



Enrico Grazzi

**TRAJECTORIES OF CHANGE
IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING.
AN ELF-AWARE APPROACH**

19

Intersezioni/Intersections
Collana di anglistica

Enrico Grazzi, *Trajectories of Change in English Language Teaching. An ELF-Aware Approach*

Copyright © 2018 Tangram Edizioni Scientifiche

Gruppo Editoriale Tangram Srl

Via Verdi, 9/A – 38122 Trento

www.edizioni-tangram.it – info@edizioni-tangram.it

Intersezioni/Intersections – Collana di anglistica – NIC 19

Prima edizione: marzo 2018, *Printed in EU*

ISBN 978-88-6458-178-1

Direzione

Oriana Palusci

Comitato scientifico

Silvia Antosa, Università degli Studi di Enna Kore

Maria Teresa Chialant, Università degli Studi di Salerno

Rossella Ciocca, Università di Napoli *L'Orientale*

Lidia Curti, Università di Napoli *L'Orientale*

Laura Di Michele, Università degli Studi dell'Aquila

Bruna Di Sabato, Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, Napoli

Paola Faini, Università degli Studi Roma Tre

Mirko Casagrande, Università della Calabria

Vita Fortunati, Università degli Studi di Bologna

Alba Graziano, Università della Tuscia, Viterbo

Gerhard Leitner Faha (Hon.), Freie Universität, Berlin

Carlo Pagetti, Università degli Studi di Milano

Biancamaria Rizzardi, Università degli Studi di Pisa

Il regolamento e la programmazione editoriale sono pubblicati

sul sito dell'editore: www.edizioni-tangram.it/intersections

In copertina: *Paper*, Soorelis – Pixabay.com

Stampa su carta ecologica proveniente da zone in silvicoltura, totalmente priva di cloro.
Non contiene sbiancanti ottici, è acid free con riserva alcalina.

For Paola, Alessandro and Marcello

Foreword	13
An interview with Jennifer Jenkins	15
<i>English as a lingua franca</i>	15
Introduction	21
<i>Globalisation and ELF: a vision for the future</i>	21
<i>Organization of the book</i>	30
1. What is ELF?	35
1.1. <i>ELF and ELT</i>	39
2. The CultNet survey on ELF	45
2.1. <i>The CultNet survey on ELF</i>	48
2.2. <i>Voices from CultNet</i>	100
2.3. <i>Discussion</i>	112
2.4. <i>Conclusions</i>	114
3. ELF and ELT: exploring controversial issues	119
3.1. <i>Should a native-speaker language model be provided in language education?</i>	122
3.2. <i>How can errors be distinguished from creative forms of ELF?</i>	126
3.3. <i>How should teachers behave when deviations from the adopted language model occur?</i>	128
3.4. <i>How should teachers assess the use of ELF in the English classroom?</i>	132
3.5. <i>Discussion</i>	134
3.6. <i>Conclusions</i>	135
4. ELF and web-mediated intercultural activities: a case study	139
4.1. <i>Theoretical framework</i>	139
4.2. <i>The implementation of telecollaboration</i>	143
4.3. <i>ELF features and intercultural telecollaboration</i>	145
4.4. <i>ELF discourse and intercultural telecollaboration</i>	150
4.5. <i>Discussion</i>	164
4.6. <i>Conclusions</i>	165
Appendix	171
<i>The CultNet survey on ELF</i>	171
Bibliography	177
Index	187

**TRAJECTORIES OF CHANGE
IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING.
AN ELF-AWARE APPROACH**

List of acronyms

ACE	Asian Corpus of English
BELF	Business English as a lingua franca
CA	Communicative approach
CAS	Complex adaptive system
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment
CF	Corrective feedback
CLT	Communicative language teaching
CoP	Community of practice
CP	Critical pedagogy
EFL	English as a foreign language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELFA	English as a lingua franca in academic settings
ELT	English language teaching
EMI	English as a medium of instruction
ENL	English as a native language
ESL	English as a second language
GA	General American
GDP	Gross domestic product
ICC	Intercultural communicative competence
IMF	International Monetary Fund
L1	First language
L2	Second language
LFC	Lingua franca core
MMORPG	Massively multiplayer online role-playing games
MWU	Multi-word unit
NBLT	Network-based language teaching
NES	Native English speaker
NNES	Non-native English speaker
RP	Received pronunciation
SCT	Sociocultural theory
SE	Standard English
SMLL	Social media language learning

SPEAKING	Situation, Participants, Ends, Acts, Keys, Instruments, Norms and Genres
TFA	<i>Tirocinio formativo attivo</i> (Italian pre-service teacher-education courses in language teaching methodology)
VOICE	Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English
WB	World Bank
WE	World Englishes
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWW	World Wide Web
ZPD	Zone of proximal development

Foreword

The spread of English as a lingua franca (ELF) is inherent in the process of globalisation. However, when the financial world crisis of 2007-2009 hit, globalisation suddenly revealed its darker side. Today, with the emergence of a new world order, and not without growing socio-political tensions, we need to argue for a profound change in English language teaching (ELT) by enhancing ELF awareness and supporting education for citizenship.

The aim of this book is to value what has been achieved in ELF research so far, and present a vision for its future. The following interview with Professor Jennifer Jenkins¹, an outstanding ELF scholar, is intended to spark this wider discussion of critical ELF-related issues.

¹ Professor Jennifer Jenkins is the Chair of Global Englishes and Director of the Centre for Global Englishes in Modern Languages at the University of Southampton.

An interview with Jennifer Jenkins

Centre for Global Englishes (CGE), University of Southampton

English as a lingua franca²

1. *My first question about ELF regards the teaching of English at present. ELF is undoubtedly the most widely used language between speakers who do not share the same native language and plays a fundamental role in the process of globalisation. To what extent do you think that teachers of English are aware of the impact of ELF globally?*

Not very aware, but it's increasing, particularly as more research about ELF is published and becomes widely available, and especially as large numbers of PhD students working on ELF related topics return to their countries and 'spread the word' about ELF!

2. *Non-native English speakers outnumber native speakers, and this results in the steady spread of ELF around the world. However, why do you think most teachers disregard or disparage ELF, while they prefer to adopt a native-speaker model?*

Because they don't understand it. Many change their minds after they have understood exactly what ELF is, and that it exists as a natural phenomenon in the real world, and isn't something invented by researchers. But this isn't exclusive to ELF or English. Most nations have very strong language ideologies according to which the native speaker is the ideal/perfect speaker and the non-natives can't speak the language properly.

² This interview was given on March 2nd, 2018.

3. *English is constantly changing, so do you think that language syllabuses should take this change into consideration and incorporate it? What are the drawbacks of sticking to the dominant ideology of standard English today?*

Starting with your second question, the drawbacks of sticking to the dominant standard English language ideology is that increasingly students will be learning a version of English that they're very unlikely to meet in real life. The proportion of native to non-native English speakers is around 4:1, and the majority of communication in English is in lingua franca groupings, whether more established or, more likely, in transient encounters. Learning standard British or American English doesn't prepare students for this. On the other hand, turning to your first question, it would be impossible for language syllabuses to incorporate constant changes in real-world English. However, this isn't even necessary or helpful, as English (i.e. ELF) use is very fluid and flexible, and depends almost entirely on who is speaking with whom. What they DO need to incorporate is the findings of ELF research, particularly in relation to familiarising students with a range of different (mostly non-native) ways of speaking English, and above all, ways of developing their accommodation skills, i.e. their ability to adjust the way they speak (especially their accents) when interacting with people from different first languages than their own, and the ability to adjust their expectations, by 'tuning into' and being able to understand the ways others speak.

4. *How would you define the difference between 'errors' and variable forms of English as regards ELF? Are all deviations from standard norms to be considered acceptable creative forms of ELF?*

For me, the only thing that counts as an error in ELF communication is something that doesn't communicate effectively. This would include the use of idiomatic language only known to the speaker (often a native English speaker). Anything that communicates effectively in the context of the interaction is not an 'error' as far as I'm concerned, and I think it would be better not to even use the term 'error' in respect of ELF, but to replace it with 'ineffectiveness' or something like that.

5. *What should the language teacher do when variations from standard English norms occur? (e.g. correct the students? Select between acceptable and unacceptable variations according to the principle of mutual comprehensibility? Do nothing?).*

Not being a language teacher, I don't feel I have the authority to answer this question. It depends very much on the local situation. My only comment is that if the aim is for students to pass a particular exam, they can't really do anything other than point out what is 'correct' in standard native English, however much they may object (as I do too) to the exam's premise that native English is the version of English that has to be tested.

6. *In European schools, different levels of proficiency in English are usually defined according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), which is based on the competences of an ideal native speaker. In your view, how is the reality of ELF going to change the way learners should be tested?*

My ultimate aim is for an end to standardized English language tests, which would also mean an end to benchmarking tests against the CEFR. Although the CEFR has recently toned down its obsession with the native speaker of the language, its descriptors still prioritise the native speaker, even in the case of English. I'm currently working with a colleague on a proposal to replace standardised English language tests with an altogether different approach to assessing English language (ELF) abilities. But I can't tell you more about this until the position paper we've recently written on this subject is published in 2019.

7. *As regards evaluation, how should teachers assess their students' competences and measure their progress in learning once standard English is no longer considered the only reference model in ELT?*

My answer to this will be in the 2019 paper. As I said in answer to question 6, I can't tell you more at the moment.

8. *Barbara Seidlhofer (2011, p. 13) observes that “(...) The discourse about English teaching has changed, but the actual content of courses has not: the discourse makes very little effective contact with the realities of practical pedagogy. This leaves English as a subject in a kind of limbo, caught between innovations in the discourse about the teaching of language and a lack of innovation in terms of actual language content”. Do you agree with this view? Is English really stuck in a limbo?*

I agree up to a point, as it's clear that the content of ELT courses is still very much native-English-oriented. But there have been changes over the past few years. E.g. some more enlightened courses are introducing more non-native English speakers into their listening texts. Meanwhile, some of the main teacher training organisations are introducing World Englishes (WE) and ELF into their syllabuses. However, this has so far happened in a rather muddled way (e.g. they don't seem to understand the difference between WE and ELF). But it's a step in the right direction, as is the inclusion over the past 15 years or so of Global/World Englishes courses in university English programmes. Having produced the first ever coursebook on this (the 1st ed. of my book, then called *World Englishes*, now *Global Englishes*, 3rd ed., in the Routledge English Language Introductions series), I think I can take some credit for this development!

9. *Very often, non-native speakers consider their English inappropriate and faulty. However, as Kramsch (1997) says, the “privilege of the non-native speaker” is the ability to accommodate to other bilingual or multilingual speakers and communicate. Do you agree with this view?*

I agree entirely. Native English speakers are generally of two kinds. The first are monolingual, and not having acquired additional languages, are unaware of the possible difficulties involved in using an additional language or of the fact that idiomatic language, slang, etc. often isn't known to people who didn't grow up with the language as their first language. They therefore assume everyone speaks 'their' language and expect everyone to accommodate to them. The second kind are bilingual native English

speakers. They've learnt and often speak fluently, one or more additional language. However, many of them learnt that language or languages for itself (often as a university major), and don't understand the concept of a lingua franca, i.e. a language that serves as a tool of intercultural communication. They therefore expect all users of English (i.e. mostly ELF) to use nativelike English, and criticise them if they don't – usually with the very ill-informed comment that if they could achieve native competence in their second language (e.g. Spanish, German, French), then non-native English speakers should also be able to.

10. Considering that multilingual competence is precious and useful in life, why do teachers tend to ignore the linguistic richness that children bring with them? Italy is a case in point.

I'm really sorry, but I can't say much about this as I'm only guessing. But I think it's covered by all the things I've already said. That is, teachers are 'infected' by standard English language ideology, so they believe the only thing they can do to help their students, including children, is to teach them standard native English, and to ignore and keep separate, the other languages the children bring with them. This goes totally against the views that have been expressed more recently in critical multilingualism, which argues that the multilingual brain isn't composed of discrete languages, but one multilingual repertoire from which speakers select appropriately in context. The latest research on translanguaging is very helpful in this respect. The same view is currently being expressed by ELF researchers, who are looking at ELF as a 'multilingua franca' and prioritising the other languages of ELF users (children included) rather than fixating about English. If you'd like examples of what I've published about this, I can send them to you.

Introduction

Globalisation and ELF: a vision for the future

The present-day primacy of English as an international lingua franca (ELF)³ (Cogo and Dewey, 2012; Crystal, 1997; Graddol, 2006; Jenkins, 2000, 2007, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Mauranen, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2003, 2011; Widdowson, 2003) is a natural concomitant of the economic, cultural and political globalisation that became established at the turn of the century. The reasons for the pervasiveness of English are not intrinsically linguistic, but largely depend on external circumstances that over time have led to the gradual spread of this language throughout immense areas of the world, and to the inevitable emergence of a wide range of varieties in diverse contact situations. As Schneider (2011, p. 37) points out:

(...) It appears that language-internal (cognitive, perceptual, articulatory, etc.) conditions establish a framework for possible structural options and evolutionary trajectories, but which of these is then realized depends first and foremost upon extralinguistic conditions. It is primarily the historical and sociolinguistic background – the communicative conditions, the fates of people, and things like linguistic and social attitudes, in short the “ecology” of the setting of a variety – which determines its fate and evolution.

The same applies to English and its history, including its global diffusion and adjustments.

Similarly, Mauranen (2012, 17) comes to the conclusion that “(...) The emergence of one language that is the default lingua franca

³ ELF is used here as a term that encompasses all uses of English where communication takes place between non-native English speakers (NNEs) who do not share the same L1, as well as between NNEs and native English speakers (NEs).

in all corners of the earth is both a consequence and a prerequisite of globalisation. [...] [I]t is clear that there is nothing in the English language itself that destined it to linguistic world dominance; the reasons lie in the social and economic factors". Nevertheless, even though the interrelation between globalisation and ELF is usually taken as axiomatic and has become a leitmotif concept in contemporary approaches to the development and understanding of global Englishes (Crystal, 1997; Jenkins, 2015a), it would be rather simplistic not to consider the controversial nature of this issue, particularly in the aftermath of the 2007-09 financial crisis that affected the world order so profoundly. Therefore, this introduction intends to provide an overview of the historical process that has turned English into a world language, to focus on the controversial features of globalisation and to sketch a broad picture of the general political-economic context in which ELF emerged and continues to grow.

Schneider (2011, p. 37) identifies three main factors behind the spread of English worldwide: a) "(...) English was spread around the globe as the language of the British Empire"; b) "It was the language of the industrial revolution and of technological innovation (...)"; c) "(...) in the twentieth century it [...] was the language of the world's remaining superpower and the leading force in globalisation, the United States". There appears to be general agreement that it was mainly the dominant position of America in the world economy and the leading role of the USA in many fields such as international politics, military power, finance, science, technology, mass media and the entertainment industry which characterized the expansionary economic cycle that followed World War II and determined the dissemination of the American model. However, it would be misleading to conclude that the USA has become the only actor in a unipolar world. On the contrary, the new geopolitical and economic order that emerged during the second half of the twentieth century shows that notwithstanding the strong imperialistic impact of the American superpower on the world scene, the historical-natural spread of capitalism (Marx and Engels, 1973) has shifted the balance towards a multipolar world, where other major advanced economies (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom), large and fast-growing national economies (the so-called BRICS nations: Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Af-

rica), as well as rising medium, regional powers (e.g. Australia, Indonesia, the European Union, Argentina, Iran, Turkey, Israel, Egypt, Algeria, Nigeria, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, to name just a few) are competing to take their place in global markets. The globalising process that led to the creation of an international network of economic systems took a huge leap forward between the mid-1980s and the 2000s, when the digital revolution, a key moment in history that reshaped the texture of modernity, brought sweeping changes to social institutions and to the way of life of millions of people. Nevertheless, there has not been general consensus about the ripple effects of globalisation, a controversial process that has been met both with enthusiastic acclaim by the advocates of neoliberalism, and by vehement opposition by social, leftist movements that challenge the power of global financial institutions like the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). Neoliberals support free international trade and the deregulation of financial markets, while social activists, like the anti-corporate globalisation movement (Juris, 2008), aspire to forms of global integration that promote human rights and sustainable development, in other words a globalisation “(...) from below” (Korzeniewicz and Smith, 2001, p. 4). Finally, opposition to globalisation also includes extreme-right nationalist movements (e.g. the French National Front, the Austrian Freedom Party, the Italian Lega, the Greek Golden Dawn and the National Democratic Party of Germany) that argue for the defence of the nation-state, its ethnic and religious identity and its cultural boundaries.

To expand on this basic overview on globalisation, let us consider the following quotations by Kissinger and Chomsky, who exemplify and embody two contrasting approaches to this process.

Kissinger (2002, pp. 210-229) highlights the economic benefits of integration in global business and digital interconnectedness, although he also warns against its inherent political dangers:

(...) For the first time in history, a single worldwide economic system has come into being. Markets in every continent interact continuously. Communications enable capital to respond instantaneously to new opportunities or to lowered expectations. [...] Globalization has encouraged an explosion of wealth and a rate of technological advance no previous epoch could ever imagine. [...]

The United States has been the driving force behind the dynamics of globalization; it has also been the prime beneficiary of the forces it has unleashed. [...] The globalized world faces two contradictory trends. The globalized market opens prospects of heretofore unimagined wealth. But it also creates new vulnerabilities to political turmoil and the danger of a new gap, not so much between rich and poor as between those in each society that are part of the globalized, Internet world and those who are not. [...] In economies driven by a near imperative for the big to acquire the small, companies of developing countries are increasingly being absorbed by American and European multinationals. While this solves the problem of access to capital, it brings about growing vulnerabilities to domestic political tensions, especially in times of crisis. And within the developing countries, it creates political temptations for attacks on the entire system of globalization.

On the other hand, in an interview given in 2002 Chomsky (<<http://aggrohh.nadir.org/2004/01/568.shtml>>) envisages an alternative form of globalisation based on international cooperation and mutual development, with more than a nod to the tradition of working-class internationalism:

(...) The term “globalization” has been appropriated by the powerful to refer to a specific form of international economic integration, one based on investor rights, with the interests of people incidental. That is why the business press, in its more honest moments, refers to the “free trade agreements” as “free investment agreements” (Wall St. Journal). Accordingly, advocates of other forms of globalization are described as “anti-globalization”; and some, unfortunately, even accept this term, though it is a term of propaganda that should be dismissed with ridicule. [...] No sane person is opposed to globalization, that is, international integration. Surely not the left and the workers movements, which were founded on the principle of international solidarity – that is, globalization in a form that attends to the rights of people, not private power systems.

In 2002, when globalisation was reaching its peak and many believed that the New Economy would bring long-term prosperity, Kissinger sees the risks involved (e.g. in his book he also analyses the crises of the Asian and Latin American markets in the 1990s and criticizes the role played by the IMF) and seems to anticipate

the world's most serious financial crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s, i.e., the global financial crisis of 2007-09.

We know today that that crisis was a historical turning point and that its disastrous consequences have definitively subverted the former relationship between leading global economies and emerging ones, as shown by the data published by the IMF in the *World Economic Outlook. April. 2016* (see Table 1), significantly entitled *Too Slow for Too Long*⁴, and in the *World Economic Outlook: Gaining Momentum? April 2017*⁵ (see Table 2).

The IMF reports that while between 1998 and 2007 the annual percent change in world output (real GDP) was 4.2%, the projections for 2016, 2017, 2018, 2021 and 2022 are 3.2%, 3.5%, 3.6%, 3.9% and 3.8% respectively. Therefore, in the medium/long term the global economy is not expected to recover its pre-crisis levels. Meanwhile, the crisis in international relations has had irreversible consequences.

If we consider these data in greater detail and compare the figures of advanced economies to those of emerging markets and developing economies, we can see that advanced economies are expected to slow down (2.8% in 1999-2007 compared to 1.7% in 2022), while developing economies are expected to grow faster and almost recover their 1999-2007 growth rate (5.8% in 1999-2007 compared to 5.0% in 2022). The figures in Table 2 also indicate that in the medium/long term advanced economies are going to face a relative economic decline, while emerging and developing Asian countries are going to take the lead. It is no coincidence, we may argue, that military expenditure has increased steadily since the year 2000, reaching its peak in 2009, the year of the great financial crisis, as SIPRI⁶ (2016) indicates.

This is a completely different scenario compared to the pre-crisis years. It presents us with new challenges posed by a different world order, and has interesting implications regarding the future of globalisation and, consequently, of ELF.

⁴ <<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2016/01/pdf/text.pdf>>, p. 168.

⁵ <<http://www.imf.org/en/publications/weo/issues/2017/04/04/world-economic-outlook-april-2017#Statistical%20Appendix>>, p. 198.

⁶ SIPRI, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, <www.sipri.org>.

Table 1, International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook, April, 2016

Summary of World Output (Annual percent change)													
	Average	Projections											
	1998-2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2021	
World	4.2	3.0	-0.1	5.4	4.2	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.9	
Advanced Economies	2.8	0.2	-3.4	3.1	1.7	1.2	1.2	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.8	
United States	3.0	-0.3	-2.8	2.5	1.6	2.2	1.5	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.0	
Euro Area	2.4	0.5	-4.5	2.1	1.6	-0.9	-0.3	0.9	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.5	
Japan	1.0	-1.0	-5.5	4.7	-0.5	1.7	1.4	0.0	0.5	0.5	-0.1	0.7	
Other Advanced Economies	3.6	1.1	-2.0	4.5	3.0	1.9	2.3	2.8	1.9	2.0	2.3	2.4	
Emerging Market and Developing Economies	5.8	5.8	3.0	7.4	6.3	5.3	4.9	4.6	4.0	4.1	4.6	5.1	
Regional Groups													
Commonwealth of Independent States	6.2	5.3	-6.4	4.6	4.8	3.5	2.1	1.1	-2.8	-1.1	1.3	2.4	
Emerging and Developing Asia	7.6	7.2	7.5	9.6	7.8	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.3	6.4	
Emerging and Developing Europe	4.2	3.1	-3.0	4.7	5.4	1.2	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	
Latin America and the Caribbean	3.1	3.9	-1.2	6.1	4.9	3.2	3.0	1.3	-0.1	-0.5	1.5	2.8	
Middle East, North Africa, Afghanistan, and													
–Pakistan	5.3	4.8	1.5	4.9	4.5	5.0	2.3	2.8	2.5	3.1	3.5	3.8	
– Middle East and North Africa	5.3	4.8	1.5	5.2	4.6	5.1	2.1	2.6	2.3	2.9	3.3	3.6	
Sub-Saharan Africa	5.3	6.0	4.0	6.6	5.0	4.3	5.2	5.1	3.4	3.0	4.0	5.0	

Table 2, International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook, April, 2017

Summary of World Output (Annual percent change)												
	Average		Projections									
	1999-2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2022
World	4.2	-0.1	5.4	4.2	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.8
Advanced Economies	2.5	-3.4	3.1	1.7	1.2	1.3	2.0	2.1	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.7
United States	2.6	-2.8	2.5	1.6	2.2	1.7	2.4	2.6	1.6	2.3	2.5	1.7
Euro Area	2.1	-4.5	2.1	1.5	-0.9	-0.3	1.2	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.5
Japan	1.0	-5.4	4.2	-0.1	1.5	2.0	0.3	1.2	1.0	1.2	0.6	0.6
Other Advanced Economies	3.5	-2.0	4.6	2.9	1.9	2.3	2.9	1.9	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.3
Emerging Market and Developing Economies	6.2	2.9	7.4	6.3	5.4	5.1	4.7	4.2	4.1	4.5	4.8	5.0
Regional Groups												
Commonwealth of Independent States	7.2	-6.4	4.7	4.6	3.5	2.1	1.1	-2.2	0.3	1.7	2.1	2.4
Emerging and Developing Asia	8.0	7.5	9.6	7.9	7.0	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.3
Emerging and Developing Europe	4.3	-3.0	4.6	6.5	2.4	4.9	3.9	4.7	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.1
Latin America and the Caribbean	3.3	-1.8	6.1	4.7	3.0	2.9	1.2	0.1	-1.0	1.1	2.0	2.6
Middle East, North Africa, Afghanistan, and												
– Pakistan	5.3	1.4	4.8	4.3	5.4	2.3	2.8	2.7	3.9	2.6	3.4	3.8
– Middle East and North Africa	5.3	1.4	5.0	4.4	5.5	2.1	2.7	2.6	3.8	2.3	3.2	3.5
Sub-Saharan Africa	5.6	3.9	7.0	5.0	4.3	5.3	5.1	3.4	1.4	2.6	3.5	3.9

Even though this brief run through the kaleidoscopic effects of globalisation might seem tangential to the primary pedagogic concerns of this book, the intent here is to reconsider our perspectives concerning the future of international relations in an age when the threat of political-economic instability and the transition towards a new world balance of power is reviving protectionist and isolationist tendencies, xenophobic policies, nationalist ideologies and the escalation of military operations reliant on huge military investment. ELF is therefore expected to play a fundamental role in the future developments of global relations, especially in this difficult phase of the new political-economic cycle, in which China has become the leading world power (with 18% of the world's GDP), with the U.S. second (with more than 15% of the world's GDP) and the EU (27 countries, not including the UK) third (with almost 14% of the world's GDP). Incidentally, apropos the use of English in the Far East, Kirkpatrick (2010, p. 4) points out that

(...) English is the de facto lingua franca of the grouping of Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and with the signing of the ASEAN Charter in February 2009 assumed official status as the sole working language of ASEAN. English is also the working language of the extended grouping known as ASEAN + 3, which includes the ten states of ASEAN plus China, Japan and Korea.

In this critical situation, where the relative decline of the Atlantic macro-area has ignited political strife as a new balance of power is established, diplomacy and warfare seem to go hand in hand. Syria is a case in point, and we could say that the financial crisis of 2007-09 was just the beginning of the profound ideological crisis of globalisation that we are facing today. Globalisation used to be a popular buzzword in the pre-crisis years; for many, it was the symbol of a new epoch, and English represented the key to a promising future. After years of economic instability and international tensions, globalisation has become a highly contentious process. Hence, it seems appropriate to think critically and reaffirm, as language educators, our beliefs and our commitment to *inclusive education* and *intercultural citizenship* (Byram, 2008). We must maintain a vision of the strategic role that ELF can play in enhancing mutual under-

standing, promoting social engagement and helping to negotiate conflict. It should be observed that, notwithstanding the fact that the historical roots of the dominance of English as a global language are deeply ingrained in Britain's colonial past and in the bygone days of America as *the* superpower, the ownership of the language is now gradually moving into the hands of the ever expanding international community of NNEs, who, as Jenkins (2000, p. 1) points out, "outnumber those for whom it is the mother tongue". Indeed, Widdowson, (1994, p. 385) claims that:

(...) It is a matter of considerable pride and satisfaction for native speakers of English that their language is an international means of communication. But the point is that it is only international to the extent that it is not their language. It is not a possession which they lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold. Other people actually own it. [...] As soon as you accept that English serves the communicative and communal needs of different communities, it follows logically that it must be diverse. An international language has to be an independent language. It does not follow logically, however, that the language will disperse into mutually unintelligible varieties. For it will naturally stabilize into standard form to the extent required to meet the needs of the communities concerned.

Following this line of thought, it seems reasonable to believe that in the present situation, English should not be a threat to the sociocultural identity of the NNEs or seen as an instrument to safeguard exclusively Western economic and political interests (what Phillipson (1992) defined as *linguistic imperialism*), even though Canagarajah (1999, p. 2) warns that "(...) If we are to appropriate the language for our purposes, the oppressive history and hegemonic values associated with English have to be kept very much in mind, and engaged judiciously". In this perspective, the emergence of a *glocal*⁷, polycentric lingua franca like ELF represents an additional resource that increases the L2-user's communicative power. Seidlhofer (2011, p. 7) contends that:

⁷ The word *glocal* is a blend created by Robertson (1995), which combines the words 'global' and 'local'. It refers to the process whereby English is adopted by a local culture to be used in global communication.

(...) Due to the numbers of speakers involved worldwide, [...] ENL [English as a native language] speakers will generally be in minority, and their English will therefore be less and less likely to constitute the linguistic reference norm. But it is important to note that this conceptualisation of ELF is a functional and not a formal one. [...] For the first time in history, a language has reached truly global dimensions, across continents, domains, and social strata, and as a consequence, it is being shaped, in its international uses, at least as much by its non-native speakers as its native-speakers. This process has obviously been accelerated by the dramatic expansion of electronic communication through the internet, which has so far enhanced the social prestige attributed to typical global users of English.

In conclusion, the ethical approach that underpins this book is to sensitize both preservice and inservice teachers, and in general all professional figures involved in English language teaching (ELT), to the great potential of ELF as a global contact language that suits the different voices of international speakers and that can be developed cooperatively as a common resource.

Organization of the book

The book has four chapters. Chapter 1, *What is ELF?*, provides a short overview of ELF theory that is principally addressed to researchers, applied linguists, and ELT practitioners who may not be acquainted with ELF studies. It considers the definitions of ELF that inform the present study in order to clarify the underlying rationale and guiding principles of the work as a whole.

Chapter 2, *The CultNet survey on English as a lingua franca and intercultural communicative competence*, presents the results of a survey that was recently administered to a group of members of CultNet, the international network of interculturalists founded by Professor Michael Byram⁸ in 1996. The aim of

⁸ Michael Byram has been Professor Emeritus in the School of Education at Durham University, since October 2008. His work in the School comprised initial teacher education and being Director of Research Degrees with supervision of research students. He began his career teaching French and German at sec-

this investigation is to hear respondents' perspectives on ELF and explore the possibility of devising a blended approach to ELT whereby the development of learners' intercultural communicative competence (ICC) and the reality of ELF as a contact language (Mauranen, 2012) converge in a comprehensive pedagogical framework that is based on the notion that English is not monolithic and its *ownership* is no longer concentrated in the hands of its native speakers (Widdowson, 2003). In addition, section 2.2. of Chapter 2, *Voices from CultNet*, contains an interview with six CultNet respondents who accepted the author's invitation to join a focus group and answer a range of questions regarding ELF and ICC.

The findings of the survey, which are drawn from a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the responses, foreground the fundamental link between ELF and the linguacultural identity of NNESS, although they also indicate that the dominance of the ex-normative Standard English model in foreign language education and the primacy of the NES are still perceived as axiomatic. CultNet respondents' ambivalent attitude towards the pedagogical implications of ELF are representative of how problematic the transition towards an ELF-aware learning curriculum may be. The CultNet survey on ELF is useful in discovering what the most urgent priorities seem to be for the reconceptualisation of the English-speaking subject in the light of ELF theory. These are the issues that are discussed in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3, *ELF and ELT: exploring controversial issues*, addresses some of the fundamental unresolved questions about the incorporation of ELF into the English syllabus. This chapter is an

ondary school level and in adult education in an English comprehensive community school. After being appointed to a post in teacher education at the University of Durham in 1980, he carried out research into the education of linguistic minorities, foreign language education and student residence abroad, as well as supervising doctoral students in intercultural studies, language teaching and comparative education. He has published many books and articles including, *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence; From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship* and *The Common European Framework of Reference, The Globalisation of Language Education Policy* (edited with Lynne Parmenter). He is the editor with Adelheid Hu of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*, which has been translated into Chinese and Arabic. <<https://www.dur.ac.uk/research/directory/staff/?id=613>>.

attempt to offer some tentative responses to the problems of: a) the role of the native-speaker model in language education; b) the distinction between *errors* and creative forms of ELF; c) the role of the teacher; and d) the assessment of ELF in the English classroom.

Chapter 4, *ELF and web-mediated intercultural activities: a case study*, offers an example of how it is possible to create a multicultural community of practice (CoP) (Wenger, 1998) with students from different linguacultural backgrounds connected online and carrying out network-based learning activities using ELF as a mediational tool. The desired educational objective is to share the experience of innovative teaching/learning practices such as telecollaboration, which can be incorporated into the mainstream ELT syllabus and stimulate further applied research in the field of educational linguistics.