

14.

ELF4EFL: Taking stock

Andy KIRKPATRICK (Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia)

Introduction

As Seidlhofer and Widdowson point out in the introductory chapter of this volume, ‘the global learning of English needs to be based on its global use’ and this means that English as a lingua franca ‘corresponds more closely to what is real for learners, and is a more realistic objective for them to achieve’. It is also important to note that there is a myriad different contexts in which ELF occurs. Previous chapters in this book have exemplified ELF use in a range of different contexts including Brazil, Greece, Turkey and Portugal. My own work (Kirkpatrick 2010) shows a range of contexts in which ELF is used in Asia. For example, the ten countries that make up the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN^{viii}) have made English the sole working language of the group thereby necessitating daily and continual use of ELF across the region. ELF is thus seen throughout the world and in many different contexts.

People therefore will have different reasons and motivations for using ELF and this complexity must somehow be considered when developing an ELF-aware approach to teaching. As many of the chapters in this volume have shown, to talk about an ELF-aware *approach* rather than the teaching of ELF *per se* is a deliberate and carefully considered position. As Kohn so elegantly notes (this volume) ELF communication is not about using a special variety of English. ELF communication depends on the context, the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the speakers and the ways in which the speakers negotiate meaning when in ELF communication. In this it exemplifies a social constructivist understanding of language use in which people learn and use a language ‘by creating their own version of it in their minds, hearts and behaviour’ (Kohn 2011:80). This also means that their need for ELF will change depending on circumstances and contexts. And while it is sensible to note that mutual intelligibility is a key aim for all ELF communication, it may not be the only aim an ELF user has in mind. As Kohn reminds us (this volume), ELF users ‘certainly want to be understood, but they may also want their performance to be accurate and fluent, or an indicator of professional competence...’.

Generally speaking, however, an ELF-aware approach recognises that it is not necessary to persist with attempts to get learners to conform to NS norms (Seidlhofer and Widdowson this volume). As Seidlhofer and Widdowson stress, English taught as a foreign language (ETFL) (and which accords to ENL) is not the same as English that is learned as a foreign language (ELFL), which very frequently does not correspond to the norms of ENL. By the same token, therefore, in any assessment of ELF, the native speaker is not a useful yardstick (Newbold, this volume). ELF assessment needs to be ‘open, inclusive and flexible’, but, as Newbold points, out, this is considerably easier said than done. The assessment of ELF remains one of the major challenges for an ELF-aware approach and I return to this issue later.

ELF corpora and the dynamic nature of ELF.

The dynamic nature of ELF is captured by a number of corpora of ELF. These include the well-known Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE <http://www.univie.ac.at/voice>), English as an Academic Lingua Franca (ELFA (<http://www.helsinki.fi/englanti/elfa/elfacorp>)) and the Asian Corpus of English (ACE <http://corpus.ied.edu.hk/ace>). These corpora all offer potential material for an ELF-aware approach to teaching. Here I shall use examples drawn from the Asian Corpus of English (ACE) as this is the corpus with which I am most familiar and, given its only relatively recent publication, it is probably the least familiar to readers of this volume.

ACE comprises the naturally occurring use of English as a lingua franca as used by Asian multilinguals for whom English is an additional language. It has been transcribed and annotated using VOICEScribe, the software used for VOICE. Like VOICE, it is readily accessible to anyone interested in using it, so that researchers can easily compare the two corpora. Thus researchers can compare a corpus that primarily comprises the use of ELF in European settings with speakers of European languages with one that primarily comprises the use of ELF in Asian settings with speakers of Asian languages.

Here I review three studies which used ACE to show how a corpus such as ACE might be used to develop ELF-aware teaching materials. The three studies are quite different in that the first examined the use or non-use of the present tense third person 's' in the ELF of speakers whose first language was Malay, a language that does not mark for tense. The second study investigated the communicative and repair strategies of ELF speakers, and the third study looked at the topics that ELF speakers in ACE talked about with a view to suggesting possible ELF-aware materials.

Three Studies

As indicated above, the first study examined the use or non-use of the present tense third person singular 's' in the ELF of first language speakers of Malay. Using a 16-hour subset of ACE with speakers whose first language was a form of Malay (Malay, Bruneian Malay, Indonesian) the hypothesis was that, as Malay does not mark for tense, these speakers would thus have a tendency not to mark for tense. The hypothesis was not confirmed. In fact, these speakers were almost always found to mark for tense when the occasion was formal. Even in more informal situations, the speakers tended to mark tense more often than they did not (Kirkpatrick and Subhan 2014]. In the 16-hour sample the total number of instances where either singular present tense '-s' or simple past tense could have been marked is 413. Of these possible instances of tense marking, 306 instances are marked and 107 are not. In stark contrast, however, in more formal interactions, such as preparing motions for a debate, there is a significant drop in the number of unmarked verbs, as there are only 7 instances of non-marking compared with 152 of marking. Below is an example excerpt from a relatively informal interaction. The unmarked verbs are in italics and the marked ones are in bold. Discourse markers from the speakers' L1, Malay, are underlined.

- ❖ S1: ah eh the men getting girls pregnant then about twenty five years below ah than I *ask* a lot of people lah then I *ask* my friends so my first three of my friend when I first *ask* ah they say oh I'll ask her to abort the baby
- ❖ S2: laugh
- ❖ S1: ah number one number two then after that the I **met** erm you know who NAME **he's** forever action type
- ❖ one of the Malaysian guys
- ❖ S1: he **he's** a Malaysian staying in Singapore ah he **stayed** underneath us then...
- ❖ ...then he **said** erm if the if I **was** younger lah and then I **would** think about leaving school lah I say why give it to your mother or father to take care lah I **might have done** that lah cos my parents then he **said** then he **said** no lah the most important time for a child **is** four years mah and I want to bond with my child.

The only unmarked verb form here is 'ask' and there are three instances of this. A possible explanation is phonological as the triple consonant cluster in [askt] is difficult to sound. Otherwise all tense forms are marked. In addition the copula ('be') is never deleted. The evidence of substrate or first language influence does not come from non-marking of tense forms or copula deletion. Rather it comes from the use of discourse particles such as 'lah' (six instances) and 'mah' (one instance).

This example shows how a corpus such as ACE can be used within an ELF-aware curriculum. The excerpt above shows that, on the one hand, these ELF speakers tend to mark for tense, especially in formal situations. This suggests that the influence of their first language on the 'grammar' of their ELF, is not as great in this context as might have been expected. At the same time, however, there is influence from the first language in the form of the use of pragmatic particles adopted from their first language. By searching the corpus for specified grammatical features, teachers and learners can see how English is really being used in ELF contexts. Insights to be drawn from the first example include the fact that, in this context, L1 speakers of Malay speakers when using ELF, mark for tense more frequently than previously thought, even in relatively informal situations. A second insight is how these speakers transfer the use of discourse markers from their L1 into their use of ELF. Learners could be asked what they think the communicative functions of these L1 discourse markers might be.

The results of this study also underline the importance of corpora for illustrating the comparative frequency of distinctive morpho-syntactic features and the crucial significance of context and levels of formality.

To put this simply, using corpora of ELF can illuminate how ELF speakers actually use English. This can often rebut claims that non-standard forms are characteristic of ELF use. ELF speakers may indeed use non-standard forms but only by examining corpora of ELF can we say whether this use of non-standard forms is a characteristic feature of a speaker's ELF or simply an occasional use.

The second study investigated the use of communicative strategies by Asian multilinguals to see if earlier research which reported that English as a Lingua Franca is characterised by ELF speakers' adoption of specific communicative strategies to

ensure successful communication and the preservation of their fellow interlocutors' face, could be supported. The editors of a review of recent trends in ELF research conclude that these trends 'evidence the supportive and cooperative nature of interactions in ELF where meaning negotiation takes place at different levels' (Archibald et al. 2011: 3). In a study of the communication strategies of Asian ELF speakers, Kirkpatrick (2010) identified 15 communicative strategies adopted by ELF speakers to ensure successful communication. These are recorded below in Table 1.

Table 1 Communicative Strategies of ASEAN ELF Speakers

<i>Strategy type (Listener)</i>
Lexical anticipation
Lexical suggestion
Lexical correction
Don't give up
Request repetition
Request clarification
Let it pass
Listen to the message
Participant paraphrase
Participant prompt
<i>Strategy type (Speaker)</i>
Spell out the word
Repeat the phrase
Be explicit
Paraphrase
Avoid local / idiomatic referents
(Kirkpatrick 2010: 141).

The second study found that, as in the first study, context was the crucial variable and that there were occasions when speakers, far from seeking to preserve the face of their fellow interlocutors, were happy to threaten it. For example, in the courtroom exchanges in the ACE data, it was found, perhaps not surprisingly, that direct, confrontational questioning and bald-on-record disagreement are common currency in these exchanges, where winning the argument supersedes the desire for interactional comity (Kirkpatrick, Walkinshaw and Subhan 2016). So, while the strategies listed above do indeed occur frequently in ELF discourse, it is also true that ELF speakers can adopt strategies aimed at threatening their interlocutors' face if the context allows or requires it.

The third study simply investigated the topics that ELF speakers discussed. These were, not surprisingly, extremely varied, but the majority concerned, again not surprisingly, Asia-centred issues. These included topics such as:

- Islamic finance – how does lending and borrowing work in Islamic banks?
- Thai-Myanmar border issues – what is happening to the refugees stranded in Thai border areas?

- What is my first language? Speakers' discuss the languages they learned as children, their parents' and grandparents' languages and how their use of language switches depending on contact and so forth.
- Who produces the best rice in Asia – is it from Southern Thailand or from Northern Malaysia?
- Contributing to arguments at ASEAN meetings.
- How important is coffee to the Vietnamese economy?
- The (mal) treatment of ethnic minorities in Hong Kong

Below is an example of the topic 'What is my first language'? Four participants are discussing how complex it can be to identify a multilingual speaker's first language. The speakers are a Filipina (S1), a Bruneian female (S2), a Thai male (S3) and a Vietnamese female (S4). The symbol 'SX-f' means it is not possible to determine which speaker is contributing at this point, only that she is female.

S2: my first language when i fam- when i'm at home in the family are actually dialect chinese dialects i speak a few languages well i speak to my father (.) in a different dialect i speak to my mother (.) hh in a different dialect -kay so that is when i am at the age of one (.) one to three one to four

SX-f: family

S3: chinese dialect

S1: growing

S4: mhm

S2: so two dialects growing at the same time and at the same time our neighbours spoke malay

S4: mhm

S3: mhm

S2: we live in an area where there were a lot of malays there were a lot of malays li- living in the area as well

S1: your mother's chinese

S2: my father's chinese my mother is chinese

S4: mhm

S2: erm so but we spo- i spoke dialect Chinese so i had so i grew up with a lot of languages around me

S1: that's interesting

S2: and i don't i don't actually remember

SX-f: laughter

S2: how i I only knew that i was drilled in grammar but erm i felt for a ve- very long time that even when i was i can still think back and i was in kindergarten i could understand the teacher

SX-f: okay

S1: uh-huh

S4: hm

S2: and she spoke erm english

SX-f: hm

S2: at that time so it wasn't a major difficulty because i was so small and so young

S1: yeah yeah so what would you say is er what is your first language now

S2: definitely english now i mean english has become i think in english i

S3: English english
SX-f: laughter
S4: so you have so you have your mo- mother tongue father tongue
SX-f: laughter
S2: in the language i use most
S1: neighbourhood tongue
(Kirkpatrick, Patkin and Wu 2012:277)

Transcripts (and, of course the tape itself) can be very useful for ELF-aware teaching materials. The example above can be used to illustrate the linguistic diversity of many ELF speakers and how they use their multilingual linguistic repertoire. It also demonstrates how an individual's language use and proficiency can shift over time. As the speaker above notes, her first language has become English, rather than her mother or 'father' tongue.

Excerpts such as these can be used simply as listening comprehension in order to allow learners to become familiar with different 'accents' of ELF. They can be used to highlight the use of non-standard forms and whether these cause any breakdowns in communication or misunderstandings. They can be used to illustrate communicative and repair strategies. They can also be used as a springboard for reflective discussion about the roles of languages in the student's own environment and the extent to which, if at all, English is playing an increasingly dominant role. Materials such as these can also lead to discussions on the problems of communicating with older generations as language shift occurs and so forth.

The point to be made here is that the topics of the type discussed by the ELF speakers in the ACE corpus are not topics that occur in English language textbooks written for Asian learners of English. Typically, as many of the chapters in this volume demonstrate, such textbooks provide native-speaker environments and native speaker models. Corpora such as ACE and VOICE, on the other hand, provide rich resources of authentic ELF talk, ideal for ELF-aware language teaching and curricula.

Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (this volume) provide a range of similar ELF-aware materials for ELF-aware teaching, focusing on developing ELF-aware English language teachers. This is crucial for the successful implementation of ELF-aware classrooms, but, as the authors themselves point out, integrating ELF into ELT is easier said than done. The idea that the native speaker model is naturally the best and the fact that assessment practices in the main remain native speaker-oriented make it difficult for ELF-aware teachers to implement change in the language classroom.

It is with this in mind that I developed six principles of what I call the lingua franca approach to language teaching (e.g. Kirkpatrick 2012) which I summarise and adapt here in the hope that these principles maybe useful in shaping ELF-aware curricula. These principles could, for example, be incorporated into ELF-aware approaches such as Llorca and Mocanu's 5-stage model (this volume) and the three phases for ELF-aware teacher education described by Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (this volume). Sifakis (forthcoming) has identified three phases for ELF-aware teacher education namely:

- Stage a) where teachers are exposed to research in and examples of World Englishes, and ELF
- Stage b) where teachers consider the challenges of the complexities discovered in stage a) pose for their own teaching contexts, and
- Stage c) where teachers develop an action plan to integrate ELF-aware teaching into their own classrooms.

The five principles outlined below could be provided to teachers to consider in developing their own ELF-aware materials and contexts. These are adapted and abbreviated from Kirkpatrick 2012.

Principles of The Lingua Franca Approach

- *Principle#1 Mutual intelligibility is the goal.*
- *Principle#2 Intercultural competence is the goal.*
- *Principle#3 ELF speakers make good ELF teachers*
- *Principle #4 ELF environments provide excellent ELF learning opportunities*
- *Principle #5 ELF aware teaching needs ELF Assessment*
- *Principle#1 Mutual intelligibility is the goal.*

Principle#1 Mutual intelligibility is the goal.

The role of English as a lingua franca in ASEAN means that English is primarily used between multilinguals whose first languages comprise a variety of Asian languages and who have learned English as an additional language. There is no need for people to approximate native speaker norms.

There is, for example, no need for people to *sound* like native speakers of English (Jenkins 2000, 2007, Walker 2010). Apart from the obvious point that there are many varieties of native speaker English, all of which are distinguished by different accents and pronunciation so that the notion of a native speaker pronunciation is fuzzy at best, the development of new varieties of English across the world has added to the range of pronunciation and accents. In addition to the Englishes of Britain and the United States, for example, we have the Englishes of the Indian sub-continent, and of many countries in Africa and Asia. The increasing role of English as an international lingua franca also means that more and more multilinguals who have learned English as an additional language are using English internationally. This inevitably means that the number of different accents and pronunciations of English are legion. In such circumstances, it is not sounding like a native speaker which is important, it is mutual intelligibility. Mutual intelligibility means that the interactants in any communicative activity are able to understand each other. And being a native speaker is no guarantee of mutual intelligibility (e.g., Smith and Rafiqzad 1979; Kirkpatrick, Deterding and Wong 2008). In any ELF context, what is therefore important is multilingual users of ELF to be mutually intelligible when communicating with their fellow multilingual ELF users.

Principle#2 Intercultural competence is the goal.

The cultures traditionally associated with English, such as British and American ‘Anglo’ cultures, are not necessarily directly relevant to ELF users of English. In the ASEAN context, The curriculum needs to focus on the cultures that comprise ASEAN (Honma 2008). This is all the more important as government schools in ASEAN typically do not offer courses in any of the national languages of the group, other than their own, of course. The English curriculum therefore could provide these students with the opportunity of at least learning about the cultures of their region. The importance of this can be gauged by noting that ASEAN is culturally extremely diverse. Not only are the major religions of Buddhism (Thailand, for example), Islam (Indonesia for example), and Christianity (The Philippines, for example) worshipped across the group, there are also literally hundreds of ethnic groups represented within the nations of ASEAN. The ELT curriculum therefore provides an opportunity to develop ASEAN intercultural competence in the citizens of ASEAN countries (see also Tantiranat and Fay, this volume).

The ASEAN cultural curriculum can be enhanced by including local literatures in English and popular culture. In ASEAN itself, there are numerous writers who have produced a wide range of literature in English. Examples include Catherine Lim, Edwin Thumboo and Gemino Abad. Reading these authors not only gives the reader an insight into local cultures, but also into ways in which English can be adapted to reflect local cultural values. In Asia more widely, there are a host of writers from the Indian sub-continent, many of whom are international figures. There are also many Chinese writers, such as the novelist Ha Jin, now writing in English about Chinese cultural experiences.

The ELF-aware curriculum can also include topics of the type identified in the third study above. As suggested earlier, corpora such as VOICE and ACE can provide a wealth of ELF-aware teaching materials.

This is, of course, not to say, that native speaking cultures should necessarily be excluded from an ELF-aware curriculum. Materials and curricula must be sensitive to specific contexts and the real needs of the learners. For example, students preparing to go and study in English-speaking countries such as Australia, the UK or the USA will obviously need to become familiar with the cultural norms of those countries. Even here, though it should be stressed that the Kachru’s inner-circle countries are all home to extraordinary linguistic and cultural diversity.

Principle#3 ELF speakers make good ELF teachers

There has been a long struggle to promote and validate the non-native speaker teacher of English. Many scholars, themselves non-native speakers of English, have argued that a prejudice against non-native speaker teachers of English exists (e.g., Braine 2010; Moussu and Lurda 2008, the chapters in this volume). The lingua franca approach really *requires* non-native speaker teachers of English. Remembering that the language learning goal is not to approximate native speaker norms, but to be able to interact successfully with fellow ELF users, it follows that a multilingual who is proficient in English and who has the relevant qualifications represents the most appropriate teacher. Being multilingual provides ELF-aware teachers with obvious advantages as language teachers, especially if they also speak the language(s) of their students.

First, they will have successfully accomplished what they are setting out to teach and thus have empathy with and an understanding of the problems that their students face (Medgyes 2002). Second, being multilinguals who are proficient in English and who come from the same or similar linguistic backgrounds to their students, they not only represent good role models for their students, they also provide the most appropriate *linguistic* models for their students. The local multilingual teacher can provide the *linguistic* target for their students.

Third, local multilingual teachers with intercultural competence can offer cultural insights for their students. It has traditionally been assumed that a great advantage of the native speaker teacher is that s/he can offer students a guide to the target culture (Moussu and Lurda 2008). But, as argued above, the cultures which the ELF learners need to know are the cultures found within specific ELF contexts. Thus the ELF-aware English language teacher needs intercultural competence in relevant cultures, coupled with the ability to transmit or instil this intercultural competence in the learners.

The fourth reason why the local multilingual and ELF-aware teacher is the most appropriate English language teacher is that s/he can use the language of the students to help them learn English. That is to say that a bi- or multilingual pedagogy can be applied in the classroom. There are many ways in which the first language of the students can be exploited in the learning of the second language and these have been documented by several language teaching professionals and scholars (e.g., Littlewood and Yu 2009; Swain, Kirkpatrick and Cummins 2011). The fundamental principle to be adhered to is that the first language must be used in such a way as to help the student learn the second language.

The fifth reason why the multilingual ELF-aware teacher is the preferred English language teacher is that an obvious goal of language learning is to develop multilinguals. It is important to establish a classroom philosophy through which the English language learner is not judged against native speaker norms and thus constantly evaluated as falling short of the mark, but is judged as a language learner who is developing multilingual proficiency. The students should be seen as becoming linguistically sophisticated multilinguals. They should not be seen or judged as failed or deficient native speakers.

Principle #4 ELF environments provide excellent ELF learning opportunities

It is commonplace to assume that the best way to learn a language is to go to where the language is spoken as a native language. In many cases, this, of course, is true. However, in the contexts with which we are dealing, sending students to learn English in native speaking countries may not be the most effective way of developing English proficiency among the learners. Rather, sending them to countries where English is used as a lingua franca may be far more beneficial. An example may help make this clear. A tertiary institution in Asia has a relationship with a British university and routinely sends its third-year students there for ten weeks to develop their proficiency in English. The British university in question is in a part of England where the local variety of English is heavily accented and difficult to understand – even for English

speakers from other parts of England. The Asian students are unlikely to make much progress in their English by communicating with the locals.

At the British university itself, if placed in tutorial or seminar groups with native speaker students, the exchange students often find themselves unable to participate fully as they are not familiar with native speaker turn-taking and turn-stealing conventions (Rusdi 1999). They also feel awkward as they assume that their English will be evaluated against native speaker norms. This may well lead them to remain silent observers rather than active participants.

This type of situation is common. A finding of research into the experience of international students in Anglophone centres is that their multilingual backgrounds tend to be seen as a problem rather than a resource, and that they tend to mix more easily with fellow international students rather than with local students (Liddicoat, Eisenchlas and Trevaskes 2003; Preece 2011).

Instead, therefore, of sending students to Anglophone centres such as Great Britain or the United States with the aim of improving their English proficiency, consideration should be given to sending them to places where English is naturally used as a lingua franca. Within Asia, Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei and the Philippines provide examples of sites where English is regularly used as a lingua franca and as a language of inter-ethnic communication. The great advantage of such sites for Asian learners of English is, paradoxically, that the native speaker is absent. Instead, English is being *naturally* used as a lingua franca between Asian multilinguals. Students will find the linguistic environment less threatening and will feel more comfortable using English. At the same time, of course, they will develop greater understanding of the cultures in which they are living. Not only, therefore, will their English language proficiency improve, so will their intercultural proficiency.

Principle #5 ELF-aware teaching needs ELF Assessment

There is no point adopting the principles outlined above and then assessing the students against native speaker norms and cultures. Assessment must be closely aligned with what is being taught (Newbold this volume, Kouvdou and Tsagari, this volume). This means that students need to be assessed on how successfully they can use English in ELF settings. This, in turn, means developing measures of functional proficiency – whether students are able to perform certain tasks in the language - as opposed to measuring how closely the students' English conforms to native speaker norms. For example, a pronunciation benchmark that only awards the top level to speakers whose accent betrays no first language influence is precisely the type of benchmark that needs to be discarded. Such benchmarks need to be replaced with criteria that measure how successfully students can get their messages across and perform certain linguistic tasks. But as Newbold (this volume) has stressed, this is easier said than done.

In the context of ASEAN, there is an overwhelming need for an overall ASEAN approach to these issues, particularly with regard the issues of teacher and student assessment (Dudzik and Nguyen 2015). They call for ASEAN-wide proficiency benchmarks and ELT competency frameworks to be developed, which would include creating a 'common regional proficiency assessment framework (61) and 'regional

English teacher competency assessment tools' (62). They also call for the development of relevant curricula (such as SE Asian cultures) and teach English 'no longer by teaching and assessing only NS varieties of English but also by introducing those spoken in neighbouring countries and by other regional multilingual speakers such as Singaporeans and Malaysians' (60).

The need for ASEAN-centred curricula is also recommended by Widiati and Hayati (2015). In their review of teacher professional education in Indonesia, including the one-year *Pendidikan Profesi Guru* (PPG), they recommend that 'there needs to be more explicit integration of the ASEAN curriculum so that the PPG students have adequate knowledge and skills on how to educate their future students about ASEAN identity and ASEAN integration through their English classes' (2015: 138); and they recommend the ASEAN Curriculum Sourcebooks as providing examples of relevant materials.

A Caveat: Spoken is not the same as written

The 5 principles enumerated above primarily apply to the teaching and learning of English as a spoken language. However, we need to stress that written language is not the same as spoken and, therefore, the differences between spoken and written need to be acknowledged.

First, written English has to be consciously learned by all, including native speakers. There are no 'native speakers' of written English. All learners, no matter their linguistic background, have to learn how to write. That is why many native speakers may remain illiterate all their lives.

Second, disciplines and genres set the rhetorical structures and styles. They set the norms. The norms are different for each discipline and genre. Writers of English need to learn these. As the differences between and among the disciplines and genres are vast, becoming an accomplished writer requires a great deal of practice and study. Consider, for example, the differences in styles between writing a 'tweet' and an engineering report, between writing a poem and an official document, between writing a love letter and a judicial judgement, between writing philosophy and writing science.

Third, different cultures play by different rhetorical rules and the level of the differences are often determined by discipline and genre. Thus, writing about science may be less influenced by local cultural influences than is writing about philosophy.

The point is that there is much to learn for all of us who want to become proficient writers. What we want or need to write will determine how we learn. The standard norms are not always determined by native speakers, but by tradition and convention; and these norms vary across discipline, genre and culture and are continually developing as new forms of writing and reasons for writing are created while older forms drop out of use. Most of us now write more personal messages with a machine and online, than we do with a pen and on paper, for example. An ELF-aware approach will need to determine what types of writing need to be included based on the needs of the students and the local context.

Conclusion

As the chapters in this volume have demonstrated and as is illustrated by the global use of English, there is a need to reconceptualise English language teaching (Seidlhofer and Widdowson this volume) so that ‘the global learning of English needs to be based on its global use’. At the same time, we must be conscious of the extraordinarily diverse contexts in which ELF is currently being used world-wide and the resultant different needs and motivations of ELF users (Kohn this volume). Given such complexity and diversity, it would be foolhardy to develop a single teaching method for ELF. At the same time, given that ELF itself is a dynamic construct and constantly changing depending on the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the participants in any ELF interaction, it would be meaningless to try to teach ELF as a stable variety. A single method to teach a stable variety is not what is needed. What is needed is a series of ideas, concepts and principles upon which an ELF-aware approach to English language teaching can be based. The chapters in this volume all contribute to this in their own and often context-specific ways. This concluding chapter has attempted to summarise the key points and then suggest a number of principles that might underpin an ELF-aware approach to language teaching. Care must be taken to stress, however, that the complexity and diversity of ELF contexts means that perhaps the most fundamental principle underlying an ELF aware approach to language teaching is its sensitivity to context. As Newbold pointed out in the context of assessment (this volume) teachers would like ELF-aware assessment to be ‘open, inclusive and flexible’. Any ELF-aware approach to English language teaching must similarly be ‘open, inclusive and flexible’.

References

- ACE. 2014. *The Asian Corpus of English*. Director: Andy Kirkpatrick; Researchers: Wang Lixun, John Patkin, Sophiaan Subhan. <http://corpus.ied.edu.hk/ace/> (accessed on 30 December 2014).
- Archibald, A., Cogo, A. and Jenkins, J. (eds.) (2011). *Latest trends in ELF research*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- Braine, G. (2010) *Non-native Speaker English Teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Britain, D. (2010) Grammatical variation in the contemporary spoken English of England. In A. Kirkpatrick (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*, (pp. 37-58). London: Routledge.
- Dudzic, D and Nguyen Q.T.N. (2015) Vietnam: Building English competency in preparation for ASEAN 2015. In R Stoupe and K Kimura (eds.) *ASEAN Integration and the Role of English Language Teaching*, (pp. 41-70). Phnom Penh: IDP.
- Honna, N. (2008) *English as a Multicultural Language in Asian Contexts*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitudes and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an Asian lingua franca: a lingua franca approach. *Journal of English as a Lingua franca* 1 (1): 212-140.

- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a Lingua Franca in ASEAN: A Multilingual Model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A., Deterding, D. and Wong, J. (2008) The international intelligibility of Hong Kong English. *World Englishes* 27 (3/4): 359-377.
- Kirkpatrick, A., Patkin, J. and Wu J. (2013) The multilingual teacher and the multilingual curriculum: An Asian example of intercultural communication in the new era. In F Sharifian and M. Jamarani (eds.) *Intercultural Communication in the New Era*, (pp. 263-285). London: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. and Subhan, S. (2014) Non-standard or new standards or errors? The use of inflectional marking for present and past tenses in English as an Asian lingua franca. In S. Buschfeld, T. Hoffman, M. Huber and A. Kautsch (eds.) *The Evolution of Englishes*, (pp. 386-400). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kirkpatrick, A., Walkinshaw, I and Subhan S. (2016). English as a lingua franca in East and Southeast Asia: implications for diplomatic and intercultural communication. In P. Friedrich (ed.) *English for Diplomatic Purposes* (pp 137-66). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kohn, K. (2011) English as a lingua franca and the Standard English misunderstanding. In A. De Hower and A. Wilton (eds.). *English in Europe Today* (pp 71-94). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Liddicoat, A., Eisenclas, S. and Trevaskes, S. (eds.). (2003) *Australian Perspectives on Internationalising Education*. Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Littlewood, W. and Yu, B. (2009) First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teacher* 42: 1-14.
- Medgyes, P. (2002) Native or non-native. Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4): 340-349.
- Meierkord, C. 2012. *Interactions across Englishes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Moussu, L. and Lurda, E. (2008) Non-native English speaking English language teachers: history and research. *Language Teaching*, 41(3): 316-348.
- Preece, S. (2011) Universities in the Anglo centre: sites of multilingualism. In Li Wei (ed.) *Applied Linguistics Review Volume 2*, (pp 121-145), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Rusdi, T. (1999) Schema of group presentations and rhetorical structures of presentation introductions. A cross-cultural study of Indonesian and Australian students in university academic settings. *Asian Englishes* 23(2): 66-89.
- Sharma, D. (2009). Typological diversity in new Englishes. *English World-Wide* 30(2): 170-195.
- Smith, L. E. and Rafiqzad K. (1979). English for cross-cultural communication. The question of intelligibility. *TESOL Quarterly* 13:371-380.
- Swain, M., Kirkpatrick, A. and Cummins, J. (2011). *How to Have a Guilt-free Life. Using Cantonese in the English Classroom*. Hong Kong: Research Centre for Language Education and Acquisition in Multilingual Societies, Institute of Education.
- Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the Pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widiati, U. and Hayati, N. (2015) Teacher professional education in Indonesia and ASEAN 2015. In R. Stoupe and K. Kimura (eds.) *ASEAN Integration and the Role of English Language Teaching*, (pp. 121-148). Phnom Penh: IDP.