Ian Walkinshaw and Andy Kirkpatrick

# Where to now? Future directions in ELF pragmatics research

As the preceding chapters in this volume demonstrate, a great deal has been learned about pragmatics in English as a lingua franca in a relatively short period of time. But what are the next steps? Clearly, there is a great deal more ground to cover; pragmatics permeates ELF interactions no less than it does L1 interactions, though often in ways that are idiosyncratic to ELF contexts. Fortuitously, ELF pragmatics researchers have the advantage of accessing an established canon of research into L1 pragmatics or intercultural pragmatics. Previous works have propounded and debated theories, identified and explored features of language in use and interactional domains, and developed and tested methodologies and approaches to analysis – all potentially transferable or adaptable to ELF environments.

This chapter first draws together the recommendations for future research proposed in the previous chapters, and then turns to established areas of pragmatics with potential utility in an ELF sphere. Lastly, we indicate potential sites for pragmatics enquiry in higher education.

## 1 Indicators for future enquiry in the current volume

In this section we recapitulate the recommendations put forward in each chapter for further research into pragmatics in ELF, beginning with the chapters in Part 1: *Developments in ELF pragmatic theory*.

Concluding her chapter on accommodation in ELF talk, Jenkins mentions four fertile areas for research. The first is English language entry testing in higher education. Since universities increasingly constitute a multilingual environment, she argues that English language entry testing needs to accommodate a range of speech behaviours, including translanguaging – accessing linguistic resources from various languages for optimal communication (Garcia and Wei 2015). Secondly, she urges further study of accommodation by refugee/asylum-seekers, pointing to high-stakes encounters in which non- or misunderstanding of officials' English may occur. Jenkins then suggests exploring the multilingual interactional practices of ELF couples and how they overcome comprehension issues

https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501512520-012

to achieve mutual understanding and rapport. Fourth is social media, a rich and so far under-explored site for ELF communication. Jenkins ends by arguing for greater emphasis on the inherently multilingual nature of ELF, and its reconceptualisation as 'multilingualism (with English) as a lingua franca.'

Kaur's chapter on pragmatic strategies in ELF communication argues for more research on ELF users with limited access to linguistic resources, such as migrant workers, refugees, international domestic help, and tourists from non-English speaking countries. Since much existing research is confined to verbalised linguistic strategies, Kaur also proposes further study of paralinguistic or non-linguistic devices which less proficient ELF speakers may employ, such as pointing, showing, drawing, acting or onomatopoeia (Pietikäinen 2018; Sato, Yujobo, Okada and Ogane 2019).

Pitzl's chapter outlines a conceptual shift from cross-cultural or intercultural to *trans*cultural pragmatics (i.e. across or through cultures rather than between them or comparing them) (Baker and Sangiamchit 2019). As a concomitant, Pitzl advocates a methodological shift from the currently prevalent cross-sectional approach to spoken data analysis to a micro-diachronic approach. Since transcultural pragmatic conventions are likely to emerge over the course of interactions, micro-diachronic analysis may illuminate how these conventions are co-constructed and negotiated in situ. The value of this approach is its adaptability to various linguistic (e.g. pragmatic, lexical, syntactic) foci, as well as analytical methods, such as conversation analysis, corpus linguistics, interactional sociolinguistics, or discourse analysis.

Haugh's chapter outlines a paradigm for investigating (im)politeness in ELF interactions through discursive analysis of specific sequential practices in situated contexts. His findings about how openings and closings are performed in initial conversations among ELF speakers suggest that both empirical norms (i.e. what is typically done in such situations) and moral norms (i.e. what should properly be done) are in play in such interactions. These findings point to a possible means for linking speech behaviour with ways of thinking about appropriate talk and conduct, providing a template for empirical evaluations of talk or conduct as (im)polite. Pointing out that (im)politeness in ELF interactions is as situated and idiosyncratic as any other kind of interpersonal interaction, Haugh cautions against claiming that ELF interactions are always consensus-oriented, mutually supportive, or that a 'let-it-pass' principle is invariably in play until sufficient empirical evidence supports such claims.

Next, we turn to Part 2: *Pragmalinguistic studies in English as a lingua franca*. Lewis and Deterding's chapter on other-initiated repair (OIR) of misunderstandings lists a variety of repair strategies, such as modifying pronunciation, reformulating, or adding information. Like Kaur, Lewis and Deterding argue for research

into less proficient ELF users, who might struggle to articulate repair strategies, particularly complex ones such as reformulation of an unclear utterance, which require additional lexical resources to be effective. The authors also propose studying a wider range of ELF contexts. Such knowledge might inform a pedagogical practice aimed at familiarising language learners with repair strategies, as well as avoiding some of the linguistic pitfalls that cause misunderstanding, such as non-standard pronunciation.

Ji's chapter describes four pragmatic strategies adopted by Asian ELF users in institutional settings (TV panel discussions and official seminars) to optimise communication: lexical suggestion, interlocutor explicitness, self-rephrase, and collaborative resolution of non/misunderstandings. She draws our attention to the frequency of explicitness strategies (such as speaker paraphrase) to boost clarity, and the collaborative and conjoint nature of meaning negotiation and explication. Further research might explore other institutional contexts, including oppositional situations such as police interviews or courtrooms (Kirkpatrick, Subhan and Walkinshaw 2016), where collaboration is less likely to be prioritised. Again, proficiency is operative: Do ELF users with limited linguistic resources use the strategies Ji mentions to maximise comprehension, or alternative strategies? If so, what are these and how effective are they?

Thompson's study of interjections in an Asian ELF corpus found that interjections are less commonly employed among the Asian ELF speakers. Expressions of emotion are more often encoded in the utterances themselves than through interjections. Positioning his study as preliminary, Thompson argues for creating a more nuanced categorisation of interjections and related expressive devices (e.g. set phrases, one-word interjections, vocalisations etc) to be utilised for formal and functional comparison among ELF corpora or between ELF and first-language corpora. Another potential line of enquiry is how interpersonal variables such as social distance guide Asian ELF speakers' use of interjections in talk.

Finally, we outline the recommendations made in Part 3: *Sociopragmatic studies in English as a lingua franca*. Walkinshaw, Qi and Milford's chapter explores (im)politeness in talk about personal finances among Asian ELF users in the ACE corpus. They found that although personal finance talk was an unmarked conversation topic when speakers were referring to their own finances or those of a non-present third party, interactants seldom asked or surmised about the financial circumstances of co-present interlocutors, and attracted avoidance strategies or censure when they did. Several questions arise: What moral evaluations (see Haugh, this volume) might underlie talk about potentially inappropriate or face-threatening topics and its reception by interlocutors in ELF communication? Are such evaluations socially or culturally grounded? How are such instances managed or resolved? More generally, research might explore more diverse situational contexts, such as

hierarchical, task-focused, role-attributing business meetings, where individuals' face-needs may be secondary to the aims of the interactional event.

Taguchi outlines her paradigm shift from positioning idealised 'native' English as a normative benchmark to prioritising intelligibility and skilful use of pragmatic strategies for optimal communication. She advocates a study of L2 speakers' local communicative needs and goals, to construct criteria for evaluating what constitutes successful ELF communication. Taguchi also proposes further research into the sub-fields of interactional pragmatics (i.e. how ELF interactants jointly construct meaning) and intercultural pragmatics (i.e. how culturally diverse interactants communicate meaning across cultural boundaries) (Taguchi and Roever 2017). She argues for further study of how divergent cultural norms can generate conflict, and conversely, how hybrid norms are generated in and through collaboration. Finally, Taguchi proposes a contrastive pragmatics paradigm to explore how pragmatics-related discourse differs between ELF users, L1-L2 users and monolingual language users.

Xu's study of Chinese English speakers' reported metacognition about adhering to, challenging or trans-creating pragmatic conventions in ELF communication also suggests interesting research possibilities. A useful next step would be to analyse instances of actual talk, augmented by a retrospective protocol to pinpoint interactants' metacognition during the 'on-line' formulation of *pro tem* pragmatic norms. Researchers might also explore whether and how ELF users adhere to any existing local or first-language cultural norms that are in play in ELF interactions.

## 2 Applying current pragmatics knowledge to ELF contexts

Pragmatics is a comprehensive area of linguistic study with a range of potential applications to lingua franca contexts. Space limitations prohibit a comprehensive overview, but we sketch how some areas of pragmatics study which have so far largely interrogated L1 contexts might offer insight into ELF environments. We outline politeness, impoliteness, relational work, rapport management, face constituting theory, and metapragmatics.

*Politeness*: Politeness is defined as a strategy or strategies which speakers employ to promote or maintain harmonious relations with their co-interactants: "a pragmatic notion [that] refers to ways in which . . . the relational function in linguistic action is expressed" (Kasper 1994: 3206). It is rooted in Leech's (1983) work on interpersonal rhetoric, along with Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. Traditionally,

politeness research has focused on the performance of speech acts (Austin 1975; Searle 1969) i.e. how speakers perform actions through language, such as expressing surprise, apologising, or disagreeing. Speech acts may be realised through formulaic utterances and conventionalised chunks of language, though ELF users may modify their structure and/or meaning in conversation (House 2010) to lower their own and co-participants' cognitive processing load.

Treatments of politeness have often drawn on Goffman's (1967) conceptualisation of *face*, "the positive social value a person effectively claims for [themselves] by the line others assume [they have] taken during a particular contact" (1967: 5). Goffman presents face as "an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share" (1967: 5). Although many theorisations of politeness are still centred around face or related concepts, politeness has in recent years been reconceptualised more broadly to explore relational aspects of interaction (Locher and Graham 2010): "the work people invest in negotiating their relationships in interaction" (Locher and Watts 2008: 78). In recent studies, politeness is often analysed discursively, that is, not through isolated phrases and sentences but through longer stretches of talk (cf. Pitzl, this volume), and without any a priori assumptions about what constitutes politeness. The focus in discursive studies tends to be on first-order politeness, that is, the perceptions of the interactional participants themselves (cf. Mills 2011) rather than those of external observers; such studies explore how status within relationships is signalled and marked by interactants, rather than assuming that politeness is simply a question of indicating concern or respect for others (Kadar and Mills 2011).

*Impoliteness:* Impoliteness is concerned with how offense is communicated and taken. Culpeper (2005: 38) offers the following definition: "Impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behaviour as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2)." Culpeper is a progenitor in the field, proposing an early categorical framework of impoliteness (1996). He first outlines mock impoliteness and jocular mockery, which are surface-level impoliteness and do not intend actual offense (Haugh 2010; Haugh and Bousfield 2012) (though offence may still be taken, as Boxer and Cortés-Conde 1997 point out). He then outlines several categories of actual impoliteness which do intend offence: bald on record impoliteness, which is unambiguously face-threatening; positive impoliteness, which targets an addressee's desire to be liked and appreciated; negative impoliteness, which targets their desire for unimpeded autonomy; and mock politeness, which is apparently positive but patently insincere, e.g. sarcasm. Finally, there is withholding politeness; the deliberate absence of politeness work where a recipient would be expecting it. More recently, Culpeper (2011) explores the forms

and functions of impoliteness as well as its context-dependent and context-shaping nature. He also examines institutional contexts wherein impoliteness forms an unmarked and conventionalised discourse form, e.g. army recruit training. Likewise, Bousfield (2008) examines the interactional dynamics of impoliteness exchanges, drawing on oppositional scenarios such as car parking disputes or restaurant kitchen arguments. Other scholars have explored situated impoliteness in particular institutional or interactional contexts such as in courtroom discourse (Lakoff 1989), in gendered talk (Mills 2003), and in getting-acquainted interactions (Haugh 2015). Limberg (2009) has researched verbal threats between police and citizens.

Impoliteness has become an established field of study in first-language contexts, but few studies have so far explored how the phenomenon plays out in lingua franca contexts. The prevailing view seems to be that because ELF interactions are often supportive and consensus-oriented, encounters encoding impoliteness or malicious intent are uncommon. But the majority of first-language interactions are consensus-oriented as well, yet there are countless recorded instances of L1 talk which encode (or are perceived by their recipients as encoding) impoliteness (cf. Keinpointner 1997). It is inevitable that in ELF milieus oppositional or even confrontational situations will arise due to situational exigencies (e.g. professional contexts where parties have conflicting goals), interactional misunderstandings occasioned by pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic infelicities, or personal incompatibility. There is already evidence that ELF speakers do not always orient to non-offense and interactional comity, particularly in higher-stakes contexts such as business (Pullin Stark 2009) or law courts (Kirkpatrick et al. 2016). And the ramifications of perceived impoliteness for the interactional sequence and beyond make this a valuable area for exploration in ELF contexts.

One scholar considering impoliteness across cultures is Kecskes (2015), who argues that impoliteness may transpire or play out differently in intercultural L2 contexts than in monocultural L1 interactions. In his view, meaning processing in a second language tends to prioritise straightforward semantic analysis and propositional meaning over pragmatic interpretations, such that "interlocutors may sometimes be unaware of impoliteness because it is conveyed implicitly or through paralinguistic means that function differently for speakers with different L1 backgrounds" (2015: 43). But there is clearly scope for further investigation into impoliteness in ELF contexts and its reception by co-interactants, such as taboo language or topics (see Walkinshaw, Qi and Milford, this volume), threats, or insults. Research might also explore whether/how ELF users produce or respond to utterances that are hearable as impolite: teasing (Boxer and Cortes-Conde 1997; Haugh 2016a; Walkinshaw 2016 on Asian ELF users); goading (Mitchell 2015);

jocular mockery (Haugh 2010, Haugh 2014, and Haugh 2016b); jocular abuse (Haugh and Bousfield 2012); disparaging humour (Ferguson and Ford 2008; Ford and Ferguson 2004); or sarcasm and irony (Attardo, Eisterhold, Hay and Poggi 2003).

*Relational work and rapport management:* How do ELF users from disparate linguacultural backgrounds negotiate interpersonal interactions in situ? Two contemporary theories of interaction offer a useful lens for analysis. One is Locher and Watts' (2005) relational work paradigm, which frames (im)politeness not as conventionally pre-established and normative, but as discursively constituted through continual relational work among interactants. Face is key to Locher and Watts' conceptualisation, but they view it as co-constructed within situated interactions (a point we develop below) rather than being a self-focused entity, as Brown and Levinson (1987) have argued. A relational approach examines what Watts (2003) terms the markedness or non-markedness of speech behaviour. Markedness relates to (in)appropriateness, which is linked to (non-)adherence to social norms. Speech behaviour that contravenes these social norms may be 'marked' as inappropriate by interlocutors. Unmarked (or 'politic' – Watts 2003) behaviour is that which is received as appropriate to the interactional norms of the situated context. Politeness is defined as behaviour that is positively marked as going beyond what is considered contextually appropriate, while behaviour which falls short of local expectations of appropriateness is negatively marked as impolite. Locher and Watts' framework also accounts for overly-polite speech behaviour (e.g. irony or sarcasm) (Attardo et al. 2003) which can be perceived as insincere and therefore negatively marked as impolite.

A second approach is Spencer-Oatey's (2005 and 2008) rapport management framework. Spencer-Oatey offers a lens for understanding how social relationships are established, sustained, or jeopardised in and through interaction, reflecting interactants' expectations of appropriate behaviour, face sensitivities, and interactional wants. Interactional rapport can be enhanced, maintained, neglected or challenged moment-by-moment. Face is viewed not as self-oriented and self-prioritising (as Brown and Levinsonian approaches aver), but as constantly re-constructed in and through interaction with others, addressing others' face as well as one's own (in line with Watts' relational work paradigm). Spencer-Oatey (2008) propounds three particular types of face: quality face (people's desire for their personal qualities to be positively evaluated), relational face (people's desire for their relationship with others to be positively evaluated) and social identity face (people's desire that their relationships within a collective be upheld). Spencer-Oatey's framework also incorporates association rights and equity rights: the perceived right to social involvement with others in keeping with the type of relationship one has with them, and the perceived right to per-

sonal consideration and fair treatment from others. For ELF pragmatics researchers, the rapport management framework potentially offers a nuanced analysis of how ELF users manage interactional rapport in face-threatening contexts (cf. Walkinshaw and Kirkpatrick 2014) such as disagreements or complaints, or following some sociopragmatic infelicity or pragmalinguistic dysfluency.

*Face Constituting Theory:* The theories of interaction outlined above position face as discursively constructed in and through interaction, a paradigm that dovetails with the situated, jointly-negotiated nature of much ELF interaction. Further analytical depth is afforded by Arundale's (2004 and 2006) Face Constituting Theory. Arundale presents face not as an individual's public self-image but as something interactionally (re-)constituted in relationships with other people, and an emergent quality of those relationships. His conceptualisation of face as relational and interactional allows for an integrated account of the spectrum of human face-work from explicit face-threat, to equal parts threat and support, to addressing face neutrally, to explicit face-support. Face-threat and face-support are therefore not inherent but rather emergent concepts, reflecting participants' ongoing co-constituted evaluations of face meanings and actions (Arundale 2006). Arundale characterises interpersonal relationships as governed by three dialectics: openness and closedness with one's interlocutor; certainty and uncertainty about the relationship; and connectedness and separateness between interactants. These oppositional labels do not reflect participants' individual needs; rather, they are characteristics of the partners' interactionally achieved relationship. Arundale's positioning of face as relationally achieved has the advantage of avoiding the self-face/other-face distinction espoused by Brown and Levinson (1987) which emphasises the individual actor. Scholars in Asia have criticised the earlier theory as Western-centric, pointing out that Asian social contexts tend to prioritise collective conventions and interdependence (Gu 1990; Ide 1989; Mao 1994; Matsumoto 1988). Arundale's relational reconceptualisation of face is potentially valuable for analysing ELF interactions in Asia and other settings where collective wants tend to be prioritised.

*Metapragmatics:* With the recurrent focus in this volume and elsewhere on ELF users' joint negotiation of meaning, a potentially rich research extension is metapragmatics in ELF talk. Metapragmatics has been defined as "the pragmatics of actually performed meta-utterances that serve as means of commenting on and interfering with ongoing discourse or text" (Hübler and Bublitz 2007: 6). Metapragmatics study encompasses language users' reflexive awareness of their linguistic/pragmatic choices and those of others, and how their use of language or metalanguage (explicitly or implicitly) indexes that awareness. A range of indicators of metapragmatic awareness exist, from the explicit (when language use itself becomes a topic of the exchange) to more implicit (where metaprag-

matic meaning is conveyed tacitly). Culpeper and Haugh (2014) list four key indicators of metapragmatic awareness: (1) pragmatic markers, i.e. expressions that signal how a speaker intends an utterance to be understood (e.g. 'frankly', 'sort of', 'to be quite honest', 'as far as I can tell'). (2) reported language use (e.g. 'He just said he wasn't going to do it'). (3) metapragmatic commentary, i.e. situated comments that convey or elicit information about an interactant's action, attitude or emotive-cognitive state processes (e.g. 'you're always complaining', 'I think that's mean', 'how are you feeling?'). (4) social discourses, i.e. metapragmatic commentary about social norms or conventions, such as the claimed value placed by Australian English speakers on not taking oneself too seriously (Goddard 2009).

How might metapragmatics be studied in ELF contexts? Broadly speaking, metapragmatic acts serve to negotiate or attempt to modify how a producer intends pragmatic meanings to be interpreted by interlocutors. ELF users might deploy them for self- or other-evaluation, to construct identity, or to reinforce or challenge communicative norms (Hübler and Bublitz 2007). Or they may use them to reflexively adopt their interlocutors' perspective in managing potentially diverging interpretations or judgments, particularly where these are interpersonal, attitudinal or evaluative: specifically, to negotiate assessments about appropriateness of their own or others' talk, clarify perceived misunderstandings, give feedback on ongoing interactions, or guide upcoming interactions (Tanskanen 2007). Users' intentions might also be disaffiliative, disputing others' pragmatic meanings or acts, evaluations or attitudes.

## 3 ELF pragmatics and higher education

The use of English as a lingua franca in higher education has increased dramatically over the past decade or so. This increase in the use of what is often called English medium instruction (EMI) was first seen in Europe but has since been mirrored in other parts of the world, including Asia. EMI has been defined as "the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English" (Macaro 2018: 1). (Though we share Humphreys' (2017) view that in Anglophone countries also, content-learning spaces that are populated by linguistically diverse learners can constitute EMI contexts.) Interestingly, the 'E' in EMI is often implicitly understood as being a native speaker variety of English. But as Jenkins (2019) argues, any examination of the real situation will show that the 'E' in EMI must mean English as a lingua franca. The overwhelm-

ing majority of students and staff in EMI courses across the world are not native speakers of English. This is also true, albeit to a lesser extent, even in Anglophone settings, given the international make-up of both students and staff (Humphreys 2017). The questions then arise as to whose pragmatic norms do these ELF users follow in these diverse linguistic and cultural contexts? Is consideration given to the fact that staff and students may favour different pragmatic norms? Is there even an understanding that this is indeed an issue worthy of note and investigation? Those that view the 'E' in EMI as a native speaker variety of English will simply assume people should accommodate to such a variety, even though native speakers may be represented, if at all, only by a small minority of the population concerned. But "if our purpose is to understand current academic discourses in English, ELF is a vital and ubiquitous context. To capture global English use, ELF is a far better representative than native English" (Mauranen, Perez-Llantada and Swales 2020: 666).

For example, what rules are observed concerning terms of address between academic staff and students? In Australian academe, it is normal for Australian staff and students to address each other by their first names, and often shortened forms of these. Thus even a first year undergraduate student will feel it normal to address a senior professor by their first name. Senior professors are, in the main, happy to be so addressed. But should the Australian pragmatic norms concerning terms of address apply to all staff and students from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds who are studying or working in Australia? Should the rules be along the lines of, 'When in Rome, do as the Romans do?' Some twenty years ago, Kirkpatrick and Xu (2002: 278) proposed the following formula: "Speakers of Variety X must accommodate to speakers of Variety Y when in the cultural domains of Variety Y speakers and vice versa. When in 'neutral' domains, speakers must accommodate to each other". This may sound reasonable and sensible, but it is not quite as easy as it seems. It would suggest that everyone studying in Australia, irrespective of their cultural or linguistic origins, should accommodate to Australian pragmatic norms. But in the case of terms of address, people from cultures where teachers are accorded great respect may find it simply impossible to refer to senior professors by their first names, on the grounds of what Li (2002) has called *pragmatic dissonance*. Pragmatic dissonance occurs when a speaker knows that it is pragmatically appropriate to adopt a certain way of speaking in a particular cultural context but to do so, so offends their own pragmatic norms that they still find it impossible to adopt such norms. On such occasions it would surely be appropriate for staff and students to negotiate among themselves in order to arrive at a solution that respects the different pragmatic norms. What might be the result of such negotiation? This, of course, depends on the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the people involved and whether or how they encode

respect for teachers linguistically. Of students who come from cultures where the teacher is traditionally accorded great respect, Muslim students are generally happy to settle on the form of address, Title + First name (e.g. Doctor Bill) to use the terminology from Brown and Ford's famous (1961) article. In contrast, Chinese students, who would be used to referring to their lecturers using the formula Title + Last name (e.g Teacher Wang/Professor Wang), seem comfortable over time to switch to using first name only. But terms of address have to be negotiated depending on the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of those involved. Other variables such as sex and age also need to be taken into account. And, of course, the ways lecturers address their students have to be similarly negotiated.

The pragmatic norms surrounding whose right it is to ask questions, when and in what order in seminars also need to be negotiated, as these can differ dramatically across cultures. Using recordings of extended interaction over full-length seminars (see Pitzl this volume), Thaib (1999) studied methods of turn taking in academic seminars conducted by four different groups of students: Australians in Australian settings; Australians in Indonesian settings; Indonesians in Indonesian settings; and Indonesians in Australian settings. He found that, in Indonesian settings, the chair of the seminar would nominate participants to ask questions and would normally ask the eldest male present to ask the first question and then allow two or three questions to be asked by the other participants, usually giving preference to the older males present. The Chair would then ask the giver of the seminar to respond to the questions after which the Chair would nominate a further three participants to ask a question and so on. In this way, although the Chair deferred to the eldest male participants in inviting them to ask the first questions, everyone who wanted to ask a question was able to do so. It was also noteworthy that each person was able to ask their question without interruption from other participants; and the seminar giver was allowed to answer questions without being interrupted. The pragmatic norms followed by Indonesians in Indonesian settings contrasted dramatically with Australian pragmatic norms in Australian settings. Australian participants felt free to interrupt each other when asking questions, and turn-taking seemed more like turn-stealing at times. It was not surprising then that Indonesians in Australian academic settings reported feeling lost and unable to participate in the seminars by asking questions. So should the pragmatic norms of the Indonesians be respected when they are in Australian settings? While it would be unrealistic and inappropriate to expect Australians to adopt Indonesian pragmatic norms in these ELF settings, it is important that the question of which pragmatic norms to use should be negotiated and all sides expected to accommodate. So we would now alter the formula presented above and simply say that the most important strategy in all ELF communication is accommodation and the negotiation of norms.

A third area where research would be valuable is in the use of humour in academic settings. Mauranen et al. (2020: 671) report an occasion many years ago when the famous British linguist Randolph Quirk gave a seminar at a Spanish university. The host of the seminar was a senior Australian academic who had taught at Spanish universities for many years. He reported on Quirk's talk as follows:

He was very funny, very urbane, made jokes about me being Australian and so on and people afterwards were disappointed because of that, because he hadn't been dense and boring enough (*laughter*) so a Spanish audience is expecting this to be difficult, dense.

So is ELF in academic settings more likely to favour a more formal and less colloquial style than say British or Australian native speaker English? This is not to say that humour has no place in ELF. A recent study which compared (im)politeness in humour by Asian users of English as a lingua franca and Australian English speakers (Walkinshaw and Kirkpatrick 2020) found that users of ELF were "perfectly able to construct and respond to humour in their interactions . . . and that these ELF users can use humour in ways that are frequently comparable with the use of humour by native speakers" (2020: 23). However, questions remain about the appropriateness of certain humour types in ELF contexts. For example, jocular abuse, "a specific form of insulting where the speaker casts the target into an undesirable category or as having undesirable attributes using a conventionally offensive expression within a non-serious or jocular frame" (Haugh and Bousfield 2012: 1108) was common among the speakers of Australian English but entirely absent among the ELF speakers. Where research is needed is to compare the contexts in which humour is appreciated and considered appropriate.

Besides pedagogy-focused interactions, numerous types and instances of non-pedagogic discourse occur in educational institutions. These range from brief informal interactions (e.g. between ELF-using students and administrative staff) to more formal, goal-oriented encounters (e.g. among students and their lecturers, as explored by Björkman 2011) to extended formal meetings (such as between linguistically diverse academic staff members communicating through ELF). These are all common sites for ELF interaction as contemporary higher education institutions internationalise (Jenkins 2013) and the linguistic and cultural diversity of staff and student cohorts increases.

To conclude we would underline that, while the comparison of the pragmatic norms adopted by people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds is important, what is fundamental is further empirical analysis of how ELF speakers negotiate and accommodate to each other's pragmatic norms, as exemplified in many of the chapters in this volume. An understanding of these negotiation and accommodation skills is crucial to cross- and transcultural understanding among ELF speakers and would thus seem to be equally essential for people oper-

ating in ELF in EMI programmes in higher education. The development of such accommodation skills is obviously also of crucial importance to native speakers who wish to interact successfully with ELF users in ELF contexts. The teaching of such skills should form part of all intercultural training for ELF users and native speakers alike.

## References


Arundale, Robert B. 2004. Co-constituting face in conversation: An alternative to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. Paper presented to the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL, November 2004.

Arundale, Robert B. 2006. Face as relational and interactional: A communication framework for research on face, facework, and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(2). 193–216.

Attardo, Salvatore, Jodi Eisterhold, Jennifer Hay & Isabella Poggi. 2003. Multimodal markers of irony and sarcasm. *Humor* 16(2). 243–260.

Austin, John L. 1975. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, Will & Chittima Sangiamchit. 2019. Transcultural communication: Language, communication and culture through English as a lingua franca in a social network community. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 19(6). 471–487.

Björkman, Beyza. 2011. Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness? *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(4). 950–964.

Bousfield, Derek. 2008. *Impoliteness in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Boxer, Diana & Florencia Cortés-Conde. 1997. From bonding to biting: Conversational joking and identity display. *Journal of Pragmatics* 27(3). 275–294.

Brown, Roger & Marguerite Ford. 1961. Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62. 375–385.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(3). 349–367.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2005. Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1. 35–72.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan & Michael Haugh. 2014. *Pragmatics and the English language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ferguson, Mark A. & Thomas E. Ford. 2008. Disparagement humor: A theoretical and empirical review of psychoanalytic, superiority, and social identity theories. *Humor* 21(3). 283–312.

Ford, Thomas E. & Mark A. Ferguson. 2004. Social consequences of disparagement humor: A prejudiced norm theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 8(1). 79–94.

García, Ofelia & Li Wei. 2015. Translanguaging, bilingualism, and bilingual education. In Wayne E. Wright, Sovicheth Boun & Ofelia García (eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*, 223–240. Hoboken: Wiley.

Goddard, Cliff. 2009. Not taking yourself too seriously in Australian English: Semantic explications, cultural scripts, corpus evidence. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6(1). 29–53.
Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interactional ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Anchor Books.
Gu, Yueguo. 1990. Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12(2). 237–257.
Haugh, Michael. 2016a. "Just kidding": Teasing and claims to non–serious intent. *Journal of Pragmatics* 95. 120–136.
Haugh, Michael. 2016b. Mockery and (non-)seriousness in initial interactions amongst American and Australian speakers of English. In Donal Carbaugh (ed.), *Handbook of communication in cross-cultural perspective*, 104–117. New York: Routledge.
Haugh, Michael. 2015. Impoliteness and taking offence in initial interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 86. 36–42.
Haugh, Michael. 2014. Jocular mockery as interactional practice in everyday Anglo-Australian conversation. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 34(1). 76–99.
Haugh, Michael. 2010. Jocular mockery, (dis)affiliation and face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42. 2106–2119.
Haugh, Michael & Derek Bousfield. 2012. Mock impoliteness in interactions amongst Australian and British speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44. 1099–1114.
House, Juliane. 2010. The Pragmatics of English as a lingua franca. In Anna Trosborg (ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*, 363–387. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Hübler, Axel & Wolfram Bublitz. 2007. Introducing metapragmatics in use. In Wolfram Bublitz & Axel Hübler (eds.), *Metapragmatics in use*, 1–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Humphreys, Pamela. 2017. EMI in Anglophone nations: Contradiction in terms or cause for consideration? In Ben Fenton-Smith, Pamela Humphreys & Ian Walkinshaw (eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*, 93–114. Dordrecht: Springer.
Ide, Sachiko. 1989. Formal forms of discernment: Neglected aspects of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua* 8(2). 223–248.
Jenkins, Jennifer. 2019. English medium instruction in higher education: The role of English as lingua franca. In Xuesong Gao (ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching*, 91–108. Dordrecht: Springer.
Jenkins, Jennifer. 2013. *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London & New York: Routledge.
Kádár, Dániel Z. & Sara Mills (eds.). 2011. *Politeness in East Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kasper, Gabriele. 1994. Politeness. In Keith Brown (ed.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 3206–3211. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Kecskes, Istvan. 2015. Intracultural communication and intercultural communication: Are they different? *International Review of Pragmatics* 7(2). 171–194.
Kienpointner, Manfred. 1997. Varieties of rudeness: Types and functions of impolite utterances. *Functions of Language* 4. 251–287.
Kirkpatrick, Andy & Zhichang Xu. 2002. Chinese pragmatic norms and China English. *World Englishes* 21(2). 269–280.
Kirkpatrick, Andy, Sophiaan Subhan & Ian Walkinshaw. 2016. English as a lingua franca in East and Southeast Asia: Implications for diplomatic and intercultural communication.

In Patricia Friedrich (ed.), *English for diplomatic purposes*, 137–166. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Lakoff, Robin T. 1989. The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua* 8(2). 101–130.
Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
Li, David C. S. 2002. Pragmatic dissonance: The ecstasy and agony of speaking like a native speaker of English. In David C. S. Li (ed.), *Discourses in search of members. In honour of Ron Scollon*, 559–595. Lanham: University Press of America.
Limberg, Holger. 2009. Impoliteness and threat responses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(7). 1376–1394.
Locher, Miriam A. & Sage L. Graham 2010. Introduction to interpersonal pragmatics. In Miriam A. Locher & Sage L. Graham (eds.), *Interpersonal pragmatics*, 1–13. Berlin: Mouton.
Locher, Miriam A. & Richard J. Watts. 2005. Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 9–33.
Locher, Miriam A. & Richard J. Watts. 2008. *Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of linguistic behaviour*. Mouton de Gruyter.
Macaro, Ernesto. 2018. *English medium instruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Mao, Luming. 1994. Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21(5). 451–486.
Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1988. Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12(4). 403–426.
Mauranen, Anna, Carmen Pérez-Llantada & John M. Swales. 2020. Academic Englishes: A standardised knowledge? In Andy Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of World Englishes*, 2nd edn, 659–676. London and New York: Routledge.
Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mills, Sara. 2011. Discursive approaches to politeness and impoliteness. In Linguistic Politeness Research Group (eds.), *Discursive approaches to politeness*, 19–56. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
Mitchell, Nathaniel. 2015. Goading as a social action: Non-impolite evaluations in targeted banter. In Staci Defibaugh (ed.), *Interdisciplinary perspectives on im/politeness*, 121–148. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Pietikäinen, Kaisa S. 2018. Misunderstandings and ensuring understanding in private ELF talk. *Applied Linguistics* 39(2). 188–212.
Pullin Stark, Patricia. 2009. No joke – This is serious! Power, solidarity and humor in business English as a lingua franca (BELF). In Anna Mauranen & Elina Ranta (eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings*, 152–177. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
Sato, Takanori, Yuri J. Yujobo, Tricia Okada & Ethel Ogane. 2019. Communication strategies employed by low-proficiency users: Possibilities for ELF-informed pedagogy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 8(1). 9–35.
Searle, John. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2005. (Im)politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1. 95–119.
Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2008. Face, (im)politeness and rapport. In Helen Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory*, 2nd edn, 11–47. London: Continuum.

Taguchi, Naoko & Carsten Roever. 2017. *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tanskanen, Sanna-Kaisa. 2007. Metapragmatic utterances in computer-mediated communication. In Wolfram Bublitz & Axel Hübler (eds.), *Metapragmatics in use*, 87–106. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thaib, Rusdi. 1999. Schema of group seminar presentations and rhetorical structures of presentation introductions: A cross cultural study of Indonesian and Australian students in university academic settings. *Asian Englishes* 2(1). 66–89.

Walkinshaw, Ian. 2016. Teasing in informal contexts in English as an Asian lingua franca. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 5(2). 249–271.

Walkinshaw, Ian & Andy Kirkpatrick. 2020. 'We want fork but no pork': (Im)politeness in humour by Asian users of English as a lingua franca and Australian English speakers. *Contrastive Pragmatics* 2(1). 52–80.

Walkinshaw, Ian & Andy Kirkpatrick. 2014. Mutual face preservation among Asian speakers of English as a lingua franca. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 3(2). 269–291.

Watts, Richard J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.