Ways forward for developing an ELF centred ELT Pedagogy

Dr Robert Weekly
Nottingham Ningbo University, China
Email: rj.weekly42@gmail.com

Abstract:

This paper presents a theoretical argument to augment current approaches which could serve as a basis for an English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) orientated pedagogy in ELT. There are four conceptual areas of teaching practices in ELT which have created tension between the language expected in the classroom and the socio-linguistic reality outside the classroom. These are translanguaging, the target language model, corrective feedback and assessment practices. Firstly, translanguaging in educational contexts has been extensively researched recently but not linked explicitly to ELF, though these research fields share an ontological and epistemically framework. Secondly, the principle problem with models used in ELT, is to subjugate the spoken language with the written. Therefore, these two different forms of language need explicit separation, and for speaking, where appropriate, a local model used, while at the same time, implicitly raising awareness of societal attitudes towards dialects and accents. Thirdly, corrective feedback (CF) requires a reorientation from an accuracy focused CF towards meaning focused correction. Finally, assessment practices, which for speaking, measure students spoken language against native models and does not accurately reflect students' language competence. These four aspects would also serve as a basis for differentiating an ELF approach to ELT from a CLT approach.

Key Words: ELF, Pedagogy, Translanguaging, Corrective Feedback, Assessment

1. Introduction

There has been extensive research in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) analysing various aspects of language (Cogo and Dewey 2012, Jenkins 2000, 2007, 2014, Jenkins et al. 2011, Jenkins and Leung 2014, Seidlhofer 2011). However, until recently research in this field has tended to resist making practical recommendations for teaching that incorporate an ELF orientation (Dewey 2015, Matsuda and Friedrich 2011). Seidlhofer (2004) cautioned against suggestions for English Language Teaching (ELT), as, at the time, she argued it was too early in the research to understand the possible implications, while Jenkins (2011) asserts it is for people working in ELT to ascertain the relevance of ELF research for their own context. It is unsurprising therefore that there has been an increasing number of ELF papers at ELT

conferences, and a number of ELF influenced articles included in the ELT journal (Cogo 2015). Nevertheless, perhaps the lack of substantial progress within the ELT industry to appreciate the importance of ELF research, has spurred ELF researchers to encroach on teaching pedagogy in ELT. This can be observed in two recent edited books addressing the subject of an ELF orientated pedagogy (Bayyurt and Akcan 2015, Bowels and Cogo 2015), and numerous papers and colloquial addressing the topic of an ELF pedagogy at the annual ELF conference (ELF 9 2017).

Seidlhofer (2011) has argued that there needs to be a comprehensive change not only in the content of what is being taught, but also in attitudes within ELT, requiring a 'paradigm shift' to reflect the context outside the classroom (Blair 2015, Canagarajah 2014, Dewey 2015). This disconnect between the classroom and sociolinguistic reality has highlighted the need to raise awareness of the ideologies in standard language models and the variable nature of language for both teachers and students (Jenkins et al. 2011, Kirkpatrick 2007, McKay 2012a). However, despite adaptations to the Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (DELTA) to include World Englishes, Global Englishes and ELF, Cogo and Dewey (2012) assert that there is little guidance of how to integrate this into teaching practices. Moreover as Dewey (2012) observes, reference to ELF is situated in the unit on language skills and learner problems, which is rooted in traditional approaches to language and concerned with correctness. The lack of awareness about ELF among ELT teachers is evident in Kiczkowiak's (2017) blog, who despite having 5 years' experience, a TEFL Cert and a DELTA, was oblivious to this research field until he discovered it on his own volition. Evidently ELF research should be central in teacher training as it addresses and challenges our fundamental understanding about what language is.

One on-going investigation into teacher training in respect to ELF is Sifakis and Bayyurt's study (2015), using a transformative framework (Mezirow and Associates 2000). The authors argue that the transformative approach goes beyond the critical approach by attempting to reformulate the world view of the teacher. There are three phrases in the transformative approach: the theoretical phase, where students explore the concepts of World Englishes and ELF; an application phase with the teachers linking the theories they have learned to their own teaching context; and finally, a reflection of the success of implementing theory into practice. The authors observe that this training for teachers resulted in raising self-awareness as NNES (Non-Native English Speakers), and a reconsideration of the

teaching practice of error correction. However, as Illés (2016) argues this does not constitute a transformative change in teachers' beliefs, and are similar to changes in beliefs that an orientation towards Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) had already achieved. As Swan (2012) observes many teachers respect the reality that learners do not fully conform to Native English Speakers (NES) and do not place an overt emphasis on formal accuracy and instead promote fluency and communicative effectiveness. In addition Illés (2016) asserts that a transformative approach might not be suitable for ELF because language beliefs have a strong affective component and are resistant to change. This could be because, as Niedzielski and Preston (2009) speculate, peoples' beliefs about correct language develop during childhood and consequently 'the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter, for these beliefs subsequently affect perception and strongly influence the processing of new information' (Pajares 1992: 317). This might help to explain why Jenkins (2007) found that international students, studying in the UK, were more open to an ELF perspective. As English has become an integral part of education among the younger generation across the world and an essential life skill (Heller 2010), so perhaps the conditions exist within their language ideological framework to allow a greater acceptance of ELF.

In addition to research on teacher training and attitudes there have also been practical teaching suggestions for an English as International Language (EIL)[1] centred pedagogy, which Hino and Oda (2015) group into 5 areas: teaching about EIL, role-plays in EIL, exposure to the diversity of EIL, content-based approaches to EIL and participation in a community of EIL users. However, these teaching practices are not dissimilar to current approaches in CLT, albeit not orientated to a native model of English. Walker (2010) also makes further suggestions for an ELF centred teaching pedagogy which derive from the Lingua Franca Core (LFC) (Jenkins 2000). He suggests a four-stage process in teaching the LFC core, as an alternative to an exclusive focus on a NES model. The first stage would involve raising awareness of the different ways that English is spoken around the world, followed by an extensive focus on LFC sounds which have particular relevance to the learners, with features that do not impact on intelligibility given no classroom time. The third stage would focus on improving accommodation skills, in terms of negotiating meaning using communication activities, and finally create opportunities for learners to be exposed to a

---

[1] English as a Lingua Franca and English as an International Language tend to refer to the same conceptual object with their use dependant on the author's preference. However, EIL is more firmly rooted in World Englishes research, while ELF has developed into its own research field and tends to focus more on English as a contact language.

range of accents. Walker's stages for teaching an ELF approach appear to be partly derived from Kirkpatrick's (2007) suggestion for a curriculum based on three strands: a focus on the LFC, different cultures and accommodation strategies. However, again, as Swan (2012) notes many of the strategies proposed here are already evident in CLT approaches, such as a focus on accommodation strategies and the negotiation of meaning. Nevertheless the difference is that the ultimate goal for learners with CLT is to conform to NES norms (Lopriore and Vettorel 2015) whereas an ELF approach would be more attuned to helping individuals develop their own individual language system or idiolect (Brumfit 2001).

Although a methodology which followed these classroom practices would be beneficial for an ELF orientated pedagogy their effectiveness would be reduced by the amount of classroom time a teacher could allocate to this, considering the other curriculum commitments. It would be necessary for Walker's (2010) four-stage proposal to be incorporated into the wider curriculum, and would require teachers to create their own materials, and given their limited time and low salary there is little incentive for them to do this. This approach would also require an extensive knowledge of the particular context of the speakers and their first language to identify the relevant parts of the LFC (Dewey 2012, Walker 2010), and for this a NNES would obviously be more suitable. Furthermore, a teacher would be unable to unilaterally decide to use this approach, as they may share classes with other teachers who are more strongly influenced by a standard language ideology, and its implementation would depend on the educational context where the teacher works and the curriculum goals of the students. Further, students may disagree and reject an ELF pedagogical approach especially when their language ability is assessed against BrE or AmE standards.

Realistically current suggestions for an ELF pedagogical practice are adaptations to the existing CLT approach, rather than a radical alternative, and perhaps it is necessary for an ELF approach to ELT that is distinct and comprehensive. As Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) assert an EIL or ELF centred curriculum cannot be achieved by simply adding lessons or components, but rather it needs a comprehensive revision. In addition to current suggestions to raise awareness among teachers and students and a focus on accommodation and negotiation strategies and intercultural communication, there are also additional aspects which I argue in this paper could augment current recommendations. These are translanguaging, a post-model approach for teaching speaking, meaning focused corrective

4

feedback, and assessment practices which have already been addressed by ELF researchers to different degrees. Although some aspects of this paper address the UK higher education context, the suggestions are applicable, and more relevant to English teaching in other countries and educational contexts.

2. Translanguaging

Kirkpatrick (2007) argues that an ELF approach could also be considered a bilingual approach, framed within the aim of creating bi or multilingual citizens, unlike the current monolingualising educational approach to language teaching. At present, within most institutions, there is an insistence that teachers should create an 'English only' environment (Cenoz and Gorter 2013), and teachers might be chastised if they do not conform to this principle. Although several authors, (Auerbach 2000, August and Shanahan 2006, Cummins 2009, Genesee et al. 2006) have outlined the positive benefits of a multilingual English language classroom, this appears to have had a minimal impact on the ideologies that are present in teaching institutions, derived from CLT. CLT promotes the idealisation that English should be taught monolingually and consequently helps support the precedence and prestige given to NES. However, in reality, multilingual speakers do not communicate monolingually in their different languages, but instead utilize all their linguistic resources, suggesting that placing boundaries between languages may not be an appropriate teaching strategy (Canagarajah 2011). Further, Jenkins (2015) argues for a foregrounding of multilingualism in ELF research and therefore recent research and recommendations for translanguaging pedagogical practice would be relevant for an ELF pedagogy and also distinct from CLT, which is grounded in monolingualism.

Translanguaging has expanded from its original meaning of describing an input activity, such as reading in one language, and output in a different language in an educational context (Baker 2006), to include multilingual speakers' practices in the sociolinguistic environment. However, examining translanguaging in education remains one of the most important strands of research. Although some authors have used translanguaging as a synonym for codeswitching (Nikula and Moore 2016), according to García and Wei (2014; 21)

> 'translanguaging does not refer to two separate languages nor to a synthesis of different
> language practices or to a hybrid mixture. Rather translanguaging refers to new

language practices that make visible the complexity of language exchanges among people with different histories, and releases histories and understandings that had been buried within fixed language identities constrained by nation-states.'

Translanguaging or translingual practices have been examined in different educational contexts with different ages and levels of students in different countries (García and Wei 2014).   The authors tend to find positive results from a translanguaging orientated approach such as building confidence in identity performance, aiding lesson accomplishment, encouraging participation, aiding learner development, giving students the power to make their own strategic choice in code-switching, and preparing them for reality in multilingual settings (Adamson and Fujimoto-Adamson 2012, Bauer et al. 2016, Creese and Blackledge 2010, Krause and Prinsloo 2016, Kwon and Schallert 2016, Nikula and Moore 2016, Sayer 2013). Other authors have also developed specific teaching practices which have a translanguaging orientation (De Costa et al. 2017, Kiernan et al. 2016). With the development of these teaching practices Flores and Aneja (2017: 443) argue that 'the goal of language development is no longer for students to attain native like proficiency but rather for students to strategically choose features of their communicative repertoire in ways that reflect their bi/multilingual identities and accommodate their interlocutors' .

One aspect that should be considered is the extent to which a translanguaging oriented classroom should be planned or responsive, with the previously mentioned studies containing examples of both. Although in some of these studies the teachers use of and allowance of translanguaging practices have been responsive, Flores and Aneja (2017) argue that a translanguaging orientation is not a free for all and instead emphasise the negotiated nature of communicative behaviour, allowing students to use their entire communicative repertoire. Flores and Aneja (2017) also note that it is necessary to prepare teachers for a continued monolingual bias in terms of assessment, resistance from students and teachers and continued discrimination towards NNS. Translanguaging and ELF share an ontological and epistemically framework and therefore it would seem logical that translanguaging would be a core aspect of an ELF centred pedagogy, and also serve to destabilise CLT learning approaches which are centred around a NES model.

3. A post-model approach for teaching speaking

The second aspect of an ELF pedagogy relates to the chosen language model, which in ELT is currently dominated by native ones. There are several reasons for the dominance of an NES model predominantly related to power: economic, politic and cultural (Milroy and Milroy 2012). An NES model has more prestige and perceived legitimacy than non-standard Englishes, materials available for teaching English are predominantly based on NES norms, and it is generally viewed by students, teachers and educational institutions as being the best model (Kirkpatrick 2007, Walker 2010). One effect on NNES teachers is that they are not given authority as 'proper' English speakers which also impacts on their authenticity as teachers (Weekly in press). Consequently, this model can not only be demotivating for students (Kirkpatrick 2007), but also for teachers who do not use the model that they are expected to teach.

The use of a native model such as Standard British English (BrE) or General American English (AmE) has been challenged as a suitable teaching model for all contexts. Dewey (2012) and Seidlhofer (2011) observe that the application of local norms and openness to varieties is mainly relevant for classrooms in non-native English contexts. However, it is also relevant in countries such as America and the United Kingdom with the changing demographics of these countries 'challeng[ing] the notion that some unsullied form of native speaker English is the dominant code' (Pennycook 2009: 197). Also, multilingual Englishes[2] in 'native English speaking countries', undermine the perspective that a BrE or AmE model would be the most beneficial for EFL students when they 'step out' of the classroom and become ELF speakers. Further, as highlighted by Gut (2011), many learners who come to the UK are already orientated to a norm that is not British Standard English. Irrespective of this, both Kirkpatrick (2007) and Walker (2010) note that there is no common accent among NES, and therefore this raises the question of why RP and GMA are considered the most suitable for all contexts and promoted in the classroom. Kirkpatrick (2007) also notes that many host universities in 'native English speaking countries' employ NNES, and therefore the dominance of a NES model in the classroom could be detrimental for students learning if

---

[2] Multilingual Englishes is used here in preference to the anachronistic terms native and non-native speakers, and denotes Englishes which are influenced by the speakers' other language(s). Also, Englishes prefixed by different nations, such as Indian English, is inadequate to denote a particular speakers' language given the complexity and variability of the way English is used today. Recently Jenkins (2015) argued for a foregrounding of multilingualism within ELF research, and therefore Multilingual Englishes is an applicable term to draw a distinction between these speakers and monolingual English speakers.

they are just provided with a NES model. Although BrE and AmE may be reasonable choices, Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) assert that this should be determined after careful consideration of the students' goals and needs, teachers expertise, availability of materials and resources. Studies which have examined ELT course books (Dewey 2015, Lopriore and Vettorel 2015, Matsuda 2012, McKay 2012b) have highlighted the native speaker bias in terms of characters being predominantly from inner circle countries, listening materials that are usually NES or NNES imitating NES and designed around BrE or AmE grammar targets. Although some new textbooks claim to be international, Dewey (2015) argues that these changes in design are superficial, and are still framed around NS target norms and a written variety of English.

In terms of teachers' choice for a model, Matsuda and Friedrich (2011, 2012) claim, that teachers have three, which 'should be selected according to the goals of the curriculum and the needs of students' (Matsuda 2012: 173). Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) assert that teachers could choose an international variety of English such as ELF, or a local variety such as Indian English or an established variety of English such as BrE or AmE, each with their own advantages and disadvantages. The authors note that whichever model is chosen it is important to raise students' awareness that the variety they are taught may differ from future interlocutors because a focus on one variety may lead to the impression there is only one correct variety. However, none of these three choices seem viable and satisfactory for an ELF centred pedagogy, when variability is one of ELF's defining features and research has moved away from defining ELF in terms of being a variety (Jenkins 2015). It would seem that in terms of models there needs to be a clear distinction for students between written and spoken English because currently written forms also tend to taken as the norms for spoken forms (Brumfit 2001), and therefore it is necessary to move away from the notion of there being a model of spoken English.

The underlying problem is equating the spoken form of the language with the written form so that 'orthographies become ever more inaccurate reflections of speech, dictionaries become repositories of archaisms and usage guides become edicts of ritualized grammar' (Milroy 2004: 276). Therefore, teaching spoken English should be more focused on communication than striving for accuracy, while written English is more applicable to accuracy, albeit dependant on the context and the function. This again is reflective of a CLT approach to language learning, (Swan 2012) though underlying the CLT approach is conformity to native

speaker norms (Jenkins 2007, Lopriore and Vettorel 2015). For an ELF pedagogy, a clear distinction needs to be made between spoken and written forms of the language. This could be achieved by using authentic listening materials with examples of English speakers from across the three concentric circles. Moreover, most teaching materials and course books provide examples of spoken discourse transformed into written text, which leads to the impression that the two language forms are the same, and therefore should be avoided. The only example of speech in written form would be the transcripts of spoken dialogue, parts of which could be exploited to not only demonstrate a language point, but also to highlight the variability in spoken language. On this basis, it would be unnecessary for the teachers to stipulate a model for spoken English, the model for the students would be taken from the listening examples, from the teacher's own spoken model, and from peers. It is on the basis of the ELT industry currently using NS models for spoken discourse that teachers use corrective feedback (CF) to help adjust or improve students' language, which is the third aspect of an ELF centred pedagogy.

4. Meaning Focused Corrective Feedback

The emergence of different potential models of English appears to have made little difference to the practice CF in terms of AmE and BrE norms. Research in CF has always been the preserve of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) which has predominantly studied language from a deficit perspective (Ortega 2013, 2014). The theoretical underpinnings of CF in the classroom are based on several hypothesis, which include the Output Hypothesis (Swain 1985, 1995), the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt 1990, 1995, 2001), and the Interaction Hypothesis (Long 1996) all of which support the claim that CF has a 'positive effect' on students language performance. However, in SLA terms 'a positive effect' tends to denote students' performance orientating towards a native English variety.

Long (1996: 451-452) argues that CF facilitates L2 learning through the negotiation of meaning, especially where this involves interactional modifications by the more competent speaker because it 'connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways'. However, not all CF involves the negotiation of meaning. For example Lyster and Ranta (1997: 46-49) have identified six types of CF; explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, meta-linguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. With the exception of clarification requests, these types of CF relate to accuracy as they

imply that the teacher is fully aware of the form of language that they expect from the students' contribution. A further way of categorising CF is by their explicitness or implicitness. Recasts, for example, tend to be the most frequent type of CF, (Lyster and Ranta 1997), and are on a continuum from explicit to implicit. Although several authors note the relevance of meaning and accuracy in CF, the practice is not usually distinguished by these variables. This could be partly due to the orientation of the scholars who are influenced by a Standard language ideology (Milroy and Milroy 2012). In this perspective, *all* CF is based on accuracy in relation to BrE or AmE, and only some are related to meaning. However categorising CF in terms of whether the correction was made by the teacher based on accuracy or meaning would focus more on what the student is doing with the language, rather than how the teacher is responding to the students' language.

There has been a substantial body of empirical studies which have sought to test the different CF related hypotheses and which have tended to report conflicting results (Sheen 2007). Li's (2010) meta-analysis of CF highlights several factors which may contribute to these differences (see also Makey and Goo 2007), which include the research context (classroom or laboratory), the research setting (ESL or EFL), the type of corrective feedback, the length of treatment and the type of linguistic feature targeted. There is not enough space here to give a full review of the available literature, but there are some aspects of the theoretical orientation and methodological approaches that share some similarities in SLA approaches to examining CF.

Many empirical studies have tended to focus on the impact that different types of CF have on learners with little attention to the question of whether the target structure is a more significant variable (Han 2002, Nassaji 2013, Rassaei 2013, Shegar et al. 2013). When studies do focus on one or more linguistic structure, the language structures which students are introduced to at an early stage of learning English, such as third person singular, articles or regular past tense –ed, appear to be resistant to corrective feedback (Ellis 2007, Long et al. 1998, Sheen 2007). This is generally attributed to the saliency of the complex structure, with little consideration that learners may have established norms, or how these features might be markers of a second language identity (Kirkpatrick 2007). While CF studies note the linguistic background of the students, this is not considered paramount in assessing the effectiveness of CF, as is evident in studies with multi-national classes. Moreover studies of corrective feedback tend to be framed within the concept of interlanguage (Selinker 1972, 1992) without challenging it (Doughty and Varela 1998, Rahimi and Zhang 2016). Another

concept which is used liberally within these studies is native and non-native, with the implication that the native model is the superior and natural target (Trofimovich et al. 2007). These studies also do not effectively give full consideration to learning that is taking place outside of the classroom during the treatment period. This tends to neglect the socio-linguistic environment outside of the classroom that also can impact on students' acquisition process, and the improvement in the accuracy of a language feature might have little to do with CF in the classroom. There is also a degree of consistency in the methodology used to examine CF, with an overreliance on control groups, quantitative statistical analysis, intensive and short treatment on a particular linguistic structure and the use of immediate uptake to measure effectiveness (Doughty and Varela 1998, Han 2002, Mackey 2006, Rassaei 2013, Rezaei et al. 2011, Sheen 2007). Therefore, approaches to the study of CF are quite narrow, and perhaps it would be more beneficial for developing this area of research by using ethnographic methods and qualitative data, examining the how individual learners respond to CF, underpinned by an ELF or World Englishes theoretical orientation.

Early ELF research identified emerging language features across different English varieties which, at the time, it was thought could provide a basis for an ELF variety (Seidlhofer 2011). However, more recent research has indicated that one of ELF's defining features is variability (Baird et al. 2014, Jenkins 2015), so a CF based on ELF's emergent features could not be a viable alternative. Perhaps this may explain why ELF researchers have tended to avoid the question of CF in the language classroom and how this relates to their research field. As Cogo and Dewey (2012: 78) state 'deciding what constitutes an error is not only a complex issue, it is possibly not an ELF compatible way of thinking about language', seeming to dismiss CF as a practice not worthy of discussion. However not questioning and developing an ELF response to the practice allows it to remain the preserve of SLA research, and promoted by educational institutions, TESOL training and TEFL instructional guides such as Harmer (2011). ELF theorizing on the practice of CF generally remains anecdotal and based on the observation of sociolinguistic discourse of English varieties and ELF.

Jenkins (2006, 2014) argues that the notion of what constitutes an error is different, depending on whether it is seen through an ELF or EFL lens. English language teachers are trained to look at language primarily with regard to the notion of correctness with a significant focus on error correction (Cogo and Dewey 2012), and many teachers believe that it is necessary to correct errors to prepare them for assessment. Therefore an EFL perspective

which views language as bounded and static will undoubtedly consider, as Swan (2012) does, that 'correct' and 'wrong' are relevant concepts in ELT. The embedded notion of language error suggests that training is needed to re-orientate existing approaches to teaching by incorporating critical language awareness (Seidlhofer 2011, Sifakis 2014). Teachers need a greater awareness of alternative conceptions of language as fluid, dynamic and variant which would give them a better understanding of language features which may be emergent, rather than being deviant features of Standard English (Brumfit 2001). This would mean a greater focus on accommodation and negotiation strategies in the classroom rather than an approach that penalises non-ENL norms (Brumfit 2001, Dewey 2012, Jenkins 2007, Kirkpatrick 2007, Seidlhofer 2011, Walker 2010). It is not suggested that CF should be abandoned as a teaching practice, but instead there should be greater focus on language forms that impede communication. A reorientation towards a CF focused on meaning rather than accuracy is supported by ELF research which emphasise intelligibility. However, in order for a meaning focused CF, a nuanced approach to presenting spoken discourse and translanguaging to be effective for developing an ELF pedagogy, assessment practices would also require modification.

5. Assessment

Assessment practices are arguably the most significant change required, the most difficult to change and also the one area where minimal progress has been made. The reason it is the most significant is because, as Menken (2008) highlights, current assessment practices, which have a strong standard English orientation, have a washback effect on teaching practices. It could be anticipated that an ELF assessment would have a similar effect on teaching practices and help to normalise an ELF centred pedagogy. Assessments, especially high stakes 'international' tests are difficult to change because they are run by institutions which have a vested interest in maintaining the *status quo*. This also partly explains why there has been limited progress, along with the lack of ELF researchers who are test developer specialists. As Jenkins and Leung (2016) note there is not an ELF language test available for them to analyse in their article. This has meant ELF researchers are restricted to focusing on criticism of current assessments which measure language ability using BrE or AmE native speaker norms (Leung 2005, Leung and Lewkowicz 2013, Lowenberg 2012, Seidlhofer 2011). Even when a 'native speaker' or 'native like' norm is not used in the assessment criteria, Leung and Lewkowicz (2006) highlight that teachers assess with these concepts in mind, being

influenced by wider social and community practices. Therefore learners are being tested on a variety they do not use, and are being punished for their inability to be British or American (Tomlinson 2010).

With only one or two standards used to determine language ability, it seems clear that testing has not kept up with contemporary developments in English (Jenkins and Leung 2014, Tomlinson 2010). So-called international tests of English only utilize NES varieties as an assessment criterion, but an ELF speaker may not necessarily be orientated to NES norms (Jenkins and Leung 2014). Moreover societies are becoming increasingly multilingual, but tests remain monolingual and traditional (Leung and Lewkowicz 2006: 223). Therefore it is necessary to understand what sort of relationship the student is aiming for with what type of English speaking community (Brumfit 2001) in order to determine whether the students have been successful. The students may be working towards integration into an NES community, attending an English medium university, or for international business communication, which require bespoke tests that assess the students' language performance according to the purpose for learning the language.

Elder and Davies (2006) give two proposals of how assessment can adjust to the changing social environment. The first, a softening of the criteria and allowances in measuring against Standard English, which they assert is already occurring. And the second, if a stable variety of ELF emerges, then this could serve as a model for measuring students' language. However as Jenkins and Leung (2016) note, this would no longer be a viable approach for assessing spoken English, as ELF research has moved beyond, and discarded, the notion of an established ELF variety. Jenkins and Leung (2016) assert that the most defining feature of ELF is variability, and therefore argue it is impossible to assess ELF by conventional psychometrically orientated standardized tests because there are no normative references. However other aspects of Elder and Davies (2006) second proposal such as testing successful negotiation, accommodation skills, communication repairs and the ability to cope with different varieties could be a viable way forward for an ELF assessment. Jenkins (2007), Jenkins and Leung (2014) Chopin (2015) also argue that instead of penalizing potential ELF variants, assessors should penalise forms that are not mutually intelligible, and reward the successful use of accommodation strategies, thereby testing what learners can do instead of what has been taught. This approach to assessment would be compatible with a meaning focused CF teaching practice. Despite promising developments in this area, assessments

which represent an ELF pedagogy have yet to materialize. This is an area which would benefit from teacher-led action research. An ELF orientated ELT teacher would have the skills, opportunity and resources to design and implement tests orientated to the local context, and evaluate their effectiveness in assessing learners' language and subsequently modify, develop and improve the tests.

6. Conclusion

This paper has argued that there needs to be fundamental changes in ELT to reflect the way that English has evolved in the global environment. There have already been several practical suggestions from ELF researchers to develop an ELF centred pedagogy such as focusing on communicative strategies such as negotiating meaning, intercultural communication, accommodation skills and communication repairs, fostering students' awareness of the variability of English by exposure to different varieties and multilingual varieties, a more effective connection to the local context, and giving more importance to intelligibility. However, many of these are presented at a theoretical level and lack concrete suggestions of how teachers would incorporate them in practice. Moreover, many of the approaches are similar to CLT and do not amount to a comprehensive ELF pedagogy. For example Walker (2010) offers some practical suggestions for teachers to facilitate the teaching of accommodation and negotiation strategies including information exchanges and reconstructing sentences from memory, but these have many similarities to existing strategies in CLT (Swan 2012). Moreover an analysis of pragmatic strategies of accommodation and negotiating in ELF (Cogo and Dewey 2012), suggest that in many ways these communicative strategies cannot be taught, and can only be learnt, with the teacher providing opportunities for communication, which again has similarities to CLT. In order for a way forward for an ELF pedagogy I have argued that there are four key aspects which would help form the basis of this: translanguaging, a post-model approach for spoken discourse, meaning focused CF and more nuanced assessment practices.

One problem implementing an ELF approach to teaching is the resistance by educational institutions, (Jenkins 2007, Tupas 2010, Walker 2010). Jenkins (2007: 246) notes that,

> 'teachers who attend courses on varieties of English to World Englishes
> may respond positively to the notion of ELF. However, when these same

students begin or resume work as English language teachers, the institutional constraints imposed on them to teach 'standard' NS English by traditional communicative methods prevent them from making the links between what they know in theory and what they do in their classrooms'.

Although this could change in the future (Jenkins 2007, Walker 2010), at present it is necessary for teachers to promote a particular model because of institutional constraints and also to enable students to pass assessments that use Standard English as a benchmark to measure other Englishes.

Short Biography

Dr Robert Weekly worked as an English language teacher for over fourteen years within different educational institution in the UK, China and Turkey, teaching EAP, ESOL and EFL. He is currently teaching at the University of Nottingham Ningbo, China in the Centre for English Language Education. Dr Weekly's current research interests are related to World Englishes Multilingualism, Language Policy and how these research areas relate to the practice of English language teaching. His email is <rj.weekly42@gmail.com>

References

Adamson, J. and N. Fujimoto-Adamson (2012). Translanguaging in Self-Access Language Advising: Informing Language Policy. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal* 3(1): 59-73.

Auerbach, E. R. (2000). When pedagogy meets politics: Challenging English Only in Adult Education. In R. D. González and I. Melis (Eds) *Language ideologies: critical perspectives on the official English movement*. (pp. 177-204). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

August, D. and T. Shanahan (2006). *Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners*. New York: Erlbaum.

Baird, R., W. Baker and M. Kitazawa (2014). The complexity of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 3(1): 171-196.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Bauer, E. B., V. Presiado and S. Colomer (2016). Writing Through Partnership: Fostering Translanguaging in Children Who Are Emergent Bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research* 1086296X16683417: 1–28.

Bayyurt, Y. and S. Akcan, Eds. (2015). *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Blair, A. (2015). Evolving a post-native, multilingual model for ELF-aware teacher education. In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (Eds) *Current perspectives on pedagogy for ELF*. (pp. 89-101). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Bowels, H. and A. Cogo, Eds. (2015). *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: pedagogical insights*. Basingstoke, Pagrave Macmilian.

Brumfit, C. (2001). *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal* 95: 401-417.

Canagarajah, S. (2014). In search of a New Paradigm for Teaching English as an International Language. *TESOL Journal* 5(4): 767-785.

Cenoz, J. and D. Gorter (2013). Towards a Plurilingual Approach in English Language Teaching: Softening the Boundaries Between Languages. *TESOL Quarterly* 47(3): 591-599.

Chopin, K. (2015). Reconceptualizing norms for language testing: Assessing English language proficiency from within an ELF framework. In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (Eds) *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*. (pp. 193-204). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cogo, A. (2015). English as a Lingua Franca: Descriptions, domains and applications. In H. Bowels and A. Cogo (Eds) *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca*. (pp. 1-12). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Cogo, A. and M. Dewey (2012). *Analysing English as a lingua franca: a corpus-driven investigation*. London: Continuum.

Creese, A. and A. Blackledge (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94(i): 103-115.

Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language classroom Pedagogical considerations. *TESOL Quarterly* 43(2): 317-321.

De Costa, P. I., J. G. Singh, E. Milu, X. Wang, S. Fraiberg and S. Canagarajah (2017). Pedagogizing Translingual Practice: Prospects and Possibilities. *Research in the Teaching of English* 51(4): 464-472.

Dewey, M. (2012). Toward a *post-normative* approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1): 141-170.

Dewey, M. (2015). Time to wake up some dogs! Shifting the culture of language in ELT. In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (Eds) *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a lingua franca*. (pp. 121-134). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Doughty, C. and E. Varela (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds) *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. (pp. 114-138). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Elder, C. and A. Davies (2006). Assessing English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26: 282-304.

ELF 9. (2017). The 9th International conference of English as a Lingua Franca. [Accessed June 2017] Retrieved from http://www.elf9.org/.

Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Eds) *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies*. (pp. 339-360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Flores, N. and G. Aneja (2017). " Why Needs Hiding?" Translingual (Re) Orientations in TESOL Teacher Education. *Research in the Teaching of English* 51(4): 441-463.

García, O. and L. Wei (2014). *Translanguaging*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Genesee, F., K. B. Lindholm-Leary and D. Christian (2006). *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gut, U. (2011). Studying structural innovations in New Englishes varieties. In J. Mukherjee and M. Hundt (Eds) *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner English: Bridging a paradigm gap*. (pp. 101-124). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *TESOL quarterly* 36(4): 543-572.

Harmer, J. (2011). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual review of anthropology* 39: 101-114.

Hino, N. and S. Oda (2015). Integrated practice in teaching English as an international language (IPTEIL): A classroom ELF pedagogy in Japan. In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (Eds) *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*. (pp. 46-61). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Illés, É. (2016). Issues in ELF-aware teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 5(1): 135-145.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2006). English Pronunciation and second language speaker identities In T. Omoniyi and G. White (Eds) *The Sociolinguistics of Identity*. (pp. 75-91). New York: Continuum.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as Lingua Franca: attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(4): 926-936.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The politics of academic English language policy*. Oxon: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice* 2(3): 49-85.

Jenkins, J., A. Cogo and M. Dewey (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a Lingua Franca. *Language Testing* 44(3): 281-315.

Jenkins, J. and C. Leung (2014). English as a Lingua Franca. In A. J. Kunnan (Eds) *The Companion to Language Assessment*. (pp. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons inc.

Jenkins, J. and C. Leung (2016). Assessing English as a lingua franca. *Language testing and assessment*: 1-15.

Kiczkowiak, M. (2017). What on elf is an ELF? [Accessed 20th July 2017] Retrieved from http://tefl-equity-courses.teachable.com/blog/966064/an-elf?utm_content=bufferfcb1c&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer.

Kiernan, J., J. Meier and X. Wang (2016). Negotiating languages and cultures: Enacting translingualism through a translation assignment. *Composition Studies* 44(1): 89-107.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krause, L. S. and M. Prinsloo (2016). Translanguaging in a township primary school: Policy and practice. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 34(4): 347-357.

Kwon, H. J. and D. L. Schallert (2016). Understanding translanguaging practices through a biliteracy continua framework: Adult biliterates reading academic texts in their two languages. *Bilingual Research Journal* 39(2): 138-151.

Leung, C. (2005). Convivial communication: Recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15(2): 119-144.

Leung, C. and J. Lewkowicz (2006). Expanding horizons and unresolved conundrums: Language testing and assessment. *TESOL Quarterly* 40(1): 211-234.

Leung, C. and J. Lewkowicz (2013). Language communication and communicative competence: A view from contemporary classrooms. *Language and Education* 27(5): 398-414.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta‐analysis. *Language Learning* 60(2): 309-365.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (Eds) *Handbook of second language acquisition*. (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.

Long, M. H., S. Inagaki and L. Ortega (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal* 82(3): 357-371.

Lopriore, L. and P. Vettorel (2015). Promoting awareness of Englishes and ELF in the English language classroom. In H. Bowels and A. Cogo (Eds) *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca*. (pp. 13-34). UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lowenberg, P. (2012). Assessing proficiency in EIL. Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language. In A. Matsuda (Eds) *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. (pp. 84-102). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lyster, R. and L. Ranta (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in second language acquisition* 19(01): 37-66.

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied linguistics* 27(3): 405-430.

Makey, A. and J. Goo (2007). Interaction Research in SLA: a meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Eds) *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquistion*. (pp. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matsuda, A. (2012). Teaching materials in EIL. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu and W. A. Renandya (Eds) *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. (pp. 168-185). New York and London: Routledge.

Matsuda, A. and P. Friedrich (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes* 30(3): 332-344.

Matsuda, A. and P. Friedrich (2012). Selecting an instructional variety for an EIL curriculum. In A. Matsuda (Eds) *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. (pp. 17-28). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. L. (2012a). English as an International Language. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (Eds) *The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice In Second Language Teaching*. (pp. 15-22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2012b). Teaching materials for English as an international language. In A. Matsuda (Eds) *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. (pp. 70-83). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mezirow, J. and Associates, Eds. (2000). *Learning as transformation*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Milroy, J. and L. Milroy (2012). *Authority in language: investigating standard English*. New York: Routledge.

Milroy, L. (2004). Language Ideologies and Linguistic Change. In C. Fought (Eds) *Sociolinguistic variation: critical reflection*. (pp. 161-177). New York: Oxford University Press.

Nassaji, H. (2013). Participation structure and incidental focus on form in adult ESL classrooms. *Language Learning* 63(4): 835-869.

Niedzielski, N. and D. R. Preston (2009). Folk linguistics. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (Eds) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. (pp. 356-373). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nikula, T. and P. Moore (2016). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. International. *Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10.1080/13670050.2016.1254151: 1-13.

Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning* 63(s1): 1-24.

Ortega, L. (2014). Ways Forward for a Bi/Multilingual Turn in SLA. In S. May (Eds) *The Mulilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. (pp. 32-53). New York and London: Routledge.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research* 62(3): 307-332.

Pennycook, A. (2009). Plurilithic Englishes: Towards a 3D model. In K. Murata and J. Jenkins (Eds) *Global Englishes in Asian contexts*. (pp. 194-207). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rahimi, M. and L. J. Zhang (2016). The role of incidental unfocused prompts and recasts in improving English as a foreign language learners' accuracy. *The Language Learning Journal* 44(2): 257-268.

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. *System* 41(2): 472-483.

Rezaei, S., F. Mozaffari and A. Hatef (2011). Corrective feedback in SLA: Classroom practice and future directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 1(1): 21-29.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, Texmex, and bilingual Pedagogy: Emergent Bilinguals Learning Through the Vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly* 47(1): 63-88.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11: 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Eds) *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. (pp. 1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Eds) *Cognition and second language acquisition*. (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10: 209-231.

Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Eds) *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies*. (pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shegar, C., L. J. Zhang and E. L. Low (2013). Effects of an input-output mapping practice task on EFL learners' acquisition of two grammatical structures. *System* 41(2): 443-461.

Sifakis, N. C. (2014). ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: a transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 3(2): 317-335.

Sifakis, N. C. and Y. Bayyurt (2015). Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes* 34(3): 471-484.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output it its development. In S. M. Gass and C. Madden (Eds) *Input in second language acquisition*. (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (Eds) *Principles and practice in the study of language: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson*. (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, M. (2012). ELF and EFL: are they really different? *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1-2: 379-389.

Tomlinson, B. (2010). Which Test of English and why? In A. Kirkpatrick (Eds) *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. (pp. 617-633). Oxon: Routledge.

Trofimovich, P., A. Ammar and E. Gatbonton (2007). How effective are recasts? The role of attention, memory, and analytical ability. In A. Mackey (Eds) *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies*. (pp. 171-195).

Tupas, T. R. F. (2010). Which norms in everyday practice: and why? In A. Kirkpatrick (Eds) *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. (pp. 567-579). Oxon: Routledge.

Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the Pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weekly, R. (in press). Accepting and Circumventing Native Speaker Essentialism. In B. Yazan and N. Rudolph (Eds) *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in)equity in ELT: Issues and Implications*. (pp. 89-123). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.