Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education) 30(1): 239-251 [Ocak 2015]

# Non-native Teachers' Attitudes towards English as a Lingua Franca

# İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğreten Öğretmenlerin Ortak İletişim Dili Olan İngilizceye Karşı Tutumları

Adem SORUÇ*

**ABSTRACT**: As the number of speakers from a wide variety of contexts has increased exponentially in recent years, English has come to be used as a lingua franca (ELF), a common language used to communicate by speakers who do not share a common first language. This has led to ELF developing a number of characteristics which distinguish it from ENL (English as a Native Language), and a lively debate has developed regarding the relative merits of ELF versus ENL. The goal of the current research was to begin to explore the practices and perceptions of non-native speakers of English from expanding circle contexts to provide information which might be used to inform policies and practices regarding the teaching and learning of English. Data came from a questionnaire administered to 45 nonnative English speaking teachers from five expanding circle countries, of whom 10 were later interviewed. The results suggested a strong preference for ENL norms. Implications of this finding are discussed, and suggestions made for ongoing research.

**Keywords:** ELF, lingua franca, ENL, native language, intelligibility

**ÖZ:** İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak konuşan insan sayısı özellikle son yıllarda arttığı için, İngilizce artık diğer milletlerin konuştuğu bir dünya dili haline gelmiştir. Bu durum ise yabancı milletlerin konuştuğu İngilizcenin (ELF) ana dili İngilizce olan milletlerin konuştuğu dilden (ENL) farklılıklar göstermesine yol açmaktadır ve bunun sonucunda akademi dünyasında tartışmalar başlamıştır. Ancak bu tartışmalar daha çok İngilizceyi ana dil olarak konuşan dil bilimciler veya uygulamalı dilbilimciler tarafından yapılmakta; İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak konuşanlar, özellikle de öğreten İngilizce öğretmenleri bu tartışmalara dâhil edilmemektedir. Bu nedenle bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizcenin genişlediği ülkelerde İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen/öğreten insanların uygulamalarını ve duygularını araştırmaktır. Araştırmadaki veriler İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten beş ülkedeki 45 İngilizce öğretmeninin özel olarak geliştirilen bir anketi uygulamasıyla toplanmıştır. Bu öğretmenlerin 10 tanesi ile daha sonra ayrıca bir mülakat gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, katılımcılar İngilizceyi ana dili olarak konuşmayı yabancı dil olarak konuşmaya tercih ettiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Makalenin sonunda bu durum ile ilgili bir dizi öneriler de verilmektedir.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** bir dünya dili olarak İngilizce, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce, ana dil olarak İngilizce

## 1. INTRODUCTION

ELF is usually defined as 'a vehicle of communication between interlocutors who do not share their first language, both among non-native speakers and when native speakers interact with non-native users' (Bjorge, 2012: 406). The study of ELF has increased in recent years (e.g. Jenks, 2012), including the use of ELF in the teaching of pronunciation, grammar, in ELT curriculum development, in teacher training and in culture (e.g. Devrim and Bayyurt, 2010). Indeed, "English is increasingly becoming the chosen medium to facilitate communication among people of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds" (Kaur, 2010: 192). As Seidlhofer (2004: 209) comments, 'the majority of the world's English users are now to be found in countries where it is a foreign language'. At the turn of the millennium, Crystal (2000) estimated that there were one billion people who spoke English as a nonnative language to communicate with native or other nonnative speakers, a figure which is almost certainly much higher now. Of these billion or more nonnative speakers, by far the majority live in what Kachru (1985) called

* Dr., Instructor, Fatih University, Education Faculty, Department of English Language Education, Istanbul-Turkey, e-mail: adem_soruc@hotmail.com

The author would like to acknowledge with gratitude the invaluable assistance of his colleague, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Carol GRIFFITHS.

the ‘expanding circle’. This is the outermost of three concentric circles encompassing countries where, although English plays no historical or institutional role, it is widely used for communication (including much of Europe, Asia, the Middle East, much of Africa, Indonesia, Central and South America, etc). These countries are contrasted with the ‘outer circle’ which includes countries where English is not the native tongue, but is important historically or institutionally (such as India, the Philippines, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Malaysia, Singapore, some parts of Africa or the Pacific, etc); and with the ‘inner circle’ which includes countries where English is typically spoken as the first or native language (such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Australasia, Ireland, Anglophone Canada and South Africa, and some of the Caribbean territories). Given these statistics, it would seem to be important to investigate the attitude of those who inhabit expanding circle environments towards English as a Lingua Franca.

It would seem possible that ELF has developed at least partly as a reaction to ‘monolithic views of languages’ (Hall, 2013: 211) and ‘linguistic imperialism’ (for instance, Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999) and it has led to a downplaying of the role of native speakers (e.g. Kohn, 2011). And although some authors (such as Quirk, 1990) have argued that the native speaker model is sufficient, a number of others have written about ‘the decline of the native speaker’ (Graddol, 1999: 57), whom Widdowson (2003: 43) declares ‘irrelevant’. The ELF movement has therefore acted as ‘a catalyst for change in established ways of thinking’ (Widdowson, 2012: 5), and a questioning of the ownership of English (e.g. McKay, 2003; Widdowson, 1994).

## 2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

A number of studies have investigated the expanding circle viewpoint. Of these, some have looked at attitudes in particular contexts, while other studies have taken a broader view:

In a German context, surveying teachers of English in two different types of schools, Decke-Cornill (2003) investigated teachers’ attitudes to ELF. The results revealed that teachers generally favored teaching ‘proper’ (ibid.: 68) English, rather than ELF features. According to Friedrich (2003), the Argentinean learners in her study aspired to ‘native like command of the language’ (ibid.: 180). This goal was especially strong in times of economic uncertainty. In Japan, Matsuda (2003) investigated the attitudes of 33 high school students towards English as an international language. Using a questionnaire, interviews and observation, Matsuda concluded that the students believed that ‘the closer they follow the native speakers’ usage, the better’ (ibid.: 493). Greek teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of English were investigated by Sifakis and Sougari (2005) who surveyed 421 teachers in three levels of schools (primary, lower secondary, upper-secondary). The data indicated that teachers believed that native speaker norms and standard pronunciation should be taught to students. In Turkey, Akcan, Mesincigiller and Ozkaya (2013) concluded that familiarity with ELF could be advantageous, although, according to Coskun (2011: 46) “native-speaker English is regarded as the correct model”. Using questionnaires and journals, Kaypak and Ortactepe (2014) investigated the perceptions regarding ELF of 53 Turkish study-abroad students and found that the students held positive attitudes towards native speaker norms, although they also acknowledged the need for intelligibility. Also in Turkey, İnceçay and Akyel (2014) investigated the perceptions of a hundred Turkish EFL teachers working at two universities regarding the role of English as a Lingua Franca. Using a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, they found that a large number of teachers are “resistant” (p. 8) to the use of ELF in their classes, although they say that they are still tolerant of students’ use of features similar to ELF.

Taking a more international view, Timmis (2002) surveyed students’ and teachers’ attitudes to native-speaker norms for pronunciation, grammar and spoken grammar and collected nearly 600 responses from more than 45 countries. He concluded that, overall, native-speaker competence is viewed as ‘the benchmark of perfection, and therefore it is axiomatic that this

should be the long-term goal' (ibid.: 243). Working with international students in the UK, Kuo (2006) discovered that, although her participants accepted a degree of 'inaccurate pronunciation and incorrect use of vocabulary or grammar' (ibid.: 217) in their own and others' communication, they did not want to learn according to this model. They preferred a native-speaker model as a learning goal. A similar conclusion was reached by Jenkins (2005), and from a study involving a questionnaire returned by 326 respondents in 12 countries, Jenkins (2007) concluded that native speaker accents are preferred 'in all respects' (ibid.: 186). Such accents were particularly valued for their perceived correctness and intelligibility. Goh (2009) compared the responses of 37 teachers from China and 38 from Singapore regarding attitudes towards spoken English norms and found that 87 per cent of the Chinese teachers found ENL norms not only useful but necessary. Although less in favour of native speaker norms than the Chinese teachers, Singaporean teachers also found ENL norms preferable. And in Finland, Ranta (2010) gave a questionnaire involving both quantitative and qualitative items to 108 students and 34 non-native teachers of English in Finnish high schools. According to the findings, although both students and teachers are well aware of the role of ELF in the 'real world' (ibid.: 156), they nevertheless prefer the native speaker model for teaching/learning purposes.

From these studies reviewed above, although there is some acceptance of 'inaccurate…..and incorrect use' (Kuo, 2006) and language in the 'real world' (Ranta, 2010) it is impossible to ignore the overall clear preference for native speaker (ENL) norms rather than ELF features.

## 3. THE STUDY

The studies summarized above, where the focus tends to be on attitudes/beliefs/preferences regarding ELF, give rise to a number of questions. It is possible, for instance, that although people may say they favor native speaker norms, the language that they actually use may not accord with their stated preferences. Maybe a more rounded and realistic insight into the current status of ELF might be obtained by trying to explore what people **do** as far as features of ELF are concerned, and the reasons they give for their practices. In order to explore this possibility, the research questions for the current study, therefore, were:

a) Which features of English do nonnative speakers of English in expanding circle countries **use**?
b) What **reasons** do nonnative speakers of English give for their responses?

### 3.1. The setting

In an attempt to avoid limiting the study to a single location which might or might not be representative of nonnative expanding circle speakers in general, participants in five different expanding circle countries were surveyed (Turkey, Italy, Egypt, Germany, and China).

### 3.2. Participants

Of the participants, 30 were personally known to the author, and they were contacted and asked to complete a short questionnaire on their use of a list of 'typical' ELF features (Seidlehofer 2004: 220). In turn, these participants involved another 15 respondents, resulting in 45 participants altogether. All of the participants were teaching at university level at the time of the study. The biographical profile of the 45 NNES teachers involved in the study is as follows:

- Nationality –
    - 19 were Turkish (42.2 per cent)
    - 7 were Italian (15.6 per cent)
    - 8 were Egyptian (17.8 per cent)
    - 6 were German (13.3 per cent)
    - and 5 were Chinese (11.1 per cent)
- Gender –

  - 26 were male (57.8 per cent)
  - 19 were female (42.2 per cent)
- Age –
  - the average age was 32
  - half of the participants (51.1 per cent) were between 23 and 30 years of age
  - 35.6 per cent were in their 30s
  - only 13.3 per cent were over 40 years old
- Teaching experience –
  - 17 (37.8 per cent) had been teaching from 1-5 years
  - 12 (26.7 per cent) had been teaching from 6-10 years
  - 13 (28.9 per cent) fell into the 11-15 year category
  - only three had more than 16 years of teaching experience.

### 3.3. Instrument

The questionnaire (see appendix) was based on the list of 'typical 'errors' that most English teachers would consider in urgent need of correction and remediation' identified by Seidlhofer (2004: 220). In order to achieve a compact survey which would hopefully reduce the risk of participant resistance and fatigue, the items on 'redundant prepositions' and 'overdoing explicitness' were amalgamated since they both involve redundancy. In addition, after piloting and consulting with a group of colleagues, the item on 'overusing certain verbs of high semantic generality' was judged to be confusing since the usage is not standard even among native speakers (e.g. have/take a shower, etc) and it was therefore removed. The questionnaire used in the study therefore had six items, each of which involved a grammatical usage commonly found among non-native learners of English.

Participants were asked to rate these items according to how often they used them from 1=never or almost never to 5=always or almost always (see Table 1 and appendix). After piloting, it was found that the alpha reliability co-efficient of the questionnaire was .96, which is considered a high level of reliability (de Vaus, 1995; Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995). In order to maintain reliability and validity of the interviews, which were conducted by the author, the interviews were recorded and notes were taken. However, the recordings and notes were later reviewed by another colleague who independently grouped the responses. Differences in grouping were resolved by discussion.

### 3.4. Data collection

The questionnaire, designed to investigate the teachers' practices, was distributed and returned via email. After the questionnaire had been completed, semi-structured interviews were held with ten of the teachers, in order to add a qualitative dimension and to find out more about the reasons teachers gave for their responses to the questionnaire. Two teachers were selected from each of the expanding circle countries at random. Those thus selected were asked if they consented to be interviewed, and all in fact agreed. The interviews included four basic questions:

(1) How do you define ELF/ENL?
(2) Do you want to use ELF?
(3) Do you prefer ELF or ENL?
(4) Why?

The first question was to ensure a basic understanding of the concepts involved so as to avoid potential misunderstanding. Questions 2 and 3 explored the interviewee's personal practices and opinions. And question 4 was designed to investigate the reasons for these expressed opinions and practices. Interviewees were also encouraged to elaborate on their ideas and to express their own views. The interviews were conducted by Skype and recorded.

### 3.5. Data analysis

The questionnaire data collected were entered into SPSS and analyzed for means which were then converted to percentages. The interview data were analyzed for common themes derived from the data (see interview results), and compared with the questionnaire data.

## 4. FINDINGS

The results of this study were both quantitative (from the questionnaire) and qualitative (from the interviews).

### 4.1. The questionnaire

As can be seen from Table 1, the tendency of the respondents in this study was towards an almost never use of ELF features in their communication.

The total percentages of 'never' and 'only occasionally' categories revealed that a majority of respondents never or only occasionally

(1) omit 3rd person present tense-s (95.6 %)
(2) interchange the relative pronouns *who* and *which* (91.1 %)
(3) misuse articles (80 %)
(4) use an all-purpose question tag (84.4 %)
(5) employ redundancy (73.3 %)
(6) use 'that' clauses instead of infinitive structures (84.4 %).

**Table 1: Reported Frequency of Use of ELF Features by Nonnative English Speaking Teachers from the Expanding Circle**

| ELF Features | (Almost) never (%) | Only occasionally (%) | Sometimes (%) | Usually (%) | Always (%) | Total (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Omission of 3rd person-s | 80.0 | 15.6 | 4.4 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Misuse of relative pronouns | 82.2 | 8.9 | 6.7 | 2.2 | 0 | 100 |
| Misused articles | 53.3 | 26.7 | 15.6 | 4.4 | 0 | 100 |
| All-purpose question tag | 64.4 | 20.0 | 8.9 | 6.7 | 0 | 100 |
| Redundancy | 31.1 | 42.2 | 17.8 | 6.7 | 2.2 | 100 |
| 'That' clause to replace infinitive | 64.4 | 20.0 | 4.4 | 8.9 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Overall | 62.6 | 22.2 | 9.6 | 4.8 | 0.8 | 100 |

### 4.2. The interviews

Given that, according to the results of the questionnaire, the respondents reported almost never or only occasionally using the surveyed ELF features, interviews were conducted in order to investigate the reasons for these responses. Interviewees (N=10) were asked to explain their own personal response to the questionnaire items regarding how frequently they used ELF features and to give reasons for their response. Any other insightful comments were also noted. Responses tended to fall into one of four groups as far as the reasons given, some of which are expressed in terms of their own needs and preferences, others in terms of what the teachers see as practical or beneficial for their students. Constraints of space dictate that only a representative selection of the responses is reported here. As far as possible (allowing for some adaptation when oral language is represented graphically), these responses are as they were spoken, including some features of ELF in some instances:

(A) ENL facilitates communication:

*Interviewee 2:* I feel myself quite relaxed in communication if I am able to speak quickly and fluently. To this end, ENL norms help me to keep my communication constant.
*Interviewee 10:* With ENL, I have no anxiety because the conversation channel is open.
*Interviewee 8:* When I am in a difficult situation, native like patterns help me to overcome my stress and anxiety.
*Interviewee 3:* Native like fluency keeps my confidence, help me speak more naturally, overcome my psychological obstacles.

(B) ENL is a gatekeeper to good positions or better jobs and status:
*Interviewee 10:* Near-native proficiency opens new doors in professional life. Since nobody is able to speak as proficiently as you in non-English environments, you can sometimes see respect.
*Interviewee 3:* Yes, you can be respected for your native-like proficiency. But if you use ELF, you can be thought as not proficient in English.
*Interviewee 6:* Native patterns provide an elite community. It gives prestige.
*Interviewee 8:* ELF is incorrect use of language. What would my students feel about me?

(C) ELF puts users at a disadvantage:
*Interviewee 9:* Having educated English is good. ELF gives harm for my aim.
*Interviewee 4:* We all know that ELF is incorrect use of English. If not, why are our students at a disadvantage in TOEFL or IELTS exams? In textbooks why do we teach correct or standard English?
*Interviewee 2:* When my students use 'broken English' or ELF in their writings, I feel that such English would do more harm than good.
*Interviewee 7:* When our students write academic articles or when they write their term papers in English, they are at a risk if they use ELF.

(D) The practical, pedagogical difficulties associated with ELF:
*Interviewee 9:* In our schools, at the beginning of the teaching semester, we try to choose ELT materials, which are mostly published in England or in America. So we have got used to such materials.
*Interviewee 5:* I have anxieties about teaching ELF. I may use it, maybe, but when it comes to teaching, it is difficult.
*Interviewee 6:* We already have limited number of teaching hours. If we would teach broken English at these hours, would it be better? No!
*Interviewee 1:* My students might have a reaction to ELF. They are motivated to learn the standard language.

As can be seen from these excerpts, the interview findings generally supported those of the questionnaire. In general, the teacher interviewees regarded ELF features as incorrect usage and argued that ENL norms rather than ELF can pave the way for intelligibility, status, academic success and better jobs, even though, as one respondent (D/5) concedes 'I may use it, maybe'. Or, as Sewell (2013: 8) puts it, the native speaker model 'is associated with the promise of social and spatial mobility'. These results are summarized in Table 2:

**Table 2: Summary of Interviewees' Comments**

| | | Interviewee numbers | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Interviewee response groups** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |
| A | ENL facilitates communication | | x | x | | | | | x | | x |
| B | ENL is a gatekeeper | | | x | | | x | | x | | x |
| C | ELF puts users at a disadvantage | | x | | x | | | x | | x | |
| D | ELF is pedagogically difficult | x | | | | x | x | | | x | |

## 5. DISCUSSION

Although English is now so widely spoken throughout the world that it is really in no longer 'owned' by any one group, even those who speak it as their mother tongue (Widdowson, 1994; Norton, 1997), this study accords with the findings of a number of previous studies and clearly shows that native speaker norms are preferred by those in a number of expanding circle countries. The participants reported never or almost never using a range of grammatical features which are often considered typical of English as a lingua franca (ELF), preferring the features of English as a native language (ENL) instead.

They gave as reasons that ENL helps to maintain communication and intelligibility, reduces stress and anxiety, boosts confidence, and provides psychological support. It creates professional opportunities and earns respect and prestige, whereas using ELF invites negative reactions. Using 'broken English' puts students at a disadvantage when writing their articles or term papers or in high-stakes exams. And when it comes to the classroom, ELF is difficult to teach because of materials and time constraints and students tend to be unmotivated because they really prefer to learn standard English. In other words, in spite of some of the notoriously difficult features of ENL (such as third person –s, etc.), these teachers made it clear that they believed 'the native–speaker model still has an important role to play' (Snowden, 2012: 89). Although Cogo (2012: 101) questions the importance of 'correct' English, the teachers in this study were unanimous in their support of 'proper' or 'standard' rather than 'broken' or 'incorrect' English.

Almost certainly, those who advocate ELF have the best of intentions, and are quite right when they suggest that many ELF features (such as omitting third person –s, or misusing relative pronouns or articles) have minimal effect on intelligibility (e.g. Alptekin, 2007). Furthermore, it is difficult to argue with the common sense of simplifying and regularizing some of the problematic areas of English (such as the complicated question tag conventions). There is also no doubt that ELF is used to good effect to achieve understanding in a wide variety of situations, as in Cogo's (2012: 101) delightful vignette of three colleagues on/in the same boat/bus/train. But the fact that ELF is used in real life communicative contexts does not necessarily mean that it is considered the ideal, even by the people using it (note interviewee D/5). As the respondents in the study reported in this article demonstrate, nonnative speakers in the expanding circle themselves use negative terms such as 'incorrect', 'harm', 'risk' and 'not proficient' when they talk about ELF. Conversely, ENL is associated with 'respect', 'prestige' and 'confidence'. These responses suggest ongoing negative attitudes towards ELF and positive attitudes towards a native-speaker model of English.

It is, of course, possible that these negative attitudes towards ELF are changing, and that they may continue to change, as Jenkins (2012: 493) suggests is the case when she claims there is 'a growing receptivity towards ELF'. However, judging by previous research evidence and the recent study reported in this article, this is far from the current situation, where expanding circle

respondents were emphatically in favor of ENL norms, which are seen as aiding communication, providing status, and avoiding negative judgments and pedagogical difficulties.

### 5.1. Implications for the teaching/learning situation

Many who write on the subject of ELF tend to sidestep the pedagogical issues raised by the topic. According to Jenkins (2012: 492), for instance, 'ELF researchers have always been careful to point out that we do not believe it is our place to tell teachers what to do'. However, the field of Applied Linguistics can hardly legitimately ignore the question of how the issues raised by ELF research apply to the classroom.

The pedagogical reality is that many learners persist with viewing native-like proficiency as an ultimate goal (for instance, Friedrich, 2003), and 'would be extremely proud if they could obtain a nearly native-like accent' (Wen, 2012: 371). The fact that there is little unanimity even among native speakers regarding 'correct' pronunciation or usage and which variety is the 'standard' one (for instance, Kohn, 2011) does not deter learners from this perceived ideal, however realistic and attainable it may or may not actually be. This being the case, attempts to teach ELF tend to strike resistance at a very fundamental level – the learner, who may feel patronized and therefore resentful, since the features of ELF are frequently perceived as undesirable and learners are therefore often unmotivated when it comes to learning what they see as an inferior version of their learning target. Since English has become a gatekeeper to better positions or jobs, Kachru (1985) points to learners' utilitarian perspectives and instrumental motivation which tend to reward them for speaking more like native speakers. Furthermore, according to Jenkins (2009), nonnative speakers often find other nonnative English accents hard to understand so that many nonnative speakers prefer 'standard' accents and these 'proper' variants of English pave the way for correctness, pleasantness, and international acceptability.

Even if learner 'resistance' (Prodromou, 2008: xi) were not a factor, on a practical level the question of what exactly would be included in an ELF syllabus remains problematic. As Decke-Cornill (2003: 59) puts it in her evocative title: 'We would have to invent the language we are supposed to teach'. Although there has been some interesting work over a number of years to identify a Lingua Franca Core and to establish a corpus of international English, such as the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) or the International Corpus of English (ICE), 'a complete and definitive description remains elusive' (Snowden, 2012: 91). This being the case, ENL remains, perhaps, the default basis for pedagogy, since, as Swan (2009: 301) puts it, it is 'bizarre' to assume that ELF is an 'independent variety which owes nothing to mother-tongue English'.

In the face of such difficulties, on what would textbooks and other teaching resources be based? Although, as Leung (2005: 139) points out 'any English-teaching programme should be related to its goals in context', it could well be that materials based on a particular local variety of ELF might not be acceptable if transferred to any other location. Given such diversity, as Snowden (2012: 92) observes: 'it is difficult to see how teachers of ELF could be adequately…..supplied with appropriate classroom resources'.

And what are the implications for teacher training/education? Although the respondents in this study expressed a clear preference for native speaker norms, there does seem to be some evidence in the literature that ELF may be gaining some acceptability among learners (e.g. Jenkins, 2007, 2012; Kuo, 2006; Ranta, 2010). This being the case, it would seem to be useful to include an awareness of ELF features and issues in pre/in-service teacher courses so that teachers are in a position to make informed decisions regarding what to include in their own programmes and regarding how to react when related issues are raised in their own classrooms.

According to Seidlhofer (2004: 228) it is essential that teachers are made aware of the close relationship among language, culture and identity. She suggests that

*rather than just being trained in a restricted set of pre-formulated techniques for specific teaching contexts, teachers will need a more comprehensive education which enables them to judge the implications of the ELF phenomenon for their own teaching contexts and to adapt their teaching to the particular requirements of their learners.*

In addition, Jenkins (2012: 492) stresses the idea that 'ELF researchers [do not] wish to impose ELF on all learners'. On the contrary, ELF is 'about offering choice to them' (Cogo, 2012: 104). This being the case, it would seem logical that learners need guidance in how to manage such choices, and teachers require training in how to facilitate choices that are useful and appropriate for the learners and the contexts involved.

### 5.2. Limitations and areas requiring further research

As we can see from the above, a number of important questions remain. Although there are now a number of studies into the perceptions and practices of those who inhabit the expanding circle, and although most seem to express a preference for ENL norms rather than ELF features, in order to further inform the field more such studies need to be conducted

- with larger numbers of participants
- in a wider range of contexts
- with a more varied participant base. It is possible, for instance, that teachers and students (who form the participant base of most studies in the area) might not be representative of general views on the subject. What about business people, or those in the tourist industry, or medical or legal professionals, or any other group which might have a stake in the ENL/EFL issue?
- using more varied methodologies. It is possible, for example, that respondents may not be able to give realistic and accurate responses to the type of questionnaire used in the study reported in this article. Perhaps a series of observations or recordings might add interesting extra detail regarding what respondents actually do and how this compares with their reporting of their own practices.

Replication of this study along the lines suggested above would help to clarify the generalizability of the findings.

Research also needs to be undertaken to provide empirical evidence which might be used to inform

- decisions regarding what is taught
- design and production of appropriate pedagogical materials
- planning for teacher training/education programmes

## 6. CONCLUSION

Since nonnative speakers in expanding circle contexts represent a large proportion of those who are directly affected by the issues involved in ELF, this study attempted to explore the use of English as a lingua franca in this context, to survey practices regarding ELF and to investigate some of the reasons for these reported practices. Perhaps contrary to expectations, the 45 nonnative English speaking teachers from five different expanding circle countries clearly indicated that they preferred to use native speaker (ENL) norms rather than features frequently associated with ELF.

It is, furthermore, one thing to recognize ELF as an acceptable alternative to ENL, which speakers/writers may choose or not according to individual preference, but we move into an altogether different sphere when we begin to talk about teaching it. Here issues of learner preference and motivation begin to take centre stage, and difficulties related to providing

suitable syllabuses, acceptable materials and adequate teacher training/education become highly problematic.

The ELF movement deserves credit for helping to break down the stranglehold of linguistic imperialism, to 'shed the straightjacket of English as a native language' (Seidlhofer, 2004: 212) which once dictated the rules. However, much more research needs to be done involving more participants in a wider variety of contexts before the questions related to the concept of English as a lingua franca can be resolved. This is especially urgent from the perspective of those who inhabit the expanding circle, which is, in fact, where the majority of the world's speakers of English reside.

## 7. REFERENCES


Akcan, S., Mesincigiller, S. & Ozkaya, S. (2013). *Pedagogical and attitudinal perspectives towards native and non-native English speaker teachers in Turkey.* In: 6th International ELF Conference on intercultural communication: new perspectives from ELF, 4-7 Sep. 2013, Italy.

Alptekin, C. (2007). Teaching ELF as a language in its own right: communication or prescriptivism? *ELT Journal, 61(3),* 267-268.

Bjorge, A. (2012). Expressing disagreement in ELF business negotiations: Theory and practice. *Applied Linguistics, 33(4),* 406-427.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Cogo, A. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca: concepts, use and implications. *ELT Journal, 66(1),* 97-105.

Coskun, A. (2011). Future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. *Journal of English as an International Language, 6(2),* 46-68.

Crystal, D. (2000). Emerging Englishes. *English Teaching Professional, 14,* 3-6.

Decke-Cornill, H. (2003). We would have to invent the language we are supposed to teach: The issue of English as a lingua franca in language education in Germany. In M. Byram, & P. Grundy (Eds.), *Context and culture in language teaching (*pp. 59-71). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

De Vaus, D. (1995). *Surveys in social research* (4th edition). London: Allen & Unwin.

Devrim, D. Y. & Bayyurt, Y. (2010). Students' understandings and preferences of the role and place of culture in English language teaching: A focus in an EFL context. *TESOL Journal, 2,* 4-23.

Friedrich, P. (2003). English in Argentina: attitudes of MBA students. *World Englishes, 22(2),* 173-184.

Goh, C. (2009). Perspectives on spoken grammar. *ELT Journal 63(4),* 303-312.

Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. *AILA Review, 13,* 57-68.

Hall, C. (2013). Cognitive contributions to pluralithic views of English and other languages. *Applied Linguistics, 34(2),* 211-231.

Incecay, G. & Akyel, A. S. (2014). Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of English as a lingua franca. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 5(1),* 1-12.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: the role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 39(3),* 535-543.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity.* Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28(2),* 200-207.

Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca: from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal, 66(4),* 486-494.

Jenks, C. (2012). Doing being reprehensive: Some interactional features of English as a lingua franca in a chat room. *Applied Linguistics, 20(2),* 386-405.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk, & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.). *English in the World: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaur, J. (2010). Achieving mutual understanding in world Englishes. *World Englishes, 29(2*), 192–208.

Kaypak, E. & Ortactepe, D. (2014). Language learner beliefs and study abroad: A study on English as a lingua franca (ELF). *System, 42*, 355–367.

Kohn, K. (2011). English as a lingua franca and the standard English misunderstanding. In D. A. Hower, & A. Wilton (Eds.), *English in Europe Today. Sociocultural and educational perspectives* (pp. 71-94). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kuo, I. (2006). Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 60(3),* 213-221.

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

McKay, S. (2003). Teaching English as an international language: the Chilean context. *ELT Journal, 57(2),* 139-148.

Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes, 22(4),* 483-496.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly 31(3),* 409-427.

Oxford, R. & J. Burry-Stock. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System, 25(1),* 1-23.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford University Press
Prodromou, L. (2008). *English as a lingua franca: A corpus-based analysis.* London: Continuum
Quirk, R. (1990). Language varieties and standard language. *English Today, 6(1),* 3-10.
Ranta, E. (2010). English in the real world versus English at school: Finnish english teachers' and students' views. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 20(2),* 156-177.
Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24,* 209–242.
Sewell, A. (2013). ELF: ontology and ideology. *ELT Journal, 67(1),* 3-10.
Sifakis, N. C. & A. Sougari. (2005). Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly, 39(3),* 467–488.
Snowden, C. (2012). ELF on a mushroom: the overnight growth in English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 66(1),* 89-96.
Swan, M. (2009). Correspondence. *ELT Journal, 63(3),* 300-301.
Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: A classroom view. *ELT Journal, 56(3),* 240-249.
Wen, Q. (2012). English as a lingua franca: a pedagogical perspective. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1(2),* 371-376.
Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 28,* 377-388.
Widdowson, H. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
Widdowson, H. (2012). ELF and the inconvenience of established concepts. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1(1),* 5-26.

# Appendix

Questionnaire of English as a Lingua Franca and/or a Native Language

**I. Demographic Data (please fill in every blank)**

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]
3. Teaching Experience: ___1-5 years ___ 6-10 years
   ___ 11-15 years ___ 16-more years

**II. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) features**

For the next several items

a) please decide which features, if any, you generally use in communication
b) choose a number from 1-5 in the box
c) Write it next to each feature below to indicate how much you use it.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| never or almost never | only occasionally | sometimes (about 50% of the time) | usually | always or almost always |

1. _____ Non-use of 3rd person –s
   e.g. He write very well
2. _____ Interchangeable use of relative pronouns *who* and *which*
   e.g. The film *who*…The man *which*
3. _____ Misuse of definite/indefinite articles
   e.g. He is best player. We live in village
4. _____ Use of an all-purpose question tag
   e.g. They were coming, *isn't it?*
5. _____ Use of *redundancy* by adding a preposition
   e.g. I mentioned/discussed *about* it.
6. _____ Use of *that clause* instead of infinitive
   e.g. I want *that* you take courses

# Genişletilmiş Özet

Son yıllarda İngilizcenin kullanımı dünya çapında yaygınlaşmış (Snowden, 2012) ve bu nedenle İngilizce artık bir dünya dili olarak (ELF) farklı milletlerce konuşulmaya başlamıştır. Ancak bu durum akademi dünyasında önemli ölçüde tartışmalara yol açmıştır. Bu akademik tartışmalar, İngilizcenin dünyanın ortak iletişim dili olduğunu ileri sürenler ile İngilizcenin uluslararası veya küresel bir dil olduğunu savunanlar arasında süregelmiştir. Fakat Jenkins (2007) İngilizcenin yerel bir dil veya sadece bir millet tarafından konuşulan dil olmadığını, bu nedenle de dünyanın ortak iletişim dili olduğunu ifade etmektedir.

Bjorge (2012) ortak iletişim dili olarak İngilizceyi (ELF) ana dili İngilizce olmayanların kendi aralarında iletişim kurmak için konuştukları dil olarak tanımlamaktadır. Alptekin (2007) dilin iletişim aracı olarak kullanılması gerektiğini ve bu nedenle iletişimdeki akışkanlığın önemli olduğunu savunmaktadır. Jenks (2012) ortak iletişim dili olarak İngilizcenin geldiği bu noktanın sürpriz olmadığını ileri sürmektedir, çünkü Jenks'e göre iletişim ihtiyacı çeşitli kurumsal, sosyal ve politik amaçlardan dolayı hızlıca artmaktadır.

Hall (2013) İngilizcenin dünyanın ortak iletişim dili olarak genişlemesinin asıl sebebinin tek dil görüşüne bir tepki olarak geliştiğini ileri sürmektedir. Ayrıca, bunun dil sömürüsünü engellemek için ortaya çıktığını iddia eden araştırmacılar da vardır (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999). Diğer taraftan ise, Kohn (2011) İngilizcenin geldiği bu noktanın ana dil olarak İngilizceyi konuşanların ellerindeki statüyü kaybetmelerine yola açabileceğini ortaya atmaktadır. Benzer bir şekilde Graddol (1999) da bu durumu İngilizceyi ana dil olarak konuşanların statülerindeki düşüşü olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Dünyada İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak konuşan bir milyar insan vardır (Crystal, 2000). İngilizcenin konuşulduğu veya bu sayıdaki insanların yaşadıkları ülkeleri Kachru (1985) üç halkaya ayırmıştır. Birinci gruptaki 'iç halka' ülkeleri İngilizceyi ana dil olarak konuşmaktadırlar (İngiltere, Amerika, Avustralya, İrlanda, Kanada ve Güney Afrika gibi). İkinci gruptaki 'dış halka' ülkelerde ise (Hindistan, Filipinler, Bangladeş, Pakistan, Malezya gibi) İngilizce tek bir ana dil olarak konuşulmamaktadır ancak İngilizce bu ülkeler için kurumsal, tarihsel ve ekonomik açıdan önem taşımaktadır. Üçüncü gruptaki 'genişleyen halka' ülkeleri ise (Avrupa'daki bir kısım ülkeler, Asya, Orta Doğu ve Afrika'nın büyük bir kısmı) İngilizceye karşı tarihsel ve kurumsal olarak hiç bir bağ taşımamaktadırlar fakat İngilizceyi ortak iletişim dili olarak kullanmaktadırlar.

Şu ana kadar yapılmış çalışmalar üçüncü gruptaki 'genişleyen halka'da yaşayan ve İngilizceyi ortak iletişim dili olarak konuşan insanların düşüncelerini, tercihlerini veya davranışlarını araştırmışlar, fakat dili kullanım biçimleri veya ortak iletişim dili olarak kullanılmasıyla ortaya çıkan dilin bazı normlarını araştırmamışlardır. Bu nedenle bu çalışma diğerlerinden ayrılmaktadır, çünkü bu çalışma İngilizceyi ortak iletişim dili olarak konuşan insanların İngilizcedeki "kullanım" biçimlerini veya ortaya çıkan normları araştırmaktadır. Daha detaylı incelemek ve genellenebilir sonuçlara ulaşmak için ise beş ülkedeki 45 İngilizce öğretmeni çalışmaya dâhil edilmiştir.

Çalışma kapsamında Seidlhofer'ın (2004) ortaya attığı ortak iletişim dili normları kullanılarak özel bir anket geliştirilmiş, katılımcılara verilmeden önce uygulanmış ve güvenirlik değeri .96 olarak bulunmuştur. Daha sonra aynı anket gerçek katılımcılara internet yoluyla verilmiş; sonuçları istatistik programı (SPPS) kullanılarak açıklanmıştır. Bulunan rakamsal sonuçları desteklemek için ise her ülkeden ikişer olmak üzere beş ülkeden rastgele seçilen toplam 10 katılımcı ile Skype yoluyla mülakat yapılmıştır.

Mülakatlarda katılımcılara İngilizcenin ortak iletişim dili olarak kullanılmasını nasıl tanımladıkları, onun hakkında ne düşündükleri ve İngilizcenin ana dil normlarını mı yoksa iletişim dili normlarını mı tercih ettikleri ve nedenleri sorulmuştur. Mülakattaki konuşmalar kayıt altına alınmış ve daha sonra da nitel olarak analizleri yapılmıştır.

Anket sonuçları katılımcıların büyük bir çoğunluğunun İngilizcenin ortak iletişim dili olarak kullanılmasını desteklemekte olduğunu göstermiştir ancak kullanılan normları hiçbir şekilde savunmamaktadırlar. Katılımcılar 'standart' ana dil normlarının kullanılmasını tercih etmişlerdir. Anketteki 'asla' ve 'bazen' yüzdelikleri beraber toplandığında şu gerçekler ortaya çıkmıştır. Katılımcılar aşağıdaki normları neredeyse hiç kullanmamaktadırlar.

(1) üçüncü tekil şahıs ekinin (-s) yanlış kullanımı (95.6 %)
(2) 'who' ve 'which' gibi sıfat tümceciklerinin birbirlerinin yerine kullanımı (91.1 %)
(3) artikellerin yanlış kullanımı (80 %)
(4) soru eklentilerinin rastgele kullanımı (84.4 %)
(5) edatların gereksiz kullanımı (73.3 %)
(6) isim cümleciği 'that' yapısının yanlış kullanımı (84.4 %)

Yüzdelere bakıldığında 85% in üzerinde katılımcıların yukarıda geçen ortak iletişim dil normlarını tercih etmedikleri görülmektedir.

Mülakatlar da nicel sonuçları destekler durumdadır. Katılımcılar tercih sebeplerini açıklamak için şu temalar üzerinde durmuşlardır.

- İngilizcenin ana dil olarak konuşulması ve ana dilde geçen normların kullanımı iletişimi kolaylaştırır.
- İngilizcenin ana dil olarak konuşulması konuşan kişiye daha iyi iş imkânları veya daha yüksek pozisyonlar sağlar.

- İngilizcenin ortak iletişim dili olarak kullanılması ve normları dil kullanıcılarının özellikle de uluslararası sınavlarda olumsuz yönde etkilenmesine neden olur.
- İngilizcenin ortak iletişim dili olarak öğretilmesi pratik ve pedagojik açılardan zordur.

İngilizce şu an dünyada konuşulan en yaygın dil olsa da, İngilizce tek bir grup tarafından hatta İngilizceyi ana dil olarak konuşanlar tarafından bile tek bir biçime sokulamaz. Bu çalışma daha önceki çalışmaları destekleyen bulgulara ulaşmıştır. Sonuçlar açıkça göstermiştir ki katılımcılar İngilizcenin ortak iletişim dili olarak kullanılması sonucu ortaya çıkan yukarıdaki normları neredeyse hiç kullanmamaktadırlar. Kullanmak da istememektedirler çünkü bu 'yanlış' kullanımlar yerine katılımcılar İngilizcenin ana dil olarak konuşulduğu ülkelerdeki insanların kullandığı standart biçimi tercih etmektedir. Ana dilde kullanılan normlar ile katılımcılar kendilerini daha iyi ifade ettiklerini ve tanımladıklarını söylemişlerdir. Katılımcılar ayrıca bu standart dil normlarının kullanılmasının kişiye daha iyi iş imkânları veya saygınlık bile sağlayabileceğini ileri sürmüşlerdir. Ana dildeki normların standart kullanım olmasının yanı sıra, katılımcılar bu normların iletişimi ve iletişimdeki akışkanlığı koruduğunu, stres ve endişeyi azalttığını, güveni arttırdığını ve psikolojik bir destek sağladığını da iddia etmişlerdir.

Bu çalışma her ne kadar az katılımcı ile yapılmış olsa da, 45 İngilizce öğretmeninin beş farklı ülkeden seçilmiş olması çalışmanın güçlü yanını ve genellenebilirliliğini göstermektedir. Mülakatlar da nicel sonuçları desteklemektedir. Ancak gelecekte yapılacak çalışmalar gözlem yaparak veya gerçek konuşmaları kaydederek zengin ve somut daha fazla sonuçlara ulaşabilir ve daha geçerli ve güvenilir sonuçlar elde edebilirler.

---

## Citation Information

Soruç, A. (2015). Non-native teachers' attitudes towards English as a Lingua Franca. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education], 30*(1), 239-251.