEAN throughout all the files, the result showed the highlighted key word asean in the middle with contexts (see Figure 3.2), and the file names and numbers were also listed on the right to correspond with each example. The total number of concordance hits, which is 58 in this case, was also shown. Furthermore, the collocation of ASEAN can be displayed with frequency by simply clicking collocation at the top. The result of ASEAN collocation (see Figure 3.3) indicated that the most frequent collocated notional word was China, which occurred 16 times together with ASEAN.
Antconc can also be used for other purposes. For example, a word list for the corpus is produced to display the repeated “tokens” (individual words) according to their...
frequency. Multiple terms can be searched at the same time with “|”, for example, go|went|gone|goes. Context words like “a ... of” can be obtained in advanced search. Characters “*”, “+”, “?” can be used to enable different types of searches. For example, book* will search all the words with book at the beginning, such as booking, books, bookshop; *book will search all the words which end with book, such as notebook; *book* for all the words with book, such as notebooks.

3.3.4 Analysis.

Non-standard forms and pragmatic features were collected and calculated for the Chinese subset after consulting previous findings regarding the non-standard features and communication strategies in European, African and Asian contexts. The list of total features identified in previous studies (see Appendix 1), were classified in the categories of lexis, grammar and pragmatics. The list includes 5 lexical features, 28 grammatical features and 27 pragmatic features. Notable features which appear more frequently and systematically, were also analysed (see Table 3.5 and Table 3.6). Some new features were also identified in this data. All tokens were classified according to the research purpose.

Table 3.5.

The Non-standard Use of Lexicogrammatical Features of Chinese ELF Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical/phrasal innovations</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>- extra use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td></td>
<td>- subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- singular-plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject pronoun copying
Tag questions
Response to general questions
Self-repeated pattern

Adjacent default tense

Table 3.6.
Pragmatic Strategies Applied by Asian ELF users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic competence</th>
<th>Sociocultural competence</th>
<th>Discourse competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avoidance strategies</td>
<td>terms of addressing</td>
<td>backchannel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word suggestion</td>
<td>how to disagree</td>
<td>referencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrasing/explaining</td>
<td>cross-cultural awareness</td>
<td>echoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code-switching</td>
<td></td>
<td>topic change/management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing with non-understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following examples of lexical innovation, tag questions and code-switching demonstrated how the data was investigated with concordance software in the aspect of lexis, grammar and pragmatic strategy respectively.

Firstly, lexical innovation refers to the words or phrases that cannot be found in the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. These words or phrases were marked as PVC (pronunciation variations and coinages) (see Section 3.3.3) according to ACE mark-up conventions. When searching PVC in Antconc, all the coined words or pronunciation variations were listed (see Figure 3.4). Then all the pronunciation variations and coined words for organizations were taken out as they were not the applicable to this research. The innovative words or phrases included 1) coined words with added prefixes or suffixes, such as *oftenly* and *incertainties*, 2) created idioms integrated with local culture, such as...
black horse, and 3) overusing common words, such as the common word *do* in *doing production* and *doing consultant*.

![Search result of coined words or phrases.](image)

*Figure 3.4. Search result of coined words or phrases.*

Secondly, in terms of grammatical features, tag questions, which were marked as *tq*, were retrieved through Antconc (see Figure 3.5). The collocation result showed that the most frequent collocated word was *right* and others were *yes, yeah, huh, alright* (see Figure 3.6). Therefore, all the tags identified were invariant.
Thirdly, code-switching, a communicative strategy, was marked as non-English speech.
with an indication of which language was used. For example, if a Chinese L1 speaker used Chinese in the interaction, the Chinese language was marked as $L1_{zh}$, followed by an English translation (see Figure 3.7). In this data, there were also examples of Chinese code-switching used by non-Chinese speakers, which was marked as $LN_{zh}$ (see Figure 3.8).

Figure 3.7. Search result of Chinese code-switching in KWIC by Chinese speakers.
When using the data, it was important to check all the search results more than once as some annotations might not have been properly marked. In addition, the researcher can go back to the original text to retrieve more contexts by double-clicking the highlighted key word in each line of the result page.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has described the methodology and data applied in this research. The corpus of naturally occurring data is used to analyse the linguistic features and pragmatic strategies of Asian ELF users in the defined contexts. The concordance software is crucial in searching the annotated features with their frequency counted. In this way, the notable features with high frequency were identified and thus analysed in this research. In addition, discourse analysis is adopted especially in interpreting the pragmatic use of language in the ELF discourse. Therefore, both corpus-based qualitative and quantitative
approach were applied in this research. The data used in this study is the Chinese component of ACE, including 18 recordings of ELF interactions. The background information of the ELF speakers and the contexts enabled the researcher to conduct a relevant discourse analysis in the specific China-ASEAN communication contexts. The findings of lexicogrammatical features of ELF by Chinese users are discussed in Chapter Four and the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users are demonstrated in Chapter Five.
Chapter Four
The Lexicogrammatical Features of ELF by Chinese Users in China-ASEAN Communication Contexts

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the non-standard forms of ELF lexicogrammar by Chinese speakers are closely scrutinized by means of both qualitative and quantitative analysis. The non-standard forms include the words or phrases and grammatical usage that cannot be found in the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. All the non-standard forms were marked throughout the Chinese subset of ACE based on the previous research. Concordance software is used to determine the patterns of use and their frequency of occurrence. The features of non-standard forms described are mainly produced by 22 Chinese speakers in the Chinese subset of ACE. Examples from other Asian ELF users and native speakers in the same subset are used as supportive and complementary evidence. The speakers came from a range of professional backgrounds and English is their chosen lingua franca when they communicate with people from other linguistic backgrounds.

This chapter presents the findings to the first set of research question:

Research question 1: How is English being used in the context of China-ASEAN communication? Specially,

1.1 What characteristic and distinctive lexicogrammatical features of ELF are used by Chinese in the context of China-ASEAN communication?

1.2 Do these non-standard forms identified in the data cause misunderstanding or breakdown in ELF interactions?

This chapter contextualises these findings through the lenses of previous studies of
ELF in other contexts and Chinese English (CE) as part of English varieties. To be specific, the basis of the examination of various Chinese ELF features stems from the comparison of the lexical and grammatical features found in previous studies, which include Seidlhofer’s (2004) list of lexicogrammar characteristics from VOICE, Cogo and Dewey’s (2012) findings in their corpora in European contexts, Kirkpatrick’s (2010a) ELF study of lexis and grammar in Asian contexts, and Xu’s (2010) and Yan’s (2002) research into spoken Chinese English (SCE). A detailed summary of the features in lexis, grammar and pragmatics can be found in Appendix 1. Table 4.1 shows the shared features of lexicogrammar in European and Asian ELF contexts, as well as SCE.

Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Zero 3rd singular</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Relative pronoun</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Articles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Overuse common words</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Uncountable words</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Question tag</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Prepositions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Less complex tense</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Non-inversion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Null subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ellipsis of object</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1 includes 5 lexical features and 28 grammatical features based on the previous ELF studies in various contexts and the CE studies. All these features were marked for the Chinese ELF users in the Chinese subset of ACE (see the detailed information of the Chinese subset of ACE in Section 3.3). In this case, the features of
higher frequency were selected. For example, lexical innovation appeared more frequently than hybrid words (code-mixing) and therefore was selected for analysis. Due to the time frame of this research, the shared features of lexicogrammar in European and Asian ELF contexts and CE (see Table 4.1) were taken into great consideration together with their frequencies in this subset. As a result, a total of nine features were selected for further study in this research (see detailed discussion in Section 4.2).

The term *non-standard form* has been used in this study to compare with the *Standard English* codified in grammar books and dictionaries, specifically, Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (Hornby, Wehmeier, & Ashby, 2000). As the Standard English is hard to define (as discussed in Section 2.1.3), the words or phrases which cannot be found in the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary are considered non-standard, coined or invented in this study. From the perspective of ELF, these neologisms or creative expressions are not necessarily viewed as errors because they do not conform to the native speaker’s norms or Standard English, and instead are seen as innovations.

Another important issue to be noted is that the first three contexts in Table 4.1 are all ELF contexts, while the last one is Chinese English, which is considered part of World English (WE). ELF is different from WE in terms of paradigm, community and variety (as discussed in Section 2.1.2). However, it was necessary to combine ELF contexts and SCE in this analysis to see how Chinese ELF users adapted their English in ELF contexts. This comparison enabled us to better understand the differences and similarities between WE and ELF, while also contributing to the study of ELF by focusing on specific ELF users.

### 4.2 Non-standard Forms of Lexicogrammar of Chinese ELF Users

Xu (2010) has summarized lexical and syntactic features of CE based on his
interview data, newspaper data and short story data. According to his spoken interview
data, Xu (2010) lists eight syntactic features of SCE, namely, adjacent default tense
(ADT), null-subject/object utterances (NS/O), co-occurrence of connective pairs (CCP),
subject pronoun copying (SPC), yes-no response (Y/NR), a preference for topic-comment
structures (TC), unmarked object-subject-verb (OSV) and inversion in subordinate finite
wh-clauses (ISC). The spoken data also provided a number of CE lexis, including Chinese
loanwords such as Putonghua, and nativised English words with semantic change, such
as sleep very late meaning “go to bed very late”. Moreover, the syntactic features of
dialogues in Xu’s short story data, including the use of imperatives and tag variation
strategies, were taken into consideration in this analysis. The categories of SCE proposed
by Xu served as important references when analysing the linguistic features of ELF by
Chinese users.

Based on the frequency of the structure patterns occurring in the Chinese subset of
ACE, the analysis of the Chinese ELF discussed in this chapter focuses on lexical or
phrasal innovation, the non-standard use of prepositions, the omission of subject, object
and copula, grammatical disagreement, subject pronoun copying (SPC), question tag and
the response to tag question, self-repetitions, “yes/no” answers and adjacent default tense
(ADT)\(^4\).

4.2.1 Lexical or phrasal innovation.

Linguistic creativity has been well illustrated in Pitzl’s (2012, 2016) systematic view.
She uses the terms norm-following creativity, which is creativity that stays within the
boundaries of the normative system; and norm-developing creativity, defined as creativity

\(^4\) The major contents and findings of this chapter have been published at the journal article titled “The
linguistic features of ELF by Chinese users in China-ASEAN communication contexts” by the author (Ji,
2016). Some of the figures in this chapter are updated from the journal article.
that transcends the boundaries (Pitzl, 2012, p. 37). Seidlhofer (2011, p. 111) also illustrates how ELF users exploit linguistic resources by using newly coined words and refers to the underlying encoding possibilities as “virtual language”. Similar examples were also found in ACE from conversation samples of Chinese speakers, as shown below.

(1) ...hh we are talking about the MODEL of singapore and the <pvc> uncertainties </pvc> that asia is facing
(2) well i mean you you play you used to play table tennis (.) <pvc> oftenly </pvc>
(3) <pvc> givently </pvc> political instability and ability as well
(4) i think that is <pvc> the must </pvc> we need to discuss on common visions...

The coined words in bold letters listed above can be classified as non-standard, as they cannot be found in a Standard English dictionary. But they do occur in these conversations, and without causing any misunderstandings. In example (1), the speaker used the self-invented word uncertainties rather than uncertainties meaning the state of being unsure of something. The prefix in in English meaning “not”, is applied by following the norms of English word formation. This is what Pitzl named norm-following creativity. However, the word uncertainty is not a proper English word, as it cannot be found in a dictionary, and therefore the creativity is meanwhile norm-developing. It is interesting to note that the same speaker has been found using the standard form uncertainties at other times. It can be inferred that when a speaker is not sure which one is the standard form or cannot think of the standard one during the conversation, he/she would make up a new word on the spur of the moment according to the rules of English word formation in order to keep communication going. Other similar cases can be found in examples (2) and (3), which can possibly be explained as the speakers’ emphasis on the function of the word as an adverbial, and so the adverbial marker ly is added. The two words oftenly and givently do not exist as Standard English words, but their functions and meanings in the contexts are clear. In example (4), the modal word must is used as a noun
in order to stress the speaker’s point of view, meaning it is absolutely necessary. Even though must is used in a non-standard manner according to Standard English grammar, its meaning here did not cause any misunderstanding. There are more examples of coined words with suffixes added as shown below.

(5) many countries you mentioned have a very high expectation on china this is high time for china <fast> to do something significantly </fast> ok so what kind of thing china can do significantly i think two categories category one just like <spel> u s </spel> japan or south korea <pvc> expectors </pvc> say you chinese (in your hand) a lot of cards ()

(6) do you foresee any more h street politics of clashes between the red shirt-en <pvc> red shirter </pvc> and <pvc> yellow shirter </pvc>

(7) er if you need me to handle i can er play as a <pvc> go-between </pvc> yeah yeah so so i think it's not a big problem ()

(8) i think it still that she kept the <pvc> comforter </pvc> on the design the material

The examples above show the suffix er or or is added to refer to a certain person or noun. In example (5), the coined word expectors rather than anticipates refers to someone who can predict what might happen. In the context, the speaker said have a very high expectation on China previously and coined the word expector with the same root. Therefore, it is clear what the coined word means in this context. The suffix or also makes it clear that it refers to a person. The speaker invented this word to achieve his communication purpose without interrupting his flow of speech. In example (6), red-shirter and yellow-shirter refer to the political party members in Thailand who wear red shirts and yellow shirts. The meanings are obvious in the context as they are talking about the political clashes between these two parties in Thailand. The extra er added for go-between in example (7) in fact emphasizes the role the speaker plays. The suffix er signals that the word refers to a kind of person. It also can be used to emphasize “the being” of
something, as in example (8). *Comforter* here means “being comfortable to wear”, which is the characteristic of her design.

The flexible use of prefixes and suffixes to create new words by following English word formation norms is a feature of Chinese ELF. This phenomenon has also been identified in other ELF contexts and illustrated by Seidlhofer (2011) as a kind of exploitation of language resources to facilitate communication. It is interesting to note that these neologisms were also produced by native speakers in this subset, although there were only five native speakers in this data. Three examples of non-standard words were created by two Americans and one British, as shown in the examples from native speakers below:

(9) S3: while you look at the street politics in connection with the past and you had when thaksin was prime minister he was (.) ousted through a military coup and the military government that follows was very unpopular it was very <pvc>unpopulist</pvc> {not populist} </pvc> ...if you do not bring thaksin back his sister at least is a symbol of the er populist power in the street

(10) S7: try to stop me try to <5> stop me </5>
    S1: <5> @@@ </5>
    S2: you are <pvc>in unstoppable {unstoppable} </pvc>

(11) S7: if you look at the <spel> a i i b </spel> i mean when it was established twenty one founding countries and indonesia twenty two now what was interesting about it was the sheer <pvc>representivity</pvc> of asia east asia south asia central asia

In example (9), the American current affairs commentator (S3) is talking about the Thai military government, which is not populist in his point of view. He creates the word *unpopulist* which cannot be found in the standard dictionary. This word is created following *unpopular* and he mentioned *populist* later in his talk. Therefore, it is clear that
unpopulist means the opposite of populist in the context. In example (10), when a Chinese male (S7) is joking that he cannot stop doing other new work, the American female (S2) makes a comment by using instoppable instead of unstoppable in Standard English. Therefore, it can be inferred that even native speakers do not always use the prefixes un and in using the codified norms set out in standard grammar books or dictionaries. In example (11), the British male (S7) thinks AIIB represents only Asia and he coins a word representivity. He needs a noun here and maybe representative is not suitable as it suggests a person. But although the speaker could have used the standard noun from the adjective representative, that is, representativeness, this coined word is understandable in this context.

The above examples demonstrate that native speakers also create new words to suit their communication needs. Whether non-native speakers tend to be more creative in ELF contexts than native speakers, needs to be further studied by comparing the ACE data with a native English corpus. What can be concluded from the data used in this research is that ELF users, including native speakers and non-native speakers, create new words by following English word formation conventions in order to achieve their communication needs.

In addition to word innovation, there were examples of phrasal or idiom innovation. Pitzl (2016) notes that creative non-English idioms not only embody a speaker’s L1 culture, but also show the speaker’s awareness or knowledge of another language and culture. The following examples show phrasal innovation by Asian ELF users.

(12) in general to say and north korea is very smartly make use of the differences
(13) well i have been doing consultant for the china fashion association
(14) on another hand? she will be more flexible in terms of dialogues engagement
(15) you've been talking in the capacity of a former (1) diplomat (.) hh now (.) would you change your head hh ...now what would you say to them (.) as an old man
With regard to the phrases above, ELF speakers tend to flexibly “restructure” set phrases according to their L1 expression or the metaphor in their language. Example (12) is the speaker’s attempt at generally speaking or in general. In general to say, however, can be easily understood as being equivalent to generally speaking. The speaker might simply convert the Chinese 一般来说 (general to say) into English. In example (13), doing consultant might also be the transfer of the speaker’s L1, as in Chinese 做顾问 (do consultant), meaning working as a consultant. Similar examples were found in the data in collocations with the common verb do: doing production and design in Europe, do global energy management. In example (14) on another hand, which appears several times in the ACE subset, is equivalent to Chinese 另一方面 (another side).

In addition, some new idioms created by speakers were also found in this subset. For example, the idiom change your head in example (15). According to the context, the speaker used this idiom to say “you can think from a different perspective rather than as a diplomat and what would you say to your grandchildren in the future as a grandpa.” Change your head here means changing your position from a diplomat to a grandpa. Another similar example (16) in this data used by a Thai speaker was:

(16) S2: trade is trade investment is er investment but we now try to mix our brain (.) er the politic the trade and the investment together

The speaker was discussing policy in Thailand, which used to separate trade and investment from politics, but now has combined them together. The phrase mix our brain was invented here, referring to the change of their mind or policy by integrating trade and investment with politics. With the explanation in the context, the invented phrase was understandable. This use of on-the-spot idioms shows speakers’ creativity and flexibility in using the language for their own purposes. Another example of the flexible use of metaphors in idioms can be seen in example (17) spoken by a Korean current affairs
commentator.

(17) S2: …i think when you deal with a child that is not behaving very well i think there are two approaches one is giving a in a candy the other one is giving a stick and sometimes we do use both of them

The Korean male creatively adapts the English idiom the carrot and the stick approach, which means giving reward or punishment. It seemed he was thinking and not sure which word should be used as he repeats in in his sentence giving a in a candy. Then he decides to use candy rather than carrot in his metaphor. It is unclear why the Korean speaker would not use the original word carrot. Nevertheless, his adapted version of the carrot and the stick approach has the same metaphoric effect and can be understood (maybe because candy is sweeter than carrot) in this context. His creative use of the English idiom to serve his ELF interaction purpose demonstrates how Asian ELF users creatively and flexibly combine native English cultures and their culture.

Example (18) below presents another interesting example of a creative idiom shared by both Chinese and Malaysian speakers. S2, a Malaysian, is talking with S1, a Chinese speaker about the South China Sea dispute in the region. S1 is worried that the dispute might divide the “ASEAN 10 + China” block and S2 is trying to reassure S1 by saying there is no such bill. But, when S2 mentions the two countries that want to submit the bill, S1 interrupts S2 by saying but they could be black horse, and S2 repeats the idiom black horse at once and said yeah maybe to show his understanding and partial agreement.

(18) S2: well as far as the asean regional forum goes er what i understand is that there is no bill at the <spel> a r f </spel> it is just some countries including the philippines and vietnam=

        S1: =but they could be black horse

        S2: black horse yeah maybe you know who want to discuss the subject at the
There is no idiom *black horse* in the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. A similar idiom *dark horse* in British English is found, which means:

1. *a person who does not tell other people much about their life, and who surprises other people by having interesting qualities*

2. *an unknown competitor in a race, etc. who surprises everyone by winning*

It seems that neither of the meanings of *dark horse* suits this context. Another similar English idiom *black sheep* is suitable, which means *a person who is different from the rest of their family or another group, and who is considered bad or embarrassing.* In this context, S1 refers the two trouble-making countries as *black horse*, which causes the situation to be embarrassing for other members of the “ASEAN 10 + China” block. His creation of this idiom *black horse* could be the combination of the English idiom *black sheep* and the Chinese idiom *害群之马* (a horse that spoils the whole herd). The speaker develops this phrase *black horse* possibly by combining both English and Chinese expressions and cultures. Interestingly, S2, the Malaysian speaker, understands S1’s meaning in the context, even though in Malay, “cattle” (*lembu*) rather than “horse” is used in the similar idiom. So, S2 continues to reassure S1 that the *black horses* (*who want to discuss the subject at the ARF*) would not cause any trouble or spoil the whole block, as *he sees no harm in that.*

Another example (19) of creative use of idioms can be found in a Maldivian speaker’s utterance (S2) when talking with a Chinese speaker (S1). The Maldivian speaker describes the Chinese table tennis player Ma Lin as *total cracking down* when he won the Olympic gold medal for the first time. According to the Oxford Learner’s Dictionary, *crack down* means “to try harder to prevent an illegal activity and deal more
severely with those who are caught doing it”. This meaning does not fit the context, as the Maldivian speaker is talking about Chinese players who rarely show emotion in sports. However, the Chinese interlocutor understood what it meant from the context immediately by explaining is crying with the backchannel yeah to show his agreement.

The possible standard English idiom used here is breaking down, which means to lose control of your feelings and start crying or cracking up, a kind of emotional breakdown. In this example, we can see that although the ELF speaker in the conversation uses the English idiom “wrongly”, the other interlocutors can understand its meaning in the context without asking for further explanation.

(19) S2: usually you don't see among chinese players (.) is them showing emotion
   S1: yes=
   S2: =er which is very rare last night you you could see ma lin totally <5>
   cracking down </5>
   S1: <5> is crying </5> yeah
   S2: which is something that's not er seen er among sports people in in china
   S1: yes

These examples provide evidence to show how Asian ELF users are flexible and creative in using idioms and, at the same time, how they make sense of and accept the idioms made up by interlocutors.

Compared with the lexis features of CE, which as discussed in Section 2.3, is rich in loanwords and code mixing, only a few Chinese borrowings have been identified in the ELF subset used in this study. The only definite CE loanword found in this data was renminbi, a transliteration of 人民币 (Chinese currency). Another possible CE example is weibo, a transliteration of 微博 (microblogging). Weibo has also been used in some news articles written by native speakers, however, it has mostly been accompanied with its English translation or explanation like “Chinese twitter” (detailed discussion can be
found in Section 5.2.1 strategic competence). Therefore, it can be concluded that Chinese loanwords or borrowings, which is an important feature of CE, rarely occur in ELF contexts. The possible reason lies in the function of ELF, where the aim is to communicate with people from different cultural backgrounds. Too many culture-loaded CE words may be an obstacle in ELF communication if the interlocutor is not familiar with Chinese culture.

4.2.2 Prepositions.

The use of prepositions has been studied in different ELF contexts (see Table 4.1). Cogo and Dewey (2012) claim that the use of prepositions in ELF settings demonstrates a strong regularity of semantic value. The preposition *about* has been identified as an over-used all-purpose preposition (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2010a).

In the Chinese component of ACE data, a total of 66 examples of the non-standard use of prepositions were identified, and these have been classified into three categories (see Table 4.2). A variety of prepositions were used as substitutes for the standard forms, accounting for 47% of all non-standard uses. 26% of the examples were additional uses of prepositions, that is, they would not be used in Standard English. Finally, 27% represented omissions of prepositions in cases where they would have been included in most standard forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extra</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Omission</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.

The Non-standard Use of Prepositions (from 66 examples)
Additional use of prepositions.

(20) so in currently we are discussing the er new resolution
(21) china is in rising and south south korea is in rising
(22) i mean contact with them
(23) mister obama doesn't even call to kim jong-un
(24) whenever <spel> u s </spel> and china (.) reduce on (no) inten-intervention on the interkorean
(25) <spel> i m f </spel> is er () ad- advocating for full convertibility
(26) try: to explain (l) to my japanese friends about () what was going on in china
(27) we are going to discuss more about HIS music dream
(28) you mentioned about the governance reform in the world bank

The additional use of certain prepositions may carry semantic value, as shown in examples (20) and (21). The additional use of in (in currently, in rising) may emphasize the continuation of the process and it is used in present progressive tense. The speaker emphasizes his point that the two countries are in a state of continued rising by saying China/South Korea is in rising. Some additional use can be seen as the influence of the mother tongue, like contact with and call to in examples (22) and (23). In Chinese, people would say 打电话给... (call to NP), 和...联系 (with NP contact). Therefore, it is not surprising why Chinese speakers add the preposition with and to when they use the words contact and call. Another reason for the use of an additional preposition is the trespass of verb transitivity. The added prepositions on and for following the transitive verbs reduce and advocate in examples (24) and (25), which are supposed to be followed by an object directly, would not cause misunderstanding.

The preposition about can be identified as the most common extra preposition used and it occurs in discuss about, mention about, explain about (see examples 26 to 28), and is also used to replace other prepositions (see examples 34 to 36 below). Similar examples have been found by other scholars in different ELF contexts (Cogo & Dewey, 2012;
Kirkpatrick, 2010a). Cogo and Dewey (2012, p. 92) conclude that the innovative use of the preposition *about* often conveys a sense of relating to a “topic” and signals reorganization. As shown in these examples (26-28), the speakers may use the preposition *about* to indicate his/her topic.

*Substitution of prepositions.*

(the standard forms are suggested at the end of each example in brackets)

(29) however we also see very proactive role by the thai military (of)
(30) the pen grip players have any advantages (.) to the (.) tennis grip (.) players (over)
(31) by the same time leave space for possibilities (at)
(32) for a large degree singapore and china (to)
(33) there is still speculation and suspicion around china's motives (of)
(34) they are holding the breath about hh uncertainty and unpredictability (for)
(35) are you surprised about the rise of asia (at)
(36) there is a burgeoning public awareness about the importance of maritime stakes (of)

These examples illustrate a variety of prepositions being used to replace the standard forms, but they are understandable substitutes. Substitution of prepositions accounted for the largest percentage (47%) of all the non-standard use of prepositions in the data subset. In examples (30) and (32), *have any advantages to* rather than the standard form of *have any advantages over*, and *for a large degree*, rather than *to a large degree* did not cause misunderstandings. It is interesting to note that the same speaker may use the standard and the non-standard preposition in different situations. For example, the person who says *for a large degree* in (32) also used *to a large degree* in the same dialogue. Examples 34 to 36 further demonstrate how *about* may serve as an all-purpose preposition in many situations.
Omission of prepositions.

(the suggested prepositions are listed at the end of each example and the places where the prepositions have been omitted are marked with <om>)

(37) the huge challenges: () be lying <om> the tips of the huge iceberg (on)
(38) northeast asia pointed <om> each other as well (at)
(39) the exclusive nationalism hh that prevailed () <om> both countries (in)
(40) our () territorial disputes with with japan may have crowded hh er <om> positive and healthy perceptions (with)
(41) how do you think <om> the energy security and the future trend of the nuclear energy (of)

Omission of prepositions accounted for nearly the same percentage as the extra use of prepositions. Omission of prepositions was found mainly in the cases showing position or direction, such as in examples (37) to (39), as the position or direction was obvious in the context. Therefore, the prepositions in the sentences on the tips of the huge iceberg, pointed at each other and in both countries have been omitted. Prepositions were also omitted in some set collocations, as shown in examples (40) and (41). The phrases think of and crowded with were used without the prepositions. However, no evidence of misunderstanding was identified in these examples of preposition omission.

4.2.3 Grammatical disagreement.

Four disagreement categories are discussed here, namely, singular-plural disagreement, subject-verb disagreement, disagreement in the there be structure and others (see Table 4.3). Singular-plural disagreement accounted for most (55%) of the grammatical disagreement. The marking or non-marking of plurals has been found in all varieties of English, including traditional varieties of English (Kirkpatrick, 2010a). In the Chinese component of ACE, many examples of the non-marking of plural countable
nouns were found.

Table 4.3.

Grammatical Disagreement (from 117 examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular-plural</th>
<th>Subject-verb</th>
<th>there be structure</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of a total of 117 examples of disagreement, more than half (55%) were related to singular-plural disagreement (see examples 42 to 44 below). There were many other examples such as all the country, two city, one of our target, another issues, a big chances, a lot of international industry. Most (48 out of 64) examples of singular-plural disagreement showed the non-marking of plural nouns, as in example (42). 12 out of 64 examples showed the unnecessary marking of plurals, as in example (43). Only four examples (populations, futures, pollutions, works) showed the plural marking of uncountable nouns, as in example (44).

**Singular-plural disagreement.**

(42) all the international organization always say competition is
(43) display (.) a different perspectives from asia
(44) social progress means for the populations

The second category, subject-verb disagreement, was most common (29 out of 35) with the 3rd person zero, as in examples (45) and (46). For the rest of the examples, the plural subject was followed by a singular linking verb or vice versa, as shown in examples (47) and (48). The disagreement of linking verbs with their subjects was also found in there be structure sentences, as in examples (49) and (50). However, only singular linking
verbs were found in all these examples of disagreement in the *there be* structures. It can be inferred that in oral communication, the singular form of *there be* structure is more likely to be used, almost as a routine formula. In fact, the use of *there is* plus plural nouns, was common in all the varieties, including the standard varieties. Some other examples of disagreement include the disagreement of possessive pronoun and the subject it refers to (see Example 51).

**Subject-verb disagreement.**

(45) *well china firmly believe the current complex er issue of nuclear*

(46) *bilateral investment always carry this kind of say geo political dif- challenge*

(47) *so i think(.) the key words is the dialogues not confrontation*

(48) *the rent are super high*

**There be structure.**

(49) *there is so much things*

(50) *is there any other sports items you are interested*

**Others.**

(51) *other players also want to come into region play its role*

The third person zero has been identified in various contexts and attracted the interest of scholars (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Nevalainen, 2017; Seidlhofer, 2004). The dropping of *–s* from main verbs in the third singular person present tense is usually of no consequence in international communication. In this research, a detailed study of the third person zero used by the Chinese ELF speakers represented in the ACE subset was conducted by calculating both the use of the *–s* form and non-use of the *–s* form for the third person.
The findings show that firstly, the use of the –s form for the third person singular by Chinese ELF speakers is more common than the non-use of the –s form, with a total number of 103 (78%) and 29 (22%) respectively. There were also two cases where the -s form was used for plural subjects. This result shows that Chinese ELF speakers use the standard –s form for the third person singular in most situations, although third person zero accounts for most of the subject-verb disagreement category (see analysis above). Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the third person zero is the result of L1 influence. In other words, the use of third person zero is not a characteristic feature of the English used by Chinese speakers.

Secondly, the use of the –s form was mostly found among certain words such as: seems (13 times), means (11 times), wants (7 times), comes (7 times), lies (7 times), takes (6 times), sounds (5 times), says (5 times), reminds (3 times). In addition, a total of 37 –s forms were used with the subject it, that or which. This might indicate a tendency of regularization in the use of the –s form for the third person, which in most cases is the singular pronoun it/that.

Thirdly, among the 29 third person zero markings, nearly half (13) were used with the country name as the subject. For example: North Korea like to talk peace issue; China take more roles more positive roles. At the same time, there were 12 examples using the –s form with the country name as the subject. For example, Japan finds it very difficult to prepare itself for the rise of China. Fourthly, the same speaker may use the –s form or non –s form in his/her speech arbitrarily. In the following example (52), S4, a Chinese professional fashion buyer, uses the –s form for says and non –s form for prefer in the same utterance.

(52) S4: he says for his market that er a lot of customers will not buy if it’s for that price and made in china or preferably not made made in china even if it IS made in
Example (53) shows that the Chinese speaker S3 uses the –s form for all the third person examples in one utterance and the non –s form in another utterance. The country name North Korea is used as a both a singular or plural noun by the same speaker:

(53) S3: between (. ) the <spel> us </spel> and the <spel> d p r k </spel> why is that (. ) er it seems strange to me that (1) peace relationship peace treaty between <spel> u s </spel> <spel> d p r k </spel> (. ) one side is far from the peninsula one side is part of the peninsula can guarantee the per-durable peace ON the peninsula (. ) i don't think so the root (. ) the fundamental solution (. ) for the permanent peace lies in both of the koreans however north korea wants <6> to </6> ...

S3: <8> let me </8> by let me put it <pp> by by this way hm ... how to build up (. ) a peace regime (. ) for the durable peace and stability for the peninsula (. ) and north korea <ag> like to (. ) talk <om><pp> peace issue and hate to talk <om><pp> nuclear issue simply because they want to (. ) be the permanent nuclear and so er this current war crisis (1) <ag> push the peace issue at the very top level (. ) for the urgent (. ) topic ... north korea want to talk with the <spel> u s </spel> to build up the peace treaty between the two...

The arbitrary use of the –s forms for the third person singular by Chinese ELF speakers in China-ASEAN contexts may imply that the use or non-use of the –s forms does not simply depend on the English proficiency of the speaker nor the contexts. The same speaker can use the –s forms or non –s forms in the same context talking to the same interlocutors. In addition, it is not clear if L1 interference plays a role in the use of the third person zero because sometimes the –s form is used for plural subjects. Therefore, how and when these speakers use or do not use the –s forms for the third person singular is a complicated issue which deserves further study. The only firm conclusion is that the use or non-use of –s forms for the third person singular by Chinese speakers does not
cause misunderstanding in these ELF interactions.

### 4.2.4 Non-standard omissions.

In the ACE data subset, a total of 133 non-standard omissions were found, including article omission (55%), preposition omission (14%), object omission (10%), subject omission (10%), copula/auxiliary verb omission (7%), and “others” (4%) (see Table 4.4). The dropping of articles accounted for the largest part of all the omission categories. Similar features have been identified in previous studies. For example, in a study examining the ICE subcorpora, Sand (2004) noted that there was a correlation with the use of definite articles in the substrate of contact varieties in only spontaneous conversations. In addition, Cogo and Dewey (2012, pp. 82-89) believe that the omission of the object, pronouns and copula be, as features of ELF lexicogrammar, is the result of speakers actively “exploiting redundancy” for the purpose of communication efficiency. The examples of non-standard omission are listed below with the omission places marked by <om>.

#### Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Copula/ Auxiliary verb</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Article omission.*

(54) after the nuclear test by <om> <spel> d p r k </spel> is it practical)}
(55) why do you think eventually <om> <spel> u k </spel> along with other european...
(56) but do you think <om> majority of south koreans are truly afraid of having a major...
(57) how can china together with her neighbors including malaysia <om> <fast> very important country </fast> (.)

The omission of the definite article the and the indefinite articles a/an frequently occurred in the Chinese component of ACE and constituted more than half (53%) of the non-standard omissions. 57 out of a total 73 dropped articles were the definite article the, which accounted for 78% of the total article omission, while there were only 16 omissions of the indefinite articles a/an. In this subset, the definite article the was mostly dropped before the countries with plural names, such as the United States or with names containing a noun stating the kind of state, such as the United Kingdom and the DPRK, as shown in examples 54 and 55. The article the and a/an were also omitted in other cases like in examples 56 and 57.

*Subject omission.*

(58) well (.) <om> must be a very interesting topic @@@ (it)
(59) competition is <6> good </6> but <om> could not compete with us (it)
(60) you can seek any help from er the the senior leaders from the local customs if <om> still cannot solve this problem (they)

According to the data analysis, all the subjects omitted were anaphoric pronouns, which referred to something or someone mentioned earlier. Speakers would therefore be unlikely to misunderstand the omissions, as they all clearly knew what was being talked about, as illustrated in examples (58) to (60). The omitted subjects are suggested at the end of each example in brackets.
Object omission.

(61) we have to double our efforts to reconcile <om>
(62) S2: so did you buy anything today
    S6: i'm going to buy <om>
(63) er quite similar with <om> doctor lee mentioned

The objects omitted included various content words and pronouns which could be inferred by the speakers. The omissions occurred mainly due to transgressing transitivity rules as shown in example (61). The transitive verb reconcile occurred without an accompanying object, (but which has been explicitly stated previously). This is an example of what Cogo and Dewey (2012, p. 88) refer to as “(speakers) avoid redundancy and enhance the communicative efficiency”. In addition, the word reconcile in Chinese 和解 can be used in this context without an object. The influence of Chinese language may be a possible reason for this omission, as seems to be the case in example (62). When S2 asked did you buy anything today? S6 answered with I’m going to buy, rather than yes, which is a typical Chinese response. In Chinese, a speaker’s answer normally needs to repeat the verb in the question rather than just saying yes or no. Another example of object omission was found in the noun clause beginning with what. In example (63), what was omitted in the noun clause but the sentence was still understood.

Copula/Auxiliary verb omission.

(64) but when i <om> holding the mike
(65) you know china and <spel> u s </spel> differences <om> deepening
(66) how <om>you think about this game?

The omission of copulas accounted for only a small part (7%). As copulas do not convey much semantic value, their omission in these contexts is unlikely to cause any misunderstanding (see examples 64 to 66). Other omissions include the omission of the
conjunction “and” in the collocation “between…and…”, such as “…the difference between the US China”. The category “Others” accounts for a very small percentage (only 4%).

4.2.5 Subject pronoun copying (SPC).

Subject pronoun copying (SPC) has been identified as a feature of spoken Singaporean English as well as other varieties of English (Z. Xu, 2010). For native varieties of English, SPC is used for stylistic effect and acts as a helpful device when the subject is long. According to Xu (2010), the frequent and unmarked use of SPC is found in spoken CE. He claims (2010, p. 77) that “the topic prominent nature of Chinese makes SPC a feature of spoken CE. In the following examples of subject pronoun copying, each subject is “copied” into a pronoun. For instance, in example (67), the pronoun this refers to ASEAN plus three, and in example (68), it refers to the DPRK. SPC also occurred in the Chinese ELF users’ speech. SPC is very possibly the result of mother tongue transfer because in Chinese, SPC is a typical syntactic feature in both spoken and written forms. However, the occurrence of SPC in this subset was not as widely used as expected, with only 15 examples in total from six Chinese ELF users. 9 of the 15 examples were produced by the same speaker. The bold-faced words in the following examples of SPC indicate the pronouns which copy the subjects:

(67) there was already asean plus three (.) this trade mechanism
(68) given the fact that <spel> d p r k </spel> it is a sovereign country
(69) even those residents er: who live near the bird's nest they cannot find the main torch (.) where is the...
(70) different local customs sometimes they have different (.) understanding or explanation
(71) shanghai ports and dalian ports (1) they have different situations sometimes so it's...
4.2.6 Tag questions.

Some scholars have found that ELF users tend to use tag questions less frequently in their interactions and the forms are simpler and invariant across many different varieties. The use of isn’t it in African English is an example (as cited in Kirkpatrick, 2010a) and the invariant tags is it and isn’t it are used in Singapore English (Deterding, 2007). In the European ELF context, Seidlhofer (2004) also identifies the use non-standard tag questions like or no? In Chinese English, Xu (2010) summarizes three tag variation strategies found in his data. For example, the A-not-A question form was a result of transfer from Chinese such as 好不好 (good-not-good) 否不对 (right-not-right) and a variety of invariant tag questions, such as got it understood were found in the communication settings in short stories. The third variation lies in the response to tag questions. In his short story data, Xu found that the second speaker elaborated on their own responses, rather than providing direct yes or no answers to a tag question (Z. Xu, 2010).

In this study, only 12 examples of tag questions used by Chinese ELF speakers occurred in the data. However, the use of right as a question tag was uniform across the data with 9 out of the 12 examples (examples 72 to 75). The other three examples (examples 76 to 78) were also invariant tags: yeah, huh and is it? The consistent use of right and other simple tags in tag questions by Chinese ELF users may be the result of L1 transfer, as Chinese use the invariant tag 是吗/对吗? (is it right?) as a tag question. It is also possible that the simple and consistent tag right makes communication easier and clearer, and this is one reason why it is used in ELF interactions.

(72) make a living by singing (.) right?
(73) you you guys er met each other before right?
(74) something like to be seen right?
(75) i’m sure you will agree with me right?
(76) well i mean you you play you used to play table tennis oftenly yeah?
(77) so music isn’t easy huh?
(78) he is part of the power struggle is it?

In terms of responses to tag questions, ten examples by Chinese ELF users were found in this data. However, unlike the results found in Xu’s data, nearly all the tag questions were given a definite response, with one exception (example 87) where other speakers responded by laughing together as they all agreed with what had been said. Examples (79) to (83) are direct, using yes/yeah/okay or no responses. Examples (84) to (86) illustrate direct response statements by the second speaker.

(79)  S1: so music isn’t easy huh?
  S5: no (.) i do not know it is very hard
(80)  S1: you you guys er met each other before right?
  S4: actually er we knew each other back in er the united states
  S5: yeah
(81)  S1: the case with you guys is all different an- and you guys all you have is independence right?
  S4: yes (.) because without a company (.) i think the good thing is that er we can control up timeline (.) and also <4> my </4>
(82)  S2: and have a lot fun with this right? <8> at night </8>
  S7: <8> yes </8> to group it to <9> buy it </9>
(83)  S1: ... er we: we can get someone who speak in english so it ’ s a much easier to the flow of communications <3> right ?</3>
  S2: <2> okay </2> <3> mhm </3> i’ll try my best
(84)  S2: so i think this could be advice for any inspiring <7> musicians </7> or vocalists out there right?
  S1: <7> that’s right </7>
(85) S1: you have you have six people right?
S4: we have @@@@@

(86) S2: <2> you have to be DOING </2> right?
S7: that is what i want

(87) S1: <1> something like to be </1> seen right?
All: @@@@@

4.2.7 Self-repetition.

Self-repetition describes when a speaker uses the same words or phrases. Possible reasons for repetition may be due to the transfer of first language rhetorical styles or to represent speakers’ intentions to stress their meaning or to make the meaning easily understood. Self-repetition has been categorised here as one of the lexicogrammatical features of Chinese ELF speakers due to the transfer of stylistic feature from Chinese. However, it could also be considered a communicative strategy as it often operates pragmatically to help make meanings clear. There are 21 examples in total identified in this study, including 15 examples from Chinese ELF users.

In Example (88), S1, a Chinese female is talking about the DPRK and international relations with another Chinese and a Korean. She uses self-repetition twice in this short commentary. First, in the sentence on the one hand it is doing the rocket launch it is doing the nuclear test, it is doing is repeated. Another sentence with repetition is on the other hand it is also talking about developing its own economy it is also talking about if possible building trust with other countries. The repetition it is also talking about emphasizes a positive aspect of the DPRK’s behaviour in contrast to the rocket launch and nuclear test. Also is used twice in this sentence even though the first use is unnecessary (it is also talking about developing its own economy) as there is no earlier action. The repeated use of also makes the sentence structure the same. The repetition used in this example along
with the use of on the one hand and on the other hand make the meaning clear.

(88) S1: <2> but </2> that is only <3> fair </3> i mean you see the two countries are all playing very similar cards for <spel> d p r k </spel> for example mister yang on the one hand it is doing the rocket launch it is doing the nuclear test despite

S3: <3> <sniffs> </3> mhm

S1: oppositions from international community to make sure (.) at least the <spel> d p r k </spel> analyses like that they say to make sure that the country will be strategically safe to deter any attack from <4> others </4> on the other hand it is also talking about developing its own <5> economy </5>

S3: <4> <sniffs> </4> <5> <sniffs> </5>

S1: it is also talking about if possible building trust with other countries however they would argue other countries are not building trust with <spel> d p r k </spel> =

In example (89), S3, a Chinese male, repeats the word rising. The word rising is used as a noun (in rising), an adjective (rising China) and a verb (are rising). The expression in rising, coined by the speaker seems an ellipsis of in the process of rising up and its repeated use stresses this. The five repetitions of “rising” (not including the first one in the unfinished sentence) also look like a transfer from Chinese as, while the frequent repetition of a word is considered stylistically dull in English, this use of repetition is acceptable and common in Chinese (M. Xu, 2009).

(89) S3: south korea er has successfully built up or strengthened the allied relation with united states and with the rising by the way er: china is in rising? and south south korea is in rising? <1> actually </1> rising china is a part of rising asia so many countries in this region are rising

Self-repetition can also be seen in the following two examples, with a repeated structure they can in example (90) and come do it in example (91).
(90) S3: yeah (.) you get better in what you do in this industry like you know **they can** start to design their own `<spel>` c d `</spel>` **they can** you know produce **they can** write **they can** package **they can** market themselves

(91) S3: but they are like we'll get other people to write you music we'll get other people to you know **come** produce **it come** write **it come** make **it**

Repetition is also seen in example (92). Here, a Japanese speaker, who is the director of an international energy agency, is answering a question about the needs of energy in the future. In this long answer, two sets of self-repetitions were identified: one is **we need more** ... and the other is ... **is necessary**. In the sentence **we need more gas we need more coal or we need more renewable energy**, the rising tone, marked as question mark ‘?’, is used at the end of the first two sentences. The rising tone does not signal a question here, as he stated clearly that it was the conclusion. In fact, the rising tone serves as a connection signal indicating that the speaker will continue to list different kinds of energy. In the second self-repetition, the speaker also lists the amount of different kinds of energy needed in the future and repeats the phrase **is necessary**.

(92) S2: ...but (.) if this slide leads us to the conclusion that **we need more** (.) gas? **we need more** coal? (.) or **we need more** renewable energy (.) and er: (.) **coal exportation? one more australia is necessary (1) gas? we need one more qatar (.) production is necessary hh and for the renewable we need five times more of the wind or solar power in germany is necessary (1)...

4.2.8 Response to general questions.

When answering general questions or tag questions, a high percentage of Chinese (35%) and other Asian (57%) ELF users in the subset tended to answer in a full sentence
to explain their ideas, or they repeated the question in a positive or negative way rather than using a short form, such as an auxiliary verb or copula (see Table 4.5). In many examples, yes or no are omitted. For example, the question “have you seen any changes in China?” is answered by “er there have been a lot you know of course…” By analysing the responses to general questions and tag questions in the data subset, the difference between Chinese ELF users and non-Chinese users and the difference between formal and less formal settings, were identified (see Table 4.5).

In total, nearly half (49%) of the ELF users answered a general question without using yes or no. Compared with Chinese ELF users (35%), there was a higher percentage (57%) of other non-native ELF users (all of whom were Asians, except one German) who responded to general questions without using a simple yes or no. It was also interesting to note that there was a difference between formal settings and less formal settings. The formal settings included serious topics related to politics, economics, foreign relations and religion while less informal settings were represented by talk shows or interviews about sports, fashion and pop stars. In formal settings, interviewers tended to avoid using fewer definite answers than those in less formal settings. For Chinese ELF users, the percentage of answers without using yes/no increased from 29% in less formal setting to 46% in formal settings; and from 18% to 67% for non-Chinese ELF users. When discussing a serious topic in formal settings and where some issues require hedging, the interviewees provided some background information and evidence to support their point of view, rather than simply answering yes or no. In example (93) below, S2, the Malaysian speaker does not directly show his stand at the beginning by answering yes or no. Instead, he only implies that religion and politics cannot be separated in Malaysia after providing examples from other countries. Expressing an idea in this way represents a typical thinking pattern for Asian people, who “prefer inductive argument” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a,
p. 117). It is common for Chinese and other Asian cultures to give reasons first rather than make their point of view clearly at the beginning. This may be why these ELF users tended to avoid a definite yes or no answer in more formal settings. However, in the less formal settings, for example when the speakers were discussing entertainment, yes, yeah and no were frequently used, with a percentage of 71% and 82% for Chinese ELF users and others respectively.

(93) S1: ... do you believe er (1) the elected government would be SECULAR enough (1) do you believe church will be separated from politics

S2: this is a good question (. . .) if you look at the (. . .) election results in tunisia (. . .) if you look at what has happened in morocco where you didn't have the same sort of uprising and the monarchy directed (. . .) the reforms which has taken place if you look at (. . .) what's been happening in egypt it hasn't COMPLETED the election process it's come to the second round? (. . .) what is the lesson will be able to draw from all these elections it is (. . .) the islamic element which has become much stronger (. . .) in every instance and if you've elections tomorrow let's say in libya? (. . .) in eighteen months time? (. . .) i'm quite CERTAIN there'll be islamic element which will emerge as the DORMInant element and that will be true of a number of other countries in turkey you have a government? which er (. . .) has an islamic root? (. . .) which tries to abide by certain islamic principles and values? it is not secular in the classical sense? (. . .) and of course in IRAN you have a (. . .) government which is closely linked to religion (. . .) even in malaysia (. . .) no (. . .) leader in malaysia will DESCRIBE (. . .) the malaysian state as a secular state (. . .) islam is the religion of the federation in our constitution article free of the <2> malaysian constitution </2>

Table 4.5.

Response to General Questions (from 88 examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settings</th>
<th>Answer with definite word “yes”, “yeah” or “no”</th>
<th>Answer without definite word “yes”, “yeah” or “no”</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In example (94) and (95), different uses of *yeah* were found, which were not equivalent to *yes*. In example (94), S2 asked a question to confirm the opinions of several guests. S1 answered negatively *not yet*, and S4 first said *no* followed by *yeah*. It is interesting to note that *no* and *yeah* have been used at the same time. We can see that S4 does not mean to change the idea by using these words of opposite meaning. In fact, *no* is the negative answer to S2’s question and *yeah*, followed by *but*, to show agreement with what S1 said. That is to say, S4 means she thinks that there is no fashion capital in China and she agrees with S1’s answer *not yet*. Therefore, both *no* and *yeah* in S4’s answer have a similar meaning.

In example (95), S1 asked an alternative question, but S4 answered first *yeah* rather than choosing one of the alternatives. He then continued to explain what happened to them and the decision they made. It can be concluded from his explanation that it was their own choice because they had a discussion. This is a typical Chinese thinking pattern, offering many clues or facts, rather than giving a direct answer. Therefore, *yeah* used here was not to give a positive answer. It was more like a discourse marker *well* to begin a sentence or to show cooperation in the communication.

A number of syntactic features of SCE have been identified by other scholars (Z. Xu, 2010; Yan, 2002). When Chinese speakers respond to a negative statement or a negative question, *yes* or *yeah* shows that they agree with the statement rather than assert the given
statement. For example, “–You do not want to make a living by playing guitar on the street. – Yes. Of course not.” (Z. Xu, 2010, p. 78). This feature is mainly the result of L1 influence as the response to general questions in Chinese is not based on the truth value of the statement (Yan, 2002). In Xu’s (2010) data, the feature occurs more frequently than in the ACE subset used in this research.

(94) S2: do you think there's no fashion capital in china <5> i mean <5> that's what i'm hearing
S1: <5> not yet <5>
S4: no yeah but there is a getting there you know

(95) S1: wait wait wait is it out of your own choice or you guys are forced to do it
S4: yeah () we we were contracted by some erm companies () but after like a discussion we we think that because we are still working full-time actually he he is an english teacher i i am er

4.2.9 Adjacent default tense (ADT).

ADT, (Z. Xu, 2010, p. 69), means if the overall tense of an utterance is marked in the context of utterance, then the “adjacent” finite verb in the utterance can be (but may not necessarily be) set in its “default” forms. The “context” refers to a phrase, a clause or a sentence in or adjacent to the utterance. ADT in native varieties of English is considered by Quirk (1985, p. 184) as “ungrammatical”. According to Xu’s (2010) finding, there is not much difference in SCE between anaphoric and cataphoric uses of the past tense as a reference function of a time frame. For example, in the sentence last year, I write two letters a week, the past time reference last year has set the context of the utterance to the past, so the verb write can be in its default present tense. The previous use of past tense
as a context is called anaphoric use of the past tense. When the adverbial follows past tense, it is called a cataphoric use of the past tense, as in the sentence *I have to sign the contract before I came here for the study*. The examples of ADT are shown as follows.

(96) *before be- be- be- before we joined the industry* we always **think** that oh being a star is <6> very </6> far away

(97) *hh previously what i see in the south china sea (.) were not as choppy (.) as this moment*

(98) *i passed and now i was COOL*

(99) *now we invited two special guests to join in our programme to*

In the data subset used in this study, 18 examples of ADT were identified. In examples (96) and (97), *before we joined the industry and previously* set the context of the utterance to the past tense, thus the adjacent verbs *think and see* could be in their default present tense. That is to say, the speaker can use the present tense rather than the past tense for the verbs that follow the time reference. What is new in the data is a present time adverbial *now* used with past tense finite verbs *was and invited* in examples (98) and (99). The reference of time *now* sets the context in present tense, and the adjacent verbs in the utterance can be (but not necessarily) set in their default past tense. Xu’s (2010) ADT focuses on the present tense that takes the place of past tense with the past time reference. In this data examples were identified where the adjacent verbs of a present time reference were in the form of past tense.

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter has addressed the first research question:

Research question 1: How is English being used in the context of China-ASEAN communication? Specially,

1.1 What characteristic and distinctive lexicogrammatical features of ELF are used
1.2 Do these non-standard forms identified in the data cause misunderstanding or breakdown in ELF interactions?

This quantitative study of the Chinese component of ACE has identified non-standard lexicogrammatical features of ELF by Chinese users. The frequency of these features have also been noted and compared. The features include lexical innovation (22 examples), the non-standard use of prepositions (66 examples), grammatical disagreement (117 examples), the omission of subjects, objects and copula/auxiliary verbs (133 examples), SPC (15 examples), tag questions (12 examples), self-repetitions (15 examples), responses to general answer (88 examples) and ADT (18 examples). In general, these non-standard uses represent only a minority of the total tokens. For example, the total number of non-standard uses of preposition was 66, which was only 4% of the total prepositions used by the Chinese ELF speakers in this subset. It can be concluded that non-standard forms do exist in the ELF by Chinese users, but they are not frequent enough to be classified as salient features and they do not necessarily cause misunderstanding or communication breakdowns in these China-ASEAN contexts. The major findings are summarized below.

First, with regard lexical innovation, Chinese ELF users may invent new words or phrases by following English word formation conventions. These words are coined naturally by adding prefixes or suffixes and seldom cause misunderstandings. Similar examples are also found in native speakers’ utterances in the same subset, which demonstrates that this innovation exists among all ELF users, including both native speakers and non-native speakers. Moreover, Chinese and other Asian ELF users also create new idioms or adapt English idioms to serve their communication purposes. New idioms or expressions can be created by combining English culture and the speaker’s own
culture. It is enlightening to see Asian ELF users with different cultural backgrounds co-build idioms to understand each other.

Second, Chinese ELF speakers demonstrate flexible use of prepositions through additional use, omission and substitution. Prepositions with similar semantic meanings in the context can be used interchangeably. Preposition substitution ranked the highest of all the non-standard use of prepositions. The omission and extra use of prepositions may be the result of mother tongue influence and confusion between transitive and non-transitive verbs. The preposition *about*, the one most commonly used, has been result found in many other contexts in previous studies. The non-standard use of prepositions in this data did not cause misunderstanding in the interactions.

Third, grammatical disagreements occurred mainly in terms of singular-plural disagreement, subject-object disagreement and the *there be* structure. More than half of the disagreements were in the non-marking and unnecessary marking of plurals. In addition, third person zero was the most common occurrence of subject-verb disagreement used by the Chinese ELF speakers. Further analysis of the main verbs of the third person singular by Chinese speakers indicated that most of the -s forms for third person were used frequently among certain words, such as *seems, means, wants*. In addition, the same speaker may have used the -s form or the non -s form arbitrarily in their interactions. Therefore, it is hard to conclude that L1 influence and English language proficiency may be the main reasons for the third person zero.

Fourth, non-standard omissions were mainly found in articles, subjects, objects, copula/auxiliary verbs and prepositions. The omission of articles had the highest percentage of all the non-standard omissions. The definite article *the* was not used as often as in Standard English, especially before certain country names. The omission of subjects and objects were found in almost equal measure. All the omitted subjects were anaphoric
pronouns which were retrieved by the participants. The omissions of objects occurred mostly when speakers transgressed standard transitivity rules and/or were influenced by Chinese language patterns. These omissions did not cause misunderstandings as the meaning was determined from the context.

Fifth, SPC, a common feature of SCE, was also identified in the ELF contexts under investigation. However, SPC was not widely used and many examples were produced by the same speaker. In this data, SPC was more common in informal daily interactions but occurred less in formal institutional talk.

Sixth, tag questions were not frequently used by the Chinese ELF speakers, with only 12 examples identified, and most of the question tags were invariant tags like right or yeah. The use of simpler and invariant tag forms is also found across many different varieties. Moreover, most of the tag questions in the data were given a definite response, which has provided a point of difference from the findings in Xu’s data (Z. Xu, 2010).

Seventh, the Chinese ELF users tended to use self-repetition to emphasize a point or make a point clear. This type of repetition can also serve as a cohesive device in discourse. The frequent repetition is acceptable in Chinese while considered stylistically dull in English. Therefore, it is possibly the result of mother tongue discourse transfer.

Eighth, the analysis of the responses to general questions found that nearly half of the general questions in formal settings were not responded to by Chinese ELF speakers with direct answers like yes or no. This may have been due to the “inductive argument” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 117) thinking pattern of Chinese people. However, on less formal occasions, direct answers were more frequent. In addition, yeah or yes were sometimes used to show agreement to what was said rather than giving a confirmative answer. This feature of SCE is seen as a result of mother tongue transfer. However, only a few examples have been found in this subset, which may imply that the non-standard use of yes/no
response tends to occur less frequently in such formal situations.

Finally, ADT, which has been identified by Xu (2010) as a feature of SCE, was found in this data. It is noted that the default tense can be present tense following a past time reference or past tense verbs following a present time reference.

These non-standard features were found in the formal and semi-formal ELF settings in the speech of Chinese ELF users with comparatively high English proficiency. The use of these non-standard forms did not necessarily cause misunderstanding in their ELF interactions. In addition, the non-standard forms have a number of possible causes, including mother tongue transfer, facilitation of communication or exploitation of language resources. In fact, it is hard to identify a specific reason or motive for a certain non-standard form in the complexity and fluidity of ELF situations because, as Thomason suggests (2010, p. 31), “multiple causes are responsible for a particular change”. The existence of non-standard forms of English being used by Chinese ELF speakers with high English proficiency suggests these features can be accepted in a positive way, rather than seen as “errors”, in ASEAN ELF contexts.

Nonetheless, it is noted that these non-standard features are not exclusive to Chinese ELF users. Many of the features are also found in different varieties of English, for example, the third person zero, non-marking of plural nouns, the non-standard use of articles and prepositions and question tag. Therefore, we must be careful not to draw a definite and general conclusion about the linguistic features for specific ELF users, such as Chinese ELF users. The purpose of the research was to identify the non-standard features of the ELF used by Chinese speakers in a defined context. It is noted that while these features occur, they are not systematically used and the features can be identified in the speech of some speakers but not all. Moreover, some speakers use standard and non-standard forms in the same context. The preliminary findings indicate that certain non-
standard features of ELF also occur in SCE, including subject pronoun copying, adjacent default tense, null subject/object and tag question. However, some features of CE as a variety are not identified in this defined context. For example, Chinese loanwords and code mixing, which have been considered important features of CE, were rarely found in this subset. Therefore, it is assumed that CE lexis, which is unique with Chinese culture, is somehow avoided by ELF speakers when communicating with people from other cultural backgrounds in order to prevent communication breakdowns. This is a communicative strategy applied by ELF users, which is discussed in the next chapter. The lexical and phrasal innovations from ELF users are normally considered grammatical errors in most varieties. To what degree the features identified in this research are shared with those of CE as a variety or ELF in other contexts needs further study. It is also important to stress that ELF by Chinese users, like ELF by any other users, is not a variety of some kind. It is concluded from these findings that Chinese ELF speakers may use these non-standard forms, and they do not appear to hinder intelligibility. By focusing on Chinese ELF users, this research has provided a preliminary study of ELF use in a specific context, while, at the same time, contributing to the overall study of ELF use.
5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users demonstrated in China-ASEAN communication. The previous chapter, Chapter Four, presented the lexicogrammatical features of ELF by Chinese ELF speakers, and this chapter extends on these results by focusing on the pragmatic competence of speakers from different Asian countries, mainly from the ASEAN+3 countries (a detailed description of the speakers can be found in Section 3.3.1). Pragmatics is about meaning, language use and the users, and thus “about how the language system is employed in social encounters by human beings” (Kecskes, 2014, p. 2). Both listeners and speakers contribute to meaning construction in the process of communication, which means it can be difficult to separate the speeches of speakers and listeners when analyzing their pragmatic competence in most of their interactions. Therefore, all the participants in the ACE subset were included in this investigation into pragmatic competence. Consequently, as the number of Chinese speakers accounted for nearly half the total participants, the analysis mainly revealed features of Chinese ELF users.

Based on the communicative competence framework elaborated in Section 2.4, four of the five competences, namely, strategic competence, sociocultural competence, actional competence and discourse competence are discussed (linguistic competence was analyzed in Chapter Four). The pragmatic features selected for analysis in this research
are also based on the previous study of the pragmatic competence of ELF users in various context (see Appendix 1). There are 27 pragmatic features listed in Appendix 1. Nineteen out of the 27 features were identified frequently as being applied by Asian ELF users in the subset and selected for detailed analysis. The features which were not prominent or frequently used, such as spell out were not selected for analysis. In this chapter, some of the strategic competences listed in Appendix 1 were combined for the convenience of analysis. For example, lexical suggestion, lexical anticipation and lexical correction were combined as lexical suggestion in this research. Participant’s paraphrasing and self-paraphrasing were included in the feature of paraphrasing, summarizing and explaining. In addition, some competences of Asian ELF speakers, such as expressing disagreement, topic management and referencing, were included in this research due to their prominence though not listed in Appendix 1. As a result, a total of 12 pragmatic features were included in this chapter.

First, strategic competence covers word suggestion, code-switching, paraphrasing and summarizing, dealing with misunderstandings and avoidance strategies. Second, sociocultural and actional competence involve cross-cultural awareness, addressing conventions and how to disagree with each other. Third, discourse competence comprises of backchannels, echoing, referencing and topic change and management.

Based on the components of the framework, this chapter presents the findings to the second set of research question:

Research question 2: What pragmatic competence do Asian ELF users demonstrate in China-ASEAN interaction? Specifically,

2.1 What communicative strategies do Asian ELF speakers employ to repair communication breakdowns or to facilitate communication?

2.2 What sociocultural competence do Asian ELF users display in the intercultural
communication settings?

2.3 What discourse competence do Asian ELF users display in their interactions?

The major findings show that Asian ELF users are able to use various strategies to prevent communication breakdowns and are actively involved in their interactions. They also demonstrated cross-cultural awareness in their communication. Asian ELF speakers are able to collaborate and support each other by using backchannels and echoing. Moreover, conflicts can be well managed and resolved in various ways in China-ASEAN communication contexts.

5.2 Strategic Competence

According to Canale (1983), communication strategies are aimed a) to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication; and b) to enhance the effectiveness of communication. For example, speakers may try to paraphrase or use synonyms for unknown phrases. Lepica (as cited in Canale, 1983) reports that learners’ confidence and willingness to communicate can compensate for grammatical inaccuracy. The functions of communicative strategies are related to communication problems and difficulties. Although some communication strategies are universal and are used in first language communication, learners must be shown how to use and be encouraged to use such strategies in their second language. Scholars generally agree that the strategic competence is crucial and has great value in second language learning (Canale, 1983; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995).

Kirkpatrick (2010a) has summarized 15 communicative strategies of ASEAN ELF users based on group discussions. The strategies adopted by speakers from ten ASEAN countries have been divided into listener and speaker strategies. There are 10 listener strategies, namely, lexical anticipation, lexical suggestion, lexical correction, do not give
up, request repetition, request clarification, let it pass, listen to the message, participant paraphrase and participant prompt. There are also another five strategies used by ELF speakers: spell out the word, repeat the phrase, be explicit, paraphrase and avoid local/idiomatic referents. These strategies are reviewed when discussing the strategic competence for ASEAN+3 ELF users below.

5.2.1 Lexical suggestion.

Lexical suggestion in this section also includes what Kirkpatrick terms as “lexical anticipation” and “lexical correction” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 141). Asian listeners may offer a word or phrase to speakers when they are searching for or hesitating over the choice of a word. The focus of this section was on the functions of lexical suggestion: to help out other participants; to show insightful understanding and to show involvement.

To help out other participants.

In Example 1, S2, a Maldivian talks about the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympic Games. He is not sure what the proper word is and mentions other words with similar meanings: the fire and the lamp. S3, a Malaysian, provides the appropriate lexical item the torch for him and S2 accepts this word immediately and uses this word in his following sentence. In the conversation, S2 does not remain silent when he cannot produce the accurate word, but keeps offering similar words to make himself understood. S3 understands what S2 is trying to say and is ready to help. S2, by using the suggested word, indicates his acceptance rather than embarrassment when being corrected. This strategy shows a high level of cooperation and the willingness to solve communication problems.

5.2.1-1 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)
S2: er i think er in all opening ceremonies er lighting the fire or the lamp er=
S3: <1> the torch </1>
S2: <1> the torch </1> is the=
S1: =yeah
S2: is the most er: anticipated part of the opening ceremony

In a similar example below, S2, a Thai speaker, helps S1, a Chinese speaker, by providing the proper term of the party pro Thai when S1 is hesitating and not sure about the term. S1 continues to use the suggested term in his next sentence.

5.2.1-2 (from File 12: Sino-Thai ties)
S1: ... and society in thailand is seriously divided between you know different parties that the the thai r- the ro- <@> thai party </@> =
S2: =pro thai
S1: and the pro thai the ruling party (1)

In Example 3, when S2, a Maldivian, seems to hesitate to complete the phrase from the top to the bottom by repeating to the, S1, a Chinese speaker, provides the word bottom right after S2’s repetition and S2 accepts the word by saying bottom yes. S1’s quick response indicates his willingness to help and be involved in the conversation. Similar to Example 1, S2 does not seem upset about forgetting this common set phrase and accepts the word by saying yes.

5.2.1-3 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)
S2: er: since beijing was awarded the er: olympics er: we must congratulate er everybody involved you know er: from the top to the to the=
S1: =bottom=
S2: =bottom yes to everybody involved (.)
To show insightful understanding.

There are examples of lexical anticipation based on the deeper meanings and intentions of the speakers. The anticipation and suggestion of proper words or expressions indicate the listeners’ insightful understanding. In Example 4, S2, a Korean, anticipates what S3, a Chinese speaker wants to say and provides the phrase *political and idealist*. S3 agrees with S2’s suggestion and echoes *political*, even though the nouns *politics* and *ideals* would probably be better here in terms of Standard English.

5.2.1-4 (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

S3: ... first of all (.) deeply (.) mutual distrust between the two (.) and the secondly (.) between (.) er: the two koreas you have a totally totally different er =

S2: =*political and <4> idealist </4>*

S3: <4> political </4> you know even for one side

In Example 5, S2, a Japanese speaker talks about the relationship between China and Japan and is searching for a proper expression by repeating *thinking*. S1, a Chinese, understands what S2 is trying to say and suggests a phrase *age of globalization* which fits the context. S2 accepts this by saying *definitely*. This kind of lexical anticipation indicates that the listener understands the speaker’s intention and the context or background information they are referring to. It also shows the participants in a conversation are “communicating successfully and are on the same wave length” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 127).

5.2.1-5 (from File 14: Prospects for China-Japan relations)

S2: ...we have o- o- o we have to overcome (.) tho:se (.) things left over by the previous centuries because human being must develop when we're thinking (.) and (.) way of thinking

S1: you know *age of globalization.*
To show involvement.

In example 6, S2, a Maldivian, talks about a news report, saying \textit{it} (the Beijing Olympic Games) \textit{will be a big challenge}. He hesitates a bit when saying \textit{London} and S1, the Chinese speaker, quickly responds, laughing, by offering the word \textit{Olympic}. However, this word is not exactly what S2 wants. Therefore, S2 ignores S1’s suggestion and continues to say \textit{twenty twelve organizers}. S1 realizes what S2 is trying to say and says \textit{yeah organizers} to show his agreement. In the example, S2 may not be searching for a word by uttering \textit{er} as he uses \textit{er} frequently during his utterance. This example shows how Asian ELF users actively participate in the conversation without feeling embarrassed when the suggested word is ignored.

5.2.1-6 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)

\begin{verbatim}
S2: ...in fact er () i read a recent report er written by er () er a journalist for the china daily () erm sort of () anticipating what is going to happen in twenty twelve as compared to this er according to her it will be a big challenge er for the london er:
S1: <@> olympic- </@>
S2: twenty twelve organizers
S1: yeah <8> organizers </8>
S2: <8> to match </8> up to er to the () to the standard here () er
\end{verbatim}

In Example 7, S1, a Chinese speaker, understands what S7, a Chinese-American is trying to say and interrupts his speech by saying \textit{practicing} as there are no signs here showing S7 is searching for a word. S7 agrees by saying \textit{yeah} and continues to use his own word \textit{perfecting} to complete his sentence. In this example, the “interruption” or turn
taking of S1 shows his active involvement and understanding in this conversation.

5.2.1-7 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)

S7: it is like you know a lot of times i think if if you are at a circus you know and i- if you watch all the activities going on you see a clown you know circling all the ball on the big ball you know i don't know what he's doing out there but you know a lot of people actually tend to (.) neglect that he actually spends a lot of time=

S1: =practicing

S7: yeah per- perfecting hi- his craft

Active interaction by word suggestions is also found in Example 8. S1, a Chinese speaker, interrupts S2, an American, by saying yes breaking even to complete S2’s sentence. Then S2 repeats breaking even and further explains as or profitable in her following sentence. Here lexical suggestions and interruptions are ways to be actively involved in the conversation.

5.2.1-8 (from File 17: Fashion in China)

S2: <7> well it was you know interesting because she said double </7> digits <8> growth </8> but she never said

S1: <8> yes </8> breaking even

S2: it’s breaking even or profitable <9> but growth is good anyway </9>

In summary, Asian ELF speakers are active and cooperative in their interactions by suggesting and anticipating lexis and expressions to help other participants who seem to be searching for the “proper” words. Lexical suggestion is also a strategy used by ELF speakers to show their involvement and understanding in interactions.
5.2.2 Paraphrasing, summarizing and explaining.

Paraphrasing is used when listeners cannot fully understand the speaker’s meaning. A fellow participant or the speaker himself/herself can use the strategy to help addressees better understand what is being talked about. In this subset, many examples of paraphrasing and summarizing were used by both the listeners and speakers. Paraphrasing is more specifically categorized by Kirkpatrick (2010a) as participant paraphrase, speaker’s paraphrase and being explicit. First, the discussion focuses on the strategy adopted by the listeners. Listeners may paraphrase, summarize and explain what the speakers have said in order to confirm their viewpoint or facts, to show involvement, to make the meaning explicit or to show agreement.

To confirm.

In Example 1, S2, a Singaporean talks about Suzhou Industrial Park, which was proposed by Lee Kwan Yew in order to share Singaporean experiences with a hands-on example in China. S1, a Chinese speaker, interrupts him by paraphrasing what S2 said in order to confirm the fact. S1, uses the expression the brainchild of Lee Kwan Yew (the then Prime Minister of Singapore) to paraphrase what S2 says Mr. Lee Kwan Yew thought the way to... and he therefore proposed the Suzhou industrial park.... This example shows that S1 understands what S2 says but he wants to confirm a historical fact which he is not sure of.

5.2.2-1 (from File 7: Singaporean model)

S2: well at that point of time er china wanted to see how singapore developed so quickly (.) and mister lee kwan yew thought the way (.) er: to not engage china is to share our experience in the development of singapore and how to do that? just by having a dialogue or several meetings? er not as good as HANDS on er: example so he he therefore proposed (.) the suzhou industrial park (.) where the emphasis is not on building of INFRASTRUCTURE alone that can be done but it=
In Example 2, S2, a Malaysian, expresses his point of view in a rather long answer and S1, a Chinese speaker, summarizes what he said in an emphatic form with the auxiliary verb *do: so you do foresee*.... The purpose of S1’s summary is to confirm S2’s point of view as they do not share similar attitudes towards religion in this conversation. Therefore, it is necessary to make their points of view clear. This paraphrasing or summarizing of S1 achieves this purpose both for himself as a listener and for the TV viewers of this program.

5.2.2-2  (from File 9: Muslims and modernization)

*S2:*  ...*and the <fast> people who want to build the mosque? so they should resolve it? peacefully? through mutual understanding <fast> i think it has been resolved it's not an issue now (.) er i know the gentleman? who is er the the highly respected gentleman? is a: e- er: very moderate muslim? you know? er: <@> so <@> he’s not an enemy of anyone at least of all: or anyone <whispering> in the united states <whispering> (.)

*S1:*  *so you DO foresee a harmonious world between christians and muslims,*
*between chinese and the rest of the world (.)*

To get involved.

In the following example, S2, a Maldivian talks about the rare phenomenon of Chinese athletes *cracking down* after winning a gold medal. S1, a Chinese speaker paraphrases what S2 says by offering *is crying yeah* to show his involvement and agreement in the conversation. It is worth noting that the appropriate expression is *cracking up* or *breaking down* (see discussion of creative use of idiom in Section 4.2.1). In this context, S2 seems to combine these two set phrases and gives a new meaning
to the phrase *cracking down*. However, S1 understands S2 by providing a suitable paraphrase.

5.2.2-3 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)

S2: *er which is very rare last night you could see ma lin totally <5> cracking down </5>*

S1: *<5> is crying </5> yeah*

S2: *which is something that's not er seen er among sports people in in china*

A similar example is presented below. S1, a Chinese speaker shows involvement by adding supporting information the *Kaesong Special Economic Zone* to what S3 is saying about *a lot of agreements and the treaties*. This is not exactly a paraphrase but is evidence to further explain S3’s idea and has the same function of paraphrase.

5.2.2-4 (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

S3: …*for example you you have two joint declarations between the two heads and a lot of agreements and the treaties* very meaningful very positive however =

S1: *and the kaesong <3> special economic zone </3>*

S3: *<3> yeah yeah yeah</3> yeah but (.) none of the treaties and agreements (.) is predictable (.) er is reliable*

*To make meaning explicit.*

S2, a Malaysian, describes an event which took place on the South China Sea. When he mentions *then came the Philippine warship*, S1, a Chinese speaker, tries to make the meaning clearer by adding more information the *marines step in.*

5.2.2-5 (from File 8: South China Sea Dispute)

S2: *in the lagoon they were fishing they were not taking shelter so the chinese*
the story in china is they were taking shelter and then came this the philippine warship which: you know=

S1: =<3> the marines </3>
S2: <3> marines </3>=
S1: =step in

In Example 6, when S2, a Korean, talks about one of the foreign policies of the US, S1, a Chinese speaker, interrupts him by explaining this policy was proposed by the US President, George W. Bush. The interruption and explanation of S1 probably aims to provide some background information about US foreign policy to S3 (another participant) and the TV viewers as well.

5.2.2-6  (File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

S2: ...<spel> u s </spel> has this foreign policy golden rule that is the (.) don't reward bad behaviour <spel> u s a </spel> is calculating the north korea's <3> bad behaviour </3>
S1: <3> that's what </3> the junior bush said you cannot reward the bad behaviour=

To make meaning clear.

Speakers may describe a situation or explain their views in extended pieces of discourse, but the fellow participants in these examples summarize the speakers’ meaning in a very concise way using an adjective, like abstract in Example 7, or an idiom, like we are in the same boat in Example 8, or with short responses as illustrated in the rest of the examples. This kind of summary by the listeners demonstrates participants’ understanding of what is being discussed and also makes meanings clearer and simpler and enhance communication efficiency.
5.2.2-7 (from File 10: South Korea first female president)
S3: <8> <coughs> </8> <9> <coughs> </9> well er i think the term of trust building process is very smart because er: on one hand er: the term provides er: a large room enough to imagine what can er what will contain <1> (in such) </1>
S1: it's <1> abstract </1>
S3: yeah yeah

5.2.2-8 (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)
S3: …we need to discuss on common visions (.) on the future of the architecture for security prosperity dual peace for both of the koreas and for the par- er er future unification of the korea so common vision common goal common approach only one <8> we have the com- </8>
S1: <8> because </8> we live in the common wealth
S3: <9> yeah </9>
S1: <9> we </9> are in the same boat

5.2.2-9 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)
S4: ... we we think that because we are still working full-time actually he he is an english teacher i i am er=
S1: =you still have a job

5.2.2-10 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)
S7: yeah per- perfecting hi- his craft and at the same time he is doing everything one i mean there might be a day when somebody actually you know acknowledges it and appreciates it sho- shows him respect that is the time when he actually becomes (.) you know a true king itself you know ...
S2: you get the recognition finally=

To agree.

Paraphrasing is also a way to show agreement between speakers as illustrated in the two examples below. S1, a Chinese speaker, agrees with S2, a Thai, by paraphrasing what
he says and adding more details. In Example 11, S1 says *time is needed* to paraphrase S2’s statement *we need more time* and S1 provides more details by saying *heal the wounds between the two sides of Yellow Shirts and the Red Shirts* to illustrate what S2 means when he says *to solve this problem*. In Example 12, S1 uses *dialogue* indicating what S2 says *everyone want to talk together* and continues to explain that *dialogue is a recipe for national reconciliation*. This paraphrase not only shows agreement between the speakers, but also makes the statements explicit.

5.2.2-11 (from File 12: Sino-Thai ties and diplomacy in Asia)

S2: …but now i think it's er (.) we need more (.) enough time to er to solve this problem i think it's better the past

S1: *time is needed to heal the wounds between the two sides of yellow er shirts and the red shirts*

5.2.2-12 (File 12: Sino-Thai ties and diplomacy in Asia)

S2: …the situation (.) need to talk the situation everyone want to talk together
i think it's er the time is er (recorder) after the long time to talk about this=

S1: =*absolutely the dialogue is a recipe for er national reconciliation having gone through you know so many hh er (1) street clashes as well as er er demonstrations*

The strategies of paraphrasing, summarizing and explaining discussed above were mainly adopted by the anchors of TV programs. It is assumed that using such strategies is necessary and important for anchors, as they would be highly involved in the conversation and understand the needs of other participants as well as the viewers’ needs. Therefore, they understand the value of paraphrasing and explaining what the speakers are saying.

In addition to the participants’ paraphrasing or explaining, there were examples of
paraphrasing by the speakers themselves. The self-paraphrase strategy is adopted mainly for the purpose of explicitness, which means the speakers are trying to make their meanings understood or prevent misunderstanding. The speakers normally use *I mean* as signals to paraphrase and explain what they have said. This can be achieved in three ways: a) further explanation of their viewpoints or abstract expression (see Examples 13-16); b) different ways of expression (see Examples 17-20); and c) adding examples and detailed information (see Examples 21-23). The self-paraphrasing strategy is a communication skill which is not exclusive to ELF speakers. However, the frequent use of the strategy in the data demonstrates Asian ELF speakers are able to make their ideas explicit in order to avoid unnecessary misunderstanding and to enhance communication efficiency.

*To explain a viewpoint or an abstract expression.*

In the following examples, the Asian ELF speakers try to make their ideas or concepts clearer through further explanation. In Example 13, S1, a Chinese speaker, explains the reason she thinks it is *fair* is that both North Korea and South Korea are *playing similar cards* in their national strategies, which she explains further in her following comments. In Example 14, S2, a Singaporean, explains the reason why the West used to feel *superior* is that they *colonized the world.* He (the same speaker in Example 15) also adopts this strategy to make his idea clearer and better understood. He is trying to explain how Asian countries manage insecurities and pressure from Western powers. He says *that is okay* when the West marks Asian countries *for this* and *for that.* Then, in his following explanation with the signal *I mean,* he explicitly states that they would *not take the markings too seriously.* In Example 16, S1, a Chinese, also gives a detailed explanation of what he thinks is a *lucky unique case,* which refers to the fact that the design is being chosen by the First Lady.
5.2.2-13  (from File 10: South Korea first female president)

S1: <2> but </2> that is only <3> fair </3> i mean you see the two countries are all playing very similar cards

5.2.2-14  (from File 15: Implications of China’s re-emergence)

S2: well ... it's natural (.) for the west to feel uncomfortable (.) about the reemergence of asia on the global stage particularly of china (.) hh because they used to (.) er (1) to be superior (.) i mean they colonized the world (.)

5.2.2-15  (from File 15: Implications of China’s re-emergence)

S2:... emotionally this is not easy (.) for western powers to accept (.) and we we must work with this we must understand (.) the new insecurities (.) and ... i think we should also as we grow stronger MANAGE (.) the insecurities (.) because it's not in our INTERESTS (.) to mismanage these it did feel frightened and it do (1) foolish things it is also not an advantage <swallows> in singapore (.) they would <swallows> markers they say we are ten upon ten yeah five upon ten for this and four upon ten for that china is six upon ten (1) er but that is okay i mean (1) we argue with them (.) we laugh (.) we don't take that markings too seriously (.)

5.2.2-16  (from File 17: fashion design in China)

S1: but the thing is that's lucky unique case i mean you can't always you cannot always expect that one day maybe the first lady is going to choose my brand my design i mean you can't really <8> expect </8> that to happen everyday...

To express in another way.

Examples 17 to 20 show how the speakers paraphrase questions and answers. The first three examples are questions raised by a Chinese anchor. Although the questions are quite clear, he rephrases the questions in order to ensure that the guests fully understand. For example, in Example 17, the question is this what is required of a singer these day is
further explained with the reason as the competition is fiercer than any time before. The question “how do you understand design in China in Example 18 is more clearly presented than “how do you see that”. The question in Example 19, who is buying, suggests clear concern about the price, which is too high, not affordable. In Example 20, S2, a Malaysian, paraphrases his point of view, inability to attend the needs and aspirations of people, by saying did not engage with people, and further argues that you can’t suppress them (the people) forever.

5.2.2-17 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)
S1: you you you sing (.) in first place (.) and then you write your own sounds and play an instrument (.) is this what is required of a singer these days i mean you are lucky in living in this age but at the same time com- competition is fiercer than any time before jess?

5.2.2-18 (from File 17 fashion design in China)
S1: in china we can see the logic here how do you see that i mean how do you see that what how do you understand design in china=

5.2.2-19 (from File 17 fashion design in China)
S1: =but back to you so who is buying i mean the question is it has to be appealing to your eyes but at the same time should be affordable

5.2.2-20 (from File 6: China-Malaysian Ties)
S2: you know it's part of the world it's it's because i- erm it's their inability to (1) er attend to the er needs and aspirations of the people i mean they (.) they did not engage with the people (.) and for too long er you know you can suppress (.) er people's er needs and and people's er aspiration (.) but you can't suppress them forever
To provide examples and detailed information.

In addition to paraphrase and explanation, these speakers also add examples and detailed information to help listeners better understand what they mean. For example, *Qinzhou Industrial Park* in Example 21 below is an example of a real effective program and *Backstreet Boys Michael Jackson* in Example 22 are examples of different types of music. In Example 23, S7, a Chinese-American, provides more information of his language skills by adding *pick up the Chinese but losing my English* to the simple answer *I do.*

5.2.2-21 (from File 6: China-Malaysian Ties)

S2: ... we do trust each other () and this has been translated into () a real effective er: programs i mean *qinzhou industrial park* is a is a () is clear manifestation of that ...

5.2.2-22 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)

S7: ... i was introduced to a lot of different types of music i mean er *backstreet boys michael <7> jackson </7> you know*

5.2.2-23 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)

S2: =did you speak chinese

S7: yeah i do i do i mean *actually pick up the chinese then* but then i started losing my english

In summary, the strategies of paraphrase, summary and explanation are used by both listeners and speakers in these Asian ELF contexts. Listeners use these strategies to confirm what has been said, show their involvement in the interaction, and make the speakers’ meanings explicit. It is also an effective way for listeners to show their agreement with the speakers. For speakers, their self-paraphrasing helps listeners better understand their points of view and prevents unnecessary misunderstandings.
5.2.3 Code-switching.

Code-switching is normally not expected in ELF interactions, as the speakers usually do not have a common first language and shared culture. The major function of English in ELF settings is communication-oriented, rather than expression of identities. The lack of code-switching and local idioms (which is discussed in Section 5.2.5) is a distinctive feature of ELF compared to WE (Kirkpatrick & McLellan, 2012). Firth (1996) also reported that there were few examples of code-switching in his data. Nevertheless, code-switching is found in some informal ELF interactions in both European and Asian contexts as a way of accommodation and rapport building (Cogo, 2009; Deterding, 2013; Kalocsai, 2011). In the subset used in this study, there were only a total of seven examples of code-switching found among the speakers who shared the same language (Chinese, spoken by the Chinese and Singaporeans) and who had some knowledge of Chinese (like the Koreans and Japanese).

Code-switching in CE.

In Example 1, S1, a Chinese speaker says he posted a message on weibo (微博, microblogging), which means he was microblogging on the Weibo site. This term can be found in Wikipedia: “Weibo may refer to microblogging in China, or China-based microblogging services” ("Weibo," 2017). Some English language media such as Forbes and BBC also use the word, but with explanation. For example, a news title from Forbes reported: *Alibaba buys 18% of “China’s Twitter” Weibo for $586 Mln* (Flannery, 2013, April 29), and a news title from BBC stated: *China microblogging site Weibo sees decline in users* ("China Weibo declines," 2014 January 17). When searching weibo in 2016 online edition of the China Daily, the official English-language newspaper published in China, it was often used together with terms such as *Weibo microblog, Weibo, the Chinese...*
counterpart of Twitter, Weibo, a Twitter-like service in China, the social networking platform. However, in many cases, weibo is used on its own in the China Daily. It can be assumed that the word weibo in Chinese pinyin accepted as a borrowing from Chinese and become part of CE. As Pitzl (2016, p. 296) claims, “code-switching is a potential trigger for borrowing.” Example 1 shows that weibo is a potential borrowing in CE. It is used in a conversation without explanation by a Chinese, as it is assumed to be understood by S2, a Korean participant.

5.2.3-1 (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

S1: well great minds (.) think alike in fact just half an hour ago i posted a message on (1) <L1zh> weibo {microblogging}</L1zh>

S2: ah

S1: calling for president obama to gave (.) his north korean counterpart a phone call that's

S2: oh <2> @@ </2>

Code-switching with English translation and explanation.

Code-switching is often found being used with an English translation or explanation. This kind of code-switching occurs mainly in special terms or proper nouns from Chinese history or culture. Asian ELF speakers adopt the strategy to provide a definite and exact term in their interactions with listeners who share the same language, or have mastery of the language, which is Chinese in these contexts. As all participants understood code-switching in Chinese, it seemed unnecessary to translate them into English. However, the translations, either by the speakers themselves or by the listeners, either before or following the code-switching, indicated they not only cared about the needs of the participants, but also the potential needs of viewers, who may have only understood English.
In Example 2, S2, a Singaporean, mentions *xiyouji* (西游记), one of the four Chinese classical novels, which is followed by his explanation: *I mean the story of Xuan Zang to the India.* S1, a Chinese speaker, could understand what S2 is talking about, but he adds the formal translation of the title of the novel *Pilgrimage to the West.* The purpose of providing the title translation seems to help non-Chinese TV viewers know exactly which novel they are talking about. Then S1 continues to use the Chinese title, *xiyouji,* and explains it is *one of the four most famous classical of Chinese novels* in his next sentence. The repetition of the code-switching *xiyouji* by S1 shows his accommodation and agreement with S2. S2 continues to use code-switching *datang xiyuji* (大唐西域记), which is the title of the book he just briefly mentioned as Xuan Zang’s account.

5.2.3-2 (from File 15: Implications of China’s re-emergence)

S2: *...there is no conflict between india and china and in fact it's a long history of cooperation hh so in [L1zh] xiyouji </L1zh> we (.) i mean the the story of [L1zh] xuan zang </L1zh> (1) to (.) to india=

S1: =pilgrimage to the west=

S2: =<4> to the west </4>

S1: <4> <L1zh> xiyouji </L1zh></4> yes one of the four (.) most famous <5> classical </5> of chinese novels

S2: <5> that </5> they were wonderful stories (.) and indeed india (.) recovered a lot of its history (1) to chinese records (.) without <L1zh> xuanzang </L1zh>’s (.) account <L1zh> datang xiyuji </L1zh> in year today (1) we would not know (.) what is nalanda university=

S1 in Example 3 is Chinese and is discussing the title of S7’s new album. S7 is an American-born Taiwanese. The original title of the album is in Chinese *wangzhe chousheng* (王者丑生), so it is natural to use code-switching when mentioning the title. S1 then translates the title literally into English by himself as *crowned clown,* which is
accepted by S7 by saying yes. The translation is aimed to help viewers understand the meaning of the album title.

5.2.3-3 (from File 16: China’s next pop stars)
S1: it is it is called 要著才使 <L1zh> wangzhe chousheng </L1zh> in chinese literally in English it is crowned clown
S7: yes

In Examples 4 and 5, S2, a Singaporean uses code-switching to express some special terms in Chinese history but with a loose English translation either before or after the code-switching. For example, in (4), Zheng He’s ship is a general term and the code-switching 宝船 (baochuan, treasure ship) is added to refer specifically to the Chinese treasure ship in the fleet of Admiral Zheng He (in the early Ming Dynasty). In Example 5, the code-switching 外国人 (yangren, literally means foreigners who come from overseas, mainly white people from Western countries. The speaker uses its English equivalence Caucasian after code-switching to refer to white people.

5.2.3-4 (File 15: Implications of China’s re-emergence)
S2: when zheng he's ships it's <L1zh> baochuan </L1zh> sailed into (.) the indian ocean people must have been very afraid (1)

5.2.3-5 (File 15: Implications of China’s re-emergence)
S2: and the ship landing from japan on the chinese mainland would have been inspected by <L1zh> yangren </L1zh> (.) by by caucasian (.)

**Code-switching with meaning negotiation.**

Code-switching is considered a form of accommodation or way of enhancing
intelligibility in communication (Cogo, 2009; Deterding, 2013). However, when it is used for a special term in a specific context, code-switching may not be totally understood by the native speakers of the code-switched language. Example 6 is an interesting case of code-switching which requires negotiation for its meaning. S2, a Korean, first mentions the political term *han ran* (悍然, outrageously) which was used by the Chinese Government to describe the North Korea (DPRK). The Korean speaker uses codeswitching to put the term into Chinese to provide further understanding for Chinese listeners. However, S1, a Chinese speaker, could not understand the term and asks directly: *What is the Chinese for ‘han ran’?* In fact, *han ran* is Chinese and it is obvious that the Chinese native speaker S1 could not understand it and probably assumes it is Korean. S3, another Chinese speaker, who is an expert in international studies, explains the term to S1 as *a very tough and negative word in Chinese diplomatic statement.* S1 signals partial understanding by responding *uh-huh* and continues to ask *to describe what?* Both S2 and S3 are trying to tell S1 that it describes something *ugly or bad,* and S3 gives an example of Chiang kai-shek, who was head of the Nationalist government in China from 1928 to 1949. The adverb *hanran* was used to describe him when he *hanran* staged a coup and broke with the Communist Party in 1927 and *hanran* launched a civil war in 1946. S1 then understands the term and says *I see* and all laugh at the end as they now understand.

5.2.3-6 (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

*S2:* ... *in two thousand and six er when china agreed on the sanctions*. *(.) they*<un>xx</un> <LNzh>*han ran* {outrageously} </LNzh>* used that word you know one thing being used in newspaper korea's behaviours and very harsh criticism*

*S1:* *<L1zh>* *han ran* </L1zh>* what's the chinese for *<L1zh> han ran* </L1zh>*

*S3:* *<L1zh>* *han ran* {outrageously} </L1zh>* is a very tough and the negative word in the his- er er historical record of chinese diplomatic statement *(.) we use *(.)
seven times by this <5> very </5>

S1: <5> uh-huh </5>

S3: tough and the negative word (. ) but the <6> ug - </6>

S1: <6> to des /6> crible what
S3: to describe the <7> ugly </7>

S2: <7> bad things </7>

S3: to describe the <7> ugly </7>

S1: <8> i see </8>

S3: chiang kai-shek ugly <8> is so - </8>

S1: <8> @ @ @ @ </8>

S2: <8> @ @ </8>

Code-switching for potential viewers.

S2 in Example 7, a Japanese speaker, expresses his wishes in Chinese at the end of the program as required by S1 the anchor. His code-switching to Chinese is addressed to Chinese viewers.

5.2.3-7 (from file 14: China-Japan relations)

S1: your command of chinese is excellent (. ) can you (. ) speak my mother tongue and say a few words to the chinese viewers hh about your best wish for the future of china japan relationship

S2: <LNzh> wo xiang xin liang guo guan xi shi hui fa zhan (. ) er zhe ge you you zhe yang xiang xin de xin nian de ren xi wang yue lai yue lai di zao geng hao de (1) ri zhong guan xi de wei lai </LNzh>

(我相信两国关系是会发展，这个有有这样相信的信念的人希望愈来愈多来缔造更好的日中关系的未来。)

(Translation by the author: I believe that the relations between both countries will develop better. Those who have such faith hope more and more people will contribute to the better future of Japan-China relations.)
In summary, code-switching between Chinese and other Asians did not occur very often in the data. Code-switching in Chinese was used mainly for special terms in Chinese history, culture and politics. It was often accompanied by English translations or explanations in order to cater for the needs of English-speaking viewers. Code-switching without translation is adopted when the word is an accepted or is a potential borrowing in CE or there is no English equivalent, where meaning negotiation may occur even among Chinese native speakers. It is noted that communication with potential listeners needs to be taken into consideration as well.

5.2.4 Dealing with misunderstanding.

Misunderstanding can occur in all kinds of communication, among native speakers as well as ELF users. However, it is assumed that people from different cultural backgrounds with different values and beliefs are less likely to achieve successful communication (Samovar & Porter, 2004; Scollon & Scollon, 1995). Yet, research in ELF reveals that the occurrence of misunderstanding is not as widespread as initial assumptions, since ELF speakers tend to be adept at avoiding misunderstanding and ELF interaction is usually successful (Deterding, 2013; Kaur, 2009, 2011; Mauranen, 2006; Pitzl, 2015). Pitzl (2015) found from her data that misunderstandings were not simply the result of plain language difficulties, lack of proficiency or straightforward cultural differences. Based on the Brunei component of ACE, Deterding (2013) studied the misunderstandings in ELF in Southeast Asia and classified them into five categories, namely, pronunciation, lexis, grammar, code-switching and miscellaneous, and he also reported that pronunciation seemed to give rise to the majority of misunderstandings. It should be also stressed also that ELF researchers have not only focused on the causes of communication problems, but also how such miscommunications are managed,
This section discusses the ways speakers in the data manage non-understanding and misunderstanding in China-ASEAN communication contexts. The definition of non-understanding and misunderstanding provided by Bremer, Roberts, Vasseur, Simonot, & Broeder (1996, p. 40) have been adopted here, namely, “non-understanding occurs when the listener realizes that he/she cannot make sense of (part of) an utterance”, while misunderstanding means “the listener achieves an interpretation…but it wasn’t the one the speaker meant”. However, there is no absolute distinction between non-understanding and misunderstanding (Bremer et al., 1996; Deterding, 2013; Kaur, 2009). For example, misinterpretation of meaning can result from partial non-understanding. Furthermore, sometimes it is difficult to tell whether the listeners understand or not, or if they misunderstand what has been said if there is no obvious response from the listeners, such as asking for clarification or responding irrelevantly. In such cases, listeners may use the “let it pass” strategy (Firth, 1996; Kirkpatrick, 2010a). In this section, examples with an explicit response from listeners, whether asking questions or responding inappropriately, are discussed.

**Non-understanding: through direct questioning.**

Example 1 below is a Q and A section of a seminar. S1, a trade commissioner from Malaysia, is asking S2, a Chinese customs officer several questions. In fact, S1 has asked four questions in a row, taking around three minutes. S2 then asks him directly to clarify the first question three times by saying, *I want you to clarify a little bit the first question; can you clarify a little bit; so the first question yeah* and says that he understands the other three questions. As we can see when S1 gives S2 a hint: *basically they are for taxes*, S2 remembers the first question at once and says *aha yeah so customs duties import VAT and consumption tax and vessel tonnage taxes*. S1 then repeats his first question in a simplified
way to make sure S2 understands.

5.2.4-1 (from File 2: China-ASEAN economic and trade relations seminar)

S1: okey er my first question is er er: you mentioned that on the tax collections er: there are four elements of it one is the custom duties er which have er not much issues at the moment because er: under the china asean f t a is er sooner rather reduced to zero so we we wouldn’t have much issue but you have mentioned three other taxes which er may er affect er the competitiveNESS of asean products er: when they enter china i i just want to know what is the calculation basis for import er <spel>v a t</spel> value added tax consumption tax and er vessel tonna- tonnage (.) tax so that the in these aspects can i advise my malaysian companies when the- they manage their costing er when they er position their their products into china that’s my first questions

S2: mhm

S1: my second question is er (.) er this is more to my knowledge is er export tax which youo didn’t touch because i think ...my last question is er: (.) is a general question the malaysian companies will always ask me is er what is the average er clearance time for goods that arrived at the ports of the c i q the customs er roughly what is the average er thing and thing range

S2: ve- very er very very special technical er questions ha @@@@@ yeah er so so you are you are stationing in in guangzhou

S1: ah yes

S2: ah okay (.) so the fir- first question i: just want i want you to clarify a little bit the first question so (.) can you clarify a little bit yeah yeah for the other three i understand yeah (.) mhm so the first question yeah

S1: the first question er: basically they are for taxes

S2: aha yeah so customs duties import <spel>v a t</spel>

S1: yeah=

S2: =consumption tax and vessel tonnage <4> taxes </4>

S1: <4> what is </4> the calculation basis er that is my question the import <spel>v a t</spel> er how does it work a hundred percent of invoice value or something how how how do you calculate on that
In Example 2, S1, a Chinese speaker, seems not to understand the point that S2, a Korean, is arguing for, so she asks directly so your argument is in order to make him confirm the point. S1 is the anchor of this talk show program and she takes the initiative to take the turn and “lead” the participant into a more concise way of expressing himself. Then S2 further elaborates his point.

5.2.4-2 (from File 10: South Korea first female president)

S2: <6> oh </6> i disagree with that because (. ) after the third <7> nuclear </7> test i said the domestic audience is the most important she needs to show something to the dome(stic) yeah north korea <fast> i did nuclear test </fast> will you not doing anything hey you should do something ...

S3: <7> <sniffs> </7>

S1: <8> right </8> <9> so your argument is </9>

S2: <smacks lips> my argument is that (. ) although it looks like a different card but then it’s there is a plug that is supposed to you know working according to the action er by north korea ...

In Example 3, S4, a Chinese economist, explains China’s role in the bank (AIIB: Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank). S1, the Chinese anchor of the forum, is confused about the role of leadership and the role of initiative, both of which he considers similar. S1 then interrupts S4 by asking the question Excuse me. Does this initiative actually indicate strong leadership? and S4 answers directly No.

5.2.4-3 (from File 18: China’s one belt one road initiative)

S4: ... this bank is china’s initiative we don’t think the that china will take the leadership but it’s definitely its initiative so that should that thing we should welcome but then american think this is something <1> something more </1>

S1: <1> excuse me does </1> this initiative actually indicate strong leadership
In Example 4, when S2, a Singaporean, says *the emphasis is on the economic side*, S1, a Chinese anchor, paraphrases what he means. This interpretation or paraphrase is correct, so S2 answers: *that's right*.

5.2.4-4 (from File 7: Singaporean model)

S2: ... and also at this stage of development the emphasis is on the economic side (. ) people want primarily freedom from WHAT (. ) at this stage

S1: *you mean both er er leadership in both countries are very practical*  
*<fast> you got to be <2> down </2> </fast>*

S2: <2> <un> x </un> yes </2>

S1: *<fast> to the earth to have attitude in developing the livelihood of the people </fast>*

S2: *that's right*

**Misunderstanding: through negotiation.**

Only a few examples of misunderstandings were detected in the subset. This supports the conclusion drawn by Meierkord (2000, p. 11) that ELF is “a form of intercultural communication characterized by cooperation rather than misunderstanding”. Kaur (2011) has identified four sources of misunderstanding in intercultural communication: performance-related misunderstanding, such as mishearing and slips of the tongue; language-related misunderstanding, such as ungrammaticalities and disfluencies; ambiguity; and gaps in world knowledge. The study of ELF, as part of intercultural communication, emphasizes how participants (from different cultural backgrounds) achieve successful communication.

In Example 5, S1, a Chinese anchor, asks the young singers if they see themselves
as professional singers and he assumes that they all are by saying you definitely are, right?

But S6, a Malaysian girl’s denial is not what was expected. Both the anchors, S1 and S2 are surprised and ask again: You are not!? Then S6 explains that she is not going to become a singer because she had been studying chemistry. S1 keeps asking and finds out that S6 has graduated and is now making a living by singing. At last, S1 confirms S6’s identity as a professional singer by saying but still you are a professional, right?

5.2.4-5  (from File 16: China's next pop stars)

S1: so where are we basically every one of you (.) do you see yourself now as a professional singer do you definitely are right

S6: no by now

S1: <3> you're not </3>

S2: <3> you're not </3>

S6: i am not going to become a singer actually (.) because i was studying er (.) chemistry (.) <4> before </4>

S1: <4> are </4> you still a student now

S6: oh no i graduated

S1: so you are now=

S6: =i am <5> sorry </5> @

S1: <5> make a living </5> by singing (.) <6> right </6>

S6: <6> yeah: </6> it is totally ou- out of expectation (.) <7> yeah </7>

S2: <7> @@@ </7>

S1:  but still you are a professional (.) right

S2: do you think it's hard for you to accept that or- or realize (.) you are actually a singer (.) that identity is a kind of new to you

S6: since relaxed (.) i accepted the truth because i want to have a special life...

When S6 answers no by now, S6 misunderstands S1’s meaning of professional, which S1 refers as “doing something as a paid job rather than as a hobby”, as defined in the Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary, because he emphasizes make a living by
singing. While S6 seems to interpret professional as referring to the discipline she learned at university and explains because I was studying chemistry before. Professional for S6 means “showing that somebody is well trained and extremely skilled”. Compared with singing, S6 thinks she is better trained in chemistry. Therefore, it can be seen that this kind of misunderstanding occurs due to the lack of the relevant cultural schemas, which are conceptual structures that “serves as the basis for a significant degree of assumed shared understanding and inference” (Sharifian, 2013, p. 6). Even though both meanings of “professional” can be found in the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, people may internalize cultural schemas differently as they grow up among different cultural groups. The mismatch of cultural schemas or cultural frames of reference between S1 and S6 causes the misunderstanding in this case. However, both S1 and S6 are open and ready to negotiate their cultural schema in their interaction when they realize there is a misunderstanding. S1 uses a “keeping asking” strategy to make his meaning understood and S6 later says I am sorry politely and agrees with S1 by saying yeah. It can be seen from the example that when misunderstandings occur, the parties involved are all actively trying to solve the problem.

Example 5 demonstrates not only how participants in China-ASEAN ELF settings actively negotiate their different cultural schemas, but also negotiate their cultural identities. It is difficult to separate cultural schema from cultural identity. “Ascription of cultural identities very often relies on participants’ schemas of what are salient category-bound activities and features (Zhu, 2015, p. 84)”. In this example, S6 did not see herself as a “professional singer” at the beginning and rejected the cultural identity ascribed by S1 by saying no by now. Through negotiation, S6 accepts this identity and claims it is totally out of expectation. S2, another anchor in the talk show, understands S6’s uncertainty in her changing identity and asks if S6 feels it is hard to accept this new
identity. S6 gives a positive answer by saying *I accepted the truth*. It is interesting to see in this example that the “self-oriented cultural identity” (Zhu, 2015) of the speakers may not be the same as the ones ascribed by others. Therefore, negotiation is necessary through interaction to see whether the identities assigned by others are accepted or not.

There was another example in the data which demonstrated how participants negotiated cultural schemas and identities when misunderstanding occurred. In Example 6, S1 and S2, anchors of the TV talk show, introduce the guests S4 and S5, who are from a boy singing group named *PandaBros*. When S1 asks *are you boy band* followed by some laughter, it is not a serious question but rather a kind of introduction as the anchor must know some background information of their guests. The laughter following the question indicates S1 is not sure about their identity as a *boy band* since the members of the singing group are all mature men rather “a group of attractive young men who sing pop music and dance, and who are especially popular with young people” (definition of “Boy Band” in Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary). However, S4 answers directly *not a band*, which might surprise the anchors a little. The other anchor, S2, then responds by saying *the man band I see* as she thought they would rather be called “men” than “boys”. S5 continues to repeat *not a band* and explains *it is a chorus*. Therefore, the point is not about “boy or man” but “band or chorus”. When S4 and S5 realize that the anchors have misunderstood when they said *not a band*, they insist their group’s identity is a “chorus” not a “band” by repeating and explaining, instead of adopting a “let it pass” strategy. They would like to be identified as a chorus mainly because the members of *PandaBros* are all singers who do not play any instruments. They insist their cultural identities or membership from the perspective of a professional vocal music group while rejecting the cultural identity of “boy band” assigned by others. The negotiation process can also be viewed as the negotiation of cultural identities and the negotiation of cultural
schema of “band”.

5.2.4-6 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)
S1: er so the pandas () the panda <7> brother </7>
S2: <7> the panda brother </7> () oh (1) <8> welcome </8>
S4: <8> this is </8> our early album <9> present </9>
S2: <9> oh:: </9> thank you
S1: thank you thank you so <1> er are you </1> (.) are you a boy band @@@
S4: <1> for the best stage </1>
S4: <2> not a band </2>
S2: <2> @@@ </2> the man band i see
S5: not a band @ it's a chorus
S1: okay

Example 7 below also demonstrates that when the speakers found that they had been misunderstood by others, they would explicitly clarify and restate their point of view. S6’s comments seem to arouse controversy as many speakers (a group of 8 speakers) try to speak at the same time. S4 finds what he said before seems to have been misunderstood and clearly explains his view by saying I was not saying... but what I was saying that...

5.2.4-7 (from File 18: China's one belt one road initiative)
S6: ... i think china is at the right moment to further open up the capital account and seek exchange rate flexibility because renminbi is now playing a very increasingly important role in the world it's now the fifth largest currency

(many speakers trying to say something at the same time unable to hear clearly)
S4: no i i was not saying the chi- er () countries should not er liberalize but what i was saying that <spel> i m f </spel> at that time ask everybody no mat- () not <2> conditional </2> er er just you know ...

In summary, there were only a few non-understanding and misunderstanding
occurrences in the data and very few were due to language problems. The analysis of non-standard forms of grammars or expressions in Chapter Four likewise supports this point. The examples of misunderstandings were mainly the result of different cultural frames of reference or personal interpretation. In China-ASEAN ELF communication contexts, English ELF users seldom adopt the “let it pass” strategy when they do not understand the other speaker’s meaning or realize they have been misunderstood. They keep asking or explaining until the problems are solved. Negotiation of cultural frames of reference and cultural identity is the key to achieving successful communication when misunderstanding is caused by different cultural schemas. More examples illustrating the sociocultural competence of Asian ELF users are illustrated in Section 5.3 below.

5.2.5 Idiom avoidance strategy.

Avoidance strategy is part of strategic competence in Celce-Murcia et al.’s framework for communicative competence. This strategy involves “tailoring one’s message to one’s resources by either replacing messages, avoiding topics, or … abandoning one’s message” (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p. 27). In ELF contexts, avoidance strategies are also identified, especially in the use of idioms. Both Seidlhofer (2011) and Pitzl (2009) share the same view that conformity to particular native English idiomatic expressions is unnecessary outside particular English-speaking communities. Kirkpatrick (2010a) also found in his ASEAN ELF data that ELF users tended to avoid using local or idiomatic terms in order to ensure mutual communication. Compared with WE, the relative absence of idiomatic expression in ELF shows “a strong orientation towards communication” (Kirkpatrick & McLellan, 2012, p. 667). In this study, the use of ENL idiomatic expressions and local idiomatic terms was analysed to see how ELF users in China-ASEAN communication settings avoided or flexibly adapted idiomatic
In Table 5.1, a total of 12 idiomatic expressions are identified, one of which (No. 10) has been slightly modified by the speaker and has been discussed in detail in Section 4.3.1. Three out of the 12 (Nos. 1, 6 and 8) are used with paraphrase or further elaboration and the other nine idioms are used as they are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Idiomatic expressions</th>
<th>L1 of the Speaker</th>
<th>File No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Put those problems on the back burner</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eyeball to eyeball against each other</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>See eye to eye with you</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Olive branch</td>
<td>Chinese, Korean</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To test water</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Has a lot of cards</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Great minds think alike</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We are in the same boat</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Blood is thicker than water</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>One is giving a candy the other one is giving a stick</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(modified from English idiom: “carrot and stick”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Copy cat</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ring of truth</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using idiom with paraphrase.

In Example 1, S2, a Malaysian, is talking about the way to deal with intractable problems. Before he uses the idiom put ... on the back burner (which means giving less attention or lower priority to something), he explains in plain English: put those problems aside. His pre-paraphrase of the idiom helps to avoid any misunderstanding of the idiomatic expression. S1, the Chinese speaker, seems to understand him and proposes another question based on this expression.
5.2.5-1 (from File 6: China-Malaysian Ties)

S2: <9> i </9> i agree with you i think er (.) if there are some rather: (.) er intractable problem or seemingly intractable problems (.) then er we should put those problems aside (.) put those problems on the back burner for a while (.) you know and and work on things that can (.) lead to: results

S1: is it in asian culture?

S2: yeah it's part of asian cul- but it's a very (.) pragmatic way (.) of looking at things...

Another example of a self-paraphrased idiom was found in Example 2. When S3, a Chinese, says you Chinese in your hand (having) a lot of cards, he is self-paraphrasing this term by providing detailed examples, like cutting off aid, cutting off oil aid and cutting off everything in order to make his meaning understood.

5.2.5-2 (from File 10: South Korea first female president)

S3:  ... just like <spel> u s </spel> japan or south korea <pvc> expectors {anticipants} </pvc> say you chinese (in your hand) a lot of cards (.) the cards means a <un> xxx </un> means you know er (economic pressure) say <loud> cut off aid cut off oil aid </loud> and cut off everything from north korea so that is the so called responsibility

Using idiom directly.

In most cases, idioms are used directly by the speakers, possibly because they think the idiom is shared by the participants. In Example 3, the idiomatic expression in English blood is thicker than water has exact equivalence in Chinese “血浓于水 (xue nongyu shui)” and in Korean “피는 물보다 진하다”. Therefore, S2, the Korean, understands this idiom and responds by showing his attitude towards the idea: making both Koreans feel ashamed.
5.2.5-3 (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

S1: why such things shouldn't take place between the two koreas and (.) there has been the (.) pan-korean settlement (.) er calling for unification er blood is thicker than water…

S2: i think you're making er koreans both south koreans north koreans feel very ashamed by that statement

In Example 4, both S1 and S3 (both Chinese) use idioms. The idiom olive branch, though coming from Western culture, is widely accepted in China as a symbol of peace. S3 understands the meaning of this idiom when S1 first mentions it and answers the question by reusing the idiom to show his partial agreement: it is a sort of olive branch. He continues to use another idiom, which is also widely accepted and understood in China: test the waters meaning to “find out what the situation is before doing something or making a decision”.

5.2.5-4 (from File 10: South Korea first female president)

S1: ... here i quote (.) south korea wanted to have <slow> a trust building process </slow> with <spel> d p r k </spel> concerning what world policies of the previous administration in south korea what's she this time (.) mister <1> yang </1> (.) extending an olive <2> branch </2> to pyongyang

S3: <1> mhm </1> <2> mhm </2> well er it's a sort of <ref> olive branch </ref> and as well it's a gesture designed to test the water…

In summary, only a few English idiomatic expressions were used in the data. Most actually have an equivalent expression in Chinese culture. These idiomatic expressions do not seem to cause misunderstanding among participants. Some idioms are accompanied by a paraphrase or explanation to make their meanings clear. Others are modified or created by Asian ELF users such as one is giving a candy the other one is
giving a stick, black horse, mix our brain (see a detailed discussion in Section 4.2.1).

In this section, the strategic competence of Asian ELF users in China-ASEAN communication settings has been discussed with a focus on the following five strategies: lexical suggestion, paraphrasing, and summarizing, code-switching, dealing with misunderstanding and avoidance. Asian ELF users are able to use these strategies to prevent communication breakdowns. For example, speakers may self-paraphrase their viewpoints to avoid misunderstanding. Idiomatic expressions tend to be avoided in order to facilitate communication flow. Code-switching, which was also rare in the data, was commonly used with English translations to ensure understanding. Secondly, Asian ELF users are cooperative when dealing with non-understanding and misunderstanding. Participants negotiate their cultural frames of reference when they cause misunderstanding. They keep asking or explaining to solve problems. Only a few cases of “let it pass” were found. Lexical suggestion or and summary are often used to help achieve effective communication.

5.3 Sociocultural Competence

This section considers the actional competence and the sociocultural competence proposed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995). These two competences can be roughly classified as the “appropriateness of meaning” and “appropriateness of form” (Canale, 1983, p. 7) (see the discussion in Section 2.4). Sociocultural factors in Asian ELF have only been studied by a few scholars. For example, Kirkpatrick (2010a) found that terms of address might have influenced Asian varieties of English. Some Asian students preferred to conform to their own cultural norms in naming practices when speaking English, for example, Japanese students may use the title ‘sensei’ or ‘teacher’ when addressing their
lecturers. In his comparative study of turn-taking in Australian and Indonesian seminars, Rusdi (1999) reported that turn-taking was determined by seniority and gender in the Indonesian seminar. In this research, this part of the study investigated how Asian ELF users disagreed with others, the use of terms of address, and cross-cultural awareness. Disagreement is part of actional competence and terms of address and cross-cultural awareness are part of sociocultural competence. However, it is worth noting that the nature of culture in ELF is complex, dynamic and fluid (W. Baker, 2009). Therefore, the concept of intercultural awareness (defined in Section 2.4) is incorporated in the discussion of cross-cultural awareness.

5.3.1 How to disagree.

According to Sifianou (2012, p. 1554), “disagreement can be defined as the expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker.” In earlier studies, disagreement is seen as “dispreferred” and should be avoided in the interest of interlocutors’ “face” (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Sifianou, 2012). However, some research has demonstrated that disagreement is not necessarily a negative behaviour and cause of conflict, but can be used to foster intimacy and stimulate various perspectives from participants (Georgakopoulou, 2001; Schiffrin, 1984).

In a recent study of disagreement in ELF settings, Maíz-Arévalo (2014) classified disagreement into two main categories: strong and mitigated disagreement (see detailed elements in the following discussion) and revealed that ELF speakers tended to avoid strong disagreement. Using ACE data, Walkinshaw and Kirkpatrick (2014) examined several types of disagreement by Asian ELF users with potential face-threatening consequences. The authors argued that the participants tended to avoid evaluative judgement of direct disagreements and focused more on the content of the message. This
type of disagreement is considered as politic and not impolite (Watts, 2003).

In this data, participants were frequently asked for their opinions and attitudes. The classification of disagreement proposed by Maiz-Arévalo (2014) was adopted, which has been, in turn, based on the taxonomies of Kreutel (2007) and Pomerantz (1984). According to Maiz-Arévalo (2014), strong disagreement is characterized by the lack of mitigation of any sort. The linguistic realization of strong disagreement includes the use of bare negative forms (no, of course not), the use of performative verbs (I disagree), or the blunt statement of the opposite. Mitigated disagreement, as opposed to strong disagreement, is characterized by the use of linguistic elements that help minimize the face-threat. The most common linguistic strategies include token agreement (yes...but... formula), the use of hedges (I guess, it seems), expressions of regret (I’m sorry but I don’t agree with you), the use of positive remarks (that’s a very good analysis), suggestions (how about doing it in a slightly different way?) and giving explanations. The mitigating strategies can also be generally categorized into Blum-Kulka’s (1989) internal and external modifications. External modification acts as a supportive move, such as explanations of various kinds (see Examples 1-3 below) and internal modification includes syntactic components, such as modals and lexical/phrasal components, such as hedges (see Example 4-5 below). In the study of the subset, all the examples of disagreement were identified with some sort of the use of mitigation mentioned above. There were no examples of strong disagreement, which would consist of bare negative forms, such as no, no way.

**Using negative forms with explanations.**

In the data, examples of using negative forms and performative verbs were identified, as shown in the following Examples (1-3). However, the participants explain the reasons for their disagreement, which can be seen as mitigation and less face-threatening.
In Example 1, when S1, a Chinese anchor, says that Iran has a long history of brilliant civilization, S2, the former minister for Foreign Affairs of Singapore, expresses his disagreement directly on S1’s comment on Iran by using the negative form “no”: No. Iran is not (an) ancient civilization. But, he then explains the reasons for his disagreement. In this context, this kind of disagreement would not be considered as face-threatening because firstly, guests are supposed to give their personal point of view; secondly, S2’s social statue and his political experience enable him to make such comments as an authority; thirdly, S2’s explanation can ease disagreement.

5.3.1-1 (from File 15: Implications of China’s reemergence)
S1: ... iran hh what do you think of the er <un>xx</un> national pride for those major powers that enjoy a long history of er brilliant civilization ... is that the way we look at say the same treacherous rise of the major powers i mean <@> non-western major powers of course </@>

S2: no iran is is not ancient civilization if history is going back to five thousand years hh and they have a tremendous sense of themselves and great wisdom <swallows> in their in their collective memory hh but they too...

In Example 2, S1, the Chinese anchor expresses her point of view on the policies of both Koreas. S2, a South Korean current affairs critic, disagrees by using the performative verb I disagree with that and gives his reasons right after his expression of disagreement, which can mitigate the disagreement. Both S1 and S2 are of similar social status, but with high social distance. In this context, a formal TV talk show, participants are encouraged to express their points of view. As in Example 1, this type of disagreement would not be seen as impolite or face-threatening behaviour.

5.3.1-2 (from File 10: South Korea’s first female president)
S1: the alliance with the <spel> u s </spel> which was analysed as always been
there over the past few decades so it seems both countries are playing very similar card you can’t blame (.) like one blame the other because everyone seems to be quite similar

S2: <6> oh </6> i disagree with that because (.) after the third <7> nuclear </7> test i said the domestic audience is the most important

Similarly in Example 3, S5, a German fashion designer is talking about the problems in China’s fashion design market, and the other participants all initially agree with her. Then S5 claims that there’s a complete wrong direction in China. At this point, S3, a Chinese fashion designer, flatly rejects S5’s comments by uttering three nos in a row. However, this strong disagreement is mitigated by what she says after it.

5.3.1-3  (from File 17: Fashion design in China)

S5: =because that’s also something which has nothing to do with this … i think this has nothing to do actually with real designing a good collection where you also have to grow i’m sorry to say but the chinese shops i think also have to take their responsibility to play some order and to make a prepayment of thirty percent how everywhere in the world it’s sorry

S4: <7> yeah yes </7> <8> @@ yes </8> i guess <9> yes </9> <1> that’s a </1> <2> yes </2> <3> i i i'm doing </3><4> @@ </4>

S5: =there’s a complete wrong direction you understand if china goes in the designer have to be a retailer=

S3: =no no no that not what I’m saying it’s just that i think nicole’s idea is that we have to have more support from the the government

Using hedges.

Hedges are most commonly employed in mitigated disagreement in the data.
According to Maíz-Arévalo (2014), there are four main types of hedges: initial/mid-speech pauses (*Uhm, eh*), subject + verb minor clauses (*I think, I don’t think, it seems*), modal hedges (*maybe, probably*) and others (*somewhat, kind of*). In Example 4, one Chinese anchor and two guests (one is South Korean and one is Chinese) are sharing their opinions on the DPRK’s policy. S1, the Chinese anchor, interrupts S3, a Chinese research fellow, by saying *hey hey hey* like an old friend and then expresses his disagreement by using hedges like *I’m afraid* and *somehow*. S1 also shows respect to S3 by addressing him as *Mister Yang*. S3 responds *em-huh* without further argument. The laughter of S2, a Korean guest on the program, relaxes the atmosphere and S1’s utterance *we are not always on the same side* indicates they three often disagree with each other and this also functions as a kind of mitigation of his disagreement with Mr. Yang.

5.3.1-4  (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

*S1: <1> hey hey hey </1> in this area i'm afraid somehow disagree with you mister yang*

*S3: <2> em-huh </2>*

*S2: <2> @ @ @ </2>*

*S1: we are not always on the same <3> side </3>*

Hedges were identified as mitigating strategies and they were also combined with other mitigating strategies, such as giving explanations. In Example 5, S2, a Singaporean, uses hedges like the initial pause *hm* and subject plus verb minor clause *I don’t think that would happen* to express his disagreement and explains the reasons in the following adverbial clause of cause.

5.3.1-5  (from File 7: Singapore model)

*S1: ... the same is likely to occur in the () rest of asia so that the social unrest*
will take place because after all china plays a leading role in (. ) not only regional recovery but er the world=

S2: =hm i don't think that would happen because er in my own view? china cannot continue to gallop away (. ) er: economically

Expressing disagreement indirectly.

The speakers also express their disagreement in an indirect way. In Example 6, S2, a Korean, says I am not that pessimistic to express his different view from S3, a Chinese speaker. He does not use the explicit expression of disagreement such as disagree, no, I don’t think so or I don’t agree. He shows his disagreement indirectly by saying not that pessimistic. In Example 7, S1, a Chinese speaker, first interrupts S2, a Malaysian, by saying, excuse me and then he expresses the disagreement indirectly by saying there was a counter argument against your analysis.

5.3.1-6 (from File 11 DPRK’s brinkmanship tests obama’s patience)
S3: ... and meanwhile <om><article> u s </article> <spel> u s </spel> won't change what they er have been doing so (. ) in short er the window of opportunity for phone call has been passed=

S2: =i'm not that pessimistic i think (. ) er the problem for obama's (preventing) making a phone call is not

5.3.1-7 (from File 9: Muslim and modernization)
S2: ... er some of the european colonial powers were able to establish yeah ke-yeah er colonies all over the world they took advantage of (1) all the little little you know? feuds er you know? that were going on-

S1: excuse me there was a counter argument against YOUR analysis when it comes to er hh the division of a country and foreign invention
Using lead-in.

Example 8 is formal and there is high social distance among the six economic experts from four different countries. During a heated discussion, S1, the Chinese anchor, notices S5’s, an Indonesian intention to speak, and asks S5 to go ahead. S5 starts by saying, *I’d like to join this debate* as a lead-in for her disagreement. Then she expresses her disagreement explicitly by saying *I’d like to disagree with you*, but mitigates it by saying that she also agrees with the speaker in the latter part of her utterance. Her strategy of using a lead-in before and partial agreement after her expression of disagreement both function as mitigation in this formal heated discussion.

5.3.1-8 (from File 18: China’s one belt one road initiative)

*S1: =yes mari go ahead=
*S5: =yeah i i’d like to join this debate i’d like to disagree with you and concur with you that…*

Using positive remarks.

Example 9 shows how S1, a Chinese, comments positively before expressing his partial disagreement by saying *you sound (it) convincing.* Then the speaker also uses hedge the mid-speech pause *er* before stating his disagreement *except for the Libya model*.... The positive remarks mitigate the expression of disagreement and help face-saving.

5.3.1-9 (from File 9: Muslim and modernization)

*S1: <4> you sound it </4> convincing er except for the libya model*

In summary, in these China-ASEAN communication settings, participants are free to voice their own opinions. The noted disagreements were not necessarily considered
impolite or face-threatening. The expressions of disagreement were mitigated to a certain degree through the linguistic strategies of using hedges, lead-ins, giving explanation, giving positive remarks or expressing indirectly.

5.3.2 Terms of address.

Kirkpatrick (2010a) predicts that Asian cultural values might influence over Asian varieties of English in the area of addressing because people feel reluctant to adopt native English-speaking cultural norms when addressing people in English, as these norms offend their own cultural norms. This is what Li has called “pragmatic dissonance” (D. C. S. Li, 2002). For example, in China, students from primary school to university never call their teachers by their first names. The most common naming practice for a Chinese student is to refer to their teachers by using the title “Teacher” or “Teacher” plus the surname. This section focuses on the addressing practice of Chinese ELF users when they communicate with other Asian people. The data analysis examined if Chinese cultural values were adopted in the naming practice in China-ASEAN communication and to what extent they were adapted to fit the context.

As addressing practice is closely related with social status, the discussion considers the formality of the talk and the social distance of the speakers. As a result, four categories are listed (see Table 5.2). The related file topic and the number of speakers (number of Chinese speakers in brackets) are also listed.
Table 5.2.

**Categories of Formality and Social Distance of Asian ELF Speakers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Formality</th>
<th>Social distance</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>File No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Semi-informal</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7 (5 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 16: China’s next pop stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (5 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 17: Fashion in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3 (1 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 1: Beijing Olympic Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 6: China-Malaysian ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 7: The Singaporean model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 15: Implication of China’s re-emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Relatively low</td>
<td>3 (2 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 10: South Korea’s first female president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (2 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3 (1 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 12: Sino-Thai ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (4 Cn)</td>
<td>No. 18: China’s ‘one belt one road’ initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first category includes two relatively informal talk shows. The speakers, though from different backgrounds, have similar social status. They are sharing their experience of their work or life. However, as they are TV talk shows and thus more formal than casual conversation, they are classified as semi-formal. Not surprisingly, the speakers in this category address each other by their first names. In these semi-formal contexts, ELF speakers appear to follow native-speaker norms in the use of terms of address.

The second category includes three formal TV talk shows on political issues and one about the Olympic Games. The invited guests have or had high positions in their national governments, including Prime Minister, former Prime Minister, former minister and ambassador. The four Chinese in this category are anchors, who have a high social distance from their guests. How the Chinese anchors address their important guests in such formal settings deserves detailed study and comparison with Chinese social norms. The Chinese anchors include the title, full name and the position of their guests when they introduce them at the beginning of the program. This accords with Chinese norms. Here
are some examples:

- you are watching dialogue with mister goh chok tong former prime minister of singapore (from File No. 7)
- welcome back as well with us here we have h.e. mister prime minister from malaysia prime minister (.) najib tun razak (from File No. 6)
- on my right hand is erm ambassador of maldive mister latheef and one on my left hand is the minister counselor of malaysia e- em- embassy mister lim juay jin (from File No. 1)
- today i feel quite honoured to interview mister george yeo yong-boon former minister for foreign affairs of Singapore (from File No. 15)

However, the Chinese anchors addressed their guests differently during their interaction. For example, the female anchor in File No. 6 uses Mister Prime Minister five times and Prime Minister once to address Malaysian Prime Minister Najib Razak. She does not use his name except in the introduction. This naming practice shows respect to the recipient and accords to Chinese norms. The two male anchors in File No.1 and No. 7 use similar terms of address by using the “Mister + surname” format most of the time. For example, Mister Goh what do you think of the major theme of this er annual conference (File No. 7). As Mister Goh Chok Tong is the former Prime Minister of Singapore and not in office any more, the Chinese anchor in File No. 7 addressing him Mister Goh would be accepted in Chinese culture. However, the Chinese anchor in File No. 1 (see example below) uses Mister Latheef, although he is still in office as an ambassador, while the guest from Malaysia always addresses him as Ambassador Latheef. The terms of address Ambassador Latheef is more appropriate in Chinese cultural norms, both because Latheef is still working as an ambassador and because he has higher social status than the anchor.

SI (Chinese): can you in- just introduce just some of the competitors of mister
In File No. 15, the guest is the former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Singapore and the Chinese anchor calls him by his first name George three times and Sir two times during their interaction. There is no other address with the title except in the introduction: Mister George Yeo Yong-Boon former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Singapore. It would be impossible to address a former minister by his first name in Chinese culture. Therefore, it can be assumed that the Chinese anchor has adopted English-speaking norms in this case, possibly influenced by the British and American educational background of George Yeo Yong-Boon.

The third category includes two formal TV talk shows. Unlike the second category, the participants in these talk shows have relatively low social distance. They comprise TV anchors, a current affairs critic and columnist, and a research fellow, and the discussion is on current political issues. The Chinese anchors in these two talk shows are different people: a female anchor in File 10 and a male anchor in File 11, whereas the two guests are the same people in both talk shows: one Korean current affairs critic and one Chinese research fellow. When the anchors introduce their guests to the audience at the beginning, they include the titles and full names of the guests. During their interaction, the female anchor in File 10 uses “Mister + surname” for the Chinese research fellow and “Doctor + surname” for the Korean current affairs critic all through the talk. However, the male anchor in file No. 11 addresses the same guests as in File 10 differently. He addresses both by using “Mister + surname” during most of the interaction. He also addresses the Korean current affairs critic by his first name Sunny two times in the talk and uses gentlemen when addressing both of them at the same time. The female anchor is
following Chinese cultural norms in this context, while the male anchor changes his address strategy for different guests. For the Chinese guest, the male anchor still keeps the Chinese norms, but follows the English-speaking norms on occasion when addressing the Korean guest.

In Category 4, the two formal talks involve participants from different cultural backgrounds and social status, including native English speaking countries, such as the U.K and the U.S. The address norms the Chinese adopt in such a mixed ELF setting deserves careful study. In file No. 12, one of the two guests is former President of the National Assembly in Thailand, and the other is a current affairs commentator from the US. When the Chinese anchor first addresses the Thai guest at the beginning of the talk, he uses the respectful title Your Excellency. However, this appears only once. The Chinese anchor does not use any terms of address for the Thai guest during the rest of the talk, except that he addresses both the American and Thai guests by their first names at the same time: Excuse me, Yongyut and Laurence since nineteen thirty…. In contrast, the Chinese anchor addresses the American guests by his first name four times throughout the interaction. The more frequent use of the first name when addressing the American guest implies that the Chinese anchor may feel it is more natural to use first names to address native speakers. Another interesting feature in this talk is how the three participants, a Chinese, an American and a Thai refer to other people with high social status. For example, when they talk about the Thai Prime Minister, the Thai guest uses “President + first name” as in President Yingluck; the American uses first name Yingluck only; and the Chinese sometimes uses “Mister + first name” as in Mister Thaksin but most of the time uses the first name Yingluck only. However, the Chinese uses “President + full name” as in President Xi Jinping when referring to the Chinese President. Both the Thai and the American keep their own cultural norms when referring to other people and the
Chinese seems to switch between norms. File 18 is a panel discussion involving one Chinese anchor, three Chinese experts in economics, one American banker, one British senior fellow and one former Minister from Indonesia. The Chinese anchor addresses the guests following the English speaking norms by using their first names only.

In summary, in the specific China-ASEAN communication settings, the use of the terms of address by Chinese speakers may vary according to the formality of setting, the social distance between the participants and the speaker’s cultural backgrounds (Category 1). In informal settings, participants with low social distance may call each other by their first names. In formal settings, Chinese speakers generally would follow Chinese cultural norms in addressing others using titles or at least with Mister. However, there were also some instances of addressing using first names, which did not conform to Chinese cultural norms (Category 2 and 3). During communication among people who have different social distances and cultural backgrounds, the Chinese speakers tried to keep a balance between different norms by using different terms of address for the same person (Category 4). The Chinese anchors generally adopted Chinese cultural norms when addressing Chinese, while using English speaking norms when addressing native speakers. As most of the examples in this study came from Chinese anchors on TV talk shows, there were limitations in terms of the number of Chinese speakers and the contextual range. Further research should engage a larger number of speakers and a wider range of situational contexts in order to provide a more comprehensive view.

5.3.3 Cross-cultural awareness.

Cross-cultural awareness is part of the cultural factors listed in the sociocultural competence components (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). Cross-cultural awareness includes the awareness of cultural similarities and differences and the strategies for cross-cultural
communication. In this section, the concept of intercultural awareness (ICA) proposed by Baker (2012) is considered in light of the fluid and dynamic communicative practices of ELF. Baker (2012) illustrates detailed components of three levels of ICA, from a basic understanding of cultural context (Level 1), to a more complex understanding of language and culture (Level 2), and finally to the fluid, hybrid and emergent understanding of cultures in ELF settings (Level 3). Based on these three levels of ICA, the discussion of the cross-cultural awareness in this section falls into three categories: first, the awareness of cultural similarities and differences; second, the awareness of the relative nature of cultural norms and the multiple perspectives within any cultural groupings; and third, the ability to go beyond cultural stereotypes and to negotiate between different frames of reference.

**The awareness of cultural similarities and differences.**

This basic level of cultural awareness includes the awareness of culture as shared behaviours, beliefs, and values, the role of culture and context in meaning interpretation and the ability to compare different cultures (W. Baker, 2012). ELF speakers need to understand others’ cultures as well as their own and be able to compare and relate different cultures in their communication. In Example 1, S2, a Malaysian is talking about the way to deal with intractable problems between countries: *to put them aside and work on things that can lead to results*. S1, a Chinese anchor, then asks: *Is it in Asian culture?* This question shows that S1 is sensitive to cultural differences and similarities. S2 agrees that it is part of Asian culture. However, Asian culture is an overly generalised concept, as there are many countries in Asia with distinctive cultural features.

5.3.3-1 (from File 6: China-Malaysian Ties)

*S2: <9> i </9> i agree with you i think er () if there are some rather: () er*
intractable problem or seemingly intractable problems (.) then er we should put those
problems aside (.) put those problems on the back burner for a while (.) you know
and and work on things that can (.) lead to: results

S1: *is it in asian culture?*

S2: yeah it's part of asian cul- but it's it's a very (.) pragmatic way

Similar examples were also found in File 7 when the Chinese anchor asked the
former Prime Minister of Singapore for his opinion. The first question refers to the
cultural similarity between China and Singapore, and the second to the cultural
similarities in Asia in general. What the similarities are, are not explicitly illustrated in
the context; nevertheless, the participants, who are both Asian, know the relevant meaning
in such a specific context.

5.3.3-2 (from File 7: Singaporean model)

S1: ... *i would like to have YOUR prospect because for a large degree singapore
and china (.) from the cultural perspective (.) share a lot of similarities and we don't
see any immediate danger of having social unrest like ...*

S1: ... *to what degree do you think er er:m the er: asian economies can be based
on the own understanding of their own unique cultural similarities*

Example 3 also demonstrates the understanding of the Asian ELF speakers of
cultural similarities. S2, a Korean, mentions that *this year is the 60th anniversary of the
end of the Korean war* and later he emphasizes the importance of “sixty years” in Asian
culture. The other two speakers in the talk are Chinese and the implied importance of
“sixty years” can be understood without explanation. According to the traditional Chinese
calendar, a 60-year cycle is a cycle of the Stems-and-Branches, which is important in
calendrical systems in Chinese-influenced Asian nations, such as Japan, Korea and
Vietnam. The emphasis of S2 on the “60-years” shows his understanding of the cultural
similarities among the speakers.
5.3.3-3  (from File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship test Obama’s patience)

S2: ... er many people forget that this year is the sixtieth anniversary of the end of the korean war actually it's not ended it's technical still <7> at war </7>

S1: <7> un-huh </7>
S3: <7> yeap </7>

S2: north korea with the so north korea for the last twenty years haven't been negotiating between united states too er the the the the the truth in the peace treaty as mister yang said and then it takes up (prostrated) at this year for ASIANS sixty years is very important () so they want to change that ...

The awareness of multiple perspectives within any cultural grouping.

The second level ICA according to Baker is advanced cultural awareness, including the awareness of the relative nature of cultural norms. There are multiple voices or perspectives within any cultural grouping and thus, there is a possibility of a mismatch between specific cultures (W. Baker, 2012). In example 4, S2, a Maldivian, is talking about the behaviour of the Chinese sportsmen when winning the gold medal at the Olympic Games. He first claims that it is rare to see Chinese players showing emotion. However, last night’s champion totally cracking down, which is something that’s not seen among sports people in China. S1, a Chinese speaker, agrees, saying the sportsman is crying, yeah. S2 continues by describing the fact that in this Olympics somehow many of them have started to show their emotions after winning and then he expresses his opinion: which is something very humane and expected at this level when you win Olympic gold for the first time. From this ELF interaction, S2 realizes the change of cultural schemas regarding the Chinese sportsman’s behaviour. Chinese players seldom show emotion, even the emotion of excitement and happiness when winning the gold medal at the
Olympics. This may be the result of traditional Chinese culture, which considers it is appropriate to have emotion self-control. However, S2 noticed that many of the Chinese sportsmen began to show emotion in this Olympics and he claimed it was natural for sportsmen to release their emotions. S2’s observation and comments demonstrate his sensitivity in the change of cultural schemas and his willingness to revise his cultural understanding. Culture is not fixed, but changeable and relative in nature.

5.3.3-4  (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)

S2: <4> you </4> surely what you don’t see among chinese players (.) is them showing emotion
S1: yes=
S2: =er which is very rare last night you you could see ma lin totally <5> cracking down </5>
S1: <5> is crying </5> yeah
S2: which is something that's not er seen er among sports people in in china
S1: yes
S2: er they they they don't show this usually but in this olympics somehow many of them have started to er to show their emotions after winning (.) erm: which is something very humane and i think which is expected at this level when you win olympic gold for the first time and <whispering> things there is </whispering>

In Example 5, the guests are asked about their parents’ attitudes towards their choice of becoming a pop singer. It is interesting to compare the parents’ views, as they grew up in three different countries, the U.S, Malaysia and China, while sharing the same ethnic cultural background, Chinese. S3 is a Chinese American who grew up in the United States. He talks about his parents as typical Chinese parents who want him to be a doctor or a lawyer. However, S3 continued and said that his parents were happy that he actually found one thing that he really wanted to do and they support him. His parents were worried, not because he wanted to be a pop singer, but he himself had no idea what to do with his life.
When S3 decided on a career in music, his parents were happy and supported him even though it was not what the typical Chinese parents expect. Therefore, S1, the Chinese anchor comments that they are quite open-minded.

S6, is a Malaysian girl from an ethnic Chinese family. She also mentioned that she was born in a very typical family and what her parents’ hoped for her was to be very healthy, study well, get a very good job and get married. This is also a typical and traditional Chinese parents’ expectation toward their children, especially girls. S6 does not mention how her parents felt when she changed her mind to become a singer. S4, a Chinese who grew up in Mainland China, also mentions his mother’s shock at his decision by saying: quit your job at Harvard? Then S4 says that I think they believe in me because I am old enough to make my own decisions, which shows how his parents are open-minded and supportive of him. The ideology of Chinese parents hoping for bright future for their children is similar wherever they live: to obtain a well-paid job and be married. However, some changes can found in this stereotype from the examples. The parents did not remain “typical Chinese parents” when their children decided to make their own decisions. They were more open-minded and supportive than the typical traditional Chinese parents, and respect the choice of their children to be pop singers, which has not been considered a good job for most traditional Chinese parents.

5.3.3-5 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)

S2: so (.) tell me what is your parents think you know you have a year of academic and classical trained pianist

S3: yeah

S2: and mom and dad i wanna be a pop singer well @@@@@

S3: they were worried because they had no idea what i wanted to do like they wanted me to be a doctor or a lawyer you know a typical you know chinese parents but er they have no idea what i really want to and er i <8> think that </8>
S1: <8> you know </8> what you want to
S3: i had no idea at that point either but <i> i think they were happy that i actually (<i>) found one thing that i really wanted to do </i>) and i wanna to spend time and energy on so <i> i think they support me </i>) and they are happy you know doing what i'm doing now

S1: <9> quite </9> open-minded <9/9> i should say
S2: <9> yeah </9>

S1: what about in malaysia jess
S6: yeah erm actually as i was born in a very typical family my parents are businessman and businesswoman they have their own=
S1: =are you also from a family of <1> ethnic minority </1>
S2: <1> like ethnic chinese </1>

S6: yeah: yeah chinese (<i>) so erm: what my parents' hope is very healthy and you study well get a very good job and then spend your entire life yeah and <2> get married </2>
S1: <2> okay </2>
S2: <2> @@@ </2>

... ...

S1: =yeah but we haven't haven't yet heard from you guys what about your parents' attitudes at that time (<i>) when you decided to hey quit my routine job you know
S4: yeah (<i>) i i think my mom was like er: you want to go to china? and quit your job at harvard?
S2: at harvard
S5: @@

S4: but (1) er they <i> they think that er i think they believe in me </i>) because i am old enough to make my own decisions so i basically came to beijing with no job offer with i do not have i didn't have many friends back then so i start like little by little and
S1: erm

The ability to negotiate between different frames of reference.
The highest level of ICA (W. Baker, 2012) is not just awareness, but also the ability to relate cultural frames of reference to emergent and hybrid intercultural communication, to move beyond cultural stereotypes and to negotiate and mediate between dynamic resources in intercultural communication. In ELF settings, “such abilities enable ELF users to cope with the diversity and fluidity of intercultural communication in which cultural frames of reference cannot be defined a priori” (W. Baker, 2012, p. 67).

In the following example, S1, a Chinese anchor, and S2, a Malaysian, are talking about how religion impacts social and economic development. They have different views on this topic, specifically in regard to Islam. This example shows how they negotiate different cultural frames of reference, especially regarding religion. S1 believes that Confucianism contributes greatly to prosperity in Asia. S2 indicates he does not share the same view by saying that no religion in Southeast Asia is an impediment to economic development. Then S1 continues to compare Confucianism and Islam in terms of contributions to industrialization. S1 considers Confucianism more practical and not so spiritual while Islam is quite against secularization or industrialization. These cultural frames of reference are not accepted by S2 as he expresses his disagreement by saying I think that is a misconception, and gives two reasons for his argument from the perspective of Islamic history. There is a mismatch between the speakers’ cultural understandings. Both speakers, even though they hold different ideas, are sincere and try their best to negotiate their understanding of the religions in Asia by providing examples from the present and history. Although their discussion did not lead to a consensus, their willingness and openness to exchange ideas could make the discussion a learning process and lead to a potential revision of personal cultural conceptions.

5.3.3-6 (from File 5: Islam and secularization)
S1: ...we BELIEVE here (.) the confucianism has played a proactive role in er CULTIVATING what we call the er chinese entrepreneurship (.) and i believe this is also contributed a lot to the prosperity (.) er in south east asia what do you make of our concern in er er the relationship (.) between economic prosperity and the religion (.) regarding confucianism

S2: ...i did not think that any of the religions in south east asia (.) islam buddhism christianity hinduism and confucianism? as a sort of civic religion (.) i do not think that any of the religions in south east asia is an IMPEDIMENT to economic development it is not

S1: but the er (.) in our estimation and observation we believe confucianism compared with other (.) major schools of thoughts (.) hh emphasizes a lot on er your attitude towards this WORLD er meaning it's very PRACTICAL it means you’re NOT er so spiritual you have to (1) work very HARD to make your living to make money to become RICH (.) now for muslims in particular (.) by nature (.) we believe (1) that muslim is quite AGAINST secularization or industrialization and therefore people may NOT work as hard as those who have a strong background of confucianism what do you think of this concern

S2: i think that is a misconception (.) and why do i say that for two reasons because if you look at (1) islamic civilization in the PAST (.) ...

S1 expresses his opinion by using the first person plural form we as in we believe here the Confucianism has played a proactive role ... and then using I believe in the next part of the sentence. S1 also uses plural form in his next turn by saying in our estimation and observation we believe ... It seems S1 wants to claim that this idea is shared by most people in China by using the collective pronoun we and he also shows he agrees by using I. The other possible reason for S1 using the plural form pronoun is to weaken the tone. The plural form “we” is more general and vague than the singular form “I” when expressing the opposite point of view. It seems to help avoid direct confrontation between two speakers with opposite views as religion can be a very sensitive topic. In ELF
communication, the attitude and the skills to negotiate and mediate cultural differences are very important.

Example 7 is a discussion of a new fashion collection by participants from different cultural backgrounds and it shows a mismatch between specific sub-cultures, along with various perspectives within cultural groupings. S5 is a German fashion designer, who is explaining that her collection is a sleeping wear collection. Both of the anchors, S2, an American, and S1, a Chinese, are surprised and laugh. S1’s question do you wear something like that to sleep indicates that the sleep-wear is not the same concept of “sleep-wear” in their mind as they are very artistic. S2 is joking that this artistic sleep-wear might be useful if running into somebody in the early morning. Then all participants (5 in total) laughed. At this point, S5 explains that she has been inspired by Chinese culture, that is, a lot of people walking around in the sleeping wear in the village. S2 feels surprised at S5’s explanation and asks yes? This shows that the aspect of Chinese culture described by S5 does match the “Chinese culture” in S2’s mind. S1, at this stage, thinks of a similar phenomenon in Shanghai and refers to it as THAT culture with emphasis, which is explicitly described by S2 as crossing the street in Shanghai in a pyjama.

5.3.3-7 (from File 17: Fashion in China)

S2: =there are artistic some very artistic elements to it=

... ...

S5: this is a sleeping wear collection <3> @@ </3>

S2: <3> @@@ </3>

S1: do you wear something like like that to sleep?=

S2: =@@ you never say they are artistry looked like stripes on the sleeping wear=

S5: =yes=

S2: if you get up and () someone's been running to you it happens=

SS: @@@

S5: =no actually it’s more you know i i have to say i wasn't maybe a little bit inspired by chinese culture also that i yeah i i had my show on <pvc> chengyi </pvc> last year and a lot of people working around in the sleeping wear in the village yes=

S2: =yes?

S1: i'm in shanghai you know we talk a lot about that in <4> twenty ten </4> when people said they were not quite used to THAT culture but maybe with your design (,) <5> it’s okay </5>

S2: <4> @@@ </4> <5> right you don’t </5> have to worry about crossing the street in shanghai in a pyjama if you are <6> wearing that </6>

S1: <6> absolutely yeah <6> ... 

In this interaction, there are two mismatches of frames of reference. First is the mismatch of the concept of sleep-wear. The new collection of sleep-wear is thought to be too artistic and trendy when compared with normal sleep-wear. In fact, this is a fashion design show and the unexpected can be expected in new designs. However, the designer’s explanation (S5) leads to another mismatch about an aspect of Chinese culture. What S5 describes as “Chinese culture” is only part of a sub-culture in the village she mentioned, or in part of Shanghai, or some other cities in China. This does not match S2’s knowledge of “Chinese culture”. When the mismatch happens, the participants actively try and resolve the situation. They ask questions, such as do you wear something like that to sleep? (S1) In addition, the Chinese culture or THAT culture in this context is an emergent frame of reference, referring to walking in the street in a pair of pyjamas. As long as the participants realize and agree on the “new meaning” of the term, they are able to keep the communication flowing.

This section of the chapter has discussed the sociocultural competence of Asian ELF speakers in China-ASEAN communication contexts, concerning the strategies used to disagree with others, the use of terms of address and cross-cultural awareness. The
findings show that Asian ELF users are free to express their disagreement in these settings and disagreements mitigated with hedges and explanations are common and not necessarily considered face-threatening. Second, the use of terms of address by Chinese ELF speakers may vary according to the formality of settings, social distance between the speakers and the cultural background of the recipient. Chinese norms of naming practices are not always strictly followed. Third, these Asian ELF users demonstrated cross-cultural awareness. This cross-cultural awareness/intercultural awareness was studied in terms of three levels. The Asian ELF users had an awareness of cultural similarities and differences, which was the basic level of cross-cultural awareness. They also realized that cultures change and presented multiple perspectives, and thus were not restricted by cultural stereotypes. At the highest level, the Asian ELF users were skillful in negotiating cultural differences.

5.4 Discourse Competence

In this research, focus was given towards conversational structure and coherence, including how to collaborate and backchannel, how to manage topics and how to use linguistic signals to make the spoken discourse cohere.

5.4.1 Backchannels.

“Backchannels are signals, including verbal and non-verbal) used to indicate to the primary speaker that he/she can continue talking or that the interlocutor is listening and interested in what is being said” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 139). Backchannels were reported by Cogo and Dewey (2012) as one of the interactional strategies of ELF users aimed at showing engagement and listenership. In the China-ASEAN ELF communication settings used in this study, a large number of examples of backchannels were identified, such as mhm, yeah, yes, right, ok, etc. Backchannels can also be used to
elicit more conversation from the speaker (Sacks & Jefferson, 1995), and they can also display the attitudes and intentions of the listeners.

In Example 1, the three people, S1, a Chinese anchor, S2, a Maldivian and S3, a Malaysian are talking about the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympic Games. S1 uses “yeah” as a backchannel frequently in this interaction to signal his interest and attention. S1 sometimes backchannels, together with laughter, and uses short responses like *I’m sure*. The backchannels used by S1 are latched onto S2’s turn, without any pauses in between, making the interaction flow naturally.

5.4.1-1 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)

S2: *er i think er in all opening ceremonies er lighting the fire or the lamp er*=

S3: <1> the torch </1>

S2: <1> the torch </1> is the=

S1: =yeah=

S2: is the most er: (1) anticipated part of the opening ceremony

S1: =yeah=

S2: er: in every opening ceremony they try to make it as unique as possible and it is a well-guarded secret

S3: @@

S2: until the last moment hh and er we were initially wondering where the torch was=

S1: =<@> yeah </@>= <2> i'm sure </2>

S2: and <2> we couldn't see any </2> if you look around er and we have always er wanted to see when this surprise would happen er but everybody was so occupied with what was happening on the on the ground that no one really saw how the things suddenly turned up =

S1: =<@> yeah </@>=

In the following Example, S2, a Filipino government official, is talking about the measures needed to prevent natural disasters in his country. S1, a Chinese interviewer, is
using various backchannels, including *ok, mhm, yeah, yes* to indicate S2 can continue talking, and also to signal that she is listening. S1 sometimes uses two backchannels at the same time like *mhm, yeah*. The backchannels often overlap naturally with the main speaker’s turn.

5.4.1 (from File 3: disaster prevention)

S2: <slow> <6> we </6> can already (.) classify as something that it's kind of safe in terms of (.) the magnitude of an earthquake </slow>

S1: *ok*

S2: and er we likewise pass er a structural goal=

S1: =*ok*=

S2: that (.) provides (.) the the minimum standard=

S1: =*mhm*=

S2: for a high rise building (.) to ensure protection to our people (.) and avoid again the loss of lives hh and (.) we are now because of this law=

S1: =*mhm*=

S2: we are avoiding any structure (.) to be built in (.) in fault line (.) and we've learned somewhat from an incident in in in china

S1: *mhm* <7> yeah </7>

S2: <7> where </7> a school building a good number of <8> kids </8> died because the school building was located on top of a fault line=

S1: <8> yeah </8> =*yes*=

S2: and and we are trying to educate the people (1) not (1) to somewhat believe in what they see in MOVIES because these things are exaggerated huh=

S1: =*ok*=

S2: and er er we are trying to educate our people likewise (.) (into) the lower government and listen to the village (.) of the very zone from where=

S1: =*mhm*=

S2: the fault line is

S1: *yeah*

There were many other examples of backchannels being frequently used by other
Asian ELF users in this subset, including Malaysians and Japanese. The frequent use of backchannels occurs in both formal and informal settings. However, not all the interactions involved frequent backchannels. In this subset of 18 files, eight interactions involved frequent backchannels, like the examples above, with backchannels occurring at the end of most sentences or in the mid of sentences. However, in seven interactions of from the 18 files, ELF users applied backchannels only occasionally; and backchannels were seldom used in the remaining three interactions. This reinforces the notion that backchannel use is a function of personal interaction. The same speaker, the female Chinese in File 6 and File 10, uses backchannels frequently. However, in contrast, the male Chinese in Files 7, 8, 9 and 18 does not use backchannels in his interactions. The Malaysian in Files 8 and 9 uses backchannels occasionally, even though his interlocutors seldom or never use backchannels in these interactions.

5.4.2 Echoing.

Echoing means that the listener repeats the phrases or sentences just said by other interlocutors. Echoing is different from repetition, which refers to the repetition made by the speaker himself/herself in order to be better understood. Listeners repeat or echo part of the sentence for various communication purposes.

To agree.

In the following example, when S3, a Malaysian, finishes saying this game is the game of China, which is followed by laughter, S1, a Chinese speaker takes the turn as the sentence looks to be completed and begins his sentence: that’s why.... Then the continued utterance by S3 being dominated by Chinese players is overlapped with S1’s new turn. However, S1 stops what he is saying and echoes what S3 said by Chinese player and shows his agreement by adding yeah, that is true. Then S1 continues. In this interaction,
S1 echoes part of S3’s utterance to show agreement.

5.4.2-1 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)
S3: so actually @ it's it's only right to say that actually this game is the=
S1: =yes=
S3: =the game of china @@ <7> being dominated </7> by by by chinese players=
S1: <7> that's why </7> =by chinese players yeah that is true because we call the table tennis our national sports and ...

There are several similar examples to demonstrate how echoing indicates agreement and the supportive attitude of the listener. In Example 2, S2 summarizes what S3 has said by saying she paved the road. Then, S3 echoes exactly the same sentence to show her agreement with S2. In Examples 3 and 4, S1 uses backchannels yeah together with echoing to show agreement with what has been said.

5.4.2-2 (from File 17: Fashion design in China)
S3: ... then it'll push us to grow faster or to move forward like exception itself that brand along has been in the chinese market for at least twenty years so to to to us(.) she is the model that we look up to
SS: <4> @@ </4>
S2: <6> right </6> she paved the road=
S3: =she paved the road=
S2: =yeah=

5.4.2-3 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)
S2: <6> remarkably </6> er: they've broken three world records er: (.) and the er (.) the chinese are also er (.) gradually coming in er into er new new sports=
S1: =yeah new sports

5.4.2-4 (from File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)
S2: but then @ (.) also there are others who said you know er he is young and
S1: yeah he is young

To confirm.

Echoing can also serve to confirm. In Example 5, S2 echoes in Guangzhou and says alright to indicate the information is well received and confirmed. In Example 6, S1 not only echoes the exact utterance you cannot go down, but further paraphrases it's the bottom line in order to confirm what S2 said and show her understanding.

5.4.2-5 (from File 2: China-ASEAN economic and trade relations seminar)
S2: <fast> so </fast> you're staying here
S1: yeah i base in guangzhou
S2: in guangzhou <1> alright </1>

5.4.2-6 (from File 3: Disaster Prevention)
S2: you can go up (.) but <4> you cannot go down </4> yes
S1: <4> you cannot go down </4> it's the bottom line

To emphasize.

Echoing can also be used to emphasize what has been said. S1, in the following example, emphasizes S6’s comments by echoing, sing loudly. The emphasis also shows S1’s agreement.

5.4.2-7 (from File 16: China's next pop stars)
S6: life happens in unexpected way so just do whatever you want just enjoy and

sing loudly

S1: SING LOUDLY

S6: yeah
In short, echoing serves the functions of agreement, confirmation and emphasis in these China-ASEAN ELF communication contexts.

5.4.3 Referencing.

Rather than repeating the last word or phrase of the utterance, these ELF users may repeat or quote the words or phrases mentioned earlier in the speech of other interlocutors. This is what is termed “referencing” in this study. Referencing means that the listeners refer to or “quote” the key words or some terms the speakers have mentioned and use them in their following question or statement for further elaboration and comments. It is also used as a link to change topic. This is a strategy of ELF users to show they understand and to make the discourse coherent.

Asking for elaboration.

In Example 1, S1, the Chinese anchor, quotes the words the potential in order to ask S2, a Malaysian, to elaborate further.

5.4.3-1  (from File 6: China-Malaysian Ties)

S2: er: this this project () indicates er: in the sense how far we've come () and the potential that relationship () er in in real tangible terms

S1: tell me about the potential then

As a link to change topic.

Quoted words can also serve as a link to change a topic. In Example 2, S1, the Chinese anchor, quotes the term political understanding in order to take the turn smoothly.
and lead into a new topic, the new generation of leaders.

5.4.3-2 (from File 6: China-Malaysian Ties)

S2: er telecommunication er in many new new areas <4> and </4> the erm ()
political understanding also is very good () between er: our leaders

S1: <4> right </4> interesting to talk about political understanding because it really reminded me () of the year nineteen seventy-four in which your father () then the second prime minister of malaysia did sign a very historical document with the chinese premier of that time ... how can () your generation of leaders both in china and in Malaysia () strengthen further () the relations between the two countries and bring it to a HIGHER level?

A similar case is found in Example 3 when S1 interrupts S3 by referring to the term “multi-faceted”. S1 explains the term again to make the meaning clear: you sing in first place and then you write your own songs and play an instrument. Then he asks a question related to the term: is this what is required of a singer these days? He further paraphrases his question to indicate his implied meaning: competition is fiercer than any time before. This use of referencing helps make the discourse coherent.

5.4.3-3 (fromFile 16: China's next pop stars)

S3: ... and after that there were likely that we can develop you into somebody who you think you know is a multi-faceted you can produce you can write you can sing and you can do a lot of stuff that erm a lot of people wish they could do here in china that was my company told me ...

S1: so you mention the word multi-faceted

S3: erm hum

S1: you you you sing () in first place () and then you write your own songs and play an instrument () is this what is required of a singer these days I mean you are lucky in living in this age but at the same time competition is fiercer than any time before jess?
To make a comment.

In many cases, speakers use a term or words mentioned by others in order to make their own comments. They may show partial agreement as in example 4 or disagreement as in Example 5. Referencing is also used to further elaborate or emphasize the referrers’ point of view, as shown in Examples 6 and 7.

In Example 4, S1 asks a question using the idiom of olive branch, which means making peace. S3, another Chinese in the dialogue, understands the idiom and quotes it in his answer to show his partial agreement by saying it’s a sort of olive branch. Then, he further explains that another purpose is to test the water.

5.4.3-4 (from File 10: South Korea first female president)

S1: in south korea what's she this time (.) mister <1> yang </1> (.) extending an olive <2> branch </2> to pyongyang
S3: <1> mhm </1> <2> mhm </2> well er it's a sort of olive branch and as well it's a gesture designed to test the water er you know

In Example 5, when S2, a Thai speaker, discusses their policy of separating economics from politics, S1, a Chinese speaker, quotes S2’s expression politics aside… economic cooperation with slight deviation as put politics aside… economic collaboration in order to clarify what S2 is saying and then shows his disagreement by saying: I think it is very difficult.

5.4.3-5 (from File 12: Sino-Thai ties and diplomacy in Asia)

S2: <9> yes yeah er </9> in the principal we talk with economic politic and social (1) and now we try to mix together (1) er the (.) politics (.) unstable (.) is make er the economic trouble (1) therefore i think it's now we can separate (.) for a while and <10> when the yeah politics aside yeah economic cooperation </10>
S1: <10> we put politics aside we talk about economic collaboration </10>
i think it is very difficult because er almost all of the er outsiders expect china to enjoy social er stabilities so that their investments would enjoy good benefit good return
In Example 6, when S3 answers S1’s question, he quotes the term *trust building process* and comments on it: *smart... and a large room to imagine* and further expresses his point of view. The same speaker in Example 7 also uses the same strategy by referencing *responsibility* and comments on it as a *meaningful and good term* and then talks more about the current situation.

5.4.3-6 (from File 10: South Korea first female president)

*S1:* ...but mister yang (.) let’s just be a little bit realistic here er she's been though talking about *trust building process* what (.) have <9> been </9> the promises (.) made by south korea to (.) <spel> d p r k </spel> and to what extent do you think (.) seoul will really be able to keep those promises ... but are those expectations (.) <soft> practical </soft>

*S3:* <8> <coughs> </8> <9> <coughs> </9> well er i think the term of *trust building process* is very smart because er: on one hand er: the term provides er: a large room enough to imagine what can er what will contain <1> (in such) </1>

5.4.3-7 (from File 10: South Korea first female president)

*S1:* it is making its own decisions on the other hand what are the *responsibilities* mister <2> yang </2> of other important players in terms of the six-party talks what kind of attitude they need to show (.) to <spel> d p r k </spel> (.) so that the process (.) can go on in terms of bringing peace <3> back </3> to the korean peninsula if very possible

*S3:* <2> <sniffs> </2> <3> yeah </3> yeah i think just now you used very er *meaningful and good term* say *responsibility* say what kind of *responsibilities* china should take under the current complicated and dangerous situation

In summary, referencing is an effective way to make verbal discourse coherent. Listeners can quote and refer back to phrases and words mentioned earlier in order to ask for elaboration, use them as a link to change topic or make further comments on the relevant topic.
5.4.4 Topic change and management.

This section discusses how the anchors in TV interviews managed and changed the topic. In TV interviews, usually it is the anchor who takes the initiative to ask questions and change the topic. In live TV talk shows, anchors need to cover the planned topics in a limited time frame, while ensuring guests fully express their points of view. They need to know when and how to change the topic naturally, how to balance the discussion and the different viewpoints, and how to run the interviews without losing control of time.

The focus here was on the programs with one anchor and two guests, as it was more illuminating to observe interactions among three participants compared to only two speakers. The three participants may argue with each other and take initiative to take turns to express their ideas. Thus the role of anchors is more crucial and diversified in such settings. This section presents the analysis of two talks with three participants as case study. Case One is File 1, where participants of high social distance talked about the Olympic Games in a semi-formal context. Case Two is File 11 where participants of lower social distance were discussing a serious political topic in a formal setting (see Table 5.3).

Table 5.3.

Details of the Two Files for Topic Management Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Formality</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case One:</td>
<td>S1: Chinese, anchor</td>
<td>Beijing Olympic Games</td>
<td>Semi-formal</td>
<td>33 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File 1</td>
<td>S2: Maldivian, Ambassador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3: Malaysian, Minister counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Two:</td>
<td>S1: Chinese, anchor</td>
<td>DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>28 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File 11</td>
<td>S2: Korean, current affairs commentator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3: Chinese, research fellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study 1. (File 1: Beijing Olympic Games)

In this talk, one Chinese anchor is talking about the Beijing Olympic Games with two guests, who are government officials working in Beijing during the Beijing Olympic Games. They have high social distance, as S2 enjoys high social status as an ambassador, while S1 is an unknown Chinese anchor from a government website program. S3 is a Minister Counsellor of Malaysia stationed in Beijing, whose official rank is lower than that of S2. They share their personal experiences and opinions on sports. This talk can be categorized as semi-formal as it is not as casual as a daily conversation, nor as formal as a serious political discussion. The Chinese anchor covers five major topics and asks a total of 21 questions in the 33-min talk. For all the five major topics, he provides background information or his personal experience. In this way, the anchor is able to clearly signal the change of topic. For example:

Question 1: (prior knowledge + question)

S1: ... first of all (.) i know both of you have watched the opening ceremony of the beijing olympic games could you please give your im- brief (.) impression about the (.) ceremony

Question 2: (prior knowledge + question)

S1: and during this olympic games we have made so many (.) <smacks lips> great achievements (.) and i know mister latheef has used to be one of the athletes of table tennis for his nation for his country and er last night we just er (.) watched the men's single table tennis final (.) how you think about this game?

Question 3: (summary + question)

S1: ok when we finish talking about the table tennis er: i just want to ask you er is there any other sports items you are interested in?

Question 4: (experience + question)

S1: er erm i know mister latheef you have come to many of the stadiums (.) for the olympic games and you have (.) erm clearly see the face to face see the volunteers services and all the organization works our (1) our governments and our people do for the olympic games (.) could you just give us a brief introduction about this and say what's your opinion on on (.) er (.) all of this
Question 5: (summary + question)

S1: okay (. ) thank you for you to come up with china talks to sharing your olympic stories and experience during this long period of time i think both of you are ENJOYING the beini- beijing olympic games and at the END of our programme (. ) could you just please give ONE sentence to (. ) like the to congrat the olympic games and to let him (. ) successfully close (3) who first=

In each of the five major questions, the anchor asks related sub-questions, which may be asked directly or accompanied by some comments. For example,

Question 6: (comments + question)

S1: and i want to ask because you both are are fairly quite EXPERTS on the table tennis (. ) do you think the pen grip players have any advantages (. )to the (. ) tennis grip (. ) players

Question 7: (ask directly)

S1: in your spare time what do you do playing what kind of sports in your spare time

It is worth noting that when the anchor asks a question of both of the guests, like Questions 1, 3 and 5 above, S2 would answer the question first. This happens from the beginning to the end in this talk. When S2 finishes his answer, the anchor would ask for S3’s opinion by saying how about you? Or, sometimes S3 may join in the discussion without being asked. A possible reason may lie in the fact that S2 is allowed access to all the events of the Games and his opinion might be more authoritative. The other possible reason is that S2 has higher social status and is thus given the privilege to speak first. S3 addresses S2 by his title plus surname (Ambassador Latheef) to show his respect for S2.

In this talk, S1, the anchor is not just asking questions, but also taking part in the discussion, sharing his views and experiences with the guests. For example:

S2: so @@ that was my my my impression

S1: yeah (. ) in my opinion the most impressive thing the part of the opening
ceremony for ME is how they light (.) the main torch (1) because it's quite in-
incredible ...

S3: i do swim sometime but er table tennis is the only games i like
S1: i think that swimming is er really: difficult for ME because i will not i'm not quite swimming very well...

In this talk, the interaction progresses in an orderly way. S1 asks a question, then S2 responds first and S3 may join in the discussion later. S1 also joins in the discussion and shares his opinions. During the discussion, the topic may change as the interaction goes on. However, S1 well manages the talk and introduces new topics. The role of S1 here is similar to that of moderator in Indonesian seminars illustrated by Rusdi (1999), as the turn-taking was orderly determined by the anchor.

Case study 2. (File 11: DPRK’s brinkmanship tests Obama’s patience)

In this case, the three participants have relatively low social distance. S1 is the Chinese anchor, who is quite well known in the Chinese Central Television English programs. S2 is a Korean current affairs commentator and S3 is a Chinese research fellow from the China Institute of International Studies. From their interaction, it seems that S2 and S3 know each other as S2 say: I like Mr. Yang (S3) because sometimes we both agree on the certain issue... and I think Mr. Yang (S3) has been always honest to me. That’s why I like him a lot .... S1 also addresses the two guests as Mr. Yang and Mr. Lee. Therefore, it is assumed that the three participants may know each other, but are not close friends. The topic they are discussing is a serious political issue.

In this talk, six major questions were raised by S1, most of which (except one which was addressed to both guests) were addressed to one guest at a time. As with Case One, the major questions were usually accompanied with some related background information,
and S1’s comments as well. For example, in the following question, S1 expresses his concerns if China suspends economic assistance to the DPRK and challenges the guest’s viewpoint.

Question 1:

S1: have you said this mister lee let me put forward another question (.) when south korean's call for china to suspend our economic assistance to (.) the <spel> d p r k </spel> then some of the chinese say hey (.) wait a minute (1) don’t you think people in the north in the <spel> d p r k </spel> are your brothers and sisters if we suspend our economic assistance many of them would die of starvation (.) they'll die of hunger (.) now is that humanitarian or the other way around

In such serious talk concerning political issues, the guests argue for their own political stands and viewpoints, which may be opposite to each other. The talk show aims to elicit the different voices from the guests in order to help the audience see different perspectives. Therefore, it is normal for the guests to debate and argue for their conflicting positions. Greatbatch (1992) explored the relationship between the turn-taking provisions in news interviews and the management of disagreement between interviewees. He claims that in most cases, disagreements are resolved by the third party, the interviewer (Greatbatch, 1992). In this case, the focus of the analysis was on the role of anchor in disagreement management.

First, the anchor resolves disagreements by changing the topic. In the following example, S2, a Korean, thinks a phone conversation between President Obama and Kim Jong-un can solve the current crisis. S1, a Chinese anchor agrees with S2 and says he has posted a message on a microblog to propose the same solution. Then S1 asks S3, a Chinese guest, for his opinion on their idea of a phone conversation. S3 clearly shows his disagreement by saying the opportunity has been passed. S2 then takes his turn to argue
with S3 that I'm not that pessimistic and, he thinks the option for hope is still open. At this point, S1 puts forward another question for S2: but do you think majority of South Koreans are truly afraid of having a major conflict to this time around to initiate an exit from this disagreement sequence.

S2: ... i think a phone conversation between obama and kim jong-un (.) for five minutes i think they can solve the problem i think we need a leadership right now

S1: well great minds (.) think alike in fact just half an hour ago i posted a message on (1) <L1zh> wei bo {microblogging} </L1zh>

S2: ah

S1: calling for president obama to gave (.) his north korean counterpart a phone call that's

S2: oh <2> @@ </2>

S1: <2> er er er </2> perfect solution instead of having something like er nineteen seventy-two richard nixon's historical visit to the <spel> p r c </spel> for you know opening the door between the two great powers what do you think of a phone call diplomacy (.) that's should be initiated er gracefully by president obama

S3: well er it's not a question about i think NOW (.) the opportunity er has been passed (.) IF president obama (.) gave a phone call before north korea's <un> xx </un> cri-crisis ... the current situation won't happen (.) but now that the situation has come to this point er politically er: (.) and: in practice (.) er: such a phone call won't stop (.) both sides' (.) er: policy process ... i don't think north korea will stop (.) er what they have been doing and meanwhile <spel> u s </spel> won't change what they er have been doing so (.) in short er the window of opportunity for phone call has been passed=

S2: =i'm not that pessimistic i think (.) er the problem for obama's (preventing) making a phone call is not <un> xxxx </un> rather domestic politics er (.) <spel> u s </spel> has this foreign policy golden rule that is the (.) don't reward bad behaviour <spel> u s a </spel> is calculating the north korea's <3> bad behaviour </3>

S1: <3> that's what </3> the junior bush said you cannot reward the bad behaviour</rp>
S2: exactly but i think as you said it's gracious it's not so coming to (attract) from north korea (.) it's a gracious a mature power handing out a opportunity exit from this er this crisis i think there's an option for hope (.) it's still open

S1: but do you think majority of south koreans are truly afraid of having a major conflict to this time around (.) 'cause president park geun hye had said (.) er she would not take into consideration political fallout should er provocative behaviour (.) in the north

Second, the anchor resolves disagreements by resorting to a third party or joking. In order to reduce the tension in an interaction, speakers may resort to or turn to another participant, or use humor and joking. In the following interaction, S1 seems to stand on the side of S3 regarding the influence of China in this crisis. S1 then asks S2’s opinion of Mr. Yang’s (S3) answer. S2 thinks S3 is always honest, but S2 still stays with his position that the game is fundamentally between US and China. The dispute escalates when S1 interrupts S2 by using aggressive words like hijack in his response: excuse me, are you saying China is using the DPRK as a hijack against US threats to China. Then S2 admits that is what he means. This interaction is actually a debate between S1 and S2 and the disagreement between them is increasing. At this point, it is necessary to have an exit from the dispute as the tension is growing. S1, as an anchor, then turns to the third party: S3 and asks what do you think? It seems that this is not a question which requires an answer as S3 has expressed his views previously, but a way to ease the tension. When S3 is hesitant and searching for words to respond, they are laughing and joking to each other by saying it is a debate between Yang and the second Yang (since two of the Chinese speakers have the same surname Yang). Then, the strain of the previous interactions is relaxed. From the example, we can see that S1 is actively involved in the discussion. In addition, S1 does not tend to maintain a “neutralistic stance” which is the way Greatbatch (1992, p. 298) describes by a news interviewer.
S1: = mister lee china should be singled out and put aside (. ) in the game of
blame right we cannot exercise genuine influence because (. ) the <spel> d p r k
</spel> is is leaving the orbit (. ) and (. ) china cannot (. ) there's a limit to what we
can do right? (. ) do you think er (. ) mister yang's reply to your answer is an honest
way is it an honest one or a more sophisticated answer

S2: i think mister yang has been always honest to me that's why i like him a lot
(. ) er but then i think as i say the earlier you know that the obama might might have
give a call to you know Kim Jong-un that also means that (. ) you know obama united
states can play a role (. ) and as i said i er north korean game =

S1: = not a joke i'm afraid <4> americans do not </4>

S2: <4> @ @ @ </4>

S1: want to have peace treaty with the <spel> d p r k </spel> because they want
to justify the foreign military presence there they want to keep their (. ) pivot to asia
alive and this is part of the whole picture (. ) what do you think of this =

S2: = and targeting who targeting <5> <un> xx </un> </5>

S1: <5> targeting the </5> <spel> u s </spel> event but no sorry china =

S2: = see <6> your answer is </6>

S1: <6> china actually </6>

S2: yeah that's why i think this game is fundamentally between north korean
the <spel> u s </spel> and china (. ) not about north korea north korea is very
(helpful chess) games a small little (chess) =

S1: = excuse me are you saying china is using the <spel> d p r k </spel> as a
hijack against <spel> u s </spel> threats to china =

S2: = and also <spel> u s </spel> as well (2) both

S1: what do you think

S3: <7> well er </7>

S1: <7> @ @ @ </7>

S2: <7> @ @ @ </7>

S1: it's <8> actually er a debate </8>

S3: <8> it's a it's a </8>

S1: between lee and the yang mister yang <9> @ @ </9>

S3: <9> yang the second yang okay </9>
This section has described the discourse competence of the Asian ELF users analysed in this study, including the use of backchannels, echoing, referencing and topic management. The findings have shown these Asian ELF speakers were able to collaborate and support each other using backchannels and echoing. Backchannels were frequently used, however, the frequency depended on the personal interactional style of speakers. Echoing can serve the functions of agreement, confirmation and emphasis. Referencing, as a way to refer to phrases mentioned earlier, can be used to ask for further elaboration, to change topic or to make comments. It is also an effective way to make the discourse coherent. Through detailed analysis of two cases in regard to the aspect of topic management, it was found that Chinese anchors were skillful in topic management in both formal and semi-formal settings. They participated in the discussion by sharing their ideas and experience and gave equal opportunity for different guests to express their points of view. Conflicts and disagreements in the interaction were well managed.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the analysis of the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users in China-ASEAN contexts in response to the second research question.

Research question 2: What pragmatic competence do Asian ELF users demonstrate in China-ASEAN interaction? Specifically,

2.1 What communicative strategies do Asian ELF speakers employ to repair communication breakdowns or to facilitate communication?

2.2 What sociocultural competence do Asian ELF users display in the intercultural communication settings?
2.3 What discourse competence do Asian ELF users display in their interactions?

In general, the findings show that Asian ELF users have demonstrated pragmatic competence. First, Asian ELF users in this research were found to be active and flexible in using various communicative strategies to overcome difficulties in their interactions. The strategic competence studied in this research includes the use of lexical suggestion, paraphrasing, summarizing and explaining, code-switching, dealing with misunderstanding and avoidance strategies. As listeners, the ELF users provided a word or phrase to help speakers, or to show involvement in the conversation; they also tried code-switching if they shared the same language or cultural background with other participants; and they tried to avoid using local idioms to prevent potential misunderstanding. Both speakers and listeners in this China-ASEAN ELF communication frequently applied paraphrasing, summarizing and explanation to make their meaning explicit and simple to understand, and they actively negotiated their meaning if there was any misunderstanding. It is worth noting that few of the misunderstanding occurrences in the data were the result of grammatical errors (see the conclusion of Chapter Four). In fact, there were few examples of misunderstanding identified in this subset, and most of them were due to cultural differences. Asian ELF speakers in this context are normally actively involved and cooperative in their communication and the “let it pass” strategy is not often used if non-understanding and misunderstanding occur. It can be concluded that Asian ELF users can communicate effectively by applying various communicative strategies. Therefore, mutual intelligibility is more important than conforming to native speaker’s norms when communicating with other Asian multilingual ELF speakers.

Second, the sociocultural competence of Asian ELF users mainly involves how they disagree with each other, the use of address terms and their cross-cultural awareness.
Asian ELF speakers are able to demonstrate a certain degree of sensitivity and flexibility in dealing with cultural differences and changes in their communicative styles. In this subset, Asian speakers were free to voice different opinions without being considered impolite or face-threatening. Mitigated disagreement with hedges and explanations were frequently used. As for the use of terms of address, Chinese speakers may vary according to the formality of settings, the social distance and the cultural backgrounds of the participants, rather than always using Chinese naming practice. Furthermore, this study of cross-cultural awareness shows that Asian ELF speakers are not only sensitive and tolerant to cultural differences, but are also able to negotiate their cultural perspectives.

Third, the study of the discourse competence of these Asian ELF speakers showed they were able to collaborate and support each other in their interaction by using backchannels and echoing. However, the use of backchannels is a function of personal interaction. Some speakers may use backchannels more frequently than others, and the same speaker may use backchannels more often in some settings than in others. Two cases of topic change and conflict management were also considered. The findings showed that Chinese anchors were able to change topics naturally and gradually. Also, they were able to manage disagreement between participants by changing topics or by resorting to joking. Based on the findings in this chapter, it can be concluded that the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users is of great importance and necessity in successful ELF communication, and therefore significant in language teaching, which is the topic for the next chapter.
Chapter Six

The Implications of ELF for Language Teaching in China

6.1 Introduction

The implications of ELF research findings for the teaching of English have attracted ELF scholars’ interest since the early study of ELF (Jenkins, 2000; Seidlhofer, 1999). Various aspects of language teaching related to ELF have been discussed, from teacher’s education, to teaching materials, curriculum design, classroom activities and assessment. ELF scholars have explored the feasibility and potential of ELF in language teaching practice and proposed an ELF-oriented approach, involving the use of ELF-aware pedagogy and ELF-based materials (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2015). It has been agreed by most ELF scholars that native speaker norms are no longer necessarily the benchmark or targets for English language teaching. In addition, ELF-aware classroom practices do not mean choosing a certain “variety” of English to teach, but instead, the focus should be on how English is used in complex multicultural ELF contexts, and identifying and teaching effective communicative strategies. It is these implications for language teaching that have represented the most controversial and debated issues in ELF.

The major challenges of ELF-oriented practice fall into two main categories: first, the status (or lack of it) of ELF; second, the security or confidence in ELF of stakeholders, including policy makers, teachers, and assessing organizations. As Seidlhofer (2015) points out, that English is used as a lingua franca around the world is not in dispute, it is the status of ELF that is in dispute. If the use of English in ELF is recognized in its own
right, our English teaching approach should be adjusted to reflect this reality. However, “the assumption of effective communication depends on linguistic competence” rather than “how they put their linguistic resources…to strategic use” (Seidlhofer, 2015, pp. 24-25). Another challenge comes from the sense of teachers’ and other stakeholders’ security. Even though they may be aware of the pedagogic implications of ELF, they are still reluctant, not surprisingly, to change their teaching approach unless there are “official” textbooks or assessments available.

In view of these challenges, this chapter discusses the pragmatic dimension of ELF-oriented teaching in a university in China, focusing on the English teaching for English majors in Guangxi University. This university was chosen as a case study for two reasons: first, due to its geographic location, Guangxi University has frequent communication with ASEAN countries (see Section 1.3 and more details are provided in the next section). Second, the author has been working in the university as an English teacher for 18 years. Therefore, the teaching syllabus, materials and practices of English teaching for English majors are familiar to the author.

Against this background, this chapter addresses the third set of research question:

Research question 3: What are the implications of the ELF features for English language teaching in China? To be more specific,

3.1 How can these ELF features and competences identified be integrated into language teaching in local universities in China;

3.2 How to implement ELF approach in local language teaching which is oriented to the situations where multilingual speakers from ASEAN and China communicate in English?

This chapter first reviews the general situation and challenges of English teaching in China with focus on Guangxi University. Then it discusses in detail the required
competences and the application of ELF pedagogy in English teaching practice in Guangxi University, combining the five principles of the “Lingua Franca Approach” proposed by Kirkpatrick (2014, in press). The suggested ELF teaching practice in Guangxi University is elaborated in the aspect of ELF teacher required, ELF practice environment, ELF teaching resources and ELF-aware assessment.

6.2 Challenges of English Teaching

6.2.1 English teaching in China.

English teaching has become increasingly important throughout China, from primary school to university. The number of English learners in China is now about 400 million, accounting for one third of China’s population (Bolton & Graddol, 2012). English is a compulsory subject from Grade 3 in primary school and is one of the three compulsory subjects tested in the National College Entrance Examination (the Gaokao) (Chinese and Maths are the other two). All university students need to learn English and sit for national English exams: the College English Test (CET) for non-English majors or the Test for English Majors (TEM). For most industries, an English language test is required as part of the senior professional and technical personnel qualification examination organized by the State Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security. As well as formal English teaching in the state education system, there are flourishing private sectors in English education at all levels, from kindergartens to adult English classes.

The attitude towards English and the use of English in China have been investigated by some scholars. According to a survey of over 600 students in six universities in Beijing by Pan and Block (2011), the perceived instrumental value of English contributes to the
motivation for learning English. Students would believe that English can lead to a better career in the future and help them become more knowledgeable about the world. They feel more “modern” or “international” when speaking English (Pan & Block, 2011, p. 395). Similar results are reported in Bolton and Botha’s (2015) study investigating the attitudes of students at Sun Yat-sen University towards English. However, even with such a large number of English learners in China, the use of English by non-English major students, in reality, is surprisingly infrequent. According to Bolton and Botha’s (2015) study, the use of English in educational settings was mainly limited to reading materials, and only 26% of undergraduate students claimed that more than half of their socializing was in English. A more comprehensive survey called The Survey of Language Situation in China, conducted by eleven ministerial-level organisations involving 475,000 respondents across China, showed the overall frequency of the use of English was between “seldom” and “sometimes”. Only 7.3% of the people who had studied English “often” used English, and 69.4% “seldom” used it (Wei & Su, 2015, p. 179). The low frequency of English language use can be largely attributed to the non-official status of English in China. Another possible reason may lie in the way English is taught in China. According to the research of Pan and Block (2011), examinations are emphasized over the development of communication skills; and, therefore, English language teaching does not meet the expectations and needs of the students. Although English is considered an international language and useful for individual development, in reality, there is still a gap between English language teaching and the needs and use of the language. In this research, English major students at Guangxi University were the focus. They are relevant to the ASEAN context and they have opportunities to use the language. How they use English in China-ASEAN communication settings may offer ideas and solutions for English education in Guangxi, and these may also be relevant to other areas of China.
6.2.2 The situation and challenges of English teaching at Guangxi University.

Guangxi University is the only key national university in the “211 Project” in Guangxi. Established in 1928, it has 31 schools offering 98 undergraduate programs. In recent years, Guangxi University has strengthened its relations with ASEAN countries. According to Ms. Shang, the Vice President of Guangxi University, in 2015, 87% of the total 1700 overseas students in Guangxi University were from ASEAN countries (Gong & Nan, 2016, Jan 18), which means over 1500 ASEAN students were studying and communicating with students and teachers in Guangxi University. At the same time, Guangxi University also has student and teacher exchange programs with ASEAN countries and is making an effort to set up more transnational higher education programs with ASEAN countries, such as Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia. Furthermore, the China-ASEAN Research Institute of Guangxi University was established in 2005, with its main research interests in China-ASEAN relations including economic, legal, cultural and ethnic studies in Southeast Asian societies.

With increasingly frequent exchanges with ASEAN countries, English major students in the university have been playing a more active role in providing English language services, especially during the annual China-ASEAN Exposition held in Nanning, which is where the university is also situated. During the 13th China-ASEAN Exposition (CAEXPO) and China-ASEAN Business and Investment Summit (CABIS) in 2016, over 260 undergraduates and postgraduates from the Foreign Languages College at Guangxi University worked as volunteers to provide language services, such as

---

5 Project 211 is the Chinese government’s new endeavor aimed at strengthening about 100 institutions of higher education and key disciplinary areas as a national priority for the 21st century, http://www.chinaeducenter.com/en/cedu/ceduproject211.php
translation and interpreting, reception, ushering and registration (N. Liu, 2016, Sept 23). English teachers are also involved in high-level language services, like conference interpreting, simultaneous interpreting, and document translation. During these events, English is used at different levels. For example, ELF is used in various informal settings, such as hotel or venue receptions, enquiring at exhibition stands, shopping and tourism. At formal meetings or ceremonies, Chinese-English translators or interpreters are often working in ELF contexts, with most English speakers coming from non-native speaking countries. According to a survey conducted by the author in 2012, English major students have more contact with non-native speakers from Asian countries than from other native speaking countries (Ji, 2015).

To better equip English major students to provide language services in China-ASEAN communication contexts, some changes in English teaching were implemented at the Foreign Languages College of Guangxi University. The school, the teachers and the students all realise the importance of including an ASEAN focus in English teaching. First, the latest version (2012) of the undergraduate education program for English majors of Guangxi University states the goal of English education:

本专业培养具有扎实的英语语言基础和广博的科学文化知识，并能熟练地运用英语在外事、教育、经贸、文化、科技、军事、旅游等部门从事翻译、教学、管理、研究等工作的英语人才；根据国家与广西经济社会发展的需要和学校的办学定位，培养德、智、体全面发展，具备实践能力、创新能力、就业能力和创业能力的应用型、复合型专门人才及立足广西、面向全国、服务东盟的区域性国际人才。

(English translation by author: The English major is to cultivate English-specialized personnel with a solid English language foundation and a versatile cultural knowledge who can skillfully apply English in the field of foreign affairs, education, trade, culture, technology, military and tourism and be engaged in translation, teaching, administration and research. Based on the needs of national and Guangxi economic and social development and the Guangxi University’s school’s orientation, the
English major aims to cultivate versatile and practical international personnel oriented to Guangxi, China and the ASEAN region.

The goal of the Guangxi University’s English major education programme indicates the local importance of the ASEAN region. Therefore, ASEAN-related courses and approaches are part of English teaching at Guangxi University. Several new ASEAN-oriented textbooks, which have been compiled by local English teachers, are used in classroom teaching. For example, The Essential Interpreter’s Guide to the China-ASEAN Free Trade Area (D. Yang, 2009) is based on the themes of China-ASEAN cooperation in various areas, including agriculture, human resources, investment, transport, energy and tourism. Another interpreting textbook Field Interpreting for Conventions and Exhibitions (Huang, 2010) has adopted live recordings of the conference with the original accents, pace of delivery and expressions of the speakers. It offers the students practice at on-the-spot interpreting. These two textbooks are used in interpreting classes for senior undergraduates and postgraduate English majors. A culture-related course is planned to open with the textbook: Introduction to the societies and cultures of Southeast Asian countries (Y. Liu, 2012).

As well as the classroom teaching with an ASEAN focus, English major students are becoming more involved in English language practice with speakers from ASEAN countries, as hundreds of them participate in the CAEXPO and the CABIS each year. According to Ji’s (2015) survey of English major students and graduates from Guangxi University, the majority of respondents reported positive attitudes towards non-native English, and the opening of ASEAN-oriented English courses for English majors. Moreover, those who had experience of using English in their work believed more than those undergraduates who had little working experience with English, that it was necessary and important to learn about non-native varieties.
The ASEAN-oriented goal set by the school, the engagement of teachers in textbook compilation and the favorable attitudes towards the Asian English varieties of the students, all indicate a fertile environment for a new language teaching direction in China-ASEAN ELF communication contexts. However, there is still a large gap between the English communication reality in Guangxi and the language teaching practice in the local universities of Guangxi. Despite the goals regarding English language teaching and the changes which have been made to reach these goals, traditional native speaker norms still dominate the English teaching for English majors in Guangxi University. Even though the goal of the undergraduate English program is oriented to local social and economic needs, how to achieve that goal needs further development. The attitude of students and graduates, especially those who use English in their work shows their needs are not yet being met in English language classes. What they learn in school is Standard English, yet most of their work requires them to deal with non-standard English. Of course, they can learn and adapt to ELF during their work. Nevertheless, it would be beneficial if the English teaching at school, in addition to Standard English, prepared them for this, thereby enabling them to use the language in ELF settings with more confidence. Although the textbooks mentioned above have provided fresh input in interpreting and cross-cultural classes, the concept of language and culture in these textbooks is still based on national varieties. Students may learn about a certain Asian culture or society and the theme of China-ASEAN cooperation, but they are still removed from the reality of English use and the development of ELF competences, in particular, communicative strategies and sociocultural competence. In fact, real ELF-awareness or an ELF-oriented teaching approach is not yet part of English major teaching in Guangxi.

The three main challenges for adopting an ELF-aware approach are:

1) The authority of the English teaching syllabus for university English majors in
Mainland China issued by the Ministry of Education (MOE) in 2000;

2) Teacher education;

3) The availability of ELF-oriented textbooks.

The standards for each language skill (listening, speaking, writing, reading and translating) set by the English teaching syllabus (MOE, 2000) issued by the Ministry of Education for English majors provides a guideline or goal for each course. For example, the requirements for English listening for Band 4 (the end of second year study) is “to understand the general social conversations between native English speakers”, “to understand the normal speed of English broadcasting like VOA and BBC”, “to tell the different English varieties, like American English, British English, Australian English”. Thus, the goal of listening is to understand native speakers, and English varieties are accordingly limited to the Inner Circle countries. Likewise, the speaking ability of Band 4 is “to communicate with native English speakers on general social occasions”. The description of the English speaking course lists the requirement for English majors “to be able to apply communicative strategies to achieve communication when you cannot recall the correct words or are not sure about the sentence structure” and “to be able to speak appropriately on different occasions, to different people”. The communicative strategies and functions for oral communication are stressed in the syllabus. However, there is no other specific description of what communicative strategies students need to acquire and whether the “different people” includes non-native speakers. Due to the lack of clarity in the syllabus, it is assumed that communication strategies are applied when communicating with native speakers and the “different people” are still native speakers from different Inner Circle countries, but possibly from different social backgrounds. As for the social and cultural course, the purpose of the course is to “enable students to become familiar with the history, geography, society, economy, politics, education, etc. of
English-speaking countries, and to improve their sensitivity and tolerance to cultural differences, their flexibility to deal with cultural differences, to cultivate their cross-cultural communication ability”. It is obvious that English-speaking countries are the goal of the course.

Moreover, the syllabus also provides guidelines for the national examination TEM (Test for English Majors). For example, one of the criteria of the TEM 4-Oral (Band 4 Oral Test for English Majors) is “correct and clear pronunciation and natural intonation” (see Section 6.4.4 for more discussion regarding the oral test criteria). The correctness is based on Standard English norms, however it is hard to tell what “natural intonation” the student should aim for because there is a lack of information or guidelines in the criteria. Not surprisingly, the English teaching syllabus and the national examination have had a significant impact on English teaching for English majors, which means English is still perceived and taught under the framework of a foreign language paradigm rather than a lingua franca paradigm.

The second challenge for adopting an ELF-aware approach is the change of English teachers’ mindset through teacher’s education. Most English teachers have not yet understood the concept of ELF; and those that have are unlikely to change their English teaching practice given the constraints of the syllabus and examination guidelines mentioned above. As argued by Seidlhofer (2015, p. 25), it is insecure for English teachers “to question the validity of conventional assumptions” of language teaching, that is, the effective communication depends on linguistic competence. Therefore, ELF-aware teacher education is significant to develop teachers required for ELF approach (see detailed discussion in Section 6.4.1). The third challenge is the availability of the appropriate textbooks for ELF approach. Without official ELF-oriented textbooks, many English teachers would not take the risk or trouble to write their own textbooks for an
The ASEAN-related textbooks mentioned above in Guangxi University indicate an orientation in local language teaching, yet they are not considered as ELF-aware textbooks if measured by the checklist for ELF-aware materials (see Section 6.4.3) in facing the three significant challenges, it seems impossible to apply ELF pedagogy in English teaching in Guangxi. However, the communication situation with ASEAN countries in Guangxi and ASEAN-oriented education goal of Guangxi University could provide a key to change the English teaching style in Guangxi University. The change does not mean abandoning conventional materials or methods, while it means changing language teacher’s mindsets through education, moving the focus from native-speaking norms to a lingua franca mode, and understanding the essential competences language learners need to acquire for ELF contexts. Language teaching in Guangxi University needs to change, as there is increasing ELF communication with ASEAN countries; it is also possible and practical to make the change, as the environment (ASEAN students on campus) and aspiration of teachers and students (ASEAN-related textbooks and student attitudes) provide natural ELF settings. ELF-aware pedagogy is also possible as the national English teaching syllabus points out: “each university can adopt various forms to assess a student’s competence and abilities according to their respective education goal and curriculum” and the goal of English majors of Guangxi University is to “serve Guangxi and the ASEAN region”. Therefore, the ELF approach shows no obvious contradiction with the national syllabus.

The five principles of the “Lingua Franca Approach” proposed by Kirkpatrick (2014, in press) are integrated into the next two sections (6.3 and 6.4), which discuss in detail the ELF competence needed and the application of ELF pedagogy in English teaching practice in Guangxi University. The five principles are: 1) Mutual intelligibility is the goal of ELF communication; 2) Intercultural competence is the goal in ELF-aware
6.3 ELF Competences and Language Teaching

In this section, the development of ELF competence is considered with regard to four components: linguistic competence, strategic competence, discourse competence and sociocultural competence. These components of the communicative competence proposed by Canale (1983) and developed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) (see Section 2.4) are discussed, along with additional components relevant to ELF communication (as demonstrated in Chapter Four and Five).

6.3.1 ELF linguistic competence.

Mastering the linguistic features of a language (including phonology, lexis and grammar) cannot guarantee that a speaker can achieve his/her communicative purpose because “Linguistic competence is never exercised in the abstract but is always actualized to serve some communicative purpose or other” (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, in press). In the China-ASEAN communication context, English is used as a lingua franca mainly by Asian bilinguals and multilinguals. Therefore, it is important for Asian ELF speakers “to be mutually intelligible when communicating with their ASEAN counterparts” (Kirkpatrick, 2014, p. 26) rather than sound like British or American. The first principle of the lingua franca approach proposed by Kirkpatrick (2014, p. 25) is to achieve the linguistic goal of “mutual intelligibility” rather than the norms of “the native speaker of English”.

Linguistic competence can be developed through two channels: input and output. Language input, including listening and reading is necessary especially for the primary
stage of learning. Extensive exposure to different varieties in Asian and ELF
conversations can enable learners to become familiar with different accents and
expressions. This is what Kohn (in press) refers as “ELF-related comprehension skills”.
Teachers can guide students to identify and analyze comprehension problems or
communication breakdowns due to unfamiliar linguistic features, such as different
accents or connotations of a word. The non-standard forms which cause no
misunderstandings in ELF interactions are also worth pointing out and learning during
language teaching. However, listening comprehension materials with non-native English
speakers are rarely found in English majors programs. Even some authentic non-native
speakers’ speeches or conversations have been reproduced by native speakers with
Standard English pronunciation and re-recorded as teaching material. This is due to the
conventional assumption that the goal of language learning is to understand native
speakers. Students often believe that all native speakers speak Standard English, as
presented in their textbooks. They are unaware that native speakers may speak with
different English accents which can be unintelligible to each other, and they use non-
standard forms as well.

Another aspect of linguistic competence is language output, which means speaking
and writing. Kirkpatrick (2014) presents a sound argument that written language is not
the same as spoken as a caveat for the lingua franca approach. Here only speaking ability,
which is the ELF-related production skill (Kohn, in press) is discussed. First, as
Kirkpatrick (2014) argues, students do not need to sound like native speakers of English
in the Asian context, to achieve mutual intelligibility. However, correct pronunciation,
that is, pronunciation that approximates standard British or General American, is a
requirement for many examinations for English majors in China. However, according to
Ji’s (2015) survey of English majors in Guangxi University, “there is a declining tendency
of their expectation to be able to speak like a native speaker as the respondents gain more work experience” and “most of the respondents think that it is unnecessary for a Chinese person to speak like a native speaker” (pp. 84-85). Therefore, given both the reality English use and students’ needs in the region, more focus should be put on intelligibility than on ‘correct’ pronunciation. For example, Jenkins’s (2000) “lingua franca core” (LFC) (see 2.2.1), which refers to certain English pronunciation features significantly contributed to intelligibility in ELF interaction, may be useful in teaching spoken English. Nevertheless, more research on the LFC among Asian ELF speakers is needed.

In addition to pronunciation, spoken expressions also deserve rethinking from the perspective of ELF communication. Traditionally, non-standard forms which occur in ELF interactions are considered errors to be avoided in language teaching. In reality, many non-standard forms also occur in the dialects of British English (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, 2014). Moreover, learners can filter out those linguistic features which would not help in their communication through their experience (Widdowson, 2012). Most of the non-standard forms found in this research, such as lexical innovation, the non-standard use of prepositions and non-standard omissions, did not cause misunderstandings (see Section 4.2). In fact, some creative use of the language facilitated communicative flow. The creative use of English words or phrases in the data used in this study demonstrated the flexibility of the Asian ELF speakers in exploiting their language resources to achieve their communicative purpose. “Being able to make creative use of one’s linguistic-communicative resources is a speaker’s most natural and distinguishing capability” (Kohn, in press). Therefore, in language teaching, non-standard forms of spoken English should not necessarily be seen as mistakes, but viewed positively as a creative use of the linguistic resources of the speaker.
6.3.2 ELF strategic competence.

ELF strategic competence refers to communicative strategies used by ELF speakers to negotiate meaning and compensate for breakdowns and thus, to enhance the effectiveness of communication and achieve mutual intelligibility. Many scholars have contributed to the study of communicative strategies adopted by ELF users before, during and after the non-understanding occurs. The strategic competence of Asian ELF speakers identified in this research (see Section 5.2), including lexical suggestion, paraphrasing and explaining, code-switching, avoidance strategies and negotiation strategies, can be integrated into language teaching. In the English teaching syllabus issued by MOE for English majors, communicative strategies are mentioned, but only limited to the occasion when the speaker cannot think of the standard words or expressions. There is no detailed and comprehensive list of communicative strategies required for English learners. It is taken for granted that if students master the linguistic property of a language, they can achieve successful communication. A Chinese student would think it is his/her fault if he/she cannot understand what a native speaker said, and it is also his/her fault if a native speaker cannot understand what he/she said because his/her English is not satisfactory. Learners may not be confident and can feel embarrassed when misunderstanding or non-understanding occurs. Therefore, it is important to teach students how to use these strategies and prepare themselves to cope with such situations. At the same time, English learners need to be aware that the language is a tool for communication and shared by all users. It means that a non-native speaker’s English is not inferior when talking with a native speaker, and likewise a native speaker’s English is not superior when talking with a non-native speaker whose English level is lower. During ELF interactions, there are many strategies which can be adopted to avoid or repair breakdowns and achieve successful communication, as illustrated in Chapter Five. This strategic competence also
serves the first principle of the lingua franca approach: mutual intelligibility is the goal and it should be the focus of language teaching.

6.3.3 ELF discourse competence.

The discourse features of Asian ELF users identified in this research and other research results can also be used in English teaching. For example, Asian speakers can collaborate and support each other by frequently using backchannels and echoing. Echoing can serve various communication functions, such as agreement, confirmation and emphasis. The cooperative functions of the discourse features of Asian ELF speakers (see examples in Section 5.4), such as using *mhm, yes, ok, yeah* to show engagement and listenership, can be discussed in classroom teaching. Discourse competence also serves the mutual intelligibility principle. It is interesting and worthwhile for teachers to point out to students that Asian people share a number of discourse features. For example, the Chinese request schema, where reasons and justifications for requests are normally made before the request itself, is also common in Indonesian, Malaysian and Japanese cultures (Kirkpatrick, 2010a). The potential transfer of the discourse features from an Asian L1 into ELF can facilitate effective communication between Asian ELF speakers as they share cultural similarities. More discussion related to sociocultural competence is provided in next section.

6.3.4 ELF sociocultural competence.

Several ELF scholars have focused on the intercultural competence (termed sociocultural competence in this thesis) of ELF users, emphasizing negotiation ability in multicultural settings (W. Baker, 2011, 2015a; Canagarajah, 2007; Sharifian, 2013). Considering the role of English as a lingua franca in China-ASAEN communication, the cultural components of English language teaching need to be relevant to ASEAN speakers.
The second principle of the lingua franca approach proposed by Kirkpatrick is to establish intercultural competence in relevant cultures (Kirkpatrick, 2014, in press). In the current textbooks for English majors in Guangxi University, it describes how to start small talk with a British person, but for example, it does not explain how to start small talk with an Indonesian. As noted earlier, the curriculum of English majors is concerned with native speakers’ culture. Students read native speaker newspapers and texts, listen to native speaker broadcasting, and watch native speaker movies and programs. The cross-cultural communication is mainly concerned with the cultural differences between Chinese and native English speakers and how to adapt to native speaker culture during communication. In fact, native speaker cultures, such as British and American culture are also part of ELF sociocultural competence because English learners in China may need to communicate with native speakers and know about their cultures. However, that is not the only goal for English language teaching, especially for English majors in Guangxi, given the reality of English being used as a lingua franca among Asian multilinguals. By only reading texts produced by native speakers, they “miss an important opportunity for more complex socio-cultural contextualisations of English” (W. Baker, 2015c, p. 135).

The study of the sociocultural competence of Asian ELF speakers in this research has provided guidelines for English learners on how to use the language appropriately within the dynamic and fluid ELF context in Asia. The three categories of cross-cultural awareness based on Baker’s intercultural awareness (ICA) (W. Baker, 2012) are useful in cultural analysis in language teaching. ICA is illustrated from the basic understanding of cultural similarities and differences, to the relative nature of cultural norms, and then the ability to move beyond stereotypes and to negotiate between different frames of reference. As Baker (2015c) points out, cultural comparisons which do not provide adequate reflection have been over-applied in language teaching; intercultural competence in a
complex and fluid ELF context is not yet well taught. Cultural competence is the “fifth skill” (Tomalin, 2008), additional to the other four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing). In classroom teaching, more English materials such as broadcasting, newspaper, literature and movies from non-native speaking countries can be used for reflexive discussion to explore diverse local cultures and acquire cultural knowledge. More importantly, real communication practice between Chinese and ASEAN ELF users is necessary for students to experience cultural differences, to cope with miscommunications and to negotiate cultural references in person. Detailed discussion on how to apply language practice for English majors in Guangxi University is presented in next section.

6.4 ELF Practice in Guangxi University

Although the importance of the four ELF competencies for language learners has been recognized, it is also important to know how to develop such competencies in language teaching. Taking Guangxi University as a case study, this section proposes possible solutions for an ELF approach for English major teaching, covering the requirements for teachers, language pedagogy, ELF-oriented teaching materials and assessment. It is necessary to stress again that an ELF approach does not mean excluding the native speaker. English as a lingua franca is used between non-native speakers, and between non-native speakers and native speakers as well (see definition in Section 2.1.1). Therefore, an ELF approach in language teaching can still include native English components. Furthermore, an ELF approach does not necessarily mean teaching different varieties of WE either, although it is important for learners to become familiar with different varieties. What crucial is understanding how to balance the native and non-native components and integrate the dynamic ELF element in language teaching.
6.4.1 Teachers and the ELF approach.

Kirkpatrick (2014, in press) has argued that the lingua franca approach requires non-native speaker teachers of English because the learning goal is no longer native speaker norms and cultures. The third principle of the lingua franca approach proposed by Kirkpatrick is that the appropriate English teachers are well-trained local multi-linguals. The reasons for this include 1) multilingual teachers can understand the problems their students face; 2) they can provide appropriate linguistic models for their students; 3) they can offer intercultural competence and cultural insight to their students; 4) they can use students’ L1 to help them learn English; and 5) the value of multilingualism can be reinforced (Kirkpatrick, 2014).

Many of the English teachers in Guangxi University have realized the important role ASEAN plays in Guangxi and are involved in ASEAN-related linguistic research with increasing academic publications in this field. For example, several ASEAN-related textbooks of translator’s training (see Section 6.2.2) and journal articles have been published. In addition, English teachers provide language services for the annual ASEAN events in Nanning. The experiences they have in ELF and intercultural communication offer important insights and can help them set attainable linguistic targets for students. What is needed now is effective training to change the teachers’ mindsets. Teacher education programs are crucial to guarantee the implementation of the ELF approach.

Sifakis (2014) has proposed a two-phase ELF-aware teacher education framework, which would be helpful for English teachers in China. In the first phase, teachers are exposed to ELF related research literature. Extensive and critical reading of books and articles in this field enable teachers to learn about language use in real contexts which they can then relate to their own experiences and teaching contexts. Further assistance would be offered from ELF scholars to help teachers identify key books or articles related
to their teaching contexts and clarify questions engendered in the literature. Teachers can also explore certain topics which interest them. For example, in Guangxi University, as translating and interpreting playing an important role in China-ASEAN communication, further study of the interface between ELF and interpreting or how interpreters handle the challenges of ELF speakers, would be an interesting topic.

In the second phase of Sifakis’s (2014) framework, he recommends teachers incorporate changes in classroom teaching in the way that is most appropriate for students’ needs. In this phase, teachers need to know how to translate the theories into action based on the specific needs of their students. However, the implementation stage can present more difficulties and challenges than the first phase. In the second phase, teachers are encouraged to work in groups to share experiences and ideas and to prepare teaching materials. In Guangxi University, teachers who teach similar lessons, for example, listening comprehension or interpreting, can work in collaboration. The online ELF interaction programs and even the teachers’ ELF experiences can be recorded and collected as a database for teaching materials. What’s more, they can also explore and exploit existing teaching materials for an ELF-aware approach. For example, some communicative strategies among native speakers can also be shared in ELF contexts.

In addition to the teacher education for local English teachers, another change which should be encouraged is to employ English teachers from other Asian countries. Currently, recruitment advertisements for foreign English teachers at Guangxi University are only aimed at teachers from native speaking countries. Qualified language teachers from other Asian countries could provide a more appropriate option because they can provide students with exposure to Asian Englishes.
6.4.2 ELF – the practical environment.

The fourth principle of the lingua franca approach proposed by Kirkpatrick (2014, in press) stresses the importance of lingua franca environments, which provide excellent ELF learning opportunities. In Guangxi University, it is both feasible and convenient to create ELF environments for Chinese students and provide materials which incorporate interactions between people from ASEAN countries, while also adhering to the requirements of the teaching curriculum.

Language practicum and extracurricular activities.

There is a five-week language practicum for second-year English major students at Guangxi University. The practicum is compulsory for English majors and accounted for five credits in the undergraduate program. During this practicum period, students choose to complete one of the language practice projects in groups of five to ten. One teacher supervises one group by providing guidance for their project and assessing student performances at the end of the practicum. Students need to take initiative in planning, implementing, coordinating and budget control throughout their project. For example, in 2016, the language projects included making videos or brochures to introduce local culture, making an English newspaper, presenting an English drama or mock TV program interviews. For the video-making projects on local cultures, students needed to act as a tour guide and invite foreigners to participate in the project. The results of all the projects were presented at the end of the practicum and students can gain opportunities to use their English in practice. As students from other Asian countries are encouraged to attend Guangxi University (as mentioned in Section 6.2.2), they can be involved in the projects as foreigners. This provides ELF contexts to introduce local culture when Chinese students discuss and negotiate with other Asian students in their language practice project, and is relevant as the foreign guests during China-ASEAN exposition are mainly from
Asian countries. The intensive five-week practicum offers English majors opportunities for personal contact and experience working with other Asian people in English and provides insight into ELF communication.

According to the teaching curriculum for English majors at Guangxi University, English major students also need to undertake at least four-weeks of extracurricular activities or social practice during the undergraduate program. For example, students can take part in volunteer services during the China-ASEAN exposition, enter a national language competition or become research assistants. In fact, the most popular activity for English majors is volunteering during the China-ASEAN exposition and the China-ASEAN Business and Investment Summit, with over a hundred undergraduates involved each year. They work as volunteers at the conference venue or around the venue, interpreting for the foreign guests at the exposition booth, showing them around the city, taking them to the hotels, conference hall or airports. The social practice is real work for students and their ELF interactions in work settings can reinforce their attitude and concept of ELF among Asian people.

Both the campus-based language practicum and the off-campus social practice offer important opportunities for students to use their language in real situations. This ELF practice environment enables students to have a feel and personal experience of how English is used in real life — because they use English to communicate with both native and non-native speakers, and, in Guangxi, mainly with non-native speakers in Asian contexts. This reality may contradict the focus of current textbooks, which emphasise the native speaker norms. (see Section 6.4.3 for a detailed analysis of the textbooks used for English majors in Guangxi University). Therefore, it is crucial to require students to reflect on their performance and experience in terms of language use and cross-cultural communication. Students can keep a reflective log, noting down the communication
breakdowns or strategies they used to facilitate communication and may also write a report at the end of the practice to reflect how they achieved communicative success. Teachers can share students’ reflections and discuss these from the perspective of ELF in class.

**Cross-cultural collaborative study.**

The large number of ASEAN students attending Guangxi University can be effective resources for language and cultural collaboration between Chinese students and ASEAN students. Although these resources are yet to be fully explored, they could be valuable in ELF-aware teaching. For example, Chinese students can pair up or work with other ASEAN students in a small group, focusing on a specific cultural topic. Therefore, students from different cultural backgrounds can contribute to discussing cultural similarities and differences. It is important is that students need to be guided to reflect if there are any changes in their own culture or if they have any stereotype of a certain culture, and how the different cultures in Asian countries influence each other. For example, students from different Asian countries can explore how people celebrate a traditional new year in different cultures. It would be interesting to discover that the Lunar New Year is not just a Chinese tradition as many other Asian countries, such as Vietnam and South Korea, also celebrate the New Year based on the lunar calendar. In addition, the ways their celebrations are different or similar, the origin of the festival and the way it has spread throughout Asia are interesting topics for undergraduate students. Such campus-based cultural collaboration in English with face-to-face communication can help students better understand English as a lingua franca and as a cultural reference.

Another option of collaborative study is network collaboration. Grazzi (2015) explored ways to improve students’ intercultural competence by combining ELF and network-based language teaching through an Italian-American research project. In the
project, Italian-American student pairs were formed to discuss a chosen topic. They uploaded written texts in their own L2 to start a discussion and their partners replied in the same week. They were only able to use “written” discussion due to the large time difference between these two countries. This type of activity could be applied in Guangxi as well. Between China and the ASEAN countries, there is little time difference so it is possible to have synchronous communication online. For example, Guangxi University can have such intercultural tele-collaboration with its sister universities in Thailand or Vietnam, where there is only a one-hour time difference. Students could exchange views and discuss cultural topics through emails and online chatting. The application of modern technology in language teaching can also attract young people’s interest and their online communication records can be kept as examples to demonstrate the use of ELF, the students’ use of communicative strategies, their communication breakdowns and their cultural awareness.

**Overseas exchange study programs.**

Overseas exchange programs can offer opportunities for students to study at a university in another Asian country for one or two years. This would allow students to have comprehensive and intensive communication with other Asian people in both academic settings and daily life. As Guangxi University plans to establish transnational higher education programs with her sister universities in ASEAN countries, it would be feasible for Guangxi University language students to study their major courses at a university in a Southeast Asian country for at least one semester. In addition, the courses and credits they earn in other universities would be accepted by their home university. As argued by Kirkpatrick (2014), Asian students may find the linguistic environment less threatening and may feel more comfortable using English in such ELF settings than in NS settings. At the same time, they can develop greater understanding and respect for
ASEAN cultures, as well as improving both their linguistic and cross-cultural competence in such environments. In addition, it is more affordable for students to study in Southeast Asian countries compared with studying in native speaking countries like the UK or the US. However, only when the school leaders, teachers, students and parents realize the significance of learning English in the countries where English is used as a lingua franca can this program be implemented.

Generally speaking, lingua franca environments provide the most appropriate learning environment for lingua franca speakers. English major students in Guangxi University enjoy the advantages of access to ASEAN resources, which enable them to interact with ASEAN people in ELF environments. It is suggested that language practicums, extracurricular activities, online or face-to-face collaboration, and overseas exchange programs are practical and beneficial opportunities for language learners in Guangxi University to interact with ASEAN people to improve their linguistic and sociocultural competence in ELF contexts.

6.4.3 Teaching resources and the ELF approach.

Teacher awareness of ELF material evaluation is relevant to the effective integration of an ELF-aware approach in language teaching (Lopriore & Vettorel, in press). Language teachers need to evaluate teaching materials when considering the ELF approach. First, teachers need to critically examine existing teaching materials to see whether the “plurilithic nature” (Lopriore & Vettorel, in press) of English rather than the Anglophone-only point of view, is taken into account. Second, teachers need to know how to develop ELF-aware materials with appropriate authentic resources and activities. This section provides a brief examination of the teaching materials for the comprehensive English courses and listening courses for first and second year students, and the interpreting
courses and sociocultural courses for third and fourth year students of English majors in Guangxi University. These courses were chosen for evaluation based on their importance as part of the university’s undergraduate programs (Comprehensive English accounts for 6 credits each semester), their relation to cross-cultural communication in local contexts (for example the sociocultural and interpreting course), and they are all compulsory courses for English majors. Furthermore, in order to explore how ELF-oriented resources can be integrated into classroom teaching, a sample of a trial ELF-aware listening course material has been developed by the author from ACE data. Moreover, a range of resources from audio-visual materials, digital media and online archives related to English varieties or ELF interactions in Asian contexts were provided for teachers to use for English majors in language teaching classroom.

**Brief evaluation of the existing teaching materials at Guangxi University.**

This study used a general checklist to examine the existing materials for Guangxi University’s English majors. The checklist was adopted from the University of Verona (Italy), where it had been used for language teacher education and ELF/WE-informed materials evaluation (Lopriore & Vettorel, in press). The checklist includes 1) perspectives on Global Englishes are included (awareness-raising activities); 2) several varieties of English are presented in listening activities; 3) ELF contexts/speakers are presented in listening activities; 4) Culture is presented including different countries and points of view; 5) Intercultural perspectives are included; and 6) Reflective activities on the students’ own culture are present. These six elements in the checklist cover awareness, linguistic and cultural aspects from an ELF perspective. Table 6.1 provides a summary of the English teaching material evaluation for Guangxi University based on the checklist:
Table 6.1.

A Summary of English Teaching Materials Evaluation in Guangxi University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Global English awareness</th>
<th>Several varieties</th>
<th>ELF contexts</th>
<th>Different cultures</th>
<th>Intercultural perspectives</th>
<th>Home culture reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive English</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Depends on teachers’ guidance in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teaching materials of the four courses, namely, comprehensive English, English listening, Chinese-English interpreting and Western cultures, were chosen for evaluation (with reasons mentioned above). In general, among the four courses, interpreting course materials reflect the ELF perspectives with English varieties and ELF contexts provided in the textbooks. For all the courses, a provision of different cultures or cross-cultural awareness is included to a certain extent in the textbooks. However, native-speaking norms and cultures are the focus of three of the courses. The last two elements of the checklist, intercultural perspectives and reflective activities on the students’ own cultures, cannot be obviously identified from the texts or activities in the textbooks. Whether these elements are integrated in the classroom teaching depends on the teachers’ awareness and guidance. A detailed analysis of each course textbook is provided below:

The Comprehensive English course aims to improve students’ comprehensive language skills, including listening, speaking, reading, writing and translating and it adopts a textbook for English majors named *Contemporary College English (intensive reading)* (L. Yang, 2011) published by the Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press in China. The texts in this course books (Book 1 and 2) for the first two years of English majors consist of roughly 70 percent narratives and 30 percent non-narratives.
The objective of the textbook is for students to acquire language knowledge and skills, understand Western cultures and develop critical thinking through intensive study of the texts for six teaching hours per week. Most of the writers of the selected texts are from native speaking countries. It is worth noting that only three out of the 32 writers in Book 1 and Book 2 are non-native speakers; they are from Thailand, Egypt and South Africa respectively. They are all renowned writers, two of whom won a Nobel Prize for literature. Some articles in the textbooks focus on cultural differences though they are written by native speakers. The textbook aims to build students’ linguistic competence based on a native speaker’s norms by providing extensive grammar, vocabulary, collocation and translation exercises. However, there are not many opportunities listening practice provided in the textbook, except for recordings of texts read by native speakers. Nevertheless, the text topics offer students opportunities for discussion and the exchange of their ideas. Teachers adopting an ELF approach can raise students’ awareness of intercultural communication and reflect on their own cultures using the textbook.

The listening material for English majors in Guangxi University named *Step by Step 3000* (M. Zhang, 2008) has been used for English teaching in China for over 30 years with three editions. The listening exercises aim to develop students’ intensive listening skills by asking them to write down key words or a summary. A large number of authentic recordings such as news reports are provided in the textbook. The latest edition includes a wide range of topics, especially on issues which are relevant around the world. However, there are no non-native speaker recordings found. Also, the teaching material does not contain many speaking activities. Nevertheless, teachers can use the listening materials as valuable resources for students to explore communication strategies or intercultural negotiation.

The interpreting course is the key course for English majors at Guangxi University
as interpreting and translating services are needed locally. The interpreting course books target China and ASEAN communication and aim to prepare students for future work by including relevant topics and contexts. Local teachers are also actively involved in writing the course book and compiling materials for the local interpreting course. For example, *The Essential Interpreter’s Guide to Guangxi* (D. Yang, 2006), *The Essential Interpreter’s Guide to China-ASEAN Free Trade Area* (D. Yang, 2009), *A Course for Business English Interpreting* (Song & An, 2015) were compiled by local English teachers. The content of these books focuses on interpreting between people from Guangxi and other Asians in business settings. However, authentic recordings by speakers from Southeast Asian countries have only been used in the last textbook: *A Course for Business English Interpreting*. The recordings in the other textbooks are spoken by native speakers. It is still encouraging to see authentic non-native speaker recordings have been considered and adopted in interpreting textbook. More attention is paid to the exposure of varieties in Asian contexts in interpreting training. However, the importance of intercultural competence and communicative strategies has not been valued enough in the interpreting materials.

In terms of the sociocultural courses, the only compulsory course is an Introduction to English-speaking Countries. *A Guide to English-speaking Countries* (F. Xie, 2007) is a textbook used in the class to introduce the societies and cultures of six English-speaking countries, that is, Britain, Ireland, America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The knowledge-based content covers the history, economy, government, education, media, literature and culture of these countries. There are other optional sociocultural courses such as, an Introduction to Chinese Culture and an Introduction to Southeast Asian Societies and Cultures. However, offering these courses is subject to the availability of teachers and textbooks. So far, the course of Introduction to Southeast Asian Societies
and Cultures has not been opened yet due to the unavailability of teachers.

The existing textbooks have their merits and demerits as discussed above. Therefore, it is important for teachers to evaluate their teaching materials from ELF perspectives. As noted above, an ELF approach does not mean ignoring or deleting native speaker roles. Language teachers need to understand how to integrate Standard English course books with appropriate authentic materials and activities according to the students’ and the local communities’ needs. Therefore, when designing teaching materials using an ELF-aware approach, teachers should know where to locate related authentic materials, the appropriate contents to be included, and how to integrate these new materials with existing materials.

**Teaching resources for the ELF approach.**

With the increase in the use of the Internet, a large amount of free online information, including written and audio-visual materials, is available for teachers to explore as teaching resources. Southeast Asian countries and China all have their own media to broadcast local, regional and international news. Some quality English media from ASEAN countries together with China, Japan and Korea (10+3) are listed in Appendix 2. Examples of online media which can be used in ELF-aware classrooms is presented below.

In China, China Global Television Network (CGTN) ([www.cgtn.com](http://www.cgtn.com)) (formerly known as CCTV international) includes interviews undertaken in English with people from around the world, such as *Dialogue* and *Crossover* (these form part of the ACE corpus used in this research). *Dialogue* is a serious daily talk show which focuses on politics, economics and diplomacy. Normally one or two guests present their ideas and discuss them with the Chinese host. *Crossover* is a cross-cultural lifestyle talk show that celebrates and explores life in China. Several guests from different cultural backgrounds are invited to share their stories or opinions with two hosts in a lively and entertaining
atmosphere. These two talk shows are both in English only. It is important for teachers to obtain appropriate episodes for their teaching. For example, if the teacher wants to focus on the ELF settings among Asian speakers, episodes with guests from other Asian countries would be appropriate choices. Another interview program called *China Talks* is available online ([www.china.com.cn](http://www.china.com.cn)/fangtan) in both English and Chinese. The English interviews in *China Talks* are mostly between a Chinese host and diplomatic officers from other countries talking about current issues. In Singapore, *Channel NewsAsia* ([www.channelnewsasia.com](http://www.channelnewsasia.com)) reports on global developments with Asian perspectives. The interview program on the website *Conversation With* provides ELF interactions among Asian people covering various topics. All these resources are useful as ELF-aware teaching materials.

The following photos were taken from the English programs: *Crossover, Dialogue* and *China Talks* from China, *Conversation With* from Singapore.

*Figure 6.1.* Photo of an English TV program in China *Crossover* ("Chasing the dream: China’s next pop stars," 2015). The two hosts (on the right) are talking with two singers from China (on the left) and one singer from the US (in the middle).
Figure 6.2. Photo of an English TV program in China Dialogue ("S. Korea’s 1st female president," 2013). The female host (on the left) is talking with a current affairs critic from S. Korea (on the right) and a research fellow from China (in the middle).

Figure 6.3. Photo of an online English program in China China Talks ("Beijing Olympic Games," 2008). The host (in the middle) is talking with a Minister counsellor from Malaysia (on the right) and an Ambassador from the Maldives (on the left).
These national websites provide abundant information on local and regional current affairs, economy and social cultures in the form of written texts, audio and video material. Teachers can use these resources to explore examples of accents, local use of words such as idioms, cultural elements at the WE level; and, at the same time, interactive programs like the interviews between Asian people can also be used in ELF-aware teaching. There are also valuable online archives for English teachers to engage their students in ELF-aware activities. For example, International Dialects of English Archive (IDEA) (www.dialectsarchive.com) consists of 170 hours of recordings of English dialects and accents with 1300 samples from 120 countries. In addition, rich resources of naturally occurring ELF interactions can be retrieved from the three major ELF corpora: VOICE, ACE and ELFA. Furthermore, literature in English written by Asian writers is valuable in language and literature teaching, in terms of the exploration of cultural identities and cultural references. There are many well-known writers, playwrights, and poets from Southeast Asian countries writing in English, for example, Lloyd Fernando and Wong Phui Nam from Malaysia, Stella Kon from Singapore, Wendy Law-Yone from Burma,
Nam Le and Lan Cao from Vietnam, and Rattawut Lapcharoensap from Thailand. Chinese writers who write in English include Ha Jin, Chiang Yee, Amy Tan, Lin Yutang.

*Suggested ways to integrate resources in teaching materials.*

Teachers need to know not only where to locate resources, but also what attributes are required for them to be appropriate. Teachers need to bear in mind the elements that need to be identified and the purpose the materials are to be used for in their classroom teaching. In addition, it is important to note that written English is not the same as spoken English. Kirkpatrick (2014, p. 31) has argued that “the standard norms of written English are not determined by native speakers, but by tradition and convention; and these norms vary across discipline, genre and culture …”. Therefore, teachers should be careful to note that non-standard forms in spoken English are not necessarily the same as the norms in news reports or literature.

In this section, some examples from ACE data are used to elaborate how online resources can be integrated into classroom practices. Firstly, several aspects of the language teaching process mentioned by Lopriore and Vettorel (in press) need to be taken into consideration in a lesson plan:

- Language functions: functions aimed at negotiating meaning and establishing identities;
- Grammar: standard and non-standard forms;
- Vocabulary: standard and non-standard forms and chunks;
- Themes: a variety of cultural and intercultural issues;
- Pronunciation: a variety of native and non-native excerpts;
- Spoken language: authentic spoken interactions among native and non-native speakers and the use of localized spoken language features;
- Aural comprehension: noticing tasks and activities using excerpts of authentic
- Reading comprehension: a range of texts produced in English within WE or ELF contexts.

There are vast online resources containing these aspects of language. However, teachers need to understand which resources are suitable for their students in terms of difficulty level and relevance. Take the excerpts of an interaction (see Appendix 3) from ACE as an example. The ELF interaction between a Chinese, a Maldivian and a Malaysian exposes students to a variety of non-native English pronunciations of Asian speakers. Gap-filling exercises can be used to instruct students in how to distinguish differences between accents. For example, the plosive [t] and [p] tend to be replaced by [d] and [b] by L1 Malay speakers. Gap filling practice is useful in the first excerpt for the missing word *torch* (see Excerpt 1 Line 3), which is pronounced as *dorch*. If students can fill in the right word based on the meaning in the context, it shows they are able to deal with pronunciation obstacles. If not, the teacher needs to help students understand the phonetic features of different accents, and at the same time, teach students how to focus on meaning rather than specific pronunciation.

There are also other examples of non-standard forms of lexicogrammar in this excerpt, which can be used to teach students how to focus on meaning rather than form in their communication. Students can judge by themselves whether these non-standard forms become obstacles or cause breakdowns in communication. Furthermore, teachers can ask students to note the creative use of phrases or idioms in the excerpt and to consider how this creation deviates from the Standard English and how it is related with the speaker’s L1. For example, S2 in the second excerpt mentions that the Chinese player *totally cracking down* (see Excerpt 2 Line 33) when winning the Olympic gold. The invented phrase *crack down* might be a combination of *crack up* and *break down*, which
in this context means an outburst of his emotions and crying. However, S1, without any hesitation, understands what S2 means here and says *is crying yeah* (see Excerpt 2 Line 35) to show his agreement. Gap filling exercises for the created phrase can be designed to attract student attention to such creations, and short answer exercises for possible meanings of the created phrase can encourage student flexibility in using and perceiving new words.

In addition, there are examples in these excerpts that show how the speakers apply communicative strategies during their interaction, such as lexical suggestions (see Excerpt 1 Line 3), frequent backchannels (see Excerpt 1 Line 5, 7, 13, 18, 21), and meaning negotiation (see Excerpt 2 Line 8-13). Teachers can guide student attention to such phenomenon and help them think reflectively and critically. These kinds of communicative strategies used by ELF speakers in real communication can be perceived and acquired by language students with appropriate teacher guidance. For example, focused study on certain communicative strategies can be adopted in class teaching. Students are encouraged to discuss how a strategy skill is used, the situations when it can be used and other strategies that might be used. In this way, students can develop their sensitivity to communicative strategies used by their interlocutors and also build their own ability to adopt these strategies in real life.

Another important aspect of the language teaching process (Lopriore & Vettorel, in press) is the cultural issue. How students perceive cultural differences, how they relate their own culture to other cultures, how to avoid cultural stereotypes and how to negotiate different cultural references require carefully designed and sensitively used materials. In Excerpt 2 (see Excerpt 2 Line 31-41), S2 is aware of the change of Chinese players’ ways of showing emotions, providing a useful topic to reflect on changes in Chinese culture. For example, students can identify the changes, the possible reasons for the change,
people’s attitude towards the change and how this change relates to other cultures.

To sum up, when designing ELF-oriented material, teachers need to use appropriate authentic ELF interactions and materials, and adapt these resources for their teaching purposes. Various aspects of the language teaching process should also be taken into consideration. For instance, teachers should direct students pay attention to the existence and the functions of non-standard forms, a variety of non-native accents, creativity in language use and intercultural issues in ELF. Based on the teaching curriculum for English majors at Guangxi University, it is suggested that the ELF approach can be integrated in the following current courses: comprehensive English, listening and speaking for the first and the second year of English majors; interpreting, sociocultural introduction, literature and foreign newspapers for the third and fourth year of English majors.

6.4.4 ELF-aware assessment.

The criteria of assessment impact what is taught and learned. The existing criteria of English assessment at Guangxi University are mainly based on approximation to Standard English norms. The main reasons for relying on the standard criteria are possibly as follows: First, it is safe to follow mainstream examination criteria, such as, the international English exams (IELTS-International English Language Testing System, TOEFL-Test for English as a Foreign Language), the national exams (TEM 4, TEM 8 for English majors in China). It would be risky for teachers to use exams, which do not use standard benchmarks. Second, there are no better options available for the time being. To date, there are no recognized exams of English used as an international language or a lingua franca.

However, there is an overwhelming need to develop “ASEAN-wide proficiency
benchmarks and ELT competency frameworks” in ASEAN context (Kirkpatrick, in press). The reality of English used as a lingua franca between China and ASEAN people could be a driving force to achieve the realization of an ELF-oriented course and assessment in Guangxi. In China-ASEAN communication contexts, it is natural that students should be assessed on how successfully they can use English in such settings more than how closely they conform to native speaker norms. Therefore, the fifth principle for the ELF approach proposed by Kirkpatrick (2014, in press), that ELF aware teaching requires ELF assessment, is applicable in this situation. Furthermore, according to the English teaching syllabus issued by MOE, English majors will take TEM 4 in the second year and TEM 8 in the fourth year of university (as mentioned in Section 6.2.1). Nevertheless, it is also stated, that each university should take various measures of assessment to evaluate their own students’ competences based on its own educational objectives and curriculum. As discussed, because the educational objectives for English majors in Guangxi University (see Section 6.2.2), include cultivating ASEAN-oriented personnel, it would be both desirable and necessary to develop ELF-oriented courses and assessment for English majors in Guangxi.

In practice, such ELF-aware assessment can be first introduced in a course in which an ELF approach has been adopted (for example, the courses discussed in the section above). Normally course teachers for English majors have the freedom to give their own tests to students who attend the course. In this section, a proposal concerning speaking assessments for English majors in Guangxi are discussed in detail with reference to the criteria in TEM 4-Oral, which is a national English oral test for second-year English majors. There are three tasks in the TEM 4-Oral: retelling a story for three minutes after listening twice from a recorded tape; making a presentation for three minutes on a given topic; and interacting with another student by playing a given role. The assessors are
required to rate students for pronunciation and intonation (accurate and clear pronunciation, natural intonation), vocabulary and grammar (correct grammar and word choice), discourse management (logical and fluent delivery) and interactive communication (flexible interaction and able to observe communication principles). Fluency and accuracy are the major concerns of the traditional assessment criteria, which are based on nearness to native speaker norms. It is worth noting that flexibility and cooperation are highlighted when rating interactive communication criteria in TEM4-Oral. However, there is not a detailed checklist concerning flexibility and cooperation in communication.

In an ELF context, as suggested by Newbold (2015, p. 218), the communicative success of a presentation may depend more on “lexical transparency (the avoidance of unilateral idiomaticity) and recognizable pronunciation” rather than correct word choice and pronunciation. In spoken interactions, “pragmatic strategies are likely to be important”. “Flexibility and adaptability (of both speakers and listeners) are likely to be positive strategies which should be recognized and rewarded” in ELF-aware assessment (Newbold, in press) Therefore, it is important to assess learners regarding how they flexibly apply various communicative strategies to achieve their communicative purpose, how they adapt themselves to various accents and expressions, how they co-construct meaning and how they deal with cultural issues in their interactions. Taking the lexicogrammatical features and pragmatic features of Asian ELF users (as analyzed in Chapter Four and Five) into consideration, a suggested rating grid for ELF-aware speaking assessment is as follows:
Table 6.2.

*Suggested Rating Grid for ELF-aware Speaking Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Interactive communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Recognizable pronunciation</td>
<td>Easily accommodates different accents of Asian people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexis</td>
<td>Avoids idiomatic expression</td>
<td>Creative use of language for communication purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Non-standard grammar which does not cause communication breakdown can be ignored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative strategies</td>
<td>Asks for clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical suggestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrasing or explaining Code-switching when there is shared language and culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural issues</td>
<td>Understands cultural differences</td>
<td>Intercultural ability (negotiation of cultural reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goes beyond cultural stereotypes</td>
<td>Co-construct meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse management</td>
<td>Logical and coherent</td>
<td>Backchannels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referencing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment grid also accords with the communicative competencies of ELF speakers discussed in Section 6.3. Teachers need to be aware that the shift from traditional assessment to ELF-aware assessment requires the creative use of non-native speaker elements. For example, in assessing spoken interaction, students from ASEAN countries can be involved in the oral test with Chinese English learners. Also, real time online communication between students from different countries can be recorded for oral assessment. However, this creative use of non-native speaker elements can be challenging in assessment practice, especially in assessing sociocultural competence in spoken interaction. English teachers might adapt the assessing grid to their real situation or
teaching needs to make it less challenging.

The discussion above has shown it is not an easy job to challenge conventional testing methods and develop an ELF-aware assessment framework in the current curriculum in Guangxi. The challenges come from both the inside, that is, teachers’ conceptualization of English, and outside, which are the pressure of international and national English language assessment frameworks. However, as argued by Newbold (2015), it is worthwhile investing energy and resources in developing ELF-aware tests, as they would be more valid and authentic in the long term and contribute to student gaining a greater understanding of the dynamics of ELF interaction.

6.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, the pedagogical implications of ELF for language teaching have been discussed regarding the specific needs for English majors at Guangxi in the contexts of China-ASEAN communication. Consequently, the third research question has been addressed in this chapter:

Research question 3: What are the implications of the ELF features for English language teaching in China? To be more specific,

3.1 How can these ELF features and competences identified be integrated into language teaching in local universities in China;

3.2 How to implement ELF approach in local language teaching which is oriented to the situations where multilingual speakers from ASEAN and China communicate in English?

Through the examination of the English teaching syllabus for English majors issued by the Chinese Ministry of Education and the teaching goal of undergraduate program for
English majors at Guangxi University, it is suggested that the ELF approach is feasible and practical for language teaching for English majors in Guangxi, where there is increasing exchange and communication with people from ASEAN countries. The five principles of the ELF approach proposed by Kirkpatrick (2014, in press) can be applied to language teaching in Guangxi given the frequent China-ASEAN communication contexts.

Based on the findings of the corpus in this research, the ELF communicative competencies for English majors, who are ELF users, are elaborated in detail as potential teaching goals and materials for an ELF approach. ELF-oriented linguistic competence, including language input and output, should focus on intelligibility rather than native-speaker norms; and the creative use of language is considered to be a positive way of exploiting language resources for the purpose of communication. Strategic and discourse competence need to be emphasized in language teaching in order to facilitate communication and avoid communication breakdowns. The focus of sociocultural competence for ELF users in the ASEAN+3 region also needs to shift from a native-speaker’s culture to Asian cultures. Asian ELF users should not only be aware of cultural differences, but also be able to move beyond cultural stereotypes and negotiate cultural references in their communication.

Considering the teaching environment of Guangxi University and the national teaching syllabus and test for English majors, ELF-aware teaching proposals have been made given the presence of suitable teachers and the provision of teacher education, and appropriate practice environments, teaching materials and assessment. First, local bilingual teachers with ELF training are appropriate teachers for an ELF approach given their ELF experience and intercultural insight. Second, it is feasible to integrate more ELF-oriented practices in language teaching, both via face-to-face and online
collaboration with other Asian students. The valuable resources of Asian ELF speakers can be made used of on campus of Guangxi and in the neighboring countries where some transnational higher education programs have been established. Third, suggestions are also made for locating appropriate resources for teaching materials through online text and audio-visual sources, including open and accessible corpora. Teachers also need to be aware of why and how to integrate the resources into current teaching materials. Finally, it is stressed that it is not easy to conduct ELF-aware assessment, due to needing to take the validity of the test and the pressure of international and national tests based on Standard English into account. It is suggested that ELF-aware assessment can first be conducted within specific courses in which an ELF approach can been easily introduced and applied.

In summary, an ELF approach represents a feasible and appropriate pedagogy for English majors at Guangxi University, even though there are a number of difficulties and challenges to be faced in implementing such an approach. The introduction of an ELF approach in English teaching does not mean there is a need to replace the traditional conventions of language teaching. It is argued that both native speaker and non-native speaker norms can be part of the teaching curriculum. However, the current curriculum of MOE, is based on native speaker norms, which ignores the complexity and reality of English used in the region. Teachers need to take the responsibility to reflect about the actual use of English in today’s world, especially in their region, and the implications of this for their classroom teaching. By integrating appropriate resources into current materials and organizing interaction or collaboration with other Asian students, teachers can improve their students’ ELF competences and meet their needs for realistic communication. At Guangxi University, the goal of English major undergraduate education is in part ASEAN-oriented and some textbooks have been published with a
focus on ASEAN countries. Therefore, applying an ELF approach more systematically is feasible. An ELF approach can be introduced step by step, from one course to more courses, from one project to more projects. There is a long way to go, but the adoption of an ELF-aware approach will be worth the effort as it can contribute to the understanding and recognition of the ELF reality and complexity of ELF use.
Chapter Seven

Conclusion

7.1 Review of the Research Aims

This research has investigated how English is used as a lingua franca in the context of China-ASEAN communication, where the ELF speakers are mainly bilinguals or multilinguals, using English as non-native speakers. The major aims of the research were: a) to study how English was being used in the context of China-ASEAN communication by describing and analysing the lexicogrammatical features of ELF, especially by L1 Chinese ELF speakers, and to examine whether the non-standard forms occurring in this defined context necessarily caused communication breakdowns; b) to investigate the pragmatic competence Asian ELF users demonstrated in China-ASEAN interactions, and c) to discuss the implications of ELF for English language teaching in local universities of China. More specifically, the lexicogrammatical features of Chinese ELF users studied in this thesis included lexical and phrasal innovation, non-standard use of prepositions, grammatical disagreement, non-standard omission, subject pronoun copying, tag questions, self-repetitions, response to general questions and the use of adjacent default tense. The pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users included their communicative strategies, and their sociocultural competence and discourse competence. The discussion of the potential implications of the findings for English language teaching focused on the language teaching situation in China, especially in a region with frequent communication with ASEAN countries, such as Guangxi Province of China.
7.2 Major Findings

Using data of naturally occurring ELF interactions from the subset of ACE, comprising 7.5 hours in 18 files, the findings of the non-standard lexicogrammatical features of Chinese ELF users, the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users, and the implications of ELF for language teaching in China are summarized below.

7.2.1 Lexicogrammatical features of ELF by Chinese users.

Chapter Four has addressed the first research question: How is English being used in the context of China-ASEAN communication? Specially, 1) What characteristic and distinctive lexicogrammatical features of ELF are used by Chinese in the context of China-ASEAN communication? 2) Do these non-standard forms identified in the data cause misunderstanding or breakdown in ELF interactions? The Nine lexicogrammatical features of Chinese ELF users were identified and their frequencies were noted in Chapter Four. They were lexical and phrasal innovation, non-standard use of prepositions, grammatical disagreement, non-standard omission, subject pronoun copying, tag questions, self-repetitions, response to general questions and the use of adjacent default tense. The findings indicate that Chinese ELF users are creative and flexible in using the language to meet their communicative needs.

First, new words and expressions were invented by following the rules of English word formation conventions or integrating local cultures. For example, the coined word *incertainties* instead of the standard form *uncertainties was* invented by adding the prefix *in*, which means negation according to the norms of English words formation. Although this kind of invented word would be considered wrong in Standard English, when it was used by ELF speakers for their communication needs it did not cause communication problems in their interaction. Second, the non-standard uses of prepositions included
additional use, omission and substitution of prepositions. Substitution of prepositions ranked the highest of all the non-standard use of preposition, and the preposition *about* was identified as being more common than in Standard English. For example, *about* was used to replace other prepositions, or used additionally as in *discuss about, mention about, explain about*. Third, grammatical disagreements were studied, mainly in terms of three categories: singular-plural disagreement, which accounted for the highest among all the disagreements, subject-verb disagreement, and the *there be* structure. In addition, the further study of the third person zero in the category of subject-verb disagreement indicated that the use of *–s* form for the third person singular accounted for a much higher percentage than the non-use of *–s* form (78% over 22%). In addition, the use of *–s* form was found mostly among certain words such as *seems, means, wants*. Fourth, among the non-standard omissions of articles, subjects, objects, copula/auxiliary verbs and prepositions, the definite article *the* was found not used as often as in Standard English. All these non-standard forms exist in ELF used by Chinese speakers, but, as noted below, not systematically. Some other grammatical features which have been identified in SCE were also examined in these ELF contexts. For example, subject pronoun copying (SPC), invariant question tags, adjacent default tense (ADT), response to general questions also occurred in this subset. In addition, self-repetition of a certain word, phrase or sentence structure was applied by Chinese ELF users in order to emphasize or make their discourse coherent.

However, there was no evidence to show these non-standard forms necessarily caused misunderstanding or communication breakdowns in these China-ASEAN contexts. It should be stressed that these features occurred in the speech of some, but not all ELF speakers, and that non-standard forms were not systematically used in these contexts. Furthermore, these non-standard forms were not necessarily exclusive to
Chinese ELF users as some of the features were also found in different varieties of English or by other ELF users. It also should be noted that the ELF of Chinese users represented a fluctuating dynamic use of language dependent upon the context and the linguistic and cultural background of the speakers, and it is not a variety. The conclusion drawn from the lexicogrammatical features is that Chinese ELF speakers may use these non-standard forms in the specific contexts without causing communicative breakdowns. Mutual intelligibility appears more important than conforming to native speaker’s norms when communicating with other Asian multilingual ELF speakers.

7.2.2 The pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users.

Chapter Five has addressed the second research question and examined the pragmatic competence of Asian ELF users in China-ASEAN contexts in terms of strategic competence, sociocultural competence and discourse competence. Asian ELF users in this data were found to be active and flexible in using various communicative strategies to overcome problems or to facilitate their communication. The common strategies used by the ELF speakers included the use of lexical suggestion, paraphrasing, code-switching, asking for clarification and avoiding the use of local idioms. In addition, Asian ELF speakers were able to demonstrate a certain degree of sensitivity and flexibility in dealing with cultural differences and changes. It is worth noting that in emergent and dynamic ELF intercultural communication, Asian ELF speakers can move beyond cultural stereotypes. Third, the study of discourse competence indicates that Asian ELF speakers collaborate with and support each other by frequently using backchannels and echoing.

7.2.3 The implications of ELF for language teaching in China.

Chapter Six has addressed the third research question and discussed the implications of ELF for language teaching in China. To be more specific, 1) How can these ELF
features and competences identified be integrated into language teaching in local universities in China; and 2) How to implement ELF approach in local language teaching which is oriented to the situations where multilingual speakers from ASEAN and China communicate in English? It is suggested that the ELF approach is feasible and practical for language teaching for English majors in Guangxi, where there is increasing communication with people from ASEAN countries. The ELF communicative competence that has been described in this research, including linguistic competence, strategic competence, discourse competence and sociocultural competence can be integrated into the pedagogical practice for English majors in Guangxi. Guided by the five principles of ELF approach proposed by Kirkpatrick (2014, in press), a new approach to language teaching can be adopted given the presence of suitable teachers, an appropriate environment, (online) teaching materials and the use of ELF-aware assessment. It is also argued that both native speaker and non-native speaker norms can be part of the teaching curriculum. Although facing challenges and pressures from language teaching authorities, English teachers’ mindsets, and the relatively scarce availability of ELF-oriented textbooks, the adoption of an ELF-aware approach can be worth the effort as it recognises the complexity of ELF reality and use.

7.3 Significance and Limitations of the Research

ELF research is a relative new field of study with only about 20 years’ history, and the role of English as a lingua franca has become increasingly dynamic with the rise in number of non-native users. However, to date, there has been little research focusing on Chinese ELF speakers communication with other Asian ELF speakers. Using naturally occurring speech from ACE, this study investigated the linguistic features of English as a lingua franca by Asian multilinguals, in particular L1 Chinese users in specific China-
ASEAN communication contexts. The findings of this research in lexicogrammar, communicative strategies, discourse management, intercultural awareness of Asian ELF users serve as complementary evidence to existing findings in other ELF contexts and contribute to the description of ELF. In addition, the findings in this research demonstrate that English is successfully used by Asian multilinguals in China-ASEAN communication contexts. That is, the findings indicate possible ways to facilitate communication between Chinese and other Asian ELF users. Therefore, the findings are useful for regional English language teaching.

This is preliminary corpus-based research of ELF in China-ASEAN communication contexts and its implications for local language teaching. Nonetheless, the source of the selected ACE data is mainly TV programmes, which means that the mode of the conversation is defined. While the data of such “institutional” talk (Cameron, 2001) enabled the study to focus on specific domains and specific ELF users, the study has not described a more diversified use of ELF.

7.4 Recommendations for Future Research

First, ACE is a rich resource for ELF study in Asian contexts and can be used for further comparative study in this area. For example, the Chinese component of ACE can be used to compare with other components of ACE to examine the similarities and differences of ELF features by different Asian users. There can also be further study of Chinese ELF users in other domains such as ordinary daily talk, rather than in formal talk shows on TV. How the Asian ELF speakers use English and on what occasions they use English can also be future study topics based on the ACE data. Furthermore, ACE can be compared with other ELF corpora, such as VOICE, to investigate the use of ELF in different contexts. To what degree the features identified in this research are shared with
other varieties or ELF in other contexts also requires further study. The features can also be compared with native speaker corpora such as the British National Corpus (BNC) and The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), to examine how Asian ELF speakers make use of the language in a different way from native speakers.

Second, the implications of ELF for language teaching can be further studied. It is recommended that an experimental study of the ELF approach be conducted in a local university in China. Through this, issues encountered and their solutions can be identified, and therefore, contribute to better formulating of the ELF approach. With regard to the specific situation at Guangxi University, it would be useful to study how the ELF approach integrates into translation and interpreting training, especially as this training is aimed at helping ELF speakers from other Asian countries.

Another issue that can be considered for future research is how Chinese identity is represented in ELF. This research has illustrated aspects of cross-cultural awareness between Chinese and ASEAN people and their cultural identities in ELF. However, there is still need for a deeper study of the cultural identities of ELF speakers. For example, examining how the use of ELF can show speaker’s identity in China-ASEAN contexts and whether English is an integral part of an Asian speaker’s multilingual identity. These topics relate the use of English in ELF contexts with the ownership of English.

7.5 Concluding Remarks

The role of English as a lingua franca in Asia, especially in the communication between China and ASEAN countries, has been growing significantly. The description and analysis of the linguistic features of the ELF used by Asian speakers contributes to the recognition and understanding of the reality of ELF. Non-standard forms in ELF
certainly exist in China-ASEAN communication contexts. However, these non-standard forms do not necessarily cause communication breakdowns or misunderstanding. Asian ELF speakers are flexible in using language and in understanding their interlocutors even when they use non-standard forms. Mutual intelligibility accounts far more than conformity to non-native speakers in this China-ASEAN communicative context. Furthermore, the pragmatic competence demonstrated in this context indicates that Asian ELF users are strategic and innovative communicators. These findings have implications for local and regional English language teaching. It is suggested that an ELF approach be integrated into the current language teaching curriculum in local universities. With an increasing number of ELF speakers and the increasing role of ELF in the China-ASEAN region, the recognition of the use of ELF has potentially significant implications for an ELF-approach to language teaching, which should contribute to better communication between China and ASEAN.
Appendix 1: Features of ELF in terms of lexis, grammar and pragmatics in previous studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Af</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Asn</th>
<th>C&amp;D</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>lexis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same meaning, different words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boot/trunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coined words from local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sushi, xiao kang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same word, new meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader or narrower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid words (code-mixing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan dan noodle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero 3rd singular</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative pron</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Which/who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articles</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>A, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse common words</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Make, have,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncountable words-plural</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advices, informations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question tag</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘This’ for sing and plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositions</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over explicitness</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less complex tense</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over use V+ing</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am not liking the food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb complement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allow him go, Make him to clean…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron no gender</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He/she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj-adv</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain the food easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron copying</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Many of the fish, they have…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no answer</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-inversion</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>I cannot tell you what is the matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free word order</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In my family, we are many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modality</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would/should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null subject (pron)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because…so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifier-modified</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic comment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some contres, we exempt of income tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT: adjacent tense</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSV</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominalization</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omit copular BE</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis of objects and complements (after vt.)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I think.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pragmatics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Speech act</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(changeable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request schema</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reason-request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliments</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rejected-accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modesty</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Turn-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Communicative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical anticipation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical suggestion</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance completion</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical correction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t give up (work together)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The abbreviations in the title categories refer to African settings (Af), VOICE (V), Asian settings (Asn), Cogo & Dewey’s corpora (C&D), and Chinese English (CE).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request repetition</th>
<th>*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request clarification</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it pass</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>avoid</td>
<td>With silence and mini backchannels in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait and see</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>With back-channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to the message</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant paraphrase</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant prompt</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>More than paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spell out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+ DO emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be explicit</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Change topic or question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid idiomatic referents</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-sharing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Not to avoid idioms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-switching</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Accommodation (Deterding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Before/after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Discourse interaction

| overlapping |  *  | involvement |  |
| echo |  *  | accommodation |  |
| Back-channels |  *  | Cooperative, encouraging |  |
Appendix 2: The list of quality media in ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and Korea)

China:

China Central Television (CCTV) -English ([www.english.cctv.com](http://www.english.cctv.com)), is the predominant national television broadcaster in PRC, offering news reports, live and on-demand videos and searchable archives in English.

China Global Television Network (CGTN) ([www.cgtn.com](http://www.cgtn.com)), China’s new international media organization, formerly known as CCTV international, launched by CCTV on Dec 31, 2016. CGTN includes interviews with people from around the world, such as Dialogue and Crossover used in this research.

China Daily Asia ([www.chinadailyasia.com](http://www.chinadailyasia.com)), featuring news, views and analysis of China and the region.

China.org.cn ([www.china.org.cn](http://www.china.org.cn)) offers broad access to up-to-date news in China, with researchable texts of government position papers and a wealth of basic information about Chinese history, politics, economics and culture.

Xinhua News ([www.news.cn/english](http://www.news.cn/english)), sponsored by the Xinhua News Agency, is China’s important central news service-oriented website, and one of most influential news portals in the world.

China Plus ([www.chinaplus.cri.cn](http://www.chinaplus.cri.cn)) is CRI’s (China Radio International) overseas all-in-one English-language media brand, providing audio, video, photo and print media as part of its extensive product range.

China-Hong Kong:

South China Morning Post ([www.scmp.com](http://www.scmp.com)) is Hong Kong’s internationally recognized English language newspaper.

Japan:

Japan Times ([www.japantimes.co.jp](http://www.japantimes.co.jp)), Japan’s largest English-language newspaper.

Japan Today ([www.japantoday.com](http://www.japantoday.com)) is an online newspaper in English.

South Korea:
Yonhap News (www/english.yonhapnews.co.kr) Yonhap News Agency is South Korea’s largest news agency.

The Korea Times (www.koreatimes.co.kr), the most influential and the oldest independent English-language daily in Korea.

The Korea Post (www.koreapost.com)

**Brunei:**

Brunei Times (www.bt.com.bn)

**Cambodia:**

Cambodia Daily (www.cambodiadaily.com)

Phnom Penh Post (www.phnompenhpost.com)

**Indonesia:**

The Jakarta Post (www.thejakartapost.com)

Jakarta Globe (www.thejakartaglobe.com)

**Laos:**

Lao News Agency (www.kpl.net.la)

Laos News net (www.laosnews.net)

**Malaysia:**

The Star (www.thestar.com.my)

New Straits Times (www.nst.com.my)

Malaysian Insider (www.themalaysianinsider.com)

Bernama (www.bernama.com)

**Myanmar:**

Burma Daily (wn.com/Burma_daily.com)

Myanmar International (www.myanmarinternationaltv.com)

The New Light of Myanmar (www.myanmar.com)

**Philippines:**

Philistar (www.philstar.com)
Manila Times (www.manilatimes.net)
Inquirer (www.inquirer.net)
Filipino Express (www.filipinoexpress.com)
ABS CBN News (www.abs-cbn.com)

**Singapore:**

Channel News Asia (www.channelnewsasia.com), reporting on global developments with Asian perspectives.

The Straits Times (www.straitstimes.com), the most-read newspaper in Singapore with comprehensive coverage of world news, East Asian news, Southeast Asian news and home news.

Today Online (www.todayonline.com)

Asia One (www.asiaone.com)

**Thailand:**

Bangkok Post (www.bangkokpost.com)

The Nation (www.nationmultimedia.com)

National News Bureau of Thailand (NNT) (thainews.prd.go.th)

**Vietnam:**

Viet Nam News Agency (www.vnanet.vn)

VnExpress (www.vnexpress.net)

Ngoisao (ngoisao.net)
Appendix 3: Transcription of excerpts from ACE for listening practice

Excerpt 1: 3’41”-5’27”

1. S1: ... and i just want to know what is YOUR most impressive part of the ceremony?
2. S2: er i think er in all opening ceremonies er lighting the fire or the lamp er=
3. S3: <1> the **torch** </1>
4. S2: <1> thi- the torch </1> is the=
5. S1: =yeah
6. S2: is the most er: (1) anticipated part of the opening ceremony
7. S1: yeah
8. S2: er: in every opening ceremony they try to make it as unique as possible and it is a
9. well-guarded secret
10. S3: @@
11. S2: until the last moment hh and er people there initially wondering where the torch
12. was
13. S1: <@> yeah </@> <2> that’s sure </2>
14. S2: and <2> we couldn't see any </2> if you look around er and we have always er
15. wanted to see when this **surprise** would happen er but everybody was so occupied
16. with what was happening on the on the ground that no one really saw how the things
17. suddenly turned up
18. S1: <@> yeah </@>
19. S2: even before the person went around to you know light it even the torch itself was
20. not there initially
21. S3: yes
22. S2: and then suddenly it appeared and and er: you know things started to happen and
23. it was really er (.) quite amazing yes @@
24. S1: even those residents er: who live near the bird’s nest
25. S3: yes
S1: they cannot find the main torch (. ) where is the main torch

S3: yeah

S1: so we before the olympic ceremony opened (. ) we have discussed and guessed where is the main torch and finally we got find a AMAZING torch it's just on on the (masses) who lighted the torch

S3: so actually we were asking you know what is the secret weapon that

S1: @@ yeah

S3: **what is actually in the sleeve** you know you are hide hiding and trying to i mean before it can be revealed to to the whole whole world

**Excerpt 2: 10’44”-12’58”**

S1: what kind of holding you you are taking when you play table tennis =

S2: =ah i use the shakehand @@

S1: shakehand? how about you

S3: pen hold

S1: <pen hold

S3: yes @@

S2: @@@

S1: are you are partners so you are against play- against each other more?

S3: sorry you er

S1: well i mean you you play you used to play table tennis (. ) <pvc> oftenly </pvc> yeah? er: you are partners or you're you're played against each other

S2: well we practiced together er <1> er er yes yes </1>

S1: <1> practice together </1>

S3: <1> practice together erm i </1> must say here that we are different class huh ambassador latheef a <2> class ahead of me </2>

S2: <2> @@@@@@@@ </2>
S1: <2> @@@@@@@@ </2> yeah er m can you just er both of you telling us why ma lin can won the game last night and er

S3: @@

S1: what do you think he: he made better than wang hao

S3: @@

S2: erm i think at that level or maybe at er at any level there are days when you are in better form and there are days when you are not at your peak so it is probably the question of you know being in form and er ma lin er er the way i see was it was er (.)
was more sort of er energetic and he had the er mental er: strength to to

S1: <3> yeah </3>

S2: <3> challenge </3> wang hao er better that that day last night to each other (. ) and er (1) between two champions er it's always a question of you know f- form and how you er play and one thing i noticed after the match is that

S1: <4> yeah </4>

S2: <4> usually </4> you don't see among chinese players (. ) is them showing emotion

S1: yes=

S2: =er which is very rare last night you you could see ma lin totally <5> cracking down </5>

S1: <5> is crying </5> yeah

S2: which is something that's not er seen er among sports people in in china

S1: yes

S2: er they they they don't show this usually but in this olympics somehow many of them have started to er to show their emotions after winning (. ) erm: which is something very human and i think which is expected at this level when you win olympic gold for the first time
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