Jennifer Jenkins

Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca[1]

Abstract

In the relatively few years since empirical research into English as a Lingua Franca began being conducted more widely, the field has developed and expanded remarkably, and in myriad ways. In particular, researchers have explored ELF from the perspective of a range of linguistic levels and in an ever-increasing number of sociolinguistic contexts, as well as its synergies with the field of Intercultural Communication and its meaning for the fields of Second Language Acquisition and English as a Foreign Language. The original orientation to ELF communication focused heavily, if not exclusively, on form. In light of increasing empirical evidence, this gave way some years later to an understanding that it is the processes underlying these forms that are paramount, and hence to a focus on ELF users and ELF as social practice. It is argued in this article, however, that ELF is in need of further retheorisation in respect of its essentially multilingual nature: a nature that has always been present in ELF theory and empirical work, but which, I believe, has not so far been sufficiently foregrounded. This article therefore attempts to redress the balance by taking ELF theorisation a small step further in its evolution.

Keywords: multilingualism, English as a Lingua Franca, translanguaging.

Jennifer Jenkins, University of Southampton. J.Jenkins@soton.ac.uk

---

1. Introduction

Since the first days of research into English as a Lingua Franca (henceforth ELF[2]) in the second half of the 1990s, scholarly output has been prolific as well as controversial. In its earliest years, ELF was often seen as something of a revolution in its break with traditional English as a Foreign Language (henceforth EFL), and in particular, its premise that the many users of English for intercultural communication, rather than for communication with native English speakers, should not be expected to defer to the latters' norms. As with English users in the English-using postcolonial countries (Kachru's 'outer circle'), the argument went, users in the rest of the non-Anglophone-English using world (Kachru's 'expanding circle') were also entitled to acceptance of their own ways of using English. This meant, as a Taiwanese participant in one of my earlier research projects enthusiastically pointed out, that her government needed "a listening programmes revolution" to enable them to appreciate that "this is a global society and … most [English] speakers are non-native speakers" (Jenkins 2005, unpublished data). Others who also saw the proposal as 'revolutionary' were not always so enthusiastic. A Polish phonetician, Sobkowiak (2005), for example, argued that ELF-oriented pronunciation would "easily bring the ideal down into the gutter" (p. 141). Many Native English ELT practitioners, with their instinctive sense of 'ownership' of the English language, meanwhile, tended at least initially to regard the notion of ELF as outrageous.

The earliest ELF research began by focusing mainly on forms, although from the start, accommodative processes were also identified as key factors in ELF communication (Jenkins 2000). Later, as increasing amounts of empirical data were made available, not least via two large corpora, VOICE (the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English) and ELFA (the corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings), attention to forms gave way to interest in the diversity, fluidity, and variability revealed in the new data. The research focus therefore switched to a view of "ELF as social practice" with "the community rather than the code, at the center of the stage" (Kalocsai 2014: 2). This meant exploring the functions fulfilled by the forms, the underlying processes they reveal, and thus the ways in which they "foster understanding of 'what is going on' in the interaction" among speakers from different language backgrounds (Seidlhofer 2009a: 56). The

---

[2] Gal (2013: 180) argues: "the acronym is handy but may sometimes be misleading. The full phrase brings out the processual aspect of what we are studying … processes that have kinship to processes observed in other kinds of communication, while also being specific to English used as a lingua franca". I take Gal's point entirely, and believe that the criticisms of 'reification' made by some who have evidently not taken the trouble to read the literature, have been facilitated by the use of the acronym which, in turn, enables them to ignore the "as a" of the full phrase. Nevertheless, for the sake of space, I use the acronym in this article.

key point here is that ELF, however conceptualised, is not only a highly complex phenomenon, but also one whose diversity is currently constantly increasing as more people from different language backgrounds engage in intercultural communication using English as one of their mediums[3]. This means that theorising, too, cannot stand still, but that ELF scholars need to be ready to revise their conceptualisations of the phenomenon in line with new empirical findings as well as by considering conceptualisations and empirical research from other fields of enquiry that can 'speak' to ELF. As Baird, Baker and Kitazawa (2014) point out:

> it is important for ELF scholars to acknowledge the necessity of continual theorisation and reflection, particularly regarding the complexity of the subject matter. Only by engaging with wider theory and considering the subject matter of the field can we adequately account for "ELF" as a field of enquiry, a phenomenon, and/or a use of language, while at the same time appreciating the complexity and variability of language and its integrated roles in human communication more generally (p. 172).

It is in this spirit that I approached the retheorisation discussed later in this article. However, I would like to emphasise from the outset that I do not see it as some kind of 'revolution' comparable to the original ELF proposal for a break with the ideology and practices of traditional EFL. Neither is the retheorisation intended to imply any criticism whatsoever of the research and theorising that preceded it. Indeed, without the latter, I would not have been able to retheorise ELF in the manner presented in this article. Rather, I am building on what has gone before, including my own early work, in a way that I see as evolutionary rather than revolutionary, a change of emphasis rather than a break with ELF's past, and one which will no doubt give way, in the future, to several further (re)theorisations.

The article begins with a discussion of the two main earlier phases of ELF research whose purpose is to contextualise what I am presenting as the potential third phase. It then presents the justification for the latter, discusses influences from fields outside ELF research, and having presented what I see as the main aspects of the third phase, ends by considering some possible implications. Although I have been thinking about this third phase for some time (around three years), it should nevertheless be seen as still a work in progress as, crucially, there is a need for others, particularly other ELF researchers, to have plenty of opportunity to respond

---

[3] On the other hand, a 'levelling out' phenomenon is later on likely to take place through adaptation, long-term accommodation, and the adoption of practices from interlocutors and communities. So whether the end product is overall more diverse, or constantly just expanding as it were, is not at all clear on theoretical grounds (Anna Mauranen, personal communication).

to the proposal before it is taken any further. It is for this reason that I have chosen to publish it for the first time in our Centre for Global Englishes freely and easily accessible De Gruyter Open working papers, *Englishes in Practice*.

2. ELF phase one ('ELF 1')

The first empirical research into ELF communication was, to my knowledge, my own ELF pronunciation research that began in the late 1980s (though the term 'English as a Lingua Franca' was not yet in use[4]). Having observed the phenomenon of ELF communication among students in (and outside) the multilingual EFL classes I was teaching in London in the 1980s, the mutual intelligibility they habitually achieved with their 'non-standard' (i.e. non-native) forms, and the easy way in which they resolved any difficulties by means of accommodation (see e.g. Beebe & Giles 1984), I began to question the usefulness of the native English norms underpinning the EFL 'industry', and to research the ELF phenomenon.

At this point, there was no previous ELF research to draw on. Nevertheless, the early World Englishes literature, e.g. Kachru (1982/1992) and Smith (1983), which was arguing for the acceptance of the postcolonial Englishes (Kachru's outer circle) offered a helpful precedent. World Englishes was, itself, at that time a relatively new field of enquiry. The first conference of the International Association of World Englishes (IAWE) had been held a few years earlier, in 1978. Papers from the conference were subsequently published in 1982 (and 1992 with revisions) in a volume edited by Braj Kachru, together with Larry Smith, the founder of the discipline. In the Preface to his edited volume of papers from the conference, Kachru makes the following point:

> The English-using community in various continents was for the first time viewed in its totality. A number of cross-cultural perspectives were brought to bear upon our understanding of *English in a global context*, of language variation, of language acquisition, and of *the bilinguals' – or multilinguals' – use of English* (1982, Preface to the First Edition; italics added).

---

[4] The World Englishes scholar, Larry Smith, had used the term 'English as an International Language' in a number of publications (e.g. 1983). Slightly later (1987), the linguistics scholar, Karlfried Knapp, had published a conceptual piece with the title 'English as an international lingua franca', although the early ELF scholars were unaware of its existence.

Charles Ferguson, meanwhile, spells out the implications of Kachru's point in his Foreword to the First Edition:

> … much of the world's verbal communication takes place by means of languages that are not the users' "mother tongue", but their *second, third, or nth language, acquired one way or another and used when appropriate* … In fact, the *whole mystique of native speaker and mother tongue should probably be quietly dropped from the linguists' set of professional myths about language* … Native speakers … may have confidence that they "know" the language better than others, but the differences from different areas and the *growing importance of non-native norms* will increasingly affect this confidence (italics added).

This ideological positioning, together with the World Englishes research programme of describing and thence legitimizing, a number of World Englishes varieties, exerted a strong influence on the earliest empirical ELF research[5], most of which, apart from my own work on accommodation, therefore focused on features.

At this stage, two areas in particular were the focus of research attention: pronunciation and lexicogrammar. My own five-year pronunciation research project led to the proposal for a 'Lingua Franca Core' (LFC). This consisted of the few native English segmental and prosodic items whose absence was found in the empirical data to lead to potential intelligibility problems in intercultural communication (see Jenkins 2000). However, the LFC was never intended as a model, let alone a monolithic model, or even a fixed 'core'. Rather, it was a small number of pronunciation 'repertoire' features that, according to the proposal, should be available for use as and when needed. Meanwhile, all other features, the many outside the LFC, were described as 'non-core', as their presence or absence was found in the data to be inconsequential in respect of mutual intelligibility. This also meant that accommodation skills were seen as crucial: in this case, the ability for interlocutors in intercultural communication to be able to assess which (if any) of their L1 pronunciations were causing intelligibility problems for their conversation partners, and to adjust those pronunciations accordingly.

---

[5] Although I attempted to introduce the term 'English as a Lingua Franca' and its acronym 'ELF' in Jenkins 1996, this proved difficult (see Jenkins 2000: 11), and for the few years that followed, ELF researchers, myself included, tended to use the more transparent 'English as an International Language' and its acronym 'EIL'. However, the two were seen as synonymous even then, and for the past decade, ELF has been the preferred term for its researchers.

The pronunciation proposals were quickly followed by the establishment of the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English or VOICE, set up by Seidlhofer (see Seidlhofer 2001) in order to collect and describe ELF lexicogrammar, and the Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings or ELFA by Mauranen (see Mauranen 2003). Shortly afterwards, Seidlhofer (2004) produced a set of initial lexicogrammatical 'hypotheses', items that seemed to be used regularly and systematically among English speakers from a wide range of first languages without causing communication problems[6]. They included the following:

- uncountable nouns to countable, e.g. *information**s**, funding**s**, software**s***
- zero marking of 3rd person *–s* in present simple tense e.g. *she suggest*
- merging of who and which, e.g. *a paper **who** will be published*
- use of an all-purpose question tag, e.g*. **isn't it? is it? no?***
- use of greater explicitness, e.g. *how long **time** (will you stay here)?*
- new use of morphemes, e.g. *fors**ify**, boring**dom**, discrimin**ization**, level**ize***

Although there were relatively small numbers of tokens of each of these items, they were considered by ELF researchers as possible examples of change in progress. However, they were always described as 'hypotheses', and were never part of the LFC, which was always restricted to pronunciation, points that are to this day regularly overlooked by some commentators.

Nevertheless, it is entirely true to say that during the early 2000s, ELF researchers, influenced by the example of World Englishes, believed it would be possible to eventually describe and possibly even codify ELF varieties. Such varieties, it was believed, would consist of those items commonly used across speakers from many different L1s along with those items related to each specific L1, e.g. German English, Japanese English and the like. Indeed, for several years, this was seen both within and outside ELF research as a necessary step in the direction of legitimising ELF use. Kirkpatrick (2007) argued, for example, that "[t]here are … glimmers of hope that, one day, the lingua franca English of highly proficient NNS multilinguals … will be recognized as legitimate varieties". Meanwhile, from outside ELF research, Coleman similarly contended that "[o]nce ELF has been objectively described as a variety and has lost its stigma … then new and less inequitable conceptions of global English and its learning and teaching become possible" (2006: 3).

---

[6] This contrasted with the feature found most often to cause communication breakdown, the use of native English idiomatic language, or "unilateral idiomaticity" as Seidlhofer (2001) called it: in other words, a speaker's use of a native idiomatic English expression that was not known to his or her interlocutor(s).

3. ELF phase two ('ELF 2')

Although accommodation, and hence variability, had already been presented as playing a central role in ELF pronunciation, it had remained under-researched and under-theorised in respect of ELF communication as a whole. It was Seidlhofer who first identified the problem with the focus on ELF features, or what she described as "the fatal attraction of lists" (2008). She argued, instead, in three conference plenary talks between 2006 and 2008 (published as Seidlhofer 2007, 2009a, 2009b) that despite the "observed regularities" found in ELF data, there is also "inherent fluidity … in the ad hoc, situated negotiation of meaning", with ELF users "making use of their multi-faceted multilingual repertoires in a fashion motivated by the communicative purpose and the interpersonal dynamics of the interaction" (2009b: 242). She therefore proposed that the research endeavour should focus on the processes underlying ELF speakers' variable use of forms, and that the concept of Communities of Practice (Wenger 2008) was therefore a more appropriate way of approaching ELF than that of the traditional variety-oriented speech community. The study of ELF's variability thence became central, with variability soon being understood as a defining characteristic of ELF communication.

The reconceptualization of ELF meant, in turn, that it was not as similar to World Englishes as had been believed earlier. Ideologically there was little change, and ELF researchers remained in agreement with World Englishes scholars that, for example it is a "fallacy" to suggest "that in the Outer and Expanding Circles, English is essentially learned to interact with native speakers", that NN Englishes are "interlanguages", and that "the diversity and variation in English is … an indicator of linguistic decay" (Kachru 1992: 357-8). Conceptually, however, there was now a major difference. For while World Englishes could (and still can) be defined as "non-native models of English [that] are linguistically identifiable, geographically definable" (Kachru 1992: 66), the same could no longer be said of ELF communication. Instead, ELF, with its fluidity and 'online' negotiation of meaning among interlocutors with varied multilingual repertoires, could not be considered as consisting of bounded varieties, but as English that transcends boundaries, and that is therefore beyond description. With hindsight, it is difficult to understand why early ELF researchers were so beguiled by the 'varieties' aspect of the World Englishes paradigm. But as Morán Panero (2015) has pointed out, there was no ELF paradigm on which to draw in those early days, so it was obvious that researchers would look to others, and particularly to World Englishes.

So how is ELF defined in respect of current thinking? These are three definitions of ELF that have been provided since its reconceptualisation as 'ELF 2', in chronological order:

- English as it is used as a contact language among speakers from different first languages (Jenkins 2009).
- any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option (Seidlhofer 2011).
- The use of English in a lingua franca language scenario (Mortensen 2013).

Nothing in these definitions suggests that native English speakers (henceforth NESs) are excluded from the definition, and in fact they were not excluded from earlier definitions either, even though some researchers restricted the percentage of NESs in their data collection for fear of too much native English influence on other participants. But critics of ELF nevertheless persist in spreading the myth of 'NES exclusion', often quoting something I said in an article in *TESOL Quarterly* (Jenkins 2006: 161)

> in its purest form, ELF is defined as a contact language used only among non-mother tongue speakers. For example, according to House (1999), "ELF interactions are defined as interactions between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue.

What these critics always fail to quote is the sentence immediately following the latter one:

> The majority of ELF researchers nevertheless accept that speakers of English from both inner and outer circles also participate in intercultural communication (albeit as a small minority in the case of inner circle speakers), so do not define ELF communication this narrowly.

Perhaps such ELF critics find the truth inconvenient because it does not fit in with their own narrative about the ELF paradigm. Or perhaps they engage in a practice that even my students know to be unscholarly: that of lazily repeating a secondary source rather than consulting the original themselves, and hence reproducing other people's mistakes in their own writings and talks. This would be understandable in the case of an inaccessible publication, but not one as easily available as *TESOL Quarterly*. Or perhaps they have not taken the trouble to read any of the vast body

of ELF research that has been published in recent years, and assume that current thinking has remained stuck in a groove from over ten years ago. This is certainly the case with some of the myths about ELF that continue to be circulated. For example, this is what Park and Wee said in an article they published in 2014 (pp. 41-42; my italics):

> Here, we refer to the project centred on the work of Jennifer Jenkins *(2000)* and Barbara Seidlhofer *(2004)*, which *aims to identify core linguistic features* that facilitate intelligibility in ELF communication so that a counterhegemonic curriculum of English language teaching may be developed. While the ELF research project has been highly influential, its tenets have also triggered much debate. Critics are concerned that such *efforts to establish an ELF core* has the danger of reintroducing a *monolithic model of English* that the notion of ELF is meant to contest.

The authors of this 2014 article show evidence neither of their reading of any of the vast amount of ELF literature published since 2004 (the days of 'ELF 1'), nor even of an understanding of the two early publications they cite. The so-called "ELF core" was always restricted to pronunciation, so did not involve Seidlhofer, who only ever talked tentatively of the possibility of identifying "common" lexicogrammatical features across L1 groups, not of "core" ones (e.g. Seidlhofer 2004). And even in the case of the LFC, as was explained above, this was not a fixed core, and was certainly not a model. If Park and Wee had taken the trouble to read Jenkins (2000), they would have found that it was local teachers whose pronunciation was advocated as the model for their students.

Despite the reconceptualising of ELF over the past ten years or so, it seems that there will always be people who choose, for whatever reason, to ignore its conceptual evolution. For those of us working in the field of ELF, by contrast, in line with Baird, Baker and Kitazawa's (2014 point quoted above), theorizing cannot stop for as long as the complex phenomenon of ELF exists and new empirical evidence about its nature continues to emerge. Indeed, the whole history of the English language has been one of constant evolution from the time the early Anglo Saxon tribes arrived in England around 500 AD to the present day, with the diversity of English use increasing at each stage along the way. The only difference nowadays is that the process has both spread and accelerated to a far greater extent than ever before, and the diversity of English use has increased substantially as a result, which leads to my next point: the need for further retheorisation.

4. Moving on again ('ELF3')

There are a number of reasons why I believe ELF is due for further reconceptualization. All relate in one way or another to the increasingly diverse multilingual nature of ELF communication. Of the five main reasons, the first has to do with orientations to this demographic trend. More than thirty years ago, Pattanayak (1984) made the following observation:

> In the developed world … two languages are considered a nuisance, three languages uneconomic and many languages absurd. In multilingual countries, many languages are facts of life; any restriction in the choice of language is a nuisance; and one language is not only uneconomic, it is absurd.

Some, such as the British Council, would no doubt argue that this is no longer true of orientations to multilingualism in the "developed world". I would argue, however, that it is certainly still true of the Anglophone world. We need only think of the US with its 'English Only' (or the more politically correct sounding 'Official English') movement, and its No Child Left Behind policy, which Robert Phillipson has called 'No Child Left Bilingual', and Pratt (2002) has subverted with "Monolingualism is a handicap. No child should be left behind". More recently, Menken (2015) reports a paper given by Flores and Schissel at the 2015 AAAL conference in which they argued "testing practices are monoglossic, treating bi/multilingualism as abnormal, and pressure emergent bilinguals to assimilate to an idealized monolingual standard American English norm" (p. 422). Which was precisely Pattanayak's point!

Meanwhile, the situation in the UK is no better. State education has cut down severely on the teaching of foreign languages, leading to the closure of a number of university modern languages departments. There is a prevailing antipathy to immigrants' use of their mother tongues. For example, a Conservative politician recently complained in a TV interview about immigrants speaking languages other than English on the buses. And there is an organization called the Queen's English Society which, although not targeted at immigrants, leaves visitors to its website in no doubt that only one type of (standard native) English will do. And mainstream SLA researchers in both countries, both native and non-native English speakers, show a "monolingual bias" according to which "the learning and use of only one language is taken to be the most natural default for human communication" (Ortega 2014: 48).

Perhaps surprisingly, a similar criticism has also been made of ELF research:

> Oddly enough ELF speakers are never apparently seen as multilingual individuals in multilingual communities. From the multi-competence perspective, ELF exists alongside the L1 in the mind, forming a complex supersystem. ELF seems to be treated in isolation, perpetuating the traditional monolingual conception of bilinguals as being two monolinguals rather than different people from monolinguals in L1. Nor do ELF researchers engage with the multi-competence of the community … it is only their role as ELF monolinguals (to coin a phrase!) that matters not the relationship of ELF to the other languages in their community (Cook 2013: 37-38).

This criticism is overstated to the extent that ELF theorising over the past several years has referred frequently to the notion of the 'multilingual repertoire', the 'creativity' of the multilingual ELF user, the 'hybridity' of ELF, and the like. On the other hand, it is true to the extent that the focus of most ELF discussion has hitherto been on the 'E' of ELF communication rather than on developing the relationship between English and other languages in respect of the multilingualism of most ELF users and the "multi-competence of the community"[7]. Even if this was not the case, multilingualism has spread both physically and virtually way beyond the postcolonial countries to which Pattanayak (1984) was referring, and in an age of increasing super-diversity (Vertovec 2006, 2007), it seems to me that ELF research needs to take a more nuanced account of this development in its orientation to the other languages of ELF users.

The second reason that prompted my proposal for a further reconceptualization of ELF is closely linked to the first: recent findings of research into, and thinking about, multilingualism. Since the 1990s, a far more critical approach to multilingualism has been developing. It began with criticisms of the monolingual bias of traditional SLA-based orientations to the learning of additional languages, according to which each language was seen as a separate entity not to be 'tainted' by the other(s) in a person's linguistic repertoire. For example, Heller describes this approach as "parallel monolingualism" in which "each variety must conform to certain prescriptive norms" (1999: 271), and Cummins as the "two solitudes assumption" (2005: 588). More recently, this has led to a 'multilingual turn' in applied linguistics with scholars from a

---

[7] This is not to suggest that there has been no ELF research interest in community and culture in relation to multilingualism and multiculturalism. Baker, in particular, has always considered these issues in his research into intercultural communication in ELF contexts, arguing, for example, that "[f]or intercultural communication the competencies of successful multilingual and multicultural communicators are needed" and that "ICA [intercultural awareness] can be seen as a crucial part of this multilingual and multicultural competence" (2011: 211).

range of specialisms starting to argue against notions such as native speaker 'competence' and in favour of "multicompetent users" (Cook 2002), to focus on language as social practice, and to recognise bi/multilingualism as a resource rather than a problem. For example, in her contribution to an AILA colloquium organized by Garton and Kubota, Larsen-Freeman proposed "a shift from SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION to PLURILINGUAL OR MULTILINGUAL DEVELOPMENT (Garton and Kubota 2015: 420; their upper case). And see the contributions in May (2014) and Cenoz and Gorter (2015) for other recent contributions to the discussion.

The newer critical work on multilingualism includes a number of individual strands that nevertheless have much in common. These include translanguaging (e.g. García 2009, García and Li Wei 2014), flexible bilingual pedagogy (e.g. Creese & Blackledge 2010, 2015), translingual practices (e.g. Canagarajah 2011, 2013), polylanguaging/poly-lingual languaging (e.g. Jørgensen 2008, Jørgensen et al. 2011), super-diversity (e.g. Vertovec 2006, 2007), and mobile resources (e.g. Blommaert 2010). Of these, the work on translanguaging has particular resonance with ELF and potential for ELF theorising. The term itself was coined by Cen Williams, a Welsh educationalist, in the 1980s, initially in Welsh ('trawsieithu', meaning 'translinguifying') and later changed to 'translanguaging, (see Williams 2002). Its original purpose was pedagogic, but it has since been extended from the classroom to refer to the use of bilingual language to achieve communicative effectiveness in any context. Or, as García puts it, "translanguagings are *multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds* (2009: 45, her italics). This is rather different from the notion of code-switching as typically described in ELF research, where (if mentioned at all) it is often one item in a list of several characteristics of ELF communication, and presented as being used for a limited number of purposes. Klimpfinger (2009), for example, mentions four: specifying an addressee, signalling culture, appealing for assistance, and introducing another idea (pp. 359-366). This is not to imply that ELF researchers have not engaged with the notion of translanguaging (see, e.g., Cogo 2012 and Kalocsai 2014 for two of those who have done). It is rather that those who refer to it have not developed its full potential in respect of ELF communication. That is, they tend to use it interchangeably with 'code-switching' rather than as a phenomenon that "goes beyond what has been termed code-switching" and "includes it, as well as other kinds of bilingual language use and bilingual contact" (García 2009: 45).

García also talks of the lack of clear-cut boundaries between the languages of bilinguals, and how these form a "language continuum" (op.cit: 47), with the languages mutually influencing one/each other. More recently, García and Li Wei have expanded the notion of translanguaging still further, arguing that "it signals a

trans-semiotic system with many meaning-making signs, primarily linguistic ones, that combine to make up a person's semiotic repertoire. Languages then are not autonomous and closed linguistic and semiotic systems" (2014: 42). Again, while ELF research refers frequently, if often only briefly, to ELF's 'hybridity' and to the 'multilingual repertoires' and 'creativity of ELF users, this larger picture is missing. Instead, the emphasis is generally on how the user's L1 (and other languages) influence their use of English, rather than on the mutual flow in two (or more) directions and "trans-semiotic system" that has been found to characterise translanguaging. On the other hand, unlike much research in applied linguistics, and particularly SLA, ELF is already theorised as a multilingual activity, so is not in need of a full 'multilingual turn'. The point is simply that for ELF users, English is only one language among others present or latent in any interaction. Its multilingual nature therefore needs to be given greater theoretical prominence than hitherto – a '*more* multilingual turn in ELF', perhaps.

The third reason for proposing a retheorisation relates to ELF's (i.e. 'ELF 2') approach to the composition of/kinds of language used by ELF 'communities' framed as 'communities of practice', or CoPs (Wenger 1998). This was undoubtedly a vast improvement on the traditional notion of 'speech community'. As Seidlhofer points out:

> [a]t a time when many of us, and particularly those who are regular users of ELF, tend to spend more time communicating with people via email and Skype than in direct conversations with partners in the same physical space, the old notion of community based purely on frequent local, non-mediated contact among people living in close proximity to each other clearly cannot be upheld any more (2011: 86-87).

Seidlhofer first proposed the alternative of CoP in a plenary talk in 2006, subsequently published as Seidlhofer (2007). As she later points out, "[i]n contrast with local speech communities, such global communities tend to be referred to as *discourse communities* with a common communicative purpose" (2011: 87; her italics). She goes on to propose that for ELF, "a more recent relevant notion is that of *communities of practice*" and lists Wenger's (1998: 72ff.) three basic criteria of "mutual engagement in shared practices, taking part in some jointly negotiated enterprise, and making use of members' shared repertoire" (ibid.; her italics). However, as will be discussed below, groupings of ELF users are not necessarily 'communities' in Wenger's sense, or even according to Eckert's broader definition of a CoP as "an aggregate of people coming together around a particular enterprise" (2000: 35), and do not necessarily engage in 'shared practices'. This means that for

ELF communication the notion of 'shared repertoire' is also in need of further theorization. All these are points at which Seidlhofer (ibid.) hints.

The fourth reason for further reconceptualising ELF is a very basic numbers one. It is nearly fifteen years since Brumfit made his much quoted point that "native [English] speakers are in a minority for [English] language use, and thus in practice for language change, for language maintenance, and for the ideologies and beliefs associated with the language" (2001: 116). Since Brumfit wrote this, the number of NNES English users has continued to increase, particularly in very recent years with the rapid growth in the number of those in China who have learnt English (estimated to be between 390 and 400 million in 2012; see Jenkins 2015: 170). Multilingualism has thus become by very far the norm in ELF communication, and this has greater implications than have yet been considered.

Fifth, and finally, a personal reason. For the past few years, particularly since around the time of the 5th International ELF conference in Istanbul (2012), I have had an uneasy sense that ELF research was becoming too self-contained, too repetitive, and was lacking the cutting edge it had previously had. Henry Widdowson perhaps sensed something similar, as during the panel discussion at the end of the Istanbul conference, he argued that there was currently too much corpus description and not enough theorizing. I disagreed with him about corpora, and still do, as it is difficult to theorise in the absence of further empirical evidence, and risks leading to a kind of self indulgence, or 'navel gazing'. It was, after all, through exploring the empirical evidence provided by the VOICE corpus that Seidlhofer was able to move theorising on from 'ELF 1' to 'ELF 2'. In any case, the two main corpora at the time were Seidlhofer's VOICE and Mauranen's ELFA, each around one million words, which is small by general corpus standards. However, Widdowson's point about the need for more conceptualization matched my own thinking, albeit possibly for different reasons.

The direct catalyst, however, came the following year, in June 2013. My colleague, Ursula Wingate and I had recently conducted some research into English in UK higher education (published as Jenkins and Wingate 2015), and were presenting it at a Research Workshop in Language and Literacy seminar at King's College London. Inevitably the subject of ELF arose during the discussion, and at one point, one of the staff participants, Celia Roberts, responded to something I had said with words to the effect that the problem with ELF researchers was that we were in an "ELF bubble". At the time I ignored Roberts's comment as a typical negative perception of someone who does not like, and possibly does not understand, ELF. But I could not put it out of my mind and finally began to read up on, and talk to other scholars

about, what seemed to be missing in the "ELF bubble": other languages, or, to put it another way, multilingualism.

5. Problematising ELF theorising in respect of multilingualism

We turn now to consider the various ways in which current ELF theory, or 'ELF 2', as I am calling it for the sake of transparency, is lacking in respect of multilingualism as both phenomenon and research paradigm. I should make clear before I go any further, however, that I have been as 'guilty' in the past as any other ELF scholar in all the respects discussed below and do not exclude myself from any of the following criticisms.

The overarching problem is that ELF research up to now has focused on English as the 'superordinate', with the other languages of its users in the role of 'co-hyponyms', typically described in phrases such as 'use of multilingual resources', 'multilingual repertoires' and the like, and presented as one among ELF's various characteristics (and often the last item in the discussion of these characteristics). Multilingualism is described, for example, as "a *backdrop* to much (B)ELF communication" (Pullin 2015: 33; my italics), whereas it is in the *foreground*, the one single factor without which there would be no ELF. Reference is made to "(B)ELF *and* multilingual practices" (e.g. Cogo 2012: 295, Cogo 2015a: 155; my italics). However ELF *is* a multilingual practice, and research should start from this premise and explore how ELF's multilingualism is enacted in different kinds of interactions, rather than set out to "explore to what extent ELF *is* a multilingual practice" (Cogo 2012: 295; my italics). Meanwhile, 'multilingualism' tends to be late or last in lists of key words, or not present at all.

Having said this, researchers into BELF (Business ELF) such as Ehrenreich, Kankaanranta, Pullin, Salminen, and particularly Cogo, are ahead of most of the researchers working on other areas of ELF in their approach to multilingualism. Cogo, for example, refers frequently to multilingualism/plurilingualism and to the presence of translanguaging in her data in ways that go well beyond the passing references of most others. My point is not that these phenomena have been completely ignored, but that the discussion has not so far progressed beyond the descriptive stage to the development of a theory of ELF that places multilingualism at its forefront, its raison d'être.

Any such discussion will also need to involve a more nuanced theorisation of terms such as 'multilingual repertoire' and 'shared resources', which, as noted above, are often mentioned in passing with no further comment. In this respect, more attention

also needs to be paid in particular to the implications of the emergent nature of ELF communication for our understanding of the concept of 'repertoire'. What is 'shared', for example, may not be shared from the start (nor do interlocutors necessarily know from the start what they do in fact 'share'). This means that we are often talking not of a priori 'resources', but of resources that are discovered as they emerge during the interaction. Some ELF researchers, particularly those interested in pragmatic competence, linguistic awareness, and intercultural awareness, do consider ELF's emergent nature and explore why and how negotiation and co-construction take place in ELF interactions (e.g. Baker 2015, Cogo 2012, Dewey 2009, Hülmbauer 2013, Kalocsai 2014, Zhu Hua 2015). On the other hand, simply referring to the fact that ELF speakers 'co-construct' or 'negotiate' meaning, as is more often the case, is not in itself sufficient.

To sum up this point, then, scholars who discuss phenomena such as super-diversity, multi/plurilingualism, and translanguaging in respect of ELF, and provide new data in support of their discussions, also need to incorporate these phenomena – and recent research relating to them – into new conceptual ELF frameworks rather than continuing to 'fit' them into the confines of 'ELF 2' theory. Admittedly, this is precisely what a few scholars have recently started to do in looking more critically at 'ELF 2' and considering alternatives. Key examples include Baker's (2015) work on complexity and Hall's (2013) on cognitively informed "plurilithic Englishes", although as yet they have not fully explored multilingualism and its implications for our understanding of ELF. On the other hand, those scholars who have little, if anything, to say about such phenomena need to give them far greater priority.

Linked to the latter issue is a problem with the notion of ELF 'communities of practice'. As was pointed out earlier, participants in ELF communication are not necessarily either 'communities' or engaging in something that could be described as 'shared practice'. Rather, they may be involved in transient encounters in which, as just noted, their 'shared' repertoire is particularly emergent rather than shared a priori. This means that it is unrealistic for researchers to focus exclusively on stable groupings of ELF users as the norm, albeit that these may be "shorter- or longer-living groups" in which participants in the former "work towards practicable levels of mutual comprehensibility and shape language practices" whereas those in the latter "regulate their language towards group norms" (Mauranen 2012: 20). And even on those occasions when an encounter does involve a ("shorter- or longer-living") 'community' as such, rather than a miscellaneous group of people brought together by chance, ELF's multilingual complexity and heterogeneity is still a complicating factor, a point made by Dewey (2009). For while to an extent condoning the notion of CoPs, he goes on to observe:

> [i]n lingua franca settings … Wenger's (1998) notion needs to be somewhat reappraised in order to better fit the fluidity of ELF settings. As the multiple influences of globalization, interconnection and contact become evermore important to our understanding of the world … and with distances continually being compressed through communications technology, traditional boundaries become more fluid, and are more often transgressed. In this light, Wenger's notion is arguably a more conservative one than is required here, especially given the protean nature of ELF communities. To better reflect this characteristic, we can envisage a still more fluid concept of community of practice, where the practice itself is modified as it is enacted (2009: 77).

Dewey concludes somewhat reticently that Wenger's term needs "only slightly modifying" (ibid.) in order to be appropriate for ELF. Ehrenreich (2009) is less reticent. She cautions against applying the notion of CoP in a superficial way, such as to an entire profession, let alone to ELF users in general. She goes on to argue that the notion of CoP is "probably not applicable" to "one-off constellations or ad hoc groupings of ELF speakers", and that "for these groups, alternative conceptual frameworks may have to be developed" (p. 134).

Other key problems with the current notion of ELF CoPs are the need to account for non-cooperative behavior that goes beyond Wenger's 'non-participation' (see, e.g., Jenks 2012), and even more importantly, the need to theorise issues of unequal power relations in ELF interactions. In addition, as Baker (2015) observes, scholars rarely address the issue of how ELF CoPs relate to other communities, societies, and cultures. Instead, they tend to treat the CoPs they discuss as if they were isolated groupings rather than part of, and influenced by, other groupings (2015: 94). Few researchers have addressed this issue empirically, notable exceptions including Ehrenreich (2009), Kalocsai (2014), and Vettorel (2013), while Mauranen makes the point that "[l]inguistic complexity in ELF communities and groupings is enhanced by the wider environments where ELF is spoken, which are *usually multilingual*" (2012: 29; my italics). Taking all this into account, it seems to me, that it may be time to explore the possibility of developing what Ehrenreich calls "alternative frameworks" for ELF.

This is not to suggest that the CoP framework needs necessarily to be abandoned altogether. There are undoubtedly occasions when ELF groupings are genuine 'communities' that are genuinely engaging in 'practice' in Wenger's sense. Good examples of this are Kalocsai's (2014) Erasmus communities in Szeged and Prague, and Smit's (2010) tourism students in Vienna. Many BELF studies also fit comfortably

into this category, such as Cogo (2012) and – despite her misgivings – Ehrenreich (2009). For as Cogo argues, BELF research is not primarily interested in transient CoPs "where people from diverse groups meet fleetingly" (2015a: 153). Nevertheless, the CoP framework, as currently theorized, does not account well for the kinds of transient and ad hoc encounters that are arguably equally (or more?) common in ELF communication.

A further problem with the current theorizing of ELF is that none of the existing ('ELF 2') definitions allow for situations in which English is not used but is potentially available to all in the interaction, or for situations in which participants choose to speak primarily in another of their mutual languages, but 'slip into' English from time to time. If ELF was theorized within a framework of multilingualism rather than vice versa, the theory would be better able to account for these kinds of communications in terms both of what is said, when and why, and of the possible influence of 'knowing' (but not necessarily using) English on the speakers and their interactions.

Another problem in foregrounding the essential multilingualism of ELF relates to the concept of the 'virtual language'. This contradicts the understanding of ELF communication as emergent, according to which "grammar is not made up of abstract principles but is the result of shared and repeated social interactions in which grammar emerges as a by-product of specific utterances" (Hopper 1998: 171). Similarly, complexity theory, as Larsen-Freeman and Cameron explain, "deals with the study of complex, dynamic, non-linear, self-organizing, emergent, sometimes chaotic, and adaptive systems" (2008: 4). According to complexity theory, then, what emerges from any interaction is not fully predictable from its antecedents, but distinctive. Creativity in language use therefore depends not on speakers applying a set of fixed rules, virtual or otherwise, but emerges in an interaction. It is this which means, in turn, as Larsen-Freeman (in preparation) observes, that the use of ELF can be seen in its own right rather than by comparison with native English (regardless of whether it is considered acceptable, i.e. from an ELF perspective, or deficient, i.e. from a traditional EFL/SLA one), and that there is no principled reason for distinguishing between an innovation and an error: in other words, there are no abstract underlying principles to which ELF innovations conform.

Taking the opposite view, Seidlhofer (2011) argues in line with Widdowson (e.g. 1997), that instances of ELF are "recognizably English" because they are realisations of a potential that Widdowson refers to as the *virtual language*" (p. 105; her italics). Hülmbauer (2013) concurs, arguing that ELF speakers make use of "virtual resources, i.e. latent possibilities within English below the surface of the encoded". However, she goes on to say that these virtual resources "interact with elements

from without English, namely plurilingual resources from the speakers' first or other language backgrounds" (p. 47). More specifically, "[i]n ELF communication … the virtuality within the English language is in constant interaction with the multilingual environment in which it takes place and exponentially extended through the resources available from its speakers' plurilingual repertoires" (p. 53). This strikes me, to use a British idiom, as trying to 'have your cake and eat it', or in the Singaporean version, to 'eat your cake and have it'. But the two positions, the 'from within' and 'from without' ELF, are incompatible, as Vetchinnikova (in press) observes:

> How does English stay recognisably English? In accordance with the perspective maintaining a classical position, it is the virtual language, or the existence of a shared code all speakers of the language draw on, which provides the common ground for all ELF and ENL realisations of the encoding possibilities and so ensures the coherence of language as a whole for English to remain English (see Seidlhofer 2011: 110–112). In complex adaptive system modelling, no such common ground or design is needed since coherence in the face of change is a natural property of all complex systems.

Vetchinnikova leaves us in little doubt that it is the second alternative that she supports. The same is true of Baird, Baker and Kitazawa (2014) and Baker (2015), who argue forcefully in favour of complex adaptive systems and a view of ELF as emergent, and of Hall's (e.g. 2013) work on cognitive approaches to ELF and his cognitively informed plurilithic view of English/ELF. Meanwhile, Mauranen's notions of 'similects' and 'second order contact', which are discussed in the following section, seem to have more explanatory potential for both the essential multilingualism of and the '(recognizably) English' in ELF, as well as aligning with a view of ELF as a complex adaptive system and ELF use, thus, as emergent. The broadly emergentist position on ELF adopted by these latter scholars, in line with usage-based theories more broadly (e.g. Bybee 2006, Tomasello 2008), is the only possible choice if multilingualism rather than English is to be understood as the overarching framework within which ELF communication takes place, the need for which is the central argument of this article.

6. Previous (re)theorisations from a multilingualism perspective:

Having established what I believe to be problematic in the current theorization of ELF, I turn now to other (re)theorisations that take a multilingual approach to language in general and lingua franca communication more specifically. This is in

part to demonstrate the key influences on my thinking about ELF from outside ELF research, and in part to make clear that I am not claiming these theorisations as my own. For the sake of clarity, I have divided them into those whose focus is on multilingualism with no particular reference to English, and those whose focus is on English specifically.

The following five theorisations focus on multilingualism:

- A multilingua franca, also multilingual francas (Makoni & Pennycook 2012)
- Multilingualism as a lingua franca (Makoni & Pennycook 2012)
- Plurilingualism (Canagarajah 2011)
- Metrolingualism (Pennycook 2010)
- Mobile resources (Blommaert 2010)

Space does not allow me to comment on all of these theorisations. I therefore limit what follows to the two that have particular resonance for the position I am developing vis-à-vis ELF, although this should not be taken to mean that the other three do not also resonate with it. Firstly, Makoni and Pennycook's (2012) notion of a multilingual franca. An understanding of multilingualism as a lingua franca, they observe, "is in sharp contrast to concepts such as plural/multiple monolingualism", according to which "languages are distinct, and autonomous". By contrast,

> in lingua franca multilingualism languages are so deeply intertwined and fused into each other that the level of fluidity renders it difficult to determine any boundaries that may indicate that there are different languages involved (p. 447).

Hence, they argue, plural multilingualism is consistent with a model that renders it possible to choose between languages: multilingualism as a lingua franca, by contrast, militates against this trend and conjures a very different notion of "language" … "the idea of a multilingua franca … posits mixed language as the singular norm" (pp. 447, 449). While the extent to which it is possible to identify "any boundaries" between different languages is open to empirical research and further debate, the focus of 'lingua franca multilingualism' on mixed language as normative can usefully inform thinking about ELF from a multilingual perspective.

Whereas some scholars prefer the term 'multilingualism', others use 'plurilingualism', often to refer to the same phenomenon. Canagarajah, in this second example, opts for the latter, highlighting what he considers to be the "central features of

plurilingualism emerging from the accounts of the few scholars working on it recently", himself included:

1. Proficiency in languages is not conceptualized individually with separate competencies developed for each language. What is emphasized is the repertoire – the way different languages constitute an integrated competence.
2. Equal or advanced proficiency is not expected in all the languages.
3. Using different languages for distinct purposes qualifies as competence…
4. Language competence is not treated in isolation but as a form of social practice and intercultural competence.
5. There is recognition that speakers develop plurilingual competence by themselves … more than through schools or formal means.

(2011: 6).

Again, what is relevant in the context of the present discussion is the notion of "integrated competence" and that of linguistic competence as "social practice". On the other hand, the orientation to different languages and to levels of proficiency in the languages within a repertoire is at odds with Makoni and Pennycook's (2012) view of unbounded, mixed language described above. This presumably reflects the different approaches in Canagarajah's sources rather than his own position. For example, the Council of Europe takes a rather more conventional view of proficiency than is typical of Canagarajah's (and all other critical pluri/multilingualism scholars') perspective.

Moving on, the following four theorisations focus on English specifically:

• Plurilingual English (Canagarajah 2011)
• Codemeshing (Canagarajah 2013)
• Translingua franca English (Pennycook 2010)
• Englishing (Hall 2014, in respect of the testing of English)

Having used the term 'plurilingualism' in his theorisation of multilingualism, Canagarajah not surprisingly goes on to adapt the term in his theorizing English (in the same publication) as 'plurilingual English'. His argument is as follows:

> Speakers of language A and language B may speak to each other in a form of English mixed with their own first languages and marked by influence of these languages. Without accommodating to a single uniform code the speakers will be able to negotiate their different Englishes for intelligibility and effective communication (2011: 7).

According to this position, "plurilingual English is not an identifiable code or a systematized variety of English. It is a highly fluid and variable form of language practice" (ibid.). Canagarajah's theorization of plurilingual has much in common with Mauranen's (2012) notions of 'similects' and 'second order contact' in relation to ELF use, to which I briefly referred earlier (both also bear some similarity to Wang's 2012 notion of 'ChELF' or 'Chinese ELF').

Mauranen's point in this respect is that ELF users' first languages almost always provide some degree of influence on their use of English. However, her argument goes, they do not generally develop their English in conversation with their L1 peers, but with speakers from other L1s, most of whom are also multilingual, in both ad hoc and longer term groups. All this, Mauranen argues, "makes the communities linguistically heterogeneous, and ELF a site of an unusually complex contact" (p.29). She continues:

> Therefore, ELF might be termed 'second-order language contact': a contact between hybrids. … Second-order contact means that instead of a typical contact situation, where speakers of two different languages use one of them in communication ('first-order contact'), a large number of languages are in contact with English, and it is these contact varieties (similects) that are, in turn, in contact with each other… To add to the mix, ENL (English as a native language] speakers of different origins participate in ELF communities. The distinctive feature of ELF is nevertheless its character as a hybrid of similects (pp.29-30).

Having said that, there are two aspects of the conceptualisation that need considering. The first relates to the idea that second-order contact does not include contact with speakers from the L1 peer group. This ignores the fact that many (most?) learners of English spend several years learning the language in classes mainly, or even exclusively, composed of learners from the same L1. It also ignores a more recent development relating to EMI (English Medium Instruction) classrooms around the world. In several countries of East Asia, such as China, Japan, and Thailand, for example, students of content subjects (i.e. not learners of English language) from the local L1 are taught together in English (see, e.g. Hu 2015 in respect of China). In both cases, and no doubt there are others, there will inevitably be an influence on the users' similects if/when they communicate in ELF settings. The second aspect concerns the fact that the notion of similects seems to refer only to an ELF user's L1. However, other languages that a user knows are likely to influence their ELF use in ways that, for now, will have to remain an empirical question. Nevertheless, both of these problems are relatively minor and capable of being incorporated into an extended version of the theory. Meanwhile, the notion of

second-order contact among "a hybrid of similects" fits well with the notion of ELF as a complex adaptive system and ELF communication as emergent, as well as with usage-based theories more broadly.

The next English-focused theorisation is also Canagarajah's: his notion of Codemeshing. This relates specifically to written English. Canagarajah describes the advantages of a codemeshing approach thus:

> It offers a possibility of bringing the different codes within the same text rather than keeping them apart …. I don't want my use of Sri Lankan English to make my text a different genre of communication for a different audience. By inserting the oppositional codes gradually into the existing conventions, I deal with the same audience and genre of communication but in my own terms (2013: 112-13).

Again, the notion of the meshing together of different languages into a hybrid text resonates with a more multilingual approach to ELF, albeit that the use of the term 'codes' could be seen as problematic in that it seems to refer to precisely the phenomenon from which Canagarajah wishes to free his students. The difficulty seems to be that none of us, inside or outside ELF, are able to completely escape what Morán Panero (2015) calls 'the terminological trap'. At least for now, we all need to refer to 'languages' in some way or other, even Makoni and Pennycook (e.g. 2012) in the very act of saying they do not exist!

Finally, we turn to Pennycook's notion of Translingua Franca English (TFE). He describes TFE as "taken to include *all* uses of English" rather than being "limited here to expanding circle use or so-called NN-NN interactions" (from which I assume he mistakenly understands ELF to exclude English users from the outer and inner circles). More importantly, TFE is:

> a term to acknowledge the interconnectedness of all English use. In this field, English users all over the world draw on various resources in English … We then need to think not so much in terms of using a language in context … but rather as a local practice. Language speakers come with language histories, and means of interpretation – the ideolinguistic dimension where English is one of many languages, a code for certain activities, a language connected to certain desires and ideologies (2010:685; his italics).

Once again, we see the problem of the 'terminological trap' in the reference to English as "one of many languages" and "a code". The position taken here is also

surprisingly incompatible with that which Pennycook takes in Makoni and Pennycook (2012), in which they argue that it is not possible to identify boundaries between languages. Nevertheless, the notions of "the interconnectedness of all English use" on the one hand, and "local practice" on the other, as well as "the ideological dimension" have much to contribute to a view of ELF approached from a more multilingual perspective than hitherto.

Canagarajah (2007) argues that ELF speakers' competence "derives from their multilingual life" (p. 925), a view that is entirely in accord with the one presented here. And if this view of ELF is right (to the extent that anything even partly in the realm of opinion can ever be considered 'right' or 'wrong'), then it becomes all the more important for ELF research to take it on board. This will mean bringing the kinds of issues discussed in this section and elsewhere in the article to centre stage, rather than continuing for the most part to treat multilingualism as secondary.

7. Problematising multilingualism theorizing in respect of ELF

Earlier, I explored problems with ELF theorising in respect of work in critical multilingualism. In order to present a balanced picture, I will now do the opposite and briefly consider problems with critical multilingualism theorizing in terms of work in ELF.

Above all, there is a tendency to completely ignore the current primary lingua franca role of English. This is not to say that English needs to be the focus of discussions of multilingualism, or even that it is relevant to *all* discussions. There are clearly contexts in which English has no role whatsoever. But the fact is that globally it is the most common language in multilingual repertoires, and as such, cannot be completely ignored in more general discussions of multilingualism such as many of those considered in this article. As a case in point, I recently attended a workshop on multilingualism[8]. In the introduction to the workshop, the point was made emphatically that English was not the focus of the workshop. In the event, however, English was unavoidable, and came up in the discussion every few minutes, albeit mainly in negative ways (seen as causing language and domain loss, Anglophone monolingualism, the closing of UK university language departments, and the like).

---

[8] 'Language learning in contexts of cultural diversity', a BAAL-Routledge Applied Linguistics Workshop, organized by Simon Coffey at King's College London, 31 October 2014.

On the other hand, some multilingualism scholars do assign a role for English, but do so in contradictory ways, on the one hand, describing English in terms of 'varieties', 'codes', 'different Englishes', and the like, but on the other hand, framing English as 'social practice', fluid, hybrid, mixed, and so on (sometimes presenting these opposing positions within the same text). In addition, even those multilingualism scholars who mention English without contradiction generally avoid reference to ELF research. For example, in the 'Index' to García and Li Wei's (2014) book on translanguaging, somewhat surprisingly, 'English' has by far the highest number of entries, whereas ELF has no entries at all. Meanwhile, the few who do refer to ELF tend to misunderstand and misrepresent it (e.g. the often repeated fictions that ELF 'excludes NESs', or that it is a 'variety').

8. And so to 'ELF 3'

We come now to my suggestion for an alternative theoretical framework. Before I present it, here is a reminder of the three frequently used current definitions of ELF, in chronological order as before:

- English as it is used as a contact language among speakers from different first languages (Jenkins 2009)
- Any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option (Seidlhofer 2011)
- The use of English in a lingua franca scenario (Mortensen 2013)

The point to note is that the first two of the above definitions focus exclusively on English, while the third also focuses on it, but in a more ambiguous manner.

Having built up to this point over the previous pages and dropped some very large hints en route, it will come as no surprise that the alternative I am going to suggest is a view of ELF that positions it within multilingualism, rather than the current view which sees multilingualism as an aspect of ELF. In other words, what I am talking about could be called 'English as a Multilingua Franca,' with the following working definition:

- Multilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice, but is not necessarily chosen.

In other words, English as a Multilingua Franca[9] refers to multilingual communicative settings in which English is known to everyone present, and is therefore *always potentially 'in the mix'*, regardless of whether or not, and how much, it is actually used. It follows from this that instead of talking about ELF users, or more specifically NNES/NES ELF users, we can talk about 'ELF-using multilinguals' and 'ELF-using monolinguals', or 'Multilingual ELF users' and 'Monolingual ELF users'. The first has the advantage of using ELF as the modifier, while the second has the advantage of highlighting multi- and monolingualism by putting them first.

I should point out immediately that I am not suggesting a name change for ELF. The paradigm is now well established, and it would simply confuse the issue to change 'Lingua' to 'Multilingua'. In addition, as Suresh Canagarajah has playfully pointed out, it would mean we "have a lot of work to do" changing the name of our conference series, journal, book series and so on. This is not feasible. In addition, once the name became known, it would be likely to be appropriated by others to mean different things, and confuse the issue still further. On the other hand, if for now, ELF researchers discuss the notion of English as a Multilingua Franca in their writings and talks, it will ensure that the subject is noticed and considered, and that if accepted, it ultimately becomes embedded in ELF theory.

Before I describe my conceptualization of English as a Multilingua Franca in detail, one further point. There has been much discussion of the use of the terms 'multilingualism' and 'plurilingualism', both inside and outside ELF research. After lengthy email discussions with two colleagues at King's College London, Simon Coffey and Constant Leung, I opted for the term multilingualism. These are the key points raised against use of the term 'plurilingualism':

> I would be cautious about using the term plurilingual as it heavily connotes the Council of Europe and their guidelines (including the CEFR and their portfolio). I think multilingualism is safer as it is applied more generally and has a greater reach … I like the term repertoire (as you know, widely used now by Blommaert and others) , but I think it needs more theorising, at least from a point of view of how "language"/"a language" and speaker-subject intersect dialectically. In Council of Europe education documents (like the

---

[9] I am not the first to use this term in a publication, although when I 'invented' it in 2014, I was unaware of its use by Janssens and Steyaert (2014), two scholars working in the field of international business studies. However, by 'English as a *multilingual franca*' (p.636; their italics), they mean something rather different from the notion of English as a Multilingua Franca that I am discussing in this article.

portfolio) I have a feeling it has simply come to mean an inventory of bits of language that someone knows (Simon Coffey, personal communication).

All I would add is that plurilingualism and individual language repertoire go well together within the Council of Europe discourse because they still hold on to pluri for individuals, and multi/bi for communities/societies. I personally don't see any principled reason for any of their preferences (Constant Leung, personal communication).

The following, then, are the key aspects of English as a Multilingua Franca as I envisage it:

Firstly, as has already been noted, multilingualism rather than English, is the 'superordinate'. ELF is conceived as within a framework of multilingualism (versus multilingualism within a framework of ELF). So to an extent, it is a question of emphasis, evolution, not revolution: reducing the size of 'English' in ELF and focusing more on the multilingualism of most ELF users. But unlike other orientations to multilingualism, for English as a Multilingua Franca, English is not seen as optional but is always potentially 'in the mix'. It is also different from other orientations to ELF, as although it is always potentially available to everyone in the interaction, it is not necessarily used. The reasons for its use, non-use, and partial use, however, remain for now an empirical question.

Secondly, the other languages of everyone present (their L1s as well as all other languages they know) are also present in the interaction. This applies even if any or all the languages other than English are not used, as there will be at least some influence from speakers' first, and possibly their other languages into their English. A more appropriate way of talking about this than conventional 'L1 transfer,' at least for ELF, then, is 'language leakage'[10]. This is similar to Mauranen's notion of similects discussed above, but goes beyond it by including speakers' languages other than their L1s. In other words, 'language leakage' covers the potential mutual influence during second-order language contact (see above) of all languages present, and not only on the participants' English but also on all their other languages. Thus, language leakage is a broader, more multilingual take on second-order language contact in that it extends the potential sources, and therefore the potential range

---

[10] The word 'leakage' has negative associations, especially for anyone who has had a leaking roof and flooded house, myself included. I have tried hard to think of an alternative but so far been unable to find one. Will Baker (personal communication) has suggested 'flow', which maintains the liquid metaphor and has a history (Appadurai 1996, Risager 2006, Pennycook 2007). However, what I am thinking of is not as strong as a 'flow'. Suggestions for a term that means something between a 'leak' and a 'flow' will be very welcome!

and degree, of hybridity in any single and – through the influence of the latter – any subsequent ELF interaction.

L1 English is of course also 'in the mix' if NESs are present in the interaction, regardless of whether the NESs involved are mono- or multilingual. Having said that, whether, and how they affect the English of the others present, and whether there is any difference depending on their mono- or multilingual status, are again empirical questions. It was assumed in early ELF research that the presence of NESs would cause the NNESs in the interaction to become more normative in their English use. However, only a limited amount of data was produced in support of this assumption (e.g. Dewey 2007), and more empirical evidence is needed to support or disprove it, especially now that the number of NNES ELF users has become so vast and the percentage of NES ELF users is thus diminishing.

Thirdly, English as a Multilingua Franca involves a rethink of the terms/notions of 'multilingual repertoires', 'shared repertoires', and 'multilingual resources'. My suggestion is to replace these with the term/notion of 'repertoires in flux', which better accounts for the emergent nature of ELF use, with its 'online' discovery of what is shared, and its co-construction including what is not shared from the start. The notion can also include monolingual NESs. Their repertoires in flux may not initially include particular items from other languages, but may be influenced during the course of an interaction by the language of their multilingual interlocutors, whether in a temporary or longer-term sense. The term repertoires in flux also emphasises more clearly that what ELF users already have in their linguistic repertoires and shared multilingual resources is only one part of their 'mobile resources', to use Blommaert's (2010) term, and that these may be added to or changed either temporarily or permanently during the course of the interaction.

Finally, as discussed above, the notion of English as a Multilingua Franca involves the need to find an alternative to CoPs that is able to characterise transient, ad hoc, and even fleeting ELF groupings. One possibility is to use Pratt's (1991) notion of 'contact zones' to account for such encounters "between speakers of different origins, experiences and characteristics" (García and Li Wei 2014: 9).The focus on 'contact' rather than 'practice' seems better suited to communication that is co-constructed 'online' (metaphorically or actually) among speakers from diverse multilingual backgrounds, who are engaging in one-off or infrequent encounters rather than in more enduring group meetings with (to an extent) pre-existing shared repertoires, though the notion could also be theorized so as to include the latter.

The notion of 'contact zones' is in any case in need of "fleshing out", as Pratt herself did not develop it (Canagarajah 2013: 66). As she originally devised it, the notion referred to "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today" (p. 34). Her focus on "colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths" does not accord with the kind of situations that much of ELF research explores, although these phenomena are not by any means ignored (see e.g. Guido 2008). By contrast, while this has not often been noted, asymmetrical power relations are a factor in many ELF encounters, including those between international students and home staff/students in Anglophone (and some EMI) universities (see Cogo 2015b). The notion of contact zones, with further theorizing, would enable us to move the ELF research focus away, where relevant, from the more homogeneous notions of community, shared practices, and mutual engagement towards greater heterogeneity and 'ad hoc-ness' in metaphorical zones or 'spaces'. And by not developing the concept herself, Pratt has left the door open to future researchers such as those working in ELF to do so.

9. Implications of reconceptualising ELF as English as a Multilingua Franca

Turning from conceptualization to implication, I conclude with a discussion of some potential implications of reframing 'ELF 2' as 'ELF 3', or English as a Multilingua Franca. But before I do so, I will briefly recapitulate the three phases of ELF research covered in this article.

The first phase, 'ELF 1', focused on forms, and envisaged the possibility of identifying and maybe codifying ELF varieties. In the second phase, 'ELF 2', the focus shifted to ELF's variability, acknowledging this, in light of new empirical data, as one of ELF's defining features. The quest for ELF varieties was abandoned in light of Seidlhofer's recognition that ELF use transcends boundaries and therefore that the notion of varieties was a contradiction in terms. Mauranen then proposed similects as an alternative. In 'ELF 3', the focus moves again, this time away from ELF as *the* framework to ELF *within* a framework of multilingualism. English, while always in the (potential) mix, is now conceived as one among many other languages, one resource among many, available but not necessarily used, with ELF defined not merely by its variability but by its complexity and emergent nature.

The reconceptualization of ELF as 'ELF 3', while evolutionary rather than a major break with past theorizing, nevertheless has some important implications. One of these is that the crucial distinction for competence (understood as intercultural communicative competence/awareness, rather than in the conventional linguistic sense) is no longer between NNES and NES, but between multilingual and monolingual. It is thus ELF-using monolingual use that is 'marked' and ELF-using multilingual use that is 'unmarked'. This means, in turn, that in ELF communication, monolingual speakers are disadvantaged relative to multilingual speakers, and need to learn other languages so as to be able to participate fully in ELF. Although this is not a major issue for ELF research given that NESs have always been included but not seen as privileged in ELF communication, it is a major departure from the monolingual bias of most (non-critical) SLA, ELT and even Applied Linguistics. It therefore demonstrates a major difference from the latter as well as what ELF has in common with multilingualism research and other critical approaches to language more broadly.

Having said that, defining what it is to be 'multilingual' is no simple matter. Nguyen (2012) for example, prefers the term 'multilanguaging', which, she argues, "helps elucidate the dynamic mechanisms of language use and reduce any possible association of multilingualism with an accomplished and perfectionist state" (p. 68). This fits in well with some of the work on multilingualism and plurilingualism discussed above. In terms of ELF, it also allows for the possibility of NESs with little (if any) ability in other languages to have a multilingual 'mentality' and to engage at some level in multilanguaging. It is, nevertheless, an empirical question as to the extent to which a monolingual ELF user can make use of multilingual practices, as well as what kinds of qualitative differences may arise in ELF communication according to whether a speaker is a monolingual or multilingual ELF user. Nevertheless, the notion of 'multilanguaging' seems to be a promising one for English conceived as a multilingual franca, and would benefit from both further theorising and empirical research.

I turn now to more practical implications. One of these concerns higher education, a setting par excellence for ELF ('ELF 3') communication. Many universities around the world claim these days to be 'international', but as was recently observed by Juan Manuel Mora of the University of Navarra, "adding the word 'international' before every noun while still teaching in only one language does not of itself mean that a university is truly open to the world" (*Times Higher Education* 21 May 2015, p. 20). The point is that to be truly international, a university needs not only to adopt a more international approach to the English language itself (i.e. an ELF perspective), but also to be multilingual. This would involve teaching in a range of languages

78

rather than in English-only. Students could then select a university on the basis of the constellation of languages it used in its content teaching. At present, however, the idea of an international university remains inseparable from that of (standard native) English. And the situation is worse still in Anglophone universities, where, for all the rhetoric of diversity, the prevailing ethos remains the outdated one of acculturation, the diametric opposite of a multilingual approach.

Another implication of English as a Multilingua Franca concerns language assessment. Hall (2014) talks of the need for an approach that he calls 'Englishing'. By this, he means measuring what students can do with English rather than how closely they can mimic native English. But for 'ELF 3', we need to go beyond this in ways that relate to multilingualism in general and translanguaging more specifically. As May (2014) argues, there is a need to "harness [multilingual] repertoires more effectively in both our pedagogical and assessment practices" (p. 216). From the perspective of English as a Multilingua Franca, English language assessment needs to focus more on the ability to negotiate diversity in contact encounters in terms of both English (in its lingua franca guise) and multilingualism. Logically, this means that co-construction and negotiation (regardless of any resulting difference from native English norms) should be prioritized and rewarded, that translanguaging ('multilingualism-with-English') should be regarded as normal language behaviour, and that the use of 'repertoires in flux' and 'language leakage' into candidates' English should not be penalised. And, of course, logically, this would all be incorporated into English language teaching.

However, evidence of how far we are from any such approach to language assessment (or teaching) is provided on the other side of the page in *Times Higher Education* from Mora's article on international universities (see above). Here, in an advertisement for IELTS, we are told not only that "IELTS is offered at over 900 locations around the world, and that IELTS scores are accepted by over 9,000 organisations globally – including over 3,000 institutions in the US", but also: "Test questions are developed by specialists in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the UK and the US, making it *a truly international test*" (my italics). If evidence was needed of how very far away we are from anything remotely approaching a multilingual orientation to English, we have it here. Plus ça change….

References

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

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

Baker, Will. 2011. Intercultural awareness: modelling an understanding of cultures in intercultural communication through English as a lingua franca. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 11/3: 197-214.

Baker, Will. 2015. *Culture and Identity through English as a Lingua Franca.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Beebe, Leslie & Howard Giles 1984. Speech-accommodation theories: a discussion in terms of second-language acquisition. In H. Giles (ed.) *International Journal of the Sociology of Language. The Dynamics of Speech Accommodation*. Amsterdam: Mouton.

Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit, Christopher. 2001. *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bybee, Joan. 2006. From usage to grammar: the mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82/2: 711-733.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2007. Lingua franca English, multilingual communities and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal* 91: 923-939.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011. The plurilingual tradition and the English language in South Asia. *AILA Review* vol. 22, *Multilingual Globalizing Asia,* ed. Lim & Low.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practice*. London: Routledge.

Cenoz, Jasone & Durk Gorter. (eds.) 2015. Multilingual Education. Between Language Learning and Translanguaging. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cogo, Alessia. 2007. *Intercultural communication in English as a Lingua Franca: a case study*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, King's College London.

Cogo, Alessia. 2012. ELF and super-diversity: a case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2/2: 287-313.

Cogo, Alessia. 2015a. Complexity, negotiability, and ideologies: a response to Zhu, Pitzl, and Kankaanranta et al. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 4/1: 149-155.

Cogo, Alessia. 2015b in press. English as a lingua franca: descriptions, domains and applications. In H. Bowles & A. Cogo (eds.) *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Coleman, Jim. 2006. English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching* 39: 1-14.

Cook, Vivian. 2002. *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevendon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, Vivian. 2013. ELF: central or atypical second language acquisition? In D. Singleton, David & Joshua. Fishman (eds.) 2013. *Current Multilingualism. A New Linguistic Dispensation*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Creese, Angela & A. Blackledge 2010. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal* 94/1: 103-115.

Creese, Angela & Adrian Blackledge 2015. Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 35: 20-35.

Cummins, Jim. 2005. A proposal for action: strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 89: 585-592.

Dewey, Martin. 2007. *English as a lingua franca: an empirical study of innovation in lexis and grammar.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, King's College London.

Dewey, Martin. 2009. 'English as a lingua franca: heightened variability and theoretical implications'. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (eds.) 2009.

Eckert, Penelope. 2000. *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ehrenreich, Susanne. 2009. English as a lingua franca in multinational corporations – exploring business communities of practice. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (eds.) 2009.

Gal, Susan. 2013. A linguistic anthropologist looks at English as a lingua franca. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2/1: 177-83.

García, Ofelia. 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, Ofelia & Li Wei 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garton, Sue & Ryoko Kubota 2015. Joint colloquium on plurilingualism and language education: opportunities and challenges (AAA/TESOL). *Language Teaching* 48/3: 417-421.

Guido, Maria Grazia. 2008. *ELF in Crosscultural Immigration Domains*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Hall, Christopher. 2013. Cognitive contributions to plurilithic view of English and other languages. *Applied Linguistics* 34/2: 211-231.

Hall, Christopher. 2014. Moving beyond accuracy: from tests of English to tests of 'Englishing'. *ELT Journal* 68/4: 376-385.

Heller, Monica. 1999. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.

Hopper, Paul. 1998. Emergent grammar. In M. Tomasello (ed.) *The New Psychology of Language.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hu, Lanxi. 2015. *Exploring Influences on and Orientations towards English as a Medium of Instruction in Chinese Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southampton.

Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2013. From within and without: the virtual and the plurilingual in ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2/1: 47-73.

Janssens, Maddy & Chris Steyaert 2014. Re-considering language within a cosmopolitan understanding: Toward a multilingua franca approach in international business studies. *Journal of International Business Studies* 45: 623-639.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 1996. Native speaker, non-native speaker, and English as a Foreign Language: time for a change. *IATEFL Newsletter* 131: 10-11.

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

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2006. Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly* 40/1: 157-181.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2009. *World Englishes* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2015. *Global Englishes* 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, Jennifer & Ursula Wingate 2015. Staff and student perceptions of English language policies and practices in 'international' universities: a UK case study. *Higher Education Review* 47/2: 47-73.

Jenks, Christopher. 2012. Doing being reprehensive: some interactional features of English as a lingua franca in a chat room. *Applied Linguistics* 33/4: 386-405.

Jørgensen, Normann. 2008. Poly-lingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5/3: 161-176.

Jørgensen, Normann, Martha Karrebæk, Lian Madsen & Janus Møller 2011. Polylanguaging in Superdiversity. *Diversities* 13/2: 23-37.

Kachru, Braj. 1982/1992. *The Other Tongue. English across Cultures*. Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Kalocsai, Karolina. 2014. *Communities of Practice and English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kirkpatrick, Andy. 2007. Review of Jenkins, *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*, Oxford University Press, 2007. *Asian Englishes*, September 2007.

Klimpfinger, Theresa. 2009. 'She's mixing the two languages together' – forms and functions of code-switching in English as a lingua franca. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta eds. 2009.

Knapp, Karlfried. 1987/2015. English as an international *lingua franca* and the teaching of intercultural communication. Reprinted in *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 4/1: 173-189.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. in preparation. Complexity and ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, in preparation.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane & Lynne Cameron. 2008. *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Makoni, Sinfree & Alastair Pennycook. 2012. Disinventing multilingualism: from monological multilingualism to multilingua francas. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London: Routledge.

Mauranen, Anna. 2003. The corpus of English as a lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly* 22/4: 513-527.

Mauranen, Anna. 2012. *Exploring ELF. Academic English shaped by non- native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, Anna. & Elina Ranta (eds.) 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca. Studies and Findings.* Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

May, Stephen. (ed.) 2014. *The Multilingual Turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education.* New York and London: Routledge.

Menken, Kate. 2015. Joint colloquium on plurilingualism and language education: Opportunities and challenges (AAAL/TESOL). *Language Teaching* 48/3: 417-25.

Morán Panero, Sonia. 2015. Discussant paper at the BAAL/CUP seminar, (De)Constructing Englishes, York St. John, 24-26 June 2015.

Mortensen, Janus. 2013. Notes on English as a subject of study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2/1: 25-46.

Nguyen, Hoa. 2012. The multilanguaging of a Vietnamese American in South Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania, *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 27/1: 65-85, www.gse.upenn.edu/wpel

Ortega, Lourdes. 2014. Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In May (ed.) 2014.

Park, Joseph Sung-Tul & Lionel Wee 2014. English as a Lingua Franca: lessons for language and mobility. *Multilingual Margins* 1/1: 53-73.

Pattanayak, Debiprasanna. 1984. Language policies in multilingual states. In A. Gonzalo (ed.) *Panagani. Language Planning, Implementation and Evaluation*. Manilla: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2007. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2010. The future of Englishes: one, many or none? In A. Kirkpatrick (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. Arts of the contact zone. *Profession* 91: 33-40.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 2002. Building a new idea about language. Presentation at ADFL

Summer Seminar West, California State University, Long Beach, 20–22 June 2002. Available at http://silverdialogues.fas.nyu.edu/docs/IO/24450/pratt.pdf

Pullin, Patricia. 2015. Culture, curriculum design, syllabus and course development in the light of BELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 4/1: 31-53.

Risager Karen. 2006. *Language and Culture: Global Flows and Local Complexity*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11/2: 133-158.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2004. Research perspectives on teaching English as lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209-239.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2007. Halle. English as a lingua franca and communities of practice. In S. Volk-Birke & J. Lippert (eds.) *Anglistentag 2006 Halle Proceedings*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2008. ELF findings: form and function. Plenary paper given at the First International ELF Conference, Helsinki, March 2008.

Seidlhofer Barbara. 2009a. Orientations in ELF research: form and function. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (eds.) 2009.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2009b. Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes* 28/2: 236-245.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. *Understanding ELF*. Oxford: Oxford University   Press.

Smith, Larry. 1983. English as an international language: no room for linguistic chauvinism. In L.E. Smith (ed.) 1983 *Readings in English as an International Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Sobkowiak, Włodzimierz. 2005/2009. Why not LFC? In K. Dziubalska-Kołaczyk and J. Przedlacka (eds.) *English Pronunciation Models. A Changing Scene*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Smit, Ute. 2010. *English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Tomasello, Michael. 2008. *Origins of Human Communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vertovec, Steven. 2006. The emergence of super-diversity in Britain. *Working Paper* No. 25, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford.

Vertovec, Steven. 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30/6: 1024-1054.

Vetchinnikova, Svetlana. 2015 (in press). Usage-based recycling or creative exploitation of the shared code? The case of phraseological patterning. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 4/2.

Vettorel, Paola. 2013. *English as a Lingua Franca in Wider Networking*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Wang, Ying. 2012. *Chinese speakers' perceptions of their English in intercultural communication*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southampton.

Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, Henry. 1997. EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interests. *World Englishes* 16/1: 135-146.

Williams, Cen. (2002). *A Language gained: A study of language immersion at 11-16 years of age.* Bangor: School of Education.
http://www.bangor.ac.uk/addysg/publications/Language_Gained%20.pdf

Zhu Hua 2015. Negotiation as the way of engagement in intercultural and lingua franca communication: frames of reference and Interculturality. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 4/1: 63-90.

Jennifer Jenkins holds the Chair of Global Englishes at the University of Southampton where she is founding Director of the Centre for Global Englishes. Before coming to Southampton, she worked for fifteen years at King's College London, where she designed and for many years directed the MA in ELT and Applied Linguistics. She has been researching ELF since the late 1980s, most recently in relation to English in higher education, and is the author of three monographs on ELF: *The Phonology of English as an International Language* (OUP 2000), *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity* (OUP 2007), and *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University* (Routledge 2014). She has also published a university coursebook, *Global Englishes* (2015, 3rd edition), and is co-editor (with Will Baker) of the book series *Developments in English as a Lingua Franca* (De Gruyter Mouton).