DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

„Which English do we teach?
ELF in Austrian textbooks“

verfasst von / submitted by

Ragnar Bartuska, BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Magister der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2020 / Vienna, 2020

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt / degree programme code as it appears on the student record sheet:	UA 190 313 344
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt / degree programme as it appears on the student record sheet:	Lehramtsstudium UF Geschichte, Sozialkunde, Polit.-Bildg. UF Englisch
Betreut von / Supervisor:	Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Seidlhofer

Acknowledgements

Most importantly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Barbara Seidlhofer, for introducing me to the fascinating field of ELF, awakening my interest in linguistics and especially for her support and feedback on this thesis. In every meeting she encouraged me to carry on and pointed me towards further interesting aspects. I would also like to thank her for the ground-breaking work on ELF. Without her contributions, the field as we know it today might not exist. The concept of ELF lifts a considerable burden off the shoulders of non-native speaker teachers of English and boosts their confidence.

Then I would like to say thank you to everyone who has provided me with input for this thesis, colleagues, friends, helpful employees at publishing houses, etc.

I would also like to thank my friend Sarah for her sharp eyes and the time she spent proofreading this thesis, and for her invaluable feedback.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their extensive financial and emotional support. Without them, I might never have written this study.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction ... 1
2. Language Policy and Planning ... 6
2.1. What is language planning? ... 6
2.2. Language planning and language teaching ... 7
3. English in today's world ... 8
3.1. ENL and World Englishes ... 8
3.2. English as a lingua franca (ELF) ... 11
3.2.1. Overview ... 11
3.2.2. What does ELF look like? ... 16
3.2.3. Why English? ... 17
3.2.4. Standard Language Ideology ... 19
3.2.5. Ownership of language. ... 23
3.2.6. Cultural/Linguistic Imperialism vs. English as a Tool ... 28
3.2.7. Virtual Language ... 34
3.2.8. Implications of ELF for Teaching ... 37
4. Research Methodology ... 45
4.1. Research Question ... 45
4.2. Scope of the study ... 47
4.3. Methodology ... 48
4.3.1. Curriculum analysis ... 48
4.3.2. CEFR analysis ... 50
4.3.3. Textbook analysis ... 50
5. The Austrian Curricula ... 55
6. The CEFR ... 60
7. Textbook Analysis ... 68
7.1. Davis et al.: Make Your Way with English 7 ... 69
7.1.1. Overview ... 69
7.1.2. Audio Analysis ... 71
7.2. Soars and Soars: New Headway AHS 7 ... 72
7.2.1. Overview ... 72
7.2.2. Audio analysis ... 76
7.3. Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar: Prime Time 7 ... 77
7.3.1. Overview ... 77
7.3.2. Audio Analysis ... 79
8. Conclusion ... 82
9. References ... 84
10. Appendix ... 92
10.1. Abstract ... 92
10.2. Deutsche Zusammenfassung ... 93

List of Tables

Table 1.	Make Your Way 7: Distribution of accents	72
Table 2.	New Headway AHS 7: Distribution of accents	76
Table 3.	Prime Time 7: Distribution of accents	80

List of Abbreviations

AHS	Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule [General secondary school]
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
EFL	English as a foreign language
EIL	English as an international language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELT	English language teaching
ENL	English as a native language
ESL	English as a second language
GA	General American
IPA	International phonetic alphabet
LFC	Lingua franca core
L1	First language
L2	Second language
NNS	Non-native speaker
NS	Native speaker
RIS	Rechtsinformationssystem des Bundes [Federal law information system]
RP	Received Pronunciation

1. Introduction

The past 35 years have seen a rapid shift in the role of the English language in the world. While English is still often perceived mainly as the native language of the British and the Americans, sometimes perhaps also that of the Irish, the Australians and the New Zealanders, it has become much more than that. In the mid-1980s, the ground-breaking circular model of World Englishes by Braj Kachru (1985) paved the ground for the codification and international acceptance of new varieties of English in former British colonies, e.g. Indian English or Singapore English, varieties that co-exist with a large number of local languages and often not the first language of their speakers but second languages, used to communicate across the barriers of small, local first languages. This concept called World Englishes will be covered in chapter 3.1.

However, more recently a much more impactful shift has begun. With drastically falling costs of air travel and particularly the rise of real-time world-wide communication at negligible cost via the internet, it has become possible for large numbers of people from at the very least first world and partly threshold and even developing countries to communicate on a global scale. This change has not only affected a small number of entrepreneurs or managers but entire populations, including children and young adults. This unprecedented change necessitated a means of communication. Particularly since the internet was, in its early days, predominantly a US-American space, this shared medium was frequently English. Mass tourism was another important factor in the spread of English, as was an increasingly globalised economy. Eventually this development led to a situation where there are several times more non-native speakers than native speakers of English (Seidlhofer 2011: 2). Many of these non-native speakers rarely or never use English like a traditional foreign language, i.e. in order to communicate with native speakers, but mainly to communicate with other non-native speakers, effectively using English as an international lingua franca. Beneke (1991: 54) suggested that as much as 80% of English communication did not involve native speakers at all, even before the widespread popularity of the internet! Brumfit (2002: 29f.; 31) also emphasises the enormous impact of the internet on international communication and the use of English among non-native speakers. He also notes that these new media are beyond the control of schools, publishers etc. (ibid. 31).

Much like Latin in the mediaeval and early-modern periods, English is the main lingua franca of the known world (cf. Crystal 2003: 11). And like Latin, English is changed by that role. Once a language is no longer primarily the means of communication among native speakers and between non-native and native speakers, native-speaker rules are questioned. Around the year 2000, the model of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) radically called into question not only the conventional models of foreign-language teaching but even the very definition of a language. Usually, language production is rated based on native-speaker norms and the expectations of native speakers. Languages are frequently perceived as relatively clear-cut, stable identities. Once native speakers are removed from the equation, the reality of communication becomes much more fluid. In fact, upon a closer look, even established languages are not as stable as they seem. An entire chapter will be dedicated to the concept of standard language (see chapter 3.2.4).

ELF replaces the concept of correctness (by native-speaker standards) with communicative success. Even more fundamentally, ELF questions the very definition of a language, replacing the usual focus on attested (native speaker) usage with an underlying basic concept referred to as the "virtual language" (cf. Widdowson 2003: 50f.), to which utterances can conform, even if they are not attested in native speaker usage. ELF is infinitely more context-dependent than a language variety, meaning is constantly negotiated within a very small, local group of participants, possibly as small as two persons. Constant adaptation to all interlocutors is the basis of mutual understanding. Non-native speaker creativity is not frowned upon but rather considered an essential aspect of successful communication. ELF encounters can and do include native speakers, but they usually are a small minority and may even encounter more difficulty as they are less used to adapting than non-native speakers. All these aspects will be discussed in detail in chapter 3.2.

Since ELF is so fluid and context-dependent, it will never be a variety of English. There will never be a complete ELF dictionary or grammar (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 8; 90f.). Designing teaching materials is also complex, as the needs of ELF users range from the most basic tourist encounters to top management and science contexts, from factual encounters, e.g. ticket purchases, to negotiating complex interpersonal relationships involving strong emotions (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 179-181).

This diversity also implies that ELF cannot simply be taught like traditional English as a foreign language, as there are no dictionaries, no grammars, no syllabi and it is largely impossible to precisely predict the future needs of the diverse groups of ELF users in general education.

This diversity of needs does not only apply to ELF but also to traditional (native-speaker centred) foreign-language teaching. Usually, some assumptions are made based on experience but considering the vast range of current interests and future careers and hobbies of young adults in general secondary education, these assumptions are bound to cover only a fraction of the potential needs, putting language courses at risk of losing learners' interest and hindering progress.

The question arises if ELF cannot be taught, how can it be incorporated into the classroom? Some fundamental principles of ELF can indeed be integrated into teaching. The ability to adapt to a wide range of interlocutors from different backgrounds can be practiced throughout the course and, in a country like Austria, where English has no official standing, automatically will be, as pupils from different linguistic backgrounds interact with each other using the medium of English. Furthermore, learners can and should be encouraged to engage in activities according to their own interests, e.g. by watching English-language videos on the internet, reading web sites and writing on blogs and forums.

Another important aspect of an ELF-informed pedagogy is the abolition of correctness based on native-speaker norms, focusing instead on creativity and communicative success (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 111). Adherence to the rules of the virtual language is still a requirement, otherwise utterances can no longer be considered English, but many social rules and conventions of native speakers become irrelevant in ELF (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 124). Those ELF users who desire to regularly interact with native speakers are free to aspire to native-speaker models, but nobody is required. Approximating native speakers becomes an option rather than the main requirement for success. The role of native-speaker models will be covered in chapter 3.2.

Obviously, one important aspect of ELF communication is pronunciation. Strict adherence to native-speaker models is not necessary in ELF encounters and may even prevent successful communication, as native speakers frequently do not realise forms fully in connected and

fluent speech, making the individual words hard to understand for less proficient users. Jennifer Jenkins (2000) proposed a set of necessary aspects of pronunciation, referred to as core features of pronunciation. These core features are any that are likely to cause misunderstandings if produced incorrectly. Other pronunciation features are considered non-core and therefore culturally required by native speakers but not necessary for successful communication (cf. Jenkins 2000: 123f.; 131-163).

Apart from pronunciation, native speakers usually rely heavily on shared cultural knowledge, both in references to texts and historic events and in non-transparent metaphors. Teaching those references is difficult, if not impossible, therefore non-native speakers are at a clear disadvantage if native speakers make heavy use of such features. An ELF-informed language course can devote considerably less time to native-speaker culture and more to features required for successful communication (see chapter 3.2).

ELF also questions the traditional definition of learning, in which learners are supplied with appropriate input and through regular practice acquire a skill, which they can use once they have mastered it. Instead, ELF research suggests that learning is already using and using is a learning process. Therefore, ELF communicators are language users rather than learners from the very beginning. However, since this thesis is located within the framework of the Austrian school system, the term *learner* will be used in some instances.

Within the linguistics community, ELF is reasonably established. However, the question arises whether this paradigm shift has affected language teaching in Austrian secondary schools. A good indicator for such change is the existence of appropriate teaching materials and of a legal framework. Language teaching and textbook writing in Austria are governed by the state-issued curricula, which in turn are based on the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, abbr. CEFR (Council of Europe 2001), an attempt to systematically describe proficiency in any language other than one's native language(s) and provide standardised assessment criteria. Since textbooks and supplementary materials (e.g. audio recordings) have a strong impact on classroom teaching, the curricula, the CEFR and the individual textbooks are the three main indicators for the pedagogic stance towards the language that is taught. Each of these aspects will be covered in detail later.

One important aspect of language teaching is pronunciation. Traditionally, teaching of English as a foreign language focused mainly on one or two highly prestigious native accents, Received Pronunciation from Britain and General American from the United States. As shown in chapter 5, older Austrian curricula actually prescribed the use of these varieties. While these accents are only spoken by a small minority of the population, they enjoy high social prestige and are well-documented and therefore considered easy to teach.

However, the requirements of ELF encounters differ considerably from those of encounters between native speakers and non-native speakers. As shown in chapter 3.2, in ELF communication, shared cultural references and social markers (especially in terms of pronunciation) play a much more limited role than in encounters between non-native and native speakers. Therefore, teaching one of the prestigious native varieties is of little use. Instead, a set of core features required for mutual intelligibility has been described, the Lingua Franca Core (LFC) established by Jenkins (2000). These features will be explained in detail in chapter 3.2. ELF-informed pronunciation teaching should mainly focus on core features, while putting much less emphasis on features considered socially desirable but difficult to learn and not important for successful communication.

The author's own upper-secondary education fell into the period "BE" (Before ELF) and the very early days of ELF research, 1999 to 2003. This study seeks to trace the development from those days (usually considered the fairly recent past) to the present, the author's journey from pupil to teacher. Due to restrictions of space and time, the focus of the analysis will be entirely on pronunciation. The Austrian curricula, the CEFR and three selected textbooks were analysed in detail. Each textbook is accompanied by one or more audio CDs containing listening comprehension tasks. The distribution of speaker accents in these recordings is perhaps one of the best indicators for 'ELF-readiness' or lack thereof. Additionally, any references to pronunciation in the books themselves and in teacher supplements were analysed. The analysis builds upon the work by Allinger (2015), who analysed textbooks for lower-secondary education and concluded that there is much left to be desired. This thesis extends the empirical aspect of her work to textbooks for upper-secondary education, including one very recent textbook, while the theoretical aspects of this study are independent.

Moving from the general to the specific, the chapters of this thesis cover language planning and policy in general, the development of World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca, the methodology for the analysis and finally the actual analyses of the Austrian curricula, the CEFR and the three textbooks. The following chapter will describe the general basics of language planning.

2. Language Policy and Planning

2.1. What is language planning?

Language use and particularly teaching are usually based on what is perceived as a clearly defined entity 'language'. The process of defining and maintaining this entity is referred to as language planning or language policy. In very general terms, language planning and language policy describe any attempts to influence the way a language is used in a certain region. Both are closely related but language policy implies the agency of an official body, it is, as Spolsky (2012: 3) puts it, an "officially mandated set of rules for language use". Language planning on the other hand can involve many different actors and the term is also used to describe the process, in which policies are created. There are three sub-fields of language planning: Corpus planning, status planning and acquisition planning. Status planning assigns certain functions to a certain language (e.g. declares it to be the official language of a state or the language of education). Corpus planning on the other hand means taking a language that had not previously been in official use, codifying it and extending its vocabulary (Spolsky 2012: 4). Acquisition planning decides on the language to be taught in formal education. This thesis focusses on the effects of international language acquisition planning manifested in Austrian curricula and textbooks.

Generally, language planning implies that languages are clearly delineated entities. As Motschenbacher (2013: 30) points out, that is not the case, boundaries are fluent, whether a variety is considered a language largely depends on social influence, rather than linguistic criteria (cf. Edwards 2009: 428, Seidlhofer 2011: 46; Wright 2012: 69). Max Weinreich (1945: 13) illustrated this issue very nicely with his quote from the unknown Bronx teacher: "A language is a dialect with an army and navy".

Yet there are usually sets of rules codified in dictionaries and grammars. In some countries, these rules are created and implemented by dedicated agencies (academies, e.g. in France, Edwards (2012: 422f.)), while in others (e.g. the UK and USA, cf. Edwards (2012: 423f.); Crystal (2003: 74)) they are created by more diverse groups including scholars and publishing houses (cf. Edwards 2009:421; 430f.; 434). Furthermore, international institutions such as the Council of Europe also create language policies (see chapter 6). These institutions also influence language acquisition planning outside of English-speaking countries, as their publications are usually considered the definition of the language to be taught. The Council of Europe with its Common European Framework of Reference is particularly influential.

2.2. Language planning and language teaching

Obviously, in EFL contexts, the number of stakeholders is even greater than in ENL countries. Large ENL countries, mainly the United States and Great Britain, seek to assert their roles of 'owners' of the language, each expanding-circle state seeks to position itself, supra-national organisations such as the EU seek to regulate education and textbook and grammar publishers want to participate in the global education market. Although there are no domestic language planning agencies, both the US and the UK have agencies for the promotion of their language and culture abroad. In Britain there is the British Council for the English Language, while the US have the US Information Service (Cenoz & Gorter 2012: 315; Seidlhofer 1999: 234). Textbook publishers are another powerful group in education, as language teaching is an enormous economic factor (cf: Cenoz & Gorter 2012: 315). In Austria, some of the most popular textbooks for secondary education are published by or in cooperation with renowned British publishers such as Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press.

Since language teaching is still a national or regional matter (cf. Cenoz & Gorter 2012: 307), each EU state also issues curricula that strongly influence teaching practice, although individual teachers are still able to exert considerable influence. In Austria, all curricula are issued by the state in the form of laws, accessible to all citizens in the "*Bundesgesetzblatt*", which is published electronically on the government's official website (Rechtsinformations-system des Bundes). These curricula will be investigated in detail in a separate chapter. However, most current national curricula are also to some extent based on the Common

European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), a set of general guidelines for language teaching and assessment issued by the Council of Europe (cf: Cenoz & Gorter 2012: 310; Council of Europe 2013). Therefore, the CEFR will also be analysed in detail in a dedicated chapter.

There are both national and international actors influencing English teaching in Austria. On a national level there are curricula, textbook authors and publishers, individual teachers and schools. While teachers are legally bound by the curricula, they still enjoy a certain amount of freedom to choose the English(es) they teach. The actual extent of this freedom will be investigated later. Schools only play a rather limited role. However, it should also be noted that parents and their ideas on "proper English" can also be an important influence. On an international level the Council of Europe with its CEFR, various textbook publishers and the cultural organisations of Inner Circle countries are the most important factors.

3. English in today's world

3.1. ENL and World Englishes

Most people probably think of English as the native language of the population of the United Kingdom and the United States. Some might also think of the official languages in former colonies, e.g. Ireland, Australia and New Zealand, now the native language of a majority of the population. However, current reality is much more complex. More than 30 years ago, Braj Kachru (1985) introduced his influential model of the three circles of English. The UK and US form the Inner Circle, the 'original home of English'. Former colonies like India, Hong Kong, Nigeria and Singapore form the Outer Circle of English, countries in which English is recognised as an official language but not necessarily the native language of the majority of its inhabitants (cf. Kachru 1985: 12f.). Ireland, Australia and New Zealand do have a majority of native speakers of English and are therefore not typical Outer Circle countries, although they are former British colonies. Kachru (1985: 12) lists them as Inner Circle countries. As discussed below, some Outer Circle Englishes have been codified and are now considered varieties.

According to Shaw, Caudery & Petersen (2009: 180) the development of a new variety is a number of processes sparked by language contact, gradually a new variety will evolve, most strongly influenced by the most prominent ones in the mix. This change occurs over several generations (e.g. New Zealand English, Modern Hebrew…) and usually involves "phonological change and simplification" (ibid.). Variety status is usually marked by codification, such as the publication of a dictionary, e.g. the Macquarie Dictionary of Australian English in 1981 (cf. Horvath 2004: 626).

In most Outer Circle countries, English serves as a second language, particularly to facilitate communication between various ethnic groups with different native languages (see e.g. Crystal 2003: 175f.) but few, if any, inhabitants use English as their main language. Finally, the Expanding Circle encompasses the rest of the world, countries in which English has no official standing at all but is learned in schools and elsewhere, as a foreign language (cf. Kachru 1985: 12).

Kachru's definition sparked a lively debate on the question of who should determine what the English language taught and spoken in the various circles should look like. Some commenters take the firm stance that only the Inner Circle countries, particularly the largest political powers among them, should provide a linguistic model for the two other circles in order to ascertain mutual intelligibility (cf. Quirk 1985). Others, like Kachru (1985) himself, argue that Outer Circle countries are users of English in fundamentally different contexts and could therefore create their own codified varieties of English. A common umbrella term for these varieties is World Englishes.

In the Expanding Circle it still seems to be widely assumed that English is learned, like any other foreign language such as German, Italian or Russian, in order to communicate with native speakers. In these countries native speakers are preferred for teaching posts or as language assistants and the ultimate goal of language learning seems to be approximating a native speaker as closely as possible, as evidenced in curricula, textbooks etc. Crystal (2003: 3-5) lists a variety of reasons why countries may choose some foreign languages instead of others, e.g. due to political alliances or historical traditions.

Widdowson (1997: 140) compares the traditional view of EFL teaching to a franchise system comparable to chains such as Pizza Hut where a language is handed out to the general public

in Expanding Circle countries by franchisees (teachers) who are not allowed to alter the language. He argues that this is not how languages work (ibid.).

As Seidlhofer (2011: 2) points out, non-native speakers of English outnumber native speakers by far, roughly estimated only one quarter of all users of English are native speakers (cf. Crystal 2003: 68f.). However, Motschenbacher (2013: 12) points out that, although these Expanding Circle Englishes are globally dominant in numbers of speakers, they are generally considered dependent on Inner Circle norms (cf. Kachru 1985: 16f.), as they have not (yet) developed their own norms. Mauranen (2009: 1) notes that even Outer Circle Englishes have never gained as much prestige as Inner Circle varieties but are nevertheless extensively studied by reaseachers of various fields. Motschenbacher (2013: 13) adds that historically (and to some extent even today) all varieties except British and American were considered deficient. Many scholars argue that the concept of World Englishes is too narrow as it is very strictly built around inner-circle English, from which the other varieties must not deviate too much and it does not include creoles either (ibid. 28).

Motschenbacher (2013: 14) compares the development of World Englishes to nation-building processes in historic Europe and considers it an essentially political process rather than a linguistic one. Seidlhofer (2011: 78) states that World Englishes are very much concerned with identity, post-colonial settings, appropriated language freed from ties to the former colonial power and the expression of local culture. According to Motschenbacher (2013: 28) postmodern scholars argue that languages and varieties are always socio-political constructs as languages cannot be defined by interior criteria. Seidlhofer (2011: 71f.) refers to languages as “convenient fictions”.

Jenkins (2009a: 17) criticises that Inner-circle speakers are traditionally seen as proficient and “authentic” while Outer-Circle speakers are attributed low proficiency, instrumental use of the language. Motschenbacher (2013: 14f.) also adds that Outer-Circle speakers are sometimes even accused of betraying their roots (neglecting their native language in favour of a foreign one). Jenkins (2009a: 17) suggests that this view completely ignores actual proficiency in all circles.

In summary, the concept of World Englishes seeks to establish new codified varieties of English, mainly in Outer Circle countries. These countries then provide their own norms of

English rather than depending on Inner Circle norms. However, the model is not concerned with Expanding Circle language learners and users, who are still generally considered dependent on Inner Circle norms.

3.2. English as a lingua franca (ELF)

3.2.1. Overview

As mentioned in the previous chapter, there are now far more non-native than native speakers of English in the world. Therefore, it seems logical to assume that in many instances few or even no native speakers of English will be present in interactions conducted in English. According to Beneke (1991: 54) 80% of the communication in English does not involve native speakers at all! Robichaud and de Schutter (2012: 142) also argue that relatively few learners of English are likely to spend extended periods of time in Inner Circle countries. English is thus often used as a lingua franca, a common foreign language that facilitates communication between speakers of various first languages.

What exactly is a lingua franca? According to Jenkins (2007: 1) a lingua franca is "[a] contact language used among people who do not share a first language, and is commonly understood to mean a second (or subsequent) language of its speakers." According to Knapp and Meierkord (2002: 9) the term originally referred to a pidgin "spoken along the South-Eastern coast of the Mediterranean between appr. the 15th and the 19th century". This language was probably based on an Italian dialect and contained elements from Spanish, French, Portuguese, Arabic, Turkish, Greek and Persian. A lingua franca is always a hybrid. Seidlhofer (2001a: 146) adds that a lingua franca has aspects of a pidgin, as it does not have native speakers and contains influences from various sources but is by no means as limited in terms of vocabulary, social status and communicative function.

Jenkins (2007: 1) argues that while the original lingua franca did not have native speakers, English does. English as a lingua franca (ELF) conversations can and do include native speakers, although they are usually a minority (Jenkins 2007: 2; Seidlhofer 2004: 211f.). While definitions of ELF often exclude native speakers of English, Seidlhofer (2011: 7) suggests that ELF is "[…] any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" instead.

However, as Knapp and Meierkord (2002: 9f.) note, English is certainly not the first language to spread across much of the known world. Wilton (2012: 341f.) considers Latin the first language that came into widespread international use. Until today this language enjoys high prestige and is learned worldwide, despite the fact that it no longer has any native speakers and is generally considered a dead language. However, it is still developed and used in spoken interaction in the Vatican, therefore some scholars argue it should not be considered dead. Wilton (2012: 346) points out an interesting similarity between the spread of Latin and the spread of English: at one point in time Latin may have had more non-native speakers than native speakers (see chapter 3.1 for figures on English)

One of the main differences between English and any other lingua franca is the unprecedented global and social spread of English. Wilton (2012: 343f.) points out that in the Middle Ages Latin was mainly spoken by educated elites. However, Jones (1999: 197) and particularly Burke (1993: 54-56) cite some reports of rudimentary knowledge of Latin among the general population, e.g. innkeepers and soldiers. This would be a phenomenon similar to modern tourist English. However, there is only sparse evidence of this (cf. Jones 1999: 197; Burke 1993: 54-56; Seidlhofer 2011: 7). By contrast, nowadays in many countries everyone is expected by the general public to have learned at least some English as Seidlhofer (2011: 7) emphasises.

ELF is a relatively recent field of study, according to Mauranen (2009: 2) empirical research only gained momentum on a somewhat larger scale around 2007 when the first ELF corpora were compiled etc. Currently there are several corpora of ELF usage from various domains e.g. VOICE (2009), ACE (2014), ELFA (2008).

What makes ELF such a special phenomenon compared to other lingua francas and to World Englishes? The main difference between World Englishes, local contact languages and ELF is that ELF is not a specific variety. Crystal (2003: 185f.) does seem to assume that ELF or International English might become a variety, World Standard Spoken English, at some point but as shown later, this is highly unlikely. Shaw, Caudery & Petersen (2009: 179) assume that while there is not one variety "ELF" there might be shared features common to all ELF communication situations, or class of ELF varieties. This seems somewhat unlikely considering the findings of others showing just how variable and context-dependent ELF is. Shaw,

Caudery & Petersen (ibid.) speculate that in a set where ELF speakers live together for an extended period of time in a more or less closely defined community, local norms might evolve and become more or less fixed.

Jenkins (2009: 12f.) emphasises that ELF is not necessarily universal, accommodation is its most central feature and ELF changes depending on who is talking to whom. Seidlhofer (2011: 8) also emphasises the highly hybrid nature of ELF, especially due to the large numbers of different L1s involved and argues that non-native speakers have become the most powerful agents in language change.

How do linguists decide whether a set of language samples constitutes a variety, i.e. a relatively fixed and codified entity? Seidlhofer (2009: 42-49) explains that the usual way of determining variety status is to check for the occurrence of various features and attempt to determine whether there is an underlying system. However, she cautions that change processes cannot be squeezed into such clear-cut categories. Therefore, the highly variable. ELF does not fit any of the traditional categories (ENL, ESL, EFL). Also see Seidlhofer (2004: 230) and Seidlhofer, Breiteneder & Pitzl (2006: 21). Seidlhofer (2015: 20) considers the notion of ELF as a variety a mistaken interpretation, which is likely one of the causes of the negative attitudes towards ELF research.

If ELF is not a specific variety, what is it? Seidlhofer (2009: 50) emphasises that ELF research prioritises communicative function over form. Seidlhofer (2015: 21) adds that by contrast World Englishes research seems to have been more interested in form in order to establish new varieties in the Outer Circle. Dewey (2009: 76-78) defines a language as a set of resources rather than a fixed entity. He argues that expertise should be seen as more context-dependent and the main aspect should be communicative effectiveness. Furthermore, he argues that the concept of ELF cherishes the creativity of innovation and variation rather than considering it deviation or errors.

Seidlhofer (2011: 90f.) suggests that ELF could be imagined as some kind of amoeba shape across all circles, with soft, permeable and moving boundaries, a free language, not tied to any ethnic or national group, unlike e.g. an L1, which is commonly tied to a nation state. She adds that globalisation changes the reality of the speech community, it becomes more diffuse and fluent. ELF defies conventional boundaries (ibid. 83). ELF speakers are usually not a

classic speech community since there is no geographic relation (e.g. nation state) and the definition of a variety usually implies regular face-to-face contact of its users, which is not the case in ELF. Moreover, a variety is mostly a social construct (ibid.).

Therefore, ELF requires entirely new concepts. Seidlhofer (2011: 87f.) names 'discourse community' or 'community of practice' but cautions that a community of practice is much smaller than a speech community or even a profession. The only unifying aspects in such a community are usually the common communicative purpose and a shared enterprise. Motschenbacher (2013) studied press conferences during the Eurovision Song Contest and argues that its participants could be considered a community of practice.

However, Seidlhofer (2011: 83f.) notes that the term community is usually understood in a mainly spatial sense, a local phenomenon that also involves sets of social values and shared beliefs. Especially the former is not usually true in ELF interactions. ELF is used outside speech communities, in transcultural communication (ibid.). She suggests that ELF is more similar to registers in different kinds of communication rather than varieties or dialects. ELF communication is "dislocated", register becomes much more important (ibid. 86).

According to her, the main issue most people have with the concept of ELF is that it does not belong to any social or ethnic community and by no amount of idealisation it can be considered consistent. The concept of variety on the other hand displays a process of change as a fixed entity (ibid. 94f.).

Ranta (2009: 84) suggests that it seems fairer to compare ELF to spoken Englishes rather than comparing it to written Standard English and then considering it erroneous. Unfortunately, as anecdotal evidence suggests, laypeople and even many language teachers seem to assume that only standard language should actually be taught and confuse written and standard language (and consider spoken language incorrect). According to Ranta (2009: 84) even some linguists claim that ELF is only what second language acquisition research terms "learner language" and erroneous.

As mentioned before, native speakers can participate in ELF communication but Motschenbacher (2013: 20) found in his study that they are usually expected to accommodate to local requirements rather than forcing others to conform to native speaker standards (Jenkins 2009:

201). McNamara (2011: 508) notes that speakers of ENL may actually be disadvantaged in ELF communication as they are not as used to accommodation as ELF speakers. Motschenbacher (2013: 53) adds that they may apply unilateral idiomaticity, i.e. use intransparent expressions only familiar to ENL speakers. Seidlhofer (2000: 53) explains that the English used by educated native speakers is so "[…] full of markers of in-group membership such as characteristic pronunciations, specialised vocabulary and phraseology, and allusions to shared experience and cultural background" that non-native speakers "[…] cannot, by definition, be members of that native speaker community, no matter how hard they try, no matter how long they study".

It is frequently claimed that ELF is a "bastardised" version of "proper English" (cf. Jenkins 2007: 9) and somehow deficient. Motschenbacher (2013: 47) agrees that ELF not strictly English and frequently contains elements usually considered part of other languages. However, he argues that native-speaker English is not strictly English either, only loans and borrowings are more established. Therefore, foreign influences are no reason to exclude ELF from "real English". He adds that an individual's linguistic repertoire does not only contain the first language and English but also chunks from various languages the individual has never (fully) acquired (ibid. 75).

Seidlhofer (2011: 38) points out that non-native speakers are often measured by different standards than native speakers, observers are explicitly looking for problems. By contrast, in his structural analysis Motschenbacher (2013): 145) set out to find similarities rather than differences between ENL and ELF in order to find evidence for the hybridity of ELF and a "fundamental overlap between ENL and ELF usage, which contests the notion of systematic differences between European ELF and native Englishes."

Wilton (2012: 353) argues that a lingua franca is not a language per se but a way of using language in a given context, a particularly appropriate closing remark for this brief introduction of ELF.

3.2.2. What does ELF look like?

In the previous chapters it was mentioned that ELF is highly hybrid and fluid, far from the idealised concept of a fixed variety. The question arises whether there are any aspects common to most or all lingua franca communication situations. Motschenbacher (2013: 22f.) names some typical features. He lists

- collaborative talk construction
- consensus-oriented interaction
- fewer misunderstandings than in asymmetric NS - NNS communication
- fewer tokens used
- shorter turns
- more non-verbal means used [than in native-speaker communication]

Seidlhofer (2005: 340) emphasises that the main objective in ELF communication is intelligibility. ELF research discovered that non-standard features such as mispronouncing /θ/ and /ð/ or dropping 3rd-person possessive <‘s> are not problematic in ELF communication. Jenkins (2000; 2007) provides considerable insight on pronunciation, her study seeks to define core features necessary for intelligibility. According to Jenkins (2000: 19f.), phonology is the most crucial factor of intelligibility or unintelligibility and also strongly subjected to prejudice and very hard to change (ibid., 4). Seidlhofer (2011: 128) points out that while lexico-grammar is usually considered highly important, it is actually less related to intelligibility than to marking social status.

Motschenbacher (2013: 148) describes the structure of ELF utterances as usually relatively transparent and regular (e.g. non-standard explicit markings of past tense, *quitted*, the results of rather obvious derivation processes (*rehearsaling*) etc.) and notes that L1 influence is usually also noticeable.

Kaur (2009: 108) adds that repetition and paraphrase are important tools in facilitating understanding. He notes that non-standard grammar (he uses the term ‘ungrammaticality’, suggesting a rather native-speaker centred view on language) in ELF is compensated for by applying various adaptation or repair strategies (ibid. 119), which are usually employed after prolonged silence, i.e. when an expected comment does not come (ibid. 111). Ehrenreich (2009: 140f.) argues that intelligibility is mainly a matter of getting used to specific realisations of language rather than something absolute. Moreover, she notes that it is usually not necessary to understand individual words for successful communication and therefore

suggests a holistic approach to understanding (ibid. 144). Motschenbacher (2013: 53) also points out that features that are usually considered fossilisation in ELT can be considered facilitation of communication in ELF.

While it seems that ELF communication has fewer misunderstandings than asymmetric communication involving native and non-native speakers, Ehrenreich (2009: 145) discovered in her study on business ELF that ELF speakers are often not very fluent but rather insecure communicators and problems are not as uncommon as indicated in other studies. Also, Motschenbacher (2013: 187) found in his study that accommodation played a rather limited role and suggests it may not be as central to ELF as previously assumed.

In general, he cautions that ELF is extremely context-dependent and there are few typical features that appear in almost all contexts (ibid. 150), which ties into previous findings mentioned above. Finally, he points out that languages are not discrete entities inside an individual's brain, activated at will but rather all active at the same time, an explanation for various influences, including the speaker's L1 (ibid. 53). However, such a compartmentalised view of languages is still rather common. For example, Seidlhofer (2018: 95) criticises this in the CEFR (also see chapter 6).

The next chapter will deal with the question of how English has become the most important lingua franca of the early 21st century.

3.2.3. Why English?

The previous chapter gave a brief introduction to the nature of a lingua franca and specifically English. This chapter explores how English has become the world's most important lingua franca in the early 21st century. How is a lingua franca chosen?

According to Crystal (2003: 11) sometimes adjacent languages are simplified and mixed (referred to as a pidgin), sometimes one local language is favoured over others but far more often an outside language (e.g. English or Latin) is called in, usually because of the political, economic or religious influence of some outside power.

While Latin was the main European lingua franca during antiquity and the middle ages, it fell out of favour. The industrial revolution drastically shortened travel times and facilitated

communication over long distances (cf. Crystal 2003: 13). Crystal (2003:12f.) states that especially the founding of international organisations (e.g. the United Nations) from the 1950s onwards made international communication necessary. He argues that such organisations have two options, they can either use several working languages, requiring expensive translation and interpretation, or they can use one working language or lingua franca. In most cases this was English, especially in economic contexts. Knapp & Meierkord (2002: 11) suggest that a shift from French to English as the international language of diplomacy was already visible immediately after World War I, as the USA steered the peace negotiations towards English.

Seidlhofer (2009: 39) adds that especially the internet revolution allows for worldwide communication at an unprecedented scale and requires a lingua franca since contributors neither share a common first language nor common primary socialisation. Personal experience shows that for the ‘Generation Y’ online communication can be a very powerful incentive to use English in order to communicate with people from all over the world, although especially in the early days of the World Wide Web the offerings were still dominantly from the United States.

It is occasionally claimed that English is particularly suitable for use as an international lingua franca since it is simple and easy to acquire. Although this popular view may have limited merits as far as learners with Germanic first languages are concerned, there seems to be no general truth in it. According to Wilton (2012: 348) both English and Latin are frequently claimed to be particularly suitable as lingua francas because of some special grammatical and lexical properties. However, as early as 1816 it was suggested that it is more important what speakers do with a language than what the language looks like, the dominant view in modern linguistics (ibid.).

Yet why did English happen to become the world’s most important lingua franca and not some other language? Crystal (2003: 10) suggests that English merely happened to be in the right place at the right time. In more elaborate terms, it seems likely that the spread of English was initially related to the enormous political and economic influence of the British Empire and, mainly after World War II the global presence of the United States, as Rajagopalan (2009: 50) puts it. The latter also likely influenced the development of the internet and thereby the strong dominance of English-language content mentioned above. It also seems

likely that at some point in history English was used widely enough that it became detached from its national ties. Motschenbacher (2013: 206f.) suggests that today other European languages are much more strongly linked to national concepts than English and therefore less usable as lingua francas (e.g. French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish).

Considering the historical link between the spread of English and the exertion of political power by the British Empire and the United states it does not seem surprising that some critics perceive this spread as a potential threat to the autonomy of other languages and cultures. These fears are usually subsumed under the term cultural imperialism. This topic is dedicated an own chapter. The following chapter will deal with the subject of Standard English and standard language in general.

3.2.4. Standard Language Ideology

Standard language is a very common term in language teaching, as seen e.g. in the Common European Framework of Reference (see chapter 6). It is not uncommon among traditional linguists either (cf. Quirk 1985: 1, 5, 6). However, upon a closer look a standard language is much harder to define than it seems at a first glance (cf. Jenkins (2007: 9).

According to Dewey (2009: 67f.; 71) both laypeople and professionals frequently treat language as a "reified system" to which speakers merely conform, a system of established rules. These rules of course 'must not' be challenged by NNS as we will see later. He defines competence as structural rather than communicative and criticises the lack of research into communicative processes (ibid. 67). Moreover, he states that especially English language teaching (ELT) is still mainly based on discrete linguistic items and the command that learners have over them.

He also criticises that communicative strategies are only seen as emergency strategies in case of language deficiencies rather than as essential competencies in their own right and notes that "intelligibility is disproportionately equated with standard language norms" (ibid. 67f.; also see 73). Instead, he suggests that ELT practitioners should see communicative competence in a less narrow way and accept a more dynamic view of language and its variability (ibid. 69).

Dewey (2009: 70) suspects that English is even more objectified than other languages for economic reasons. For native speaker countries, producing and selling teaching materials is an

important economic factor! Dewey also considers the CEFR highly native speaker centred and prescriptive (ibid. 71-73). Instead he suggests that successful communication entails extensive accommodation including the production of “errors” rather than the strict adherence to abstract norms (ibid. 73). Language should be seen as a set of resources rather than a fixed entity and expertise should be more context dependent. The main focus should be on communicative effectiveness rather than correctness (ibid. 78). He also points out that language is never static but rather a practice that is constantly modified or even created during use (ibid. 76f.).

According to Ranta (2009: 87-90) the native speaker is often highly idealised and assumed to use standard language at all times. She also sees frequent confusion of the terms *written language* and *standard language.* Research is generally biased towards written language, mainly because it is easier to study, since spoken language needs to be transcribed by hand before it can be analysed electronically (ibid.). Ranta also notes that many speakers mistaken-ly assume that their speech follows written language patterns or grammar. However, written language is rather useless for speaking, yet many language teachers seem to assume that features of spoken language are errors (ibid. 90f.).

Bybee & Hopper (2001: 3) suggest that even grammar is not stable but constantly adapted as it is used. Seidlhofer (2018: 85) suggests that the variability of (native) languages “is a sociolinguistic commonplace” and suggests that instability is an intrinsic feature of any language (ibid. 86). Unfortunately, the general public seems to have little appreciation for such concepts, as shown by countless amateur “language policers” on the internet who, for example, can spend hours trying to tell somebody that German “Sinn machen” (make sense) is incorrect because it is a mis-translation from English (cf. Mr. Ed 2011; Sam2 2009, TAB 2012). As Motschenbacher (2013: 29) notes, grammars conceptualise language as a state, “a snapshot that ignores change and variability”. Seidlhofer (2018: 86) concedes that humans prefer a certain amount of stability and therefore prefer to view languages as mostly static. ELF is less sedimented than those concepts usually referred to as languages, more hybrid and variable. Motschenbacher (2013: 30) adds that most critics of ELF seem to assume that there is a clearly delineable object “English” (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 46, referring to Quirk 1985: 6).

Widdowson (2012: 7-9), referring to Seidlhofer (2011: 70-72) calls the concepts ‘language’ and ‘variety’ convenient fictions which are necessary in research but certainly not absolute realities. Motschenbacher (2013: 193) adds that these fictions are often used to exert or support power (e.g. of native speakers and the ELT industry, cf. Dewey 2009: 70). He argues that different concepts of language are necessary, since otherwise the spreading of English would indeed become close to linguistic imperialism (a highly debated issue that will be covered in a separate chapter). Furthermore, he states that these concepts must also constantly adapt to social reality.

Wright (2004: 4f.) points out that instead of thriving, Latin lost its role as an L1 as soon as attempts were made to standardise the language (mainly by the Catholic church) because it became too inflexible and archaic and suggests that the same could happen if Standard English were enforced worldwide. However, Rajagopalan (2009: 53) argues that the situation in late antiquity was fundamentally different since speakers of Latin had much less actual contact than modern speakers of English world-wide.

While standardisation may actually cause the demise of a language, it may not even be necessary in order to preserve mutual intelligibility. According to Seidlhofer (2011: xi) there is clear evidence that standard English is not a prerequisite for successful communication. At this point it is probably worth noting that not even native speakers always conform to the prescribed norms of correctness, particularly in spoken interaction. Seidlhofer (2011: 48) points out that all natural languages are relatively flexible and less static than generally assumed.

The term standard language is also to a large extent linked to ideas of preserving an existing form of language and resisting change, as in the German example above. Crystal (2003: 165) admits that new (World) Englishes have no clear boundaries but seems to conveniently ignore that neither do the old ones, since languages are not clearly bounded entities as mentioned above. Seidlhofer (2011: 44) even states that Standard English has never been defined and is likely impossible to define. She also notes that standards are ideological constructs and depend more on self-perception than on linguistic details (ibid. 47).

To use her own words, “[…] discrete varieties are a convenient methodological fiction. The very fact that any natural language is of its nature unstable, always in flux and variable, means

that any definition of a variety, or code, or established norm is an idealized construct", a construct created by linguists. In reality "[t]here is only the continuum, the continual process of variation" (ibid. 71f.). However, outside these fictions become independent and people take them at face value. Languages are perceived as clearly delineated entities and bi- or multilingual people are thought to have two or more of these entities in different compartments of their brains. They need to possess them completely in order to be considered acceptable, even if fairly basic command would be entirely sufficient for the person's needs (ibid.).

Even if one accepts the concept of standard language, it remains mostly limited to written texts. According to Ranta (2009: 102f.), corpus studies that revealed that even academic spoken language conforms much less to written standards than previously assumed, although the frequency of non-standard constructions does differ. She suspects that ELF is closer to vernacular spoken (native) Englishes than to academic spoken (native) Englishes (ibid.). Generally, she suggests that various non-standard items in ELF communication are typical features of spoken language rather than of ELF usage or learner language (ibid. 101f.).

Apart from the difficulty of even defining Standard English, ELF is clearly independent from native speaker standards and often criticised as an ideological concept. However, Seidlhofer (2011: xiii) emphasises that advocating for continuity (or stagnation) is just as ideologically loaded as advocating for change, a detail usually overlooked by the supporters of the former because change is more noticeable. Lingua franca English is frequently used on the internet and in e-mails, media which are usually beyond the reach of common control mechanisms, e.g. education systems, publishers etc. Under these circumstances ELF has largely become independent of traditional norms (ibid. 8).

However, the Austrian education system is, despite all claims to the contrary, still largely focussed on correctness (see chapters 5 and 6) and the hybrid nature of ELF precludes the very existence of standards against which to measure correctness. Seidlhofer (2018: 86f.) concedes that standards are handy for measuring. However, she also points out that, since standard language is an idealised fiction, so is correctness (ibid. 93). As mentioned before, the main factor of ELF is communicative success, but this is hard to measure and grade, a serious issue in a school system increasingly centred around concepts like comparability and accountability. Besides, it seems that laypeople tend to believe in correctness and native

speaker norms even more strongly than linguists. Since parents are highly important stakeholders in primary and secondary education and usually laypeople, an inclusion of ELF in language teaching seems rather complicated. The implications of ELF for language teaching will be covered in considerably more detail in a dedicated chapter.

However, the main aim of this chapter was to show that "standard language" is by no means as easy to define as it seems. Therefore, references to standards in documents such as curricula and the CEFR are problematic. It could even be asked how teachers are supposed to teach Standard English if there is no such thing as a standard. These issues are closely related to the topic of the following chapter, which will deal with the question of who makes the rules of a language.

3.2.5. Ownership of language.

If asked who is entitled to determine whether an utterance is acceptable or to modify a language, most people would likely say "the native speakers". Most language learners automatically accept the authority of native speakers. Upon deeper reflection they might limit the ability to judge to educated native speakers or language professionals but native speakers nonetheless. Seidlhofer (2018: 94) adds that among native speakers there is a tendency to bow to the authority of language professionals. However, the unprecedented spread of English far beyond its native speaker community has resulted in an entirely new situation. As mentioned before, non-native speakers outnumber native speakers by far and the question arises whether native speakers are still the only authority on English.

According to Crystal (2003: 141) English is no longer owned by British and Americans, therefore its future development is much less predictable. However, that raises the question how predictable language development is anyway, especially in terms of lexical innovation. Crystal still favoured the Inner and Outer circles but assumed that the Outer Circle would likely gain influence as the number of speakers was almost identical to the Inner Circle but showed much higher growth (ibid.).

Jenkins (2007: 5) confirms the initial assumption that traditionally native speakers are seen as having authority over the language and all non-native speakers are placed somewhere on an interlanguage continuum. This concept is based on the assumption that all non-native

speakers want to become part of the native-speaker community. However, this is not necessarily true in the case of English.

As mentioned before, native speakers only play a rather limited role in ELF communication. Why is the notion of native-speaker authority still so strong then? Jenkins (2007: 7) and Seidlhofer (2000: 59) suggest that in the first decade of the 2000s the majority of both professionals and language learners/users still saw ELF in a rather negative light. While even then some scholars already assumed that ELF might become independent of NS norms at some point in the future (Jenkins 2007: 5), others feared just that.

The main reason for these fears seems to be related to identity. Language plays an important role in the formation and expression of identity and is therefore a rather sensitive and emotional issue (cf. Motschenbacher 2013). This close relationship commonly leads to ideas of language change threatening one's identity. Most readers will likely have experienced similar fears about the demise of their own mother tongue supposedly brought about by loan words or neologisms, worse if the loan words come from a neighbouring country, with which the political relationship is somewhat strained. For example, most Austrians are likely familiar with heated debates about the 'horrible influence' of German-German lexis and in some instances even grammar (e.g. from recent personal experience the tendency of some German dialects to drop the definite article after spatial prepositions in colloquial speech, '*auf Toilette gehen*' instead of '*auf die Toilette gehen*', literally 'go to toilet' instead of 'go to the toilet' or the different genus of some lexical items e.g. numerals used as grades in the school system. Among some of the author's friends, the debate on whether the French term 'pommes frittes' for chips needs to be preserved in its entirety and French pronunciation in German or whether it may be abbreviated to 'Pommes' in German pronunciation has rather become a recurring joke).

Under these circumstances it seems logical for most people to assume that native speakers of other languages feel similarly threatened about non-conformity to the rules of their native language. Jenkins (2007: 8) confirms that the spread of English is commonly perceived as a loss of control and that even non-native speakers usually assume that native speakers own the language (Jenkins 2009: 15). She adds that some scholars simply ignore ELF and claim that non-native speakers use English much less often than native speakers and therefore native

speaker usage is far more important, a claim not backed by any evidence according to her (Jenkins 2007: 8).

Furthermore, Jenkins (2009: 11) notes that even sociolinguists often do not treat non-native speaker varieties with as much respect as non-standard native speaker ones. Trudgill (2005: 87) gives a prime example of these reasonings, he claims that native speakers have some historically justified ownership of their language and assumes that adherence to their norms is a necessary condition, although the degree of approximation is open for debate. Motschenbacher (2013: 24) names Trudgill and Randolph Quirk as examples for linguists who still strongly insist on native speaker ownership. He argues that non-native speakers are strongly disadvantaged by this stance, in some instance their non-conformity to native-speaker ideals is perceived as a lack of intelligence (ibid.). Seidlhofer (2018) extensively covers the topic of the perceived relation between adherence to (native speaker) standards and perceived degree of education and intelligence.

Jenkins (2009: 16f.) adds that many seem to regard anything that does not confirm to native speaker norms as wrong, regardless of context. Non-mainstream forms are highly stigmatised, especially if influenced by other first languages (ibid. 19). However, these notions also apply to change within one's own native language, as evidenced by numerous prescriptive "Better English" campaigns and publications throughout the past centuries (ibid. 29f.). All authors in this tradition express concern that the language decays and becomes corrupted, unless their advice is heeded.

Widdowson (2004: 361) has a different stance on the matter. He argues that instead of threatening the English language, the recognition of ELF developments would enrich the language and the possibility of speakers to express themselves by lifting restrictions imposed by native-speaker sociocultural identity. Jenkins (2009: 14) argues that learners should be offered the (informed) choice of varieties rather than being forced to learn either one native-speaker variety as EFL or a locally influenced ELF. Seidlhofer (2011: 48) adds that all natural languages are rather less stable than some seem to think. She also notes that mutual accommodation is a sign of user control rather than of instability (ibid.).

However, the reality of language teaching is still slightly different. According to Jenkins (2009: 11) Received Pronunciation (RP) is dominant in teaching materials in Europe and parts

of Asia and Latin America, sometimes it is the only accent presented, rarely among other NS varieties. She adds that it is frequently assumed that RP is somehow superior to any other accent, more authentic or real (ibid.). This notion of superiority, not only concerning pronunciation, is backed by the British Council. According to Jenkins (2009: 32f.) the British Council saw itself as the worldwide centre of language teaching in 2007 and – one might hazard to guess – likely still does. The council's web site for language learning (Learn English Online - British Council) refers to the council as "[…] the British Council, the world's English teaching experts".

While Crystal (2003: 167) admits that Standard (Native Speaker) English is not actually necessary for successful international communication, he still somewhat inconsequentially suggests Standard English for such contexts (ibid. 176). By contrast, Jenkins (2009: 13) discovered that the most successful ELF speakers actually avoid certain features of NS pronunciation, e.g. /θ/ and /ð/. She emphasises that ELF is not to be confused with EFL since ELF does not consider native speakers' models of correctness. She also doubts the viability of EFL teaching (ibid. 14).

As mentioned before, language is closely tied to identity. Therefore, the question arises whether ELF is concerned with identity too. Motschenbacher (2013: 198) argues that ELF is not suitable for traditional identity building, but it is by no means identity- or culture-free, although there is little research on that issue (except Virkkula and Nikula 2010). Since ELF is highly fluid and context-dependent and, as Motschenbacher (2013: 48) points out, involves much code-switching and segments from various languages combined at will and tied into English utterances, an ELF identity will necessarily also be fluid and more related to a certain linguistic practice, a way of using language than to traditional ethnical or political group boundaries.

However, since current Austrian language teachers, teacher educators and parents were schooled by teachers who firmly believed in native speaker norms for foreign language teaching and usually studied long before the concept of ELF was even introduced, introducing ELF in the classroom is a delicate issue. As discussed above, the general public is also very likely to believe in native-speaker ownership, both concerning their own mother tongue and any foreign language. Therefore, frequently people are criticised for not conforming to native-

speaker standards, including by peers in foreign language classrooms. Even teachers are criticised by learners for not having a native-like pronunciation, as the author clearly remembers. Seidlhofer (2011: 35f.) confirms that non-native speakers occasionally consider non-native speaker production incorrect even if it follows native English patterns. It seems that first and foremost, much public relations work is required to make ELF acceptable for the stakeholders of education, a task that is even daunting on a macro-scale, e.g. in a group of friends (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 56).

The concept of native speaker ownership also includes a strong belief about the infallibility of native speakers. However, on closer observation it should be clear that even based on the assumption of a clearly delineated standard language, native speakers by no means always conform to that standard (cf. Seidlhofer 2018: 88). Linguistic skills vary greatly across the population, depending on education, profession, personal interest and social interaction among other factors (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 89). Seidlhofer (2011: 73) even argues that "[n]o matter how expert a user of English might be, their expertise is confined only to a fraction of the recorded language" and that "[...] all English as actually used is similarly [as ELF], and necessarily incomplete and restricted, its acquisition and use bounded by functional need. Nobody knows the language, the whole language, and nothing but the language". She suggests that any language use is essentially using a partial resource strategically and appropriately.

Furthermore, it seems perfectly reasonable to assume that native speakers will use one or several dialects and sociolects, some of which diverge considerably from any standard. Some of these dialects are even used in informal written communication, e.g. in Swiss-German Facebook groups. The author's experience is that while this language is considered a German dialect, those writings are close to incomprehensible or at least require considerable efforts for speakers further away on the dialect continuum.

While in Europe close to 100% of any country's adult population can be expected to have received some formal schooling in their native language, the amount and outcome of such schooling vary greatly. Therefore, it seems somewhat unreasonable to consider any native speaker a perfectly reliable informant and model. Yet according to Seidlhofer (2011: 32f.) both linguists and laypersons seem to agree that there is something mystic about the native

speaker, something that cannot be defined or argued but only believed in, a strong and unconditional belief unusual among scholars.

Seidlhofer (2009a: 239) argues that since non-native speakers vastly outnumber native speakers of English, they should be considered norm-developing rather than norm-dependent (cf. Kachru (1985: 16f.). She explains that native speakers do not only grant non-native speakers the mercy of being allowed to adapt their language - adaptation occurs naturally as the language is appropriated, therefore it is rather a fact that must be acknowledged (ibid. 66). Moreover, she points out that language changes where- and whenever it is used, yet especially in an international context this is usually not acknowledged (ibid. 66f.). The prevailing concept of international language use is still Widdowson's (2003: 50f.) "language franchise view", in which native speakers distribute their language to be used exactly according to their specifications.

Yet language change is not merely a matter of ownership and identity. Seidlhofer (2011: 66) argues that simply adopted native-speaker English could not possibly function as an international language! Finally, she points out that there is an inherent contradiction in the debate on international English, native speakers cannot at the same time celebrate that their language has become an international language while still claiming ownership of it, yet even if some have realised this contradiction, it has had few effects, both traditions and interests in power and economic control are hindering factors (ibid. 66).

3.2.6. Cultural/Linguistic Imperialism vs. English as a Tool

While some native speakers fear that the international spread of English could lead to the demise of the language, some international observers fear the opposite - that the English language could force British and American culture on the entire world in a kind of colonial expansion, a phenomenon commonly called "linguistic imperialism". According to Motschenbacher (2013: 6f.) this theory is based on the assumption that native speakers own the language and are the central agents behind the spread of the language. However, he points out that a large number of scholars doubt the direct link between spread of English or ELF and Anglo-American culture. He suggests that actually, the spread of English seems to be more closely related to the overcoming of imperialism (ibid.).

Wilton (2012: 338f.) adds that the debate on the effects of the spread of English is often very emotional and extends far beyond the scientific community. She also notes that positions are often extreme - proponents of the one side claim that English will surely eradicate all other cultures while the other side claims that ELF is only used as a pragmatic choice and carries no identity aspects and cultural meaning at all (ibid.). Neither of these extreme positions seems very logical.

Wilton (2012: 339) explains that these very active concepts of language are based on the idea that languages are entities with an own will, entities that can “act independently of other entities”. This notion dates back to the 19th century and was mainly aimed at establishing language as a proper object of study. She adds that languages are also said to be agents of power and can spread the power of a political entity like a nation (ibid. 339f.). It is indeed true that language can be used to exert power, e.g. if political rulers use a language other than the majority language of the local population and thereby exclude the majority or a minority from political and possibly economic participation. These dynamics have been observed in many colonial contexts. Motschenbacher (2013: 9f.) strongly suggests that English is only a threat to minority languages in anglophone cultures, e.g. Gaelic but not to other minority languages. Wilton (2012: 340) also cautions that a language cannot be considered an entity on its own, disconnected from its users as such a concept disregards time, context and other factors.

Seidlhofer (2011: 68) argues that the loss of local languages does seem to be an issue in some areas but probably not anywhere in Europe. She suggests that this change is a matter of socio-economic prestige and not an issue of English itself. The perception of English as a threat to local languages is only valid if languages are assumed to be exclusive and competing and linked to nation states (ibid.). Moreover, the disappearance of languages is not necessarily negative either, provided the people involved are able to build satisfactory new identities, which is fairly likely if they actively adapt a new language.

Moreover, today English is frequently chosen in addition to well-established local languages, not only in order to communicate with native speakers but mainly with other non-native speakers. As Wilton (2012: 339f.) points out, the concept of language as an individual ignores the active role of its users, those who adopt the language and adapt it to fit their purposes. A

language without users is a static curiosity that resides only between the two covers of a book, with little influence on daily life (ibid.).

At the other end of the spectrum it is suggested that lingua francas can only be used for simple, factual translations, devoid of any emotions and therefore do not have any identity function (cf. Wilton 2012: 340). As mentioned before, this is not entirely true. Motschenbacher (2013: 8f.) suggests that language use is always closely linked to identity but not necessarily to national or regional identity. While ELF is clearly not a national or regional language, it is still linked to identity. He argues that it cannot be simply assumed that languages are "strictly tied to the nation" and deterministically linked to culture, i.e. that using a certain language immediately implies the "[…] (automatic) construction of a certain national identity" (ibid. 8f.). Furthermore, he considers it highly unlikely that language learners are likely to give up their national affiliations because they use ELF and emphasises that language learning does not imply automatic assimilation into target language culture (ibid. 9).

Wilton (2012: 349) states that a lingua franca can indeed be used to express identity, although often only specific aspects of an individual's identity, i.e. the lingua franca is used for specific domains. She adds that the view of ELF as "only a tool" quickly leads to functionalist reduction and ELF is even called "Bad Simple English" (BSE). This is a value judgement by experts, but they expect that language users judge ELF the same way (ibid. 341). This notion is closely linked to the issues discussed in chapter 3.2.4 on standard language ideology.

Finally, she notes that "[…] users of such a tool are not expected to be emotionally attached to it", a notion that clearly limits the potential functional range of ELF (ibid.). While there are some domains, in which a very restricted linguistic code is required (e.g. air traffic control), lingua franca English is much less specific and used in countless formal and informal settings, including extremes such as international diplomats on the one hand and young adults discussing their hobbies on the internet on the other hand (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 125f, 155f.). Many of these contexts can hardly be considered formulaic and devoid of emotion. Based on House's (1999: 74) suggestion that ELF is likely to be used among 'important people', e.g. in business, politics or science, Seidlhofer (2011: 146) considers it likely to be sophisticated and versatile.

Proponents of the tool approach tend to suggest the creation of a fixed simplified language to be used in international encounters. Such ideas have been voiced for a long time. The first well-known suggestion was BASIC by Ogden (1932) in the 1930s as Seidlhofer (2001: 276) explains. BASIC consisted of 850 words and only a few grammar rules and was designed as a second language for science, commerce and travel (cf. Seidlhofer (2001: 276), Seidlhofer (2011: 162)). Seidlhofer (2011: 162-164) explains that these words were collected mainly based on semantic research and supposed to cover every communicative concept, e.g. by taking advantage of redundancy and simplifying language by using terms such as *young dog* instead of *puppy*. She adds that BASIC, while simplified, stays within the boundaries of Standard English including some regulative conventions (ibid. 164).

Furthermore, there is a crucial difference between the concepts of BASIC and ELF. BASIC was designed for specific domains and intended only for factual exchanges, not meant to be used to express feelings. Therefore, it is unsuitable for general use (Seidlhofer 2001: 279f.; 2011: 168). Seidlhofer (2011: 179-181) points out that it is unreasonable to expect that ELF learners/speakers will never use English to express feelings, at least beyond the most basic tourist encounters. By contrast, lingua franca English is not restricted at all.

Furthermore, the absolute limit of 850 words means that creativity is not allowed, its users cannot change the language, therefore it lacks vitality (Seidlhofer 2011: 170). On the positive side, the concept of BASIC strongly focussed on the underlying system rather than pre-fabricated chunks of native-speaker production to be learned by heart (Seidlhofer 2001: 288; 2011: 178).

Similar attempts were made by West (1953), whose system was based on frequency in native-speaker English rather than perceived usefulness (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 159), further developed by Mackey 1965 (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 178f.). In the 1980s Quirk (1981) suggested a concept called Nuclear English, essentially a simplified Standard English (Seidlhofer 2011: 158-160). One of the most recent designs is Globish, which claims to be universal rather than restricted to specific domains but is at the same time explicitly limited to factual exchanges, it deliberately excludes metaphor, humour, acronyms and most of all creativity (Seidlhofer 2011:156-158; Globish.com. About Globish), rendering it useless for most real communication situations.

According to Seidlhofer (2011: 180f.) research has shown that lingua franca English is used for the same variety of functions as native-speaker English or any other L1. Emotions and ideas are so closely related that it is hardly possible to even distinguish between the two (clearly).

Essentially, the "language as a tool" approach insists on language that is only useful in tightly restricted communication situations and domains by allowing only the use of the ideational metafunction (interacting with the environment, understanding it, cf. Halliday 1985: xiii).

This approach is useful in fields such as air traffic control but of little help in more general communication situations beyond the most basic tourist transactions (e.g. asking for directions, purchasing tickets etc.). Lingua franca English on the other hand is only restricted by the limits of the virtual language (a concept explained in the following chapter) and the participants' willingness to accommodate. Therefore, for ELF users' language is more than a tool, emotions can certainly be involved.

On the other hand, native speakers occasionally fear that ELF would threaten their native language and therefore refuse to yield control of that language (cf. Wilton 2012: 347). However, Wilton (2012: 350f.) insists that lingua franca use is a universal feature of human language use rather than some kind of misuse, a natural way of communicating in certain contexts. Motschenbacher (2013: 9f.) adds that according to recent ELF concepts it is neither necessary to conform to external native-speaker norms nor to create internal ELF norms for successful communication. He also notes that ELF is always a local adaptation of English and therefore no instance of cultural imperialism (ibid.). Moreover, he suggests that if English was conceptualised as a de-nationalised lingua franca there would no longer be a spread of Anglo-American culture that could threaten anything and therefore no threat of cultural imperialism at all (ibid. 52f.). Essentially, as soon as the language is no longer considered property of its native speakers, the threat of cultural imperialism vanishes (ibid. 206). He also notes that the more familiar non-native speakers are with anglophone native-speaker culture sometimes the less they aspire to native-speaker language norms, either because they are considered unreachable or undesirable (ibid. 23).

Seidlhofer (2011: x) points out an interesting contradiction between "linguistic imperialism" and "ELF as a threat to proper English" theories - in one case the language dominates the

speaker, in the other vice versa. Both views refuse to accept that a language needs to be subject to change if it is to function at all. However, that refusal not all that uncommon, especially outside the world of professional linguistics. She adds that both views are based on the assumption that English (or for that matter any natural language) is some kind of stable entity, which it is clearly not, although this seems to be a deeply-entrenched belief (ibid. 33; Seidlhofer 2018).

Interestingly enough, even the most vocal opponents of linguistic imperialism occasionally criticise ELF speakers for not following native-speaker norms. Seidlhofer (2011: 34f.) lists some instances and suggests that this insistence on native-like language actually increases the power of native speakers over non-natives. She adds that in this case "[…] non-conformity can be used as a weapon against ELF users" (ibid. 38f.). Motschenbacher (2013: 207) argues that an official implementation of ELF would require both native speakers and non-native speakers to adjust and help remedy the imbalance of power. However, as shown above, such an implementation would be against the interests of countless economic stakeholders.

Finally, it should be noted that the spread of English in the recent past did not occur in a typical geo-political context, (i.e. military expansion or colonisation). Wilton (2012: 343) emphasises that unlike the spread of Latin in antiquity there is no colonial and military aspect to the current spread of English. Motschenbacher (2013: 207) adds that this spread is actually a bottom-up phenomenon, it reflects the needs and desires of the wider population rather than official efforts.

For all these reasons it seems rather unlikely that the spread of English will cause the extinction of other languages and cultures, at least if the users of the language are seen as active participants rather than recipients of pre-packaged language chunks distributed by their rightful owners. He also pointedly suggests that more recently English is "[…] less seen as a 'killer' language ousting other languages and lead-ing to Anglophone homogenisation across Europe, but more in terms of a medium whose internal hybridity causes new forms of linguistic variation and diversity" (ibid. 202f.).

3.2.7. Virtual Language

It has been mentioned that ELF is certainly not a variety, some kind of impoverished or even bastardised version of Native Speaker English (NSE). ELF is also highly flexible and subject to constant change depending on restricted local contexts. ELF is also constantly influenced by various first languages. Yet why is ELF still English? Why does it not disintegrate into unintelligible gibberish as Norwegian comedy show "Uti vår hage" ("Out in Our Garden", author's translation) (Urban Dictionary: Kamelåså) fears for Danish?

In this TV comedy, someone enters a bicycle repair store after his tyre is punctured but is unable to ask for a replacement inner tube, as he has forgotten the word since his own native language has changed so much. Instead he invents a word, which the mechanic does not understand either. However, the mechanic does not admit this but rather hands the customer the first object he can think of. The punch line is that Danish has changed so much that the native speakers no longer understand their language. Similar fears are often voiced for English if it is changed by non-native speakers.

Kaur (2009: 107f.) notes that it is often claimed that even World Englishes will eventually become mutually unintelligible and that the situation is assumed to become even worse if non-native speakers also "meddle around" with English. House (1999) expresses similar fears and doubts that ELF users only assume they understand each other without actually doing so.

Yet the reality seems to be different. Kaur (2009: 107f.) states that in fact there are remarkably few misunderstandings in ELF communication, far less than in interactions between native speakers and non-native speakers and suggests that this is probably caused by the willingness of all participants to accommodate. Seidlhofer (2001a: 143; 147-149) notes that her findings did not match those of House (1999), even based on what little corpus data was available at that time. Seidlhofer (2004: 218) covers this issue in more detail and suggests that House's suspicions do merit closer investigation.

Motschenbacher (2013: 195f.) points out that ELF is not completely random and creative, constraints do exist. According to his study these constraints mainly depend on local factors, e.g participants' linguistic repertoires, ELF proficiency, generic context (language conventions depending upon event type), ritualised practice (Motschenbacher (2013: 195f.) gives the example of celebrating Europeanness at the Eurovision Song Contest), "local requirements of

communicative efficiency" (ibid.). A more detailed account can be found in Seidlhofer (2004). Ehrenreich (2009: 140f.) adds that generally intelligibility in ELF merely a matter of getting used to something. ELF is not entirely random but according to Motschenbacher (2013: 194) correctness and proficiency are context-dependent, determined by communicative needs rather than by native-speaker standards.

However, there is a reason for continuous stability of English far beyond local circumstances and that is the underlying abstract rule system of the language. Based on Widdowson (2003: 50f.) Seidlhofer (2011: 111f.) refers to these rules as the "virtual English" and states that all utterances are measured against this virtual standard to determine whether they are 'English' or not. She adds that both native-speaker English and ELF are realisations of the same virtual language (ibid.).

What is a virtual language? Seidlhofer (2011: 113) compares languages to games and describes two kinds of rules. Constitutive rules define the actual game itself, if players do not follow at least most of them they are playing a different game. Regulative conventions on the other hand are common moves that define certain ways of playing (e.g. certain chess moves), different ways of realising the game within the framework of the constitutive rules (ibid.). However, she notes that the system is more easily applied to games than to languages since games are typically pre-defined while languages are not and therefore the constitutive rules can only be inferred from the study of actual language use (ibid. 114). Applied to languages, the total set of constitutive rules equals the virtual language while the regulative conventions govern how native speakers actually produce language (ibid. 114f.).

However, if these regulative conventions are assumed to be binding for any language user regardless of context, they suddenly become constitutive - if players do not strictly use the moves of certain well-known chess players, they are no longer considered playing chess (ibid.). It seems unlikely that anyone would agree to such a definition of chess, yet as shown in previous chapters all too many people readily accept such a definition of the language game!

Seidlhofer (ibid.) also points out that the constitutive rules of virtual English are much more comprehensive than e.g. Standard Grammar or Hymes' rules on the "possible" (Hymes 1972: 278) as they allow for realisations that would be considered deviant or creative (depending on

the observer's stance). One example of a lexical item that is not attested in native-speaker English would be *Handy* [N]. The word conforms to English morphology, phonology and is even attested, although in a different word class but changes of word class (referred to as conversion) are a very common word-formation process (cf. Yule 2010: 57). Therefore, *handy* conforms to the rules of the virtual language and is an English word. Yet it is frequently considered 'plain wrong' as it is probably a German coinage and not readily understood by native speakers of English.

New expressions can be non-conformist on one level but not on others but obviously they are always non-conformist on the lexical level (Seidlhofer 2011: 116). If lexis is excluded, as usually done in real-world native-speaker communication, adherence to the rules of the virtual language does not prevent creativity (ibid. 117). Moreover, as Seidlhofer (2011: 119) puts it, "creativity [is] a design feature of human language in general". However, it seems that even within one native language, a substantial group of language users furiously resents such change if it occurs within their lifetime, as shown by the examples concerning grammar (*Sinn machen*). As soon as non-native speakers are involved the situation becomes even more extreme. It seems to be generally assumed that only native speakers have the right to participate in creative processes and therefore teaching tends to ignore the creative potential entirely, forcing learners to simply reproduce ENL usage as closely as possible (ibid.).

However, research indicates that native-like language is not always appropriate or necessary. Seidlhofer (2011:124) argues that the regulative conventions of native-speaker English are not necessarily relevant to ELF communicative purposes and may even be at odds with them, following them would be an obstacle. She suggests that indeed "non-conformity is a natural consequence of appropriate communicative adaptation" and that ELF is simply a different language for different purpose (ibid). However, she adds that non-conformity is often perceived as anti-social and threatening (Seidlhofer 2018: 88).

There are numerous examples of highly successful professional communication that does not adhere to native-speaker standards. Seidlhofer (2011: 125f.) cites former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, who used the non-standard plural "evidences". She states that it is apparently possible to successfully navigate a highly important professional position that requires very intense international communication (a high degree of communicative effec-

tiveness) without adhering to native-speaker English standards! His example "evidences" even follows the constitutive rules of Virtual English (ibid.). As Seidlhofer (2011: 127) puts it, "non-conformity of form does not at all preclude communicative effectiveness but, on the contrary, can enhance it". However, she cautions that virtual English does not have clear and timeless boundaries either (ibid. 112). She also points out that neither grammars nor corpora can represent the entire language but are necessarily reductions and abstractions, as the former omit attested language use while the latter omit the potential of the virtual language (ibid. 113).

As shown in this chapter, it is the virtual language rather than the codified system in grammars and dictionaries or the attested native-speaker use as documented in corpora that determines whether an utterance conforms to the constitutive rules of a language. However, this raises the question how learners or novice language users can gain access to these rules in order to actively use the new language rather than reproduce prefabricated chunks of native-speaker language.

3.2.8. Implications of ELF for Teaching

The question arises, whether the concept of ELF could possibly have any influence on the teaching of English to non-native speakers. Jenkins (2000: 11) defines ELF communication as the primary reason for learning English as a foreign language today. Wilton (2012: 349f) states that English is a basic aspect of the curriculum in many European countries and that curricula also emphasise importance of ELF. She mentions that some curricula also require meta-knowledge on ELF (ibid.). However, she notes that unfortunately curricula usually fail to mention how to achieve, let alone assess lingua franca competence and tend to reinforce native speaker standards (ibid. 350). The Austrian curricula will be covered in detail later.

Wilton (2012: 350) shows that one German curriculum even implies that native-speaker English is the most likely kind of English to be encountered in communication situations - a highly dubious hypothesis. She argues that in reality, today's pupils (or rather young language users) encounter English in their everyday lives, "through mass media, in social networks, in marketing and advertising and in contacts with people from all over the world", an English

that is not standard native-speaker English but manipulated, often considered simplified, even degenerate (ibid. 350f.).

In a similar vein, Dewey (2009: 73) criticises that European English Language Teaching is still largely based on prescription and proscription and native English norms and that errors (or deviations from native-speaker patterns) are seen as negative. He suggests that teachers need to see language more as something situative, created by and in a specific context rather than a static system (ibid. 74). Seidlhofer (2005: 340) states that the main objective in ELF communication is intelligibility rather than correctness. Therefore, she suggests to focus on those elements of the language likely to cause misunderstandings rather than on fine details (ibid.). Seidlhofer (2018: 96) perceives a continuously strong fixation on code, i.e. a strong over-emphasis of the impact of native-speaker (written) standards on intelligibility, largely ignoring many other factors that influence intelligibility, e.g. shared cultural knowledge.

Dewey (2009: 78) suggests that language should be considered a set of resources rather than a fixed entity and that expertise should be more context-dependent. According to him the main aspect in ELF is communicative effectiveness and teachers should cherish the creativity of innovation and variation rather than considering it deviation, errors (ibid.). Seidlhofer & Widdowson (2019: 26f.) also emphasise that what is taught never equals what is learned, yet despite this discrepancy, teachers around the world still desperately try to make the learners learn the fine details of native-speaker standards.

Based on these findings (also see Kohn 2019) it seems sensible to let language teaching be informed by ELF research. However, this is a rather complex task. As mentioned before, ELF is not a fixed entity and by definition cannot be, therefore it cannot simply be cast into a new curriculum. As Motschenbacher (2013: 24f.) puts it, based on Seidlhofer (2011: 189), ELF cannot be learned, it has to be acquired while and by using it. However, this is not only true for lingua franca English. Widdowson (2009: 211) emphasises that any language learning is not a linear, cumulative process but rather an iterative process of learning and un-learning.

Seidlhofer (2011: 181) suggests a fundamental re-evaluation of language teaching practices in general. She defines two aspects of learning, the eventual objective and the learning process (ibid.). In the context of current foreign language learning the objective is usually the closest possible approximation of native-speaker norms (ibid. 181f.). However, little thought seems

to be spared on how to actually achieve this outcome and determining which kind of language input is most suitable for this learning process (ibid. 182f.). Widdowson (2009: 211) defines learning as an iterative process of constant cognitive adaptation, un-learning and re-learning rather than cumulative, in the instance of language learning the conversion of language input into processable data. He argues that "the more real or authentic the input, the more difficult is the conversion likely to be" and suggests that "[f]rom this perspective, then, teaching is mainly a matter of guiding this process of learning by unlearning, and the actual input presented by teachers is of sec-ondary importance" (ibid.).

According to Seidlhofer (2011: 182f.) second language acquisition research indicates that there are clear developmental stages, i.e. learners pick up some aspects of language more quickly than others, possibly due to some underlying schema of language acquisition. Therefore, it does not seem sensible to focus on aspects of the language the learners are not yet ready to learn. This assumption runs counter to the pleas for authentic native-speaker production as the only input for learners. Seidlhofer (2011: 183) concludes that a strict focus on objectives hinders the learning process. She also suggests that considerations of usefulness and potential for exploitation could also play a role in how fast learners pick up aspects of the language (ibid. 187). However, learners are frequently criticised for actively focussing on high-yield items rather than what the teacher considers important (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 188).

According to Seidlhofer (2011: 189) it is commonly assumed that a language is first learned and can then be used. However, she argues that these two aspects cannot be separated, they are parts of one process, "of exploiting the meaning-making potential virtually inherent in the language" (ibid.). Using the language enables further learning and the language is learned by using it. However, using a language on one's own terms is often frowned upon and the learners/users are punished for it, as the end of current language teaching is the close approximation of native-speaker norms, essentially by imitation (ibid.). In this system, proficiency is always measured against NS standards and inextricably linked to future communicative efficiency. The assumption is that the more closely learners follows native-speaker standards, the more proficient communicators they will become (Seidlhofer 2011: 184f.; Seidlhofer 2018: 92f.). Even the CEFR (see chapter 6) is native-speaker centric, despite all the attempts at plurilingualism. However, according to Seidlhofer (2011: 185) successful

communication does not require strict adherence to native-speaker standards. Motschenbacher (2013: 24) points out that indeed the opposite seems to be true, innovative language rarely leads to communication breakdown in ELF interaction, instead insistence on native-speaker models does. He emphasises that innovation in ELF is usually driven by the need to communicate successfully and not unilateral and random (ibid.).

Seidlhofer (2011: 187) suggests finding new criteria to measure performance against than native-speaker norms, i.e. communicative success. In such a system, the focus is no longer on how much of the language is picked up (i.e. how closely the learners emulate native speakers) but on how it is learned (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 187f.). It measures the development of the ability to make meaning, using the potential of the virtual language and learners are enabled to appropriate the language for themselves (ibid.). This is obviously an application of the principle of learner-centredness (ibid.).

Seidlhofer (2011: 186) sees two perspectives on ELF in current language teaching research.

According to the first concept, ELF is incompletely acquired, fossilised native-speaker English, fossilised interlanguage. The second concept considers deviations from native-speaker standards signs of successful learning. However, in both cases ELF is regarded as an interim stage on the way to full native-speaker English, an interlanguage (cf. Seidlhofer 2018: 93). As there is no clear definition of native-speaker English, there is no way of measuring a learner's position on that scale. Therefore, Seidlhofer (2011: 186f.) suggests finding alternatives to these two concepts and accepting ELF as "an end by itsELF". Sadly, even in the past eight years little seems to have changed, as Seidlhofer & Widdowson (2019) show.

Although as shown above, teaching ELF using a standard curriculum is impossible, teaching can become ELF-informed, e.g. by focussing on those aspects of the language that are important for understanding rather than those that only serve as social shibboleths. One important example would be Jenkins' (2000) ELF core in pronunciation. Dewey (2009: 78) suggests that teaching materials need to be more local rather than based on NS culture and norms. In an Austrian context that would likely imply the acknowledgement that all English learners have at least one language other than English in their linguistic repertoires and are immersed in a largely German-speaking setting rather than keeping the fiction that the learners can be submerged in an English-only context (cf. Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2001:

67). Furthermore, teachers and materials designers should acknowledge the fact that most Austrian English learners will become ELF speakers rather than communicate mainly or even exclusively with native speakers. Lopriore & Vettorel (2019) provide a good set of guidelines for determining whether teaching materials are suitable for an ELF-informed classroom.

Yet as Seidlhofer (2011: 9) found, teaching materials generally still focus on the English of the Inner Circle (or rather its theoretic representation in grammars and dictionaries). Teachers also tend to uncritically accept native speakers as authorities regardless of context (cf. Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2001: 66). Ever since the advent of computer-based corpora "authentic language" has been repeated like a mantra in the ELT business (cf. Seidlhofer 2001: 281; Seidlhofer & Widdowson 2019: 27).

However, the question is whether authentic language of native speakers is actually suitable input for non-native learners. Widdowson (1998: 331) strongly argues that such language is unsuitable for the classroom as classroom language is not "language to be learned as such, but language to be learned from", necessarily contrived and modified to suit the learning process. He adds that language teaching should enable learners to keep learning as long as they live, in any context they encounter (ibid.). Seidlhofer (2011: 181) confirms that and notes that naturalness does not necessarily make language more suitable for learning.

The question arises whether unfiltered, naturally occurring ELF production would be any more suitable as classroom input than naturally occurring native-speaker input, which seems dubious considering the nature of learning mentioned above. However, it does seem reasonable to expose nascent ELF users to a variety of accents and varying grammar.

Ranta (2009: 87-91) emphasises that teachers and materials designers should not confuse or mix spoken and written language, i.e. expect spoken language to conform to written standards. She suggests that many typical non-standard features of ELF are typical features of informal spoken Englishes rather than learner issues or instances of L1 transfer (ibid. 94-96; 101). Some of these features are even attested in academic native-speaker English, although at a considerably lower frequency (ibid. 94-96; 102f.)! This realisation is especially important as there seems to be a general bias towards written language among Austrian teachers as the author's anecdotal evidence suggests. As shown in chapter 3.2.4, this bias is nothing specifically Austrian.

The last chapter dealt with some attempts of creating simplified versions of English for international use, e.g. BASIC and Globish. While these constructs differ radically from ELF in certain aspects, they could serve as a core repertoire for future expansion, the life-long learning mentioned above (Seidlhofer 2001: 280). However, Seidlhofer (2011: 158-160) notes that all these simplified languages rely on standards and none of them allow for non-native speaker innovation. Motschenbacher (2013: 24f.) argues that learners should have the choice whether they want to become ELF users or strive towards native-like language. Simplified languages could be a starting point for both but no more than that. They are likely not models to be imitated slavishly. Those who opt for ELF would then acquire it by practice in real communication situations, as discussed above the only way of acquiring ELF or any language. The others can do the same in communication situations with native speakers and additionally use materials produced for native-speaker centred teaching.

Seidlhofer (2001: 289) considers language awareness the most important component of teaching and sees current language teaching largely as a waste of time considering its limited outcomes. According to her the majority of learners never develop "satisfactory communicative abilities in one foreign language, let alone in several." (ibid.). Seidlhofer (2001: 290) seems to suggest replacing "communication" with teaching of metalinguistic knowledge, which might be complicated for children and young adults. She argues that Ogden (1932) already suggested a focus on underlying principles of language rather than the rote-learning of prefabricated chunks in order to approximate native-speaker usage (Seidlhofer 2011: 178; 188). Furthermore, she suggests that learners should be enabled to cope with situations when they arise (ibid.).

As Seidlhofer (2011: 197) puts it, the main aim of language learning should be enabling the "development of a capability for effective use which involves the exploitation of whatever linguistic resources are available, no matter how formally 'defective'". The important criterion is communicative or functional effectiveness rather than correctness of form (ibid). She also emphasises that any language acquisition is necessarily partial (ibid. 198). Unfortunately, one occasionally cannot help but suspect that the current Austrian education system is more interested in accountability of assessment than in actual learning, despite frequent public

outcries about the downfall of education. McNamara (2011: 502) sees this focus on accountability as a general trend.

Native-speaker language should by no means be entirely excluded from the classroom. However, native-speaker usage can either be used as a norm or as a model. According to Seidlhofer (2001b: 60), linguistic norms have to be imitated slavishly, regardless of contexts of language use. Successful imitation means correctness. If a native-speaker variety serves as a model on the other hand, it is a “point of reference to which learners can approximate more or less closely, depending on the needs of the specific situation. The notion of models privileges the criterion of appropriacy over that of correctness” (ibid.). However, according to Seidlhofer (2018: 92.f) and Seidlhofer & Widdowson (2019: 27), norms are still prevalent in English teaching.

Unsurprisingly then, these considerations seem to have had little impact on education and particularly teacher education in Austria. Thir (2014) discovered that the pronunciation part of the teaching programme at the University of Vienna still largely views native-speaker pronunciation (either RP or GA) as norms. As Seidlhofer (1999: 234) puts it, deviations from the standard are usually met by embarrassment. Other bystanders might react with ridicule. This is not only true for foreign-language use but for wide areas of education, as shown by the popularity of books on native language “misuse”, e.g. by German author Bastian Sick.

The question is whether there are any concrete aspects of ELF communication that can be incorporated into teaching. Kaur (2009: 119) lists the use of adaptation and repair strategies as one of the core features of ELF communication. Language teaching could certainly focus on such simple strategies, e.g. repetition and paraphrase, and encourage learners to employ them. Using such strategies requires rather active participation of all interlocutors, constant checking for signs of non- or misunderstanding.

Ehrenreich (2009: 135) emphasises that ELF users are not language learners, in fact nobody is merely a language learner - a language is learned by using it. As Wilton (2012: 350f.) puts it, all users of English are agents, nobody is only a passive learner who is to receive the ancient wisdom of omniscient native speakers. Ehrenreich (2009: 144) describes a rather open concept of ELF, a holistic approach to understanding, suggesting that understanding individual words is often unnecessary for successful communication. She also has a very open

definition of intelligibility in ELF, considering it merely a matter of getting used to something (ibid. 140f.).

However, if taken to extremes, such a process of accommodation could be rather lengthy, possibly involving extensive non-verbal means of communication, e.g. pointing at objects (in the kamelåså example given on page 34 (a TV comedy episode, in which a man enters a bicycle repair shop with a punctured tyre but is given a file as he is unable to remember the word for *inner tube* because his native language has changed so much he can no longer use it), understanding could have been greatly facilitated had the customer brought his bicycle into the store and pointed at the flat tyre). Motschenbacher (2013: 24) suggests that innovation in ELF rarely causes misunderstandings, while strict insistence on following native-speaker models does. Finally, Ehrenreich (2009: 146) noticed a pronounced struggle among some ELF speakers to rid themselves of what was considered appropriate in school and learning what is considered appropriate in ELF communication.

Seidlhofer and Widdowson (1998: 8f.) also deconstruct the perceived supremacy of the native-speaker teacher. They argue that non-native teachers often know their learners' first language and "[…] have a pedagogic competence of a special kind: the ability to use language effectively *in the classroom*." (italics in original), which is not necessarily the same as everyday language use (ibid.). Furthermore, they suggest that native speakers might not be familiar with local contexts and therefore be less effective than local teachers despite their higher linguistic competence (ibid. 12). Seidlhofer (2000: 52) also notes that non-native speaker teachers have the advantage of having gone through the same learning process as their learners. Moreover, if the desired outcome is not adherence to native-speaker norms, native-speaker teachers no longer have any advantage.

Seidlhofer and Widdowson (1998: 9) argue that learners need to authenticate the new language, make it their own. One way to achieve this is translation, according to Seidlhofer and Widdowson (1998: 10-11) natural and unstoppable. Current textbooks tend to omit translation entirely, partly because many of these books are designed for heterogeneous groups without a shared first language and often immersed in a target-language environment according to Seidlhofer and Widdowson (1998: 10). Teacher education courses at the University of Vienna in the recent past strongly discouraged the use of translation in the

classroom and praised target-language only classrooms. The current Austrian curriculum is slightly divided on this issue, on the one hand it instructs that German (implicitly assumed to be the universal L1) shall be used as little as possible, on the other hand it recommends translation and contrastive analysis as a tool, especially in upper-secondary education (BGBl. 219/2016).

Seidlhofer (2001a: 134) suggests that the notions of "correctness", "mistakes" etc. are no longer as important in ELT theory as they used to and instead there is more awareness of social factors etc. However, the question is whether that is actually reflected in curricula and textbooks. Unfortunately, it seems only to a limited extent, as in CEFR rating scales that include fluency etc. rather than only correctness. As shown in chapter 6, even the CEFR only made moderate attempts at change with the 2018 Companion (Council of Europe 2018). On the other hand, grammars, dictionaries, textbooks had not changed much at that time and did not reflect the current discourse about teaching. Therefore, teaching had not changed either. It remains to be seen in the practical section of this study whether this is still the case.

Seidlhofer (1999: 235f.) argues that curriculum design from an inner-circle perspective completely ignores local context and potential cultural differences. However, she emphasises that teachers serve as mediators between textbooks and classroom reality, in fact they are considerably more important than the books since all texts have to be interpreted (ibid.). Furthermore, instruction and adapting the language to learners' needs is more important than the teachers' language skills are (ibid. 236f.).

As a final note of caution, she urges teachers never to take anything for granted and carefully analyse what their learners need and repeats that even highly unfashionable methods can sometimes be used successfully and shouldn't be excluded per se (ibid. 240).

4. Research Methodology

4.1. Research Question

Austria has a long tradition of English teaching in secondary education that reaches back into the early 20th century. A brief glance at curricula (see chapter 5) and older textbooks shows that during much of the last century English teaching was strongly focused on the United

Kingdom, mainly England, and to a certain extent on the United States of America, both in terms of language forms and of cultural content. Relatively recently the concept of World Englishes (see chapter 3.1) brought attested variety status to numerous new Englishes used in former British colonies, similar to the evolution of American English in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Even more recently, during the author's final years of secondary school in Austria, the concept of English as a lingua franca evolved and called into question the most basic assumptions about English Language Teaching (ELT), particularly in Expanding Circle countries. As shown in chapter 3.2, non-native speakers of English far outnumber native speakers and frequently use the language as an international lingua franca, with few or no native speakers present.

This study seeks to determine how well textbooks and the requirements both in Austrian curricula and in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages correspond to the current reality of English in the world as outlined in chapter 3.2.

The four main deciding factors on the choice of language input in Austria are the national curricula, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages by the Council of Europe (Council of Europe 2001a; 2001b; 2018), the various textbooks available on the market (and their authors) and the individual teachers. Apart from the latter, each of these factors will be investigated in this paper. Some insight into the role of the individual teachers and the training and education they have received, at least in Vienna, can be found in Thir (2014) but is beyond the scope of this study.

All Austrian textbooks published since approximately 1985 are accompanied by cassettes or, more recently, CDs with listening comprehension tasks, as teaching listening comprehension is required by the curriculum (see chapter 5). Since pronunciation is an important aspect of ELF communication, the distribution of accents of speakers in those tasks provides a good insight whether the books are native-speaker centric or not. Jenkins (2009: 11) found that Received Pronunciation is still dominant in teaching materials in Europe. Allinger (2015: 46) also suggests that despite the extensive research on ELF, textbook publishers still seem to assume native speakers as the main interlocutors for the learners and therefore "play it safe" by mainly including native accents in their recordings and even largely restricting themselves to the two most prestigious native varieties, Received Pronunciation and General American.

However, considering the findings in the chapter on ELF, it seems considerably more likely that Austrian learners will participate in ELF communication much more often than in exchanges with native-speaker interlocutors. Even at rather basic levels, learners (or less experienced ELF users) are likely to encounter e.g. tourists asking for directions in the street. Therefore, this thesis seeks to answer the question whether textbooks can be considered 'ELF-ready' or not by analysing the actual listening comprehension tasks, also considering additional information on the speakers in accompanying materials (e.g. task descriptions).

Allinger (2015) already investigated listening comprehension exercises and pronunciation sections in lower-secondary textbooks. She discovered that all textbooks included in her analysis do cover some aspects of ELF-aware teaching but none of them fulfil all requirements (Allinger 2015: 83). She chose nine core pronunciation features (cf. Jenkins 2000) and found that the textbooks analysed cover between four and only one of them (Allinger 2015: 83). Furthermore, she suggests that teacher's handbooks could do much more to convey the relevance of ELF pronunciation to sceptical teachers by presenting the central ideas and results of ELF research (ibid. 84f.). Finally, she discovered that the audio materials accompanying the textbooks heavily rely on a small number of standard accents, mainly RP, which is spoken by only a small minority of native speakers even in the UK (ibid 88f.; Seidlhofer 2018: 90). Therefore she suggests the inclusion of more non-native accents in textbook audio recordings and recommends tasks that involve more active participation of the learners rather than just repetition and imitation (Allinger 2015: 87; 89).

This study is partly based on her work and extends it to upper secondary education. From the point of view of future and active teachers this thesis asks the question: "Which English do we teach?" - or "Which English is suggested in our textbooks?". More precisely, it asks the question: "Is the language in our textbooks suitable for preparing learners for the current reality of English in the world?".

4.2.Scope of the study

Due to restrictions of space and time it would be impossible to cover the entire history of Austrian secondary education since the introduction of the concept of World Englishes. This study seeks to trace developments in English teaching materials during the author's educatio-

nal development from pupil to teacher. First, the status quo in the school year 2001/2002, the author's seventh form, is examined and then newer textbooks are investigated for changes that may reflect the growing scholarly influence of ELF. Furthermore, it casts a brief glance onto the question whether there is a difference between textbooks designed and published in Austria, specifically for the Austrian market and school system, and books designed for the international market and only adapted to the Austrian education system.

In the seventh year of Austrian general secondary education (AHS) it can be assumed that the learners of English as their first foreign language have acquired a solid grounding in the four skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking, see chapter 5) and, according to the CEFR, (see chapter 6) could be expected to cope with non-standard language. On the other hand, the school-leaving exam (Matura) is still far enough in the future that new items can be introduced to the learners without unnecessarily confusing them. Therefore, it seems safe to assume that if World Englishes and ELF are featured in any textbooks, those for the seventh form will have such content. The methods for selection and analysis of the textbooks will be covered in detail in the following chapter.

4.3. Methodology

4.3.1. Curriculum analysis

Curricula are one of the main factors that influence the development of (language) teaching in Austria, as they govern both textbook design and teaching practice. Therefore, they have considerable influence on the focus of Austrian English teaching and could either enable or hinder the implementation of ELF principles in language teaching. However, since they are not the focus of this thesis but only provide a general legal framework, no detailed analysis has been undertaken.

Artner (2013) performed a very detailed analysis of the Austrian curricula for language teaching with special regards to English as a lingua franca. He developed his own assessment grid for curricula (Artner 2013: 52-57) based on a German-language concept by Haenisch (1982). He also provides a very good overview of the Austrian education system for the age group 6-18 (Artner 2013: 58f.). While Artner (2013) focussed on the curricula themselves in his study, the main interest of this chapter is to trace explicit references to the native speaker

and specific accents as well as lingua franca usage in general or specifically English as a lingua franca in the curricula for general upper-secondary education. For further insights on other aspects of the curricula, see Artner (2013).

As shown in chapter 3.2, the concept of ELF means that a lingua franca is detached from what is traditionally perceived as native-speaker 'ownership' of a language and even constructed as an entirely new concept of language. This realisation could have considerable impacts on language teaching if suitably implemented. The most critical aspect regarding language teaching is that native speakers can still serve as models for language learners and users but do not necessarily have to. Rather than stubborn imitation of native-speaker patterns and fixed rules, ELF is about creativity and cooperation in order to negotiate meaning and ensure mutual understanding, while following the underlying patterns of the virtual language (see chapter 3.2.7.

Since ELF users are considerably more likely to communicate primarily with non-native speakers of English than with native speakers (see chapter 3.2), a strong focus on native-speaker input in education is rather counter-productive and indicative of a traditional EFL teaching approach. The importance given to native-speaker input is therefore a helpful indicator for the degree of ELF-awareness.

Curricula for Austrian secondary schools issued since 1964 are laws and published by the state. All laws are available free of charge on the government's Law Information System web site (Rechtsinformationssystem des Bundes). Each issue was downloaded and then analysed in detail, mainly with regards to specific language and pronunciation models to discover, to what extent the national curricula support the concept of ELF or hinder its implementation. While the curricula are legally binding, they do offer some room for adaptation to local context within the classroom (Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 15).

This section provides a historic overview of the development of the legal framework for both teaching and textbook publication with special regards to concepts such as target-language culture, the native speaker and specific accents. Considering that they are legally binding, curricula are one of the most important factors in the development of materials for teaching. While individual teachers can certainly exceed the requirements of the curriculum in specific

classroom situations, they are still bound to conform to the extent of enabling the pupils to pass examinations based on the requirements of the curriculum (BGBl. 2000/133: 983). Furthermore, all published resources, like textbooks, are designed within the limits set by the curriculum.

4.3.2. CEFR analysis

Faced with rapidly increasing mobility and global communication, as well as the growing importance of European integration, especially within a rapidly expanding European Union, the Council of Europe created an extensive system of assessment criteria for language learning, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (abbr. CEFR; Council of Europe: 2001a). For the first time, the CEFR sought to define set levels of language proficiency for any language, especially in order to facilitate mobility in education. These six levels, ranging from A1 to C2, are designed to represent the development of language learners from the most basic introduction to a proficiency level surpassing some native speakers, although the Council of Europe does emphasise that C2 is by no means the highest possible proficiency level (Council of Europe 2018: 50). This setup indicates a rather linear, compartmentalised view on language learning, the polar opposite of the iterative process outlined in chapter 3.2.8 (cf. Widdowson 2009: 211).

Additionally, the Council developed an extensive set of descriptors referred to as “Can-do descriptors”, enabling both learners and external assessors (e.g. teachers or examiners) to grade language proficiency on each level. Since the CEFR is the main theoretical framework for language teaching in Europe, its requirements are likely to have considerable influence on the implementation or non-implementation of ELF into Austrian school teaching.

4.3.3. Textbook analysis

While individual teachers are responsible for planning courses and selecting materials appropriate to the current classroom context (see chapter 4.3.2), textbooks shape the learning experience in the classroom to a considerable degree. From experience, both as a pupil and as

a student teacher, the majority of in-class tasks will likely come from the textbook, the teacher deciding, which ones are appropriate and necessary at what time and which ones are not.

Austrian public schools typically rely on government-subsidised textbooks. In order to become eligible for those subsidies, books have to be approved by the Ministry of Education. Currently approved textbooks are listed in the *Schulbuchliste* (2019) [schoolbook list]. In each school, all teachers of one subject choose one textbook for each form and order it for all learners in that form. Pupils only pay a small sum for the textbooks for all subjects (the author still remembers the time when schoolbooks were 100% subsidised by the government). Consequently, all books examined in this study were taken from the *Schulbuchliste*. At the time of writing nine textbooks were approved by the government (Schulbuchliste 2019: 193f.). Each publisher was contacted to obtain information on the popularity of their books, as most publishers offer at least two approved textbooks, usually in cooperation with international partners. Unfortunately, these attempts did not yield any results, as the publishers refused to provide numbers. Publishers were also requested to give information on the speakers in the audio material, the results are discussed below. This study is based on its own set of criteria but a good overview on the analysis of teaching materials can be found in Lopriore & Vettorel (2019).

The author's seventh year of secondary education began in 2001 and the most current book at that time, which also had a large market share (as an informal survey showed), Davis et al.'s *Make Your Way* 2000, was chosen for the study. Approximately in the middle of the study's time frame, *New Headway* by Liz and John Soars (Soars & Soars 2009) was published in an adapted version for the Austrian market. In order to find whether there are any differences between books specifically designed for the Austrian market and those for an international market, this book originally published in the UK was chosen for analysis. The most recent textbook specifically designed for the Austrian market is *Prime Time* (Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018), the third book analysed in this thesis. As this textbook series was designed specifically for the Austrian school system, it allows for a direct comparison to the first book.

By comparing both materials across a time span of almost twenty years and from two different publishing context, the study seeks to combine diachronic and synchronic analysis. Further research could be carried out extending the synchronic aspect of this study. Particular-

ly a comparison to the most recent edition of *Make Your Way* would provide interesting insights.

Since the curricula require learners to be made familiar with different varieties of English (see chapter 5) it seems reasonable to expect some input on varieties other than British and American English in textbooks, although Jenkins (2009: 11) found a strong dominance of RP, as did Allinger (2015). Two areas where this variation is most likely to be encountered are pronunciation sections and listening comprehension tasks. The main focus of this study is to investigate speakers' backgrounds in listening comprehension tasks, using both linguistic data from the actual recording and all available information in the task description, the text and in the teachers' handbook, i.e. any available information.

Early in the selection process, each publishing house currently offering textbooks on the Austrian market was contacted and asked to provide information on the speakers. Unfortunately, most publishers did not disclose this information. Only one Austrian publisher (Helbling, not covered in the analysis, e-Mail 17 Apr. 2018,) provided information at all, stating that all the recordings were done by external sound studios and the publishers had limited control over the choice of speakers. Helbling also referred to Cambridge University press (not covered in this analysis). In an e-mail (23 Apr. 2018) Cambridge University Press confirmed that all recordings for their textbooks were done by external recording studios. The publisher also wrote that in most instances the scripts do not contain specific accent requirements, unless the origins of a character are explicitly mentioned. The speakers are voice actors, who can convincingly reproduce various accents. Only in few instances, native speakers of languages other than English are employed. The third book (Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018) is an exception, as it discloses the names of all speakers on the booklet of the CDs. The audio tracks were recorded at Studio Soundborn in Vienna according to the booklet.

Then the task descriptions and additional information in the teacher's handbook were searched for information on each speaker's background. Davis et al. (2000) does not list any speakers but the recordings are also credited to Studio Soundborn.

In a first step, the textbooks and Teachers' Handbooks were examined for specific sections on pronunciation. If there were any, they were analysed to discover whether they are compatible with the principles of ELF. Jenkins (2000) defined a number of pronunciation features

essential for successful communication, referred to as the lingua franca core. Core features are essential for successful communication, while non-core features are unnecessary or even detrimental in ELF communication (Jenkins 2000: 124). The following section is a brief overview of her concept.

As Jenkins (2000: 124) puts it, in some instances transfer from the speaker's first language is perfectly acceptable, while in others, certain forms are necessary to ensure mutual intelligibility. She argues that in ELF communication, acceptability is no longer defined by native-speaker interlocutors. As shown in chapter 3.2, the interlocutors are mainly non-native speakers and the question arises, how much adherence to specific forms is acceptable to require of speakers (ibid.).

Jenkins (2000: 126f.) cautions that just defining a core does not automatically lead to mutual intelligibility, as evidenced by issues in communication involving only native speakers, assuming there is a common core to all (Inner Circle) varieties of English. Furthermore, she warns that the mere existence of a core does not have any pedagogic implications (ibid. 127f.). She also notes that while there likely is some shared element between non-native Englishes, mutual intelligibility is equally likely not only the result of that overlap but also of exposure to other non-native speaker Englishes and an ability to adapt, more than an average native speaker (ibid. 128). Jenkins (2000: 132f) lists several main features of a lingua franca core, namely

- most (RP and GA) consonants
- consonant cluster simplification
- vowel length
- nuclear stress

as well as teachability and learnability (some aspects of pronunciation are simple to isolate and teach, e.g. the distinction between fortis and lenis consonants, while others are not, particularly intonation), as discussed in chapter 3.2.8, and some phonological universals. Phonological universals are features shared by most languages of the world to a certain degree, e.g. the relative numbers of vowel and consonant phonemes (ibid. 133f.).

Supra-segmental pronunciation features mostly are non-core (Jenkins 2000: 135), except for nuclear stress (cf. Jenkins 2000: 153f.). As evidenced in the analysis, many textbooks put strong emphasis on the attitudinal function of intonation, but as Jenkins (2000:151) found, it

is much more context-dependent than previously assumed.and of little use in classroom teaching. She also points out that pitch, another feature that occurs often in textbook pronunciation sections, is extremely hard to analyse and model, even for native speakers (ibid. 152f.).

Furthermore, Jenkins (2000:153) found that - as the only supra-segmental aspect of pronunciation - nuclear stress placement is highly important and simpler to teach. Nuclear stress placement is the accentual function of intonation. However, while nuclear stress placement seems to be easy to acquire receptively, it seems to be very difficult to acquire productively (ibid. 154). Finally, Jenkins (2000: 156) found that articulatory settings (mainly the positions of articulators and muscle tension) are a highly important aspect of pronunciation learning. However, none of the textbooks analysed in this study consider this at all. Since the main focus of this study are the audio recordings, the pronunciation sections were only briefly analysed in order to determine to what extent they conform to the requirements of the lingua franca core. Allinger (2015) performed a similar study on textbooks for lower-secondary education and found only moderate convergence. Her findings have been mentioned before and will be mentioned again in the detailed analysis.

In the next step, the task descriptions for each listening comprehension task and the additional material in the Teachers' Handbooks were searched for information on the native language or origin of any of the characters. Finally, all the recordings on the CDs that accompany the textbooks were analysed for instances of various common English accents. For simplicity, accents were first grouped into broad categories likely to be found in the recordings. Firstly, established prestigious accents, namely Received Pronunciation in the UK (according to Jenkins (2009: 11) and Allinger (2015) the dominant accent in teaching materials) and General American in the US. Secondly, other native-speaker accents (mainly including regional variation within the UK, e.g. Estuary English, Scottish Standard English, Cockney, etc.) but also Irish English, and thirdly non-native speaker accents. The latter category includes both attested varieties that are generally assumed to be spoken mainly by speakers of English as a second language (Outer Circle Englishes, e.g. Indian English) and of non-native speakers of English from the Expanding Circle (cf. Kachru 1985).

Further categories and sub-categories were added as necessary during the analysis. Following Allinger's (2015: 54) example, a new category "British Near-RP" was introduced, as the vast majority of speakers on the CDs fall into this group. The category "other English accents" includes various regional dialects from England, e.g. Northern English, Southern English or Cockney. A category "Canadian" was considered, but although Canadian English does differ from General American, the differences are so subtle they are unlikely to be noticed by a learner of English at this stage (reaching level B2 of the CEFR), therefore no differentiation was made. Any accents that are not listed in the table did not occur in the recordings.

The categories above were first chosen based on probability and, during the analysis, expanded as necessary. When speaker nationality was mentioned in the description, the analysis confirmed or falsified these claims. Where no information was available at all, the phonetic analysis served to identify the speakers' linguistic backgrounds. Based on this analysis, a percentage of tasks that include World English or ELF speakers was calculated based on the total number of listening comprehension tasks accompanying each book.

In the following chapters, the three parts of the analysis outlined in this chapter will be carried out. The first chapter deals with the Austrian curricula, the second with the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* and the final chapter of this thesis covers the three textbooks.

5. The Austrian Curricula

This thesis deals with English language teaching in the Austrian equivalent of Grammar schools, the "Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule" (AHS), a general education eight-year secondary school. For those less familiar with the Austrian education system, Artner (2013: 58f.) provides an excellent overview. Curricula (German '*Lehrplan*') for the AHS and other Austrian schools are laws, which are published by the government in the "*Bundesgesetzblatt*". These are freely accessible to all citizens on the internet (Rechtsinformationssystem des Bundes) dating back to the 19th century. Older issues have been scanned and converted into searchable PDF files, while those since 2004 have been issued as official PDFs (RIS - Allgemeine Informationen).

Since the main focus in this study is on sound recordings supplied with textbooks, the curricula are only briefly analysed in order to determine the general legal conditions for language teaching in Austrian schools, as outlined in chapter 4.3.1. Artner (2013) undertook a much more extensive and detailed investigation of these documents, while the present study is limited to the curricula for the 7th form of the AHS. Artner (2013: 52-57) notes that very little work has been done providing tools for the analysis of existing curricula. His own analysis (Artner 2013: 52-57) is based on Haenisch, 1982. Nunan (1988) provides some insights from a different perspective, presenting guidelines for the collaborative construction of curricula. It should perhaps also be pointed out that the general English literature uses the term *curriculum* in a much broader sense than the German *Lehrplan*, which is an officially mandated set of guidelines for an entire school system rather than for a specific language course. In this study, only the narrow, legal sense is covered.

While this thesis deals with the general time frame between 2000 and 2018, this chapter will provide a general historic overview of the Austrian curricula for the subject *English*. Although the focus is on upper secondary education, the curricula frequently refer to those for lower secondary schools and therefore all curricula have to be examined. Earlier examples were very detailed, especially regarding teaching contents for each subject, while more recent ones foreground underlying skills and competencies. Most curricula refer to varieties of English, particularly in terms of pronunciation but also vocabulary. However, most references to specific aspects of language in older curricula are in the lower-secondary documents, while those for the upper secondary only build upon what has already been acquired by the learners.

The AHS requires pupils to learn at least one modern foreign language for the entire eight years with at least one additional foreign language, which can be either ancient Greek, Latin, or one or more other modern foreign language or languages. The selection of those languages is made by each individual school and some offer parallel programmes with different language requirements, e.g. one with three foreign languages and another with two languages and a focus on science. These formal requirements for language programmes (duration, number of weekly lessons, etc.) can be found in the various curricula, e.g. BGBl. 133/2000: 995-1003.

The first foreign language is usually English for all pupils (Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum 2007: 4). This first foreign language is taught from year one to year eight, additional foreign languages are taught from either year three or year five to year eight. Since the curricula for second or third foreign languages are largely identical to the lower-secondary curricula for the first foreign language, this analysis will focus on those for the first foreign language, especially since English is very likely to be learned as the first foreign language. According to Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum (2007: 4) 96 per cent of the pupils in upper-secondary education learned English during the school year 2004/05!

The first AHS curriculum available in the RIS is the 1964 curriculum for the lower secondary (BGBl. 163/1964), presumably the first issued after the 1962 school reforms decreed in BGBl. 1962/242. The section on pronunciation declares that "Aussprache und Tonführung müssen derart geschult werden, daß sie der Sprechweise des gebildeten Engländers möglichst nahekom- men." [Pronunciation and intonation have to be trained in a way that approximates that of an educated Englishman as closely as possible.] (BGBl. 163/1964: 980). The detailed curriculum for the fourth form (BGBl. 163/1964: 982) mentions that the most important aspects of American pronunciation and spelling should be explained, the only instance of accents other than British in this document. Teachers are recommended to use records and tapes of native speakers in order to provide pronunciation models. Although the curriculum strictly prescribes British English, it is later conceded that while Austrian schools teach British English (also referred to as "BBC English", presumably Received Pronunciation), American English should be presented as equal (BGBl. 163/1964: 983).

The 1967 revision (BGBl. 295/1967: 1735) dropped the reference to the 'educated Englishman' and replaced it with the „[…] Aneignung einer möglichst fehlerfreien Aus- sprache nach dem Vorbild der ungezwungenen Sprechweise des gebildeten Fremdsprachigen [...]", mostly correct pronunciation modelled on the casual speech of an educated foreign-language speaker. However, the reference to 'BBC English' remains identical (BGBl. 295/1967: 1739). The upper-secondary curricula introduced with this revision make no reference to pronunciation or language varieties, nor does the 1970 revision (BGBl. 275/1970).

In 1985, the curricula were extensively revised for the first time (BGBl. 88/1985). Here the concept of the "four skills" (listening, speaking, reading, writing) was introduced and, as part

of teaching those skills, the listening comprehension task (BGBl. 88/1985: 813). While previously recorded native-speaker input was only considered a pronunciation model, now actual comprehension became important.

The 1985 curriculum also ended the primate of the (British) English native. According to the curriculum (BGBl. 88/1985: 814): pupils should now acquire a pronunciation "resembling the standard pronunciation of an English-speaking country as closely as possible". This change of wording implies the acceptability of any native-speaker standard but does not necessarily include Outer Circle (Kachru 1985: 12) varieties, depending on whether these are considered English-speaking countries that have a standard language or not. Considering that Kachru's model was only published the same year, it seems safe to assume that the curriculum designers mainly thought of British and American English. Besides, Outer Circle countries are usually assumed to have few, if any native speakers of English.

In 1989 (BGBl. 63/1989: 650) the concept of inviting native speakers into the classroom, (e.g. as guests, exchange teachers or assistants) was introduced, presumably to expose the pupils to even more authentic input and also enable actual communication with native speakers. It is also explicitly mentioned that listening comprehension tasks should only include native speakers, thereby mostly excluding Outer Circle speakers (BGBl. 63/1989: 650f.). This can be considered a clear sign of a native-speaker bias.

In 1995, another important change occurred. The pupils were now explicitly expected to cope with different varieties of English, not referring to standard language (BGBl. 644/1995: 7635). However, in 2000 (BGBl. 133/2000) this was reduced to "different standard varieties of English" again, although the possibility of including regional variation is mentioned (BGBl. 133/2000: 1013-1015). This revision of the curriculum also introduced the concept of successful communication instead of correctness, stating that „Als Ziel ist die Fähigkeit zur erfolgreichen Kommunikation, die nicht mit fehlerfreier Kommunikation zu verwechseln ist, anzustreben", the aim should be the ability to communicate successfully rather than correctness (BGBl. 133/2000: 1012). Presumably, the term 'regional variation' only refers to dialects within native-speaker varieties.

The 2004 revision for upper-secondary education (BGBl. 277/2004) officially introduced the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR, Council of Europe

2001a) and its rating scales (ibid. 26-28), which will be analysed in detail in the next chapter. Teachers are instructed to consider errors as a necessary part of the learning process but advised that the eventual aim should still be close approximation of native-speaker production, especially concerning pronunciation, although within reason (ibid. 24f.). Again, this shows a continued strong native-speaker bias. As outlined in chapter 3.2.8, such an insistence on native-speaker norms is not very helpful for aspiring language users in the Expanding Circle. The document also mentions that input should be as authentic as possible (ibid. 23) and lists native speakers as the only recommended communication partners, e.g. assistant teachers, exchange students etc. (ibid. 24). As mentioned before, Austrian pupils are much more likely to participate in ELF encounters in their daily lives than in communication situations with native speakers of English, therefore this exclusive focus on native-speaker input seems dubious.

The curriculum is not specifically for English and therefore only provides general guidelines for modern languages. It states that examples of national varieties are to be included in listening comprehension tasks, if appropriate even regional, social, professional and non-native variation (ibid. 25). The latter condition probably refers to vocational schools as well as regional variation of neighbouring languages in border areas or areas with large minorities. The most important part, however, is the last sentence. The 2004 curriculum is the first to mention that if a language is used as an international lingua franca, teachers are to include examples of non-native speaker pronunciation (ibid.). While this ignores the field of ELF grammar and creativity in vocabulary entirely, it is the basis for the necessary inclusion of non-native production in listening comprehension tasks. However, this is a slight contradiction to the requirement mentioned above (BGBl. 277/2004: 24).

The 2016 revision (BGBl. 219/2016) contains only one significant change from the previous version. For each school year "competency modules" for all four skills are described and the modules for year 7 listening only require learners to understand standard language (ibid. 35f.). This contradicts even the superficial requirement for lingua franca input (ibid. 31; BGBl. 277/2004), suggesting that the inclusion of the lingua franca may have been little more than lip service.

Especially the more recent curricula are increasingly limited to general guidelines for foreign-language learning and contain little language-specific input. They obviously attempt to include research findings and new methods but often appear to find it difficult to reconcile various contradictory requirements. On the one hand they focus on assessment while on the other hand they emphasise communicative competence. Similarly, the curricula focus strongly on standard language and native-speaker approximation, while requiring non-native speaker input in languages that are used as lingua francas. The curricula also rely heavily on the CEFR, which will be analysed in detail in the following chapter. Regardless of any potential shortcomings of these curricula, one could reasonably expect to find at least some examples of non-native speaker input in recent textbook materials, considering the explicit requirement in the 2004 and later curricula mentioned above.

6. The CEFR

This chapter deals with another aspect of international language policy, the CEFR, short for Common European Framework of Reference for Language (Council of Europe: 2001a). The CEFR is a document published by the Council of Europe, designed to facilitate the design of language teaching curricula, courses and materials and facilitate international mobility in education. It is also designed to provide guidelines for assessing language proficiency by introducing a six-level scale ranging from A1 (lowest) to C2 (highest). It should be mentioned that C2 is not the highest possible proficiency level, Council of Europe (2018: 50) specifically mentions professional translators and interpreters as examples of individuals most likely to considerably exceed C2 proficiency.

For each of these levels, there is a set of “Can do” descriptors that can be used to measure various aspects of language proficiency. The framework is accompanied by an extensive list of descriptors for the assessment of linguistic proficiency (Council of Europe 2001b). In 2018, an updated and extended version was published: the CEFR Companion Volume (Council of Europe: 2018). The companion is explicitly designed as an extension of the original document rather than a replacement (Council of Europe 2018: 21f.)!

Since its original publication, the CEFR has become a widely accepted basis for curriculum design and language assessment both within the EU and worldwide. The Austrian curriculum has been based on CEFR levels since 2004 (see chapter 6), specifying the desired levels for language learners at the end of each school year. Textbooks usually also refer to the CEFR levels on the cover. Therefore, the CEFR is an important basis for the analysis of Austrian textbooks.

Since the focus of this thesis is ELF in Austrian language teaching materials, the most important question is whether the CEFR allows for or even encourages the inclusion of ELF-related concepts or whether it is limited to traditional foreign-language teaching. Therefore, the CEFR was assessed using the criteria set out in chapters 3.2 and 3.2.8. Since the CEFR is designed to apply to the teaching and learning of any given language it can be assumed that lingua franca use and ELF in particular is unlikely to play a central role but it remains to be seen whether it is covered at all.

As discussed in chapter 3, the general assumption in language teaching is that learners acquire a language in order to communicate with its native speakers and strive for the ultimate goal of a performance equal to or as close as possible to that of an ideal native speaker. Native speakers are assumed to exert control over the language and provide norms that the language learners follow. Learner progress is measured against these norms. Any deviation from native-speaker patterns is considered erroneous rather than creative. Seidlhofer & Widdowson (2019: 26f.) emphasise what a fruitless effort the pursuit of such a view on teaching and learning is.

In ELF-informed teaching on the other hand, native speakers only provide models to those who strive to communicate mainly with native speakers and adapt both to their linguistic norms as well as to their culture and they provide data on the underlying system of the language, the virtual language that each language user, no matter how inexperienced, can exploit creatively (see chapter 3.2.7).

As shown in chapter 3.2.2, ELF encounters usually only encompass a minority of native speakers, if any, therefore idiomaticity, colloquialisms and shared cultural references play a much more limited role as in interactions with native speakers of a common cultural background. The most important feature of ELF interactions is the willingness to adapt to an infinite variety of influences in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, metaphors etc. as well as

spontaneous coinage etc. and the only benchmark is communicative success rather than adherence to native-speaker standards.

Since English is currently probably the most important lingua franca in Europe and the CEFR applies to any language it seems sensible to assume that the CEFR will focus mainly on traditional foreign-language learning, but the main question is whether lingua franca use is covered at all. The first source is the full list of descriptors from the 2001 edition (Council of Europe 2001b). It contains scales of descriptors for all four skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing). This thesis focusses mainly on listening comprehension, therefore all descriptors related to written production and reading comprehension have been omitted.

Already the table of contents promises frequent encounters with the concept of the native speaker and there is an entire section dedicated to "Understanding a Native Speaker Interlocutor" (Council of Europe 2001b: 3). Many of the descriptors mention native speakers, e.g. Global Scale B1 "Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party." (Council of Europe 2001b: 5) or B2 conversation: "Can sustain relationships with native speakers without unintentionally amusing or irritating them or requiring them to behave other than they would with a native speaker." (Council of Europe 2001b: 13). The section on phonological control provides another item of evidence on the native-speaker orientation of the CEFR. A1 proficiency is defined as "Pronunciation of a very limited repertoire of learnt words and phrases can be understood with some effort by native speakers used to dealing with speakers of his/her language group." (Council of Europe 2001b: 28)

The wording strongly suggests that native speakers are considered the only likely interlocutors and also judges of any production. As discussed above, this is a highly unlikely scenario for the majority of Austrian English learners. The CEFR rating scales also frequently mention cultural issues, e.g. Sociolinguistic Appropriateness C2 (Council of Europe 2001b: 29):

> Appreciates fully the sociolinguistic and sociocultural implications of language used by native speakers and can react accordingly.
> Can mediate effectively between speakers of the target language and that of his/her community of origin taking account of sociocultural and sociolinguistic differences.

or B1 (ibid.):

> Is aware of, and looks out for signs of, the most significant differences between the customs, usages, attitudes, values and beliefs prevalent in the community concerned and those of his or her own."

If the CEFR were concerned with lingua franca use, at least in this context it would seem wise to mention the lesser importance of cultural references for lingua franca users. Since ELF encounters are likely to include participants from an infinite number of cultures, appropriateness is a very local term that needs to be constantly negotiated, even more so than within one established group, e.g. a nation (see chapter 3.2). Awareness is certainly even more necessary in those dynamic contexts but considering the constant emphasis on the native speaker in the CEFR it seems likely that the quotes refer to a more traditional notion of target culture.

The general assumption seems to be that the interlocutor in any sort of exchange will be far more proficient, possibly a native speaker. In reality, any language user is fairly likely to encounter people on a wide range of proficiency levels, from minimal tourist English (e.g. in Croatia, Turkey or China or tourists from these countries in Austria) to C2 level non-native speakers, e.g. academics, and additionally near-native EFL/ESL speakers. Even if we accept the fiction that everyone is learning English in order to travel to the UK, language learners are fairly likely to encounter a large number of ESL speakers of varying proficiency, even in the most basic exchanges, e.g. ordering food. Few to none of these speakers are likely to speak the standard language (especially in terms of pronunciation) taught in schools. Moreover, as mentioned in chapter 3.2, proficiency varies greatly among native speakers and one is also likely to encounter strong regional and social variation. Therefore, it seems reasonable to expose even novice language learners at least to varying accents, if only in appropriately simple exchanges.

As mentioned in chapter 3.2.4, the term "standard language" is rather problematic, yet it frequently occurs in both the original descriptors (Council of Europe 2001b) and the Companion (Council of Europe 2018), not only concerning phonology but in all aspects of language including writing, e.g. Council of Europe (2001b: 5; 6, 28); Council of Europe (2018: 56; 167). The latter instance is perhaps also the most reasonable, as standard language is generally (if we accept its existence at all) only used in writing (cf. Seidlhofer 2018: 87).

This focus on standard language is partly understandable as it suggests a higher degree of predictability for insecure language users and a limited range of lexical, semantic and

phonologic features to be encountered but as shown in chapter 3.2.4, standardisation is a convenient fiction (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 71f.) considering the permanent evolution of language. Therefore, a concept built largely around “standard language” is unlikely to represent the reality of ELF users, particularly regarding pronunciation.

In 2018 an extended and revised document was published, the Companion Volume (Council of Europe 2018). According to the authors, it is to be considered an extension rather than a replacement of the original publication (Council of Europe 2018: 23). They also assure that competence is not measured against native-speaker standards but against the performance of other top learners (Council of Europe 2018: 35; 165). This line of reasoning seems somewhat circular. Assuming that most past learners used materials designed around native-speaker standards, their proficiency is an approximation of native-speaker standards, therefore anyone measured against the performance of those speakers is indirectly measured against native-speaker standards. Moreover, the Companion (Council of Europe 2018: 165) immediately emphasises the importance of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. While this may be acceptable for most languages, it is certainly not suitable for all learners of English considering the unique situation of English in the world as discussed in chapter 3.2.

The Companion (Council of Europe 2018: 45; 47; 50) also prides itself on having removed all references to the native speaker in the reference scales. This claim raises the question with what the concept was replaced. From an ELF perspective, one would hope for an approach that is mostly centred around communicative success and at a first glance that seems to be the case. Most descriptors now refer to “natural speed” (Council of Europe 2018: 223) and references to the native speaker have largely been replaced with “other speaker” (e.g Council of Europe 2018: 91). The CEFR (Council of Europe 2018: 47) explicitly prides itself of having removed all references to the native speaker in the phonology section, replacing it with intelligibility. However, the term “standard language” has largely been retained (e.g. Council of Europe 2018: 56, Understanding conversation between other speakers B2 and B1), despite the term being almost as problematic as “native speaker”. The perhaps oddest remark is the reason for the omission of the term native speaker (Council of Europe 2018: 50) because it had become “controversial”. No theoretical reasoning is given for that change.

Upon further reading it also seems that traditional concepts such as the *interlanguage continuum* reappear. The concept of the interlanguage continuum (cf. Seidlhofer 2018: 93) assumes that foreign language learning is an essentially linear process from no knowledge at all through stages of partial language acquisition to full native-speaker capacity. The range between the two extremes is referred to as the interlanguage continuum, in which learners are still influenced by their native language and have not yet mastered the foreign language completely, using an interlanguage, i.e. a "a simplified or distorted representation of the target competence" (Council of Europe 2001a: 155). As discussed previously, this linear view of learning is highly problematic.

Council of Europe (2018: 131) suggests that while creativity is encouraged, even at the cost of mistakes, eventually the learner will master certain forms and cease making mistakes and errors, i.e. approximate native-speaker norms more and more closely. Non-attested language use is thereby restricted to the lower ranges of the continuum. Moreover, some CEFR scales put considerable weight on collocations and idiomaticity (Council of Europe 2018: 134), two aspects entirely dependent on native-speaker norms, which can only be learned by imitation.

Council of Europe (2018: 134) also suggests that the phonology scales have been entirely re-developed in order to remove the existing native-speaker bias and replace the notion of correctness with that of intelligibility. However, native-speaker norms are still explicitly present and part of assessment, i.e. only the weight placed on correctness has been reduced. Furthermore, as mentioned before no reasons are given for the change, except that the term had become "controversial" (Council of Europe 2018: 50), which suggests that the changes might have been rather superficial.

The implicit assumption that the ideal native speaker is the only possible pronunciation model is also expressed by the generous allowance for some traces of a "foreign accent even at C2 level (Council of Europe 2018: 136). In the detailed description of the proficiency levels, even the native speaker, who is unintentionally amused by errors or mistakes in non-native speaker production, reappears (Council of Europe 2018: 164).

While moving the focus from correctness to intelligibility (Council of Europe 2018: 135) is certainly laudable, the practical consequences of this shift depend entirely on the perspective of the interlocutor. If the interlocutor is again assumed to be a native speaker, little is gained

over the old model. As shown in chapter 3, intelligibility largely depends on the participants' willingness to accommodate and that tends to be lower in native speakers, as mentioned in chapter 3.2.

The main issue is that the CEFR is supposed to be applicable to any language and does not take lingua franca use into consideration at all. While there are some decidedly positive developments towards a lingua-franca informed teaching and learning framework as will be discussed later, there is no explicit mention of lingua franca use. Instead, the CEFR frequently refers to native-speaker standards (cf. Seidlhofer 2011: 184f.). Mc Namara (2012: 199f.) also emphasises the native speaker focus of the CEFR and the complete absence of lingua franca concepts. The positive identity function of L1 influence is not considered either, "the extent of influence from other languages spoken" is still considered detrimental to proficiency (Council of Europe 2018: 135). McNamara (2011: 500) points out that attempts of universal standardisation are detrimental to language learning and especially lingua franca communication.

Sociolinguistic appropriateness is another important concept in the Companion. Generally, appropriateness is highly context-dependent and therefore applies to any communication situation. However, in the Companion (e.g. Council of Europe 2018: 137f.; 6) it seems strongly focussed on a "target language cultural community", which essentially appears to be the native speaker community in a new guise. This suspicion is backed by the mention of "implicit cultural references" (ibid.). That suggests that language according to the CEFR always includes the baggage of the target community's culture, based on the assumption of a clearly defined target language community, likely consisting of ideal native speakers.

The Companion (Council of Europe 2018) does contain a major conceptual ground-break, the introduction of plurilingual competence. This concept emphasises the inter-related nature of any individual's linguistic resources and the active role of any language user in the shared construction of meaning in interaction (cf. Council of Europe 2018: 23). This view of the language user is much closer to that in ELF-research than to older models. However, care needs to be exerted not to force communication into slavish reproduction of attested native-speaker patterns. Seidlhofer (2018: 95) suggests that despite all attempts of improvement the CEFR still compartmentalises languages rather than promoting an integrated view.

The Companion (Council of Europe 2018: 26) does make some promising claims: “The CEFR presents the language user/learner as a ‘social agent,’ acting in the social world and exerting agency in the learning process. This implies a real paradigm shift in both course planning and teaching, promoting learner engagement and autonomy.”

The authors also suggest that plurilingualism improves perception of the “linguistic organisation of different languages” and increases meta-linguistic awareness, also facilitating future learning by using the language (Council of Europe 2018: 29; 51), essential features of ELF! Pluricultural competence with its emphasis on local context appears to be a central aspect of ELF communication, at least if one allows for deviation from native-speaker standards. The authors (Council of Europe 2018: 113) even concede that an individual’s competence in a foreign language may sometimes exceed that in their L1, effectively stating that the native speaker is not necessarily the only benchmark for language learners. Perhaps this should not be too surprising, as L1 proficiency varies greatly across societies as well as across domains within individuals, as mentioned in chapter 3.2.

Moreover, some of the CEFR requirements appear rather challenging and assume ideal conditions, possibly even unrealistic for native speakers, considering cognitive limits, technical challenges (e.g. poorly transmitted announcements and telephone calls resulting in noise, echoes and momentary loss of connection), familiarity with accents and clarity of articulation (see e.g. Council of Europe 2018: 58; 92).Especially lacking clarity of articulation occasionally leaves even highly articulate native speakers at a loss, forcing them to rely on contextual clues. One remarkable example of this are the old Vienna underground announcements “Train departing” [*Zug fährt ab*], where most operators mangled three words into one, considerably shifted vowels and rendered the result generally unintelligible to anyone. Even worse are faulty PA systems that overlay important information with noise.

The theoretical section of the Companion also lists several important ELF strategies (cf. chapter 3.2, particularly 3.2.2 and 3.2.8), e.g. paraphrase, simplification, repetition, link to previous knowledge, register shifting, the willingness to request and offer clarification etc. (Council of Europe 2018: 126; 158) and invites the mixing of resources from what is usually considered different languages (ibid. 126, 139, 160). Moreover, it emphasises the importance

of flexibility, creatively using the linguistic items available to an individual (ibid. 139), although this is usually frowned upon as it tends to reduce accuracy.

Another concept that closely relates to ELF research is pluriculturalism. Since ELF encounters are highly diverse and may involve as many cultures as participants, “the need for understanding that different cultures may have different practices and norms, and that actions may be perceived differently by people belonging to other cultures […]” (Council of Europe 2018: 158) is even greater than in encounters between non-native and native speakers. The Companion (Council of Europe 2018: 158) also lists “anticipating possible risks of misunderstanding”, which seems to be considerably more complicated in ELF than in typical foreign-language encounters since ELF is much more diverse and much less predictable than an assumed target culture (see chapter 3.2.2). Nonetheless, the willingness to deal with such differences is essential for ELF users. The Austrian curricula (see chapter 5) also sometimes go beyond the requirements of the CEFR, e.g. concerning understanding non-native accents.

In general, the CEFR is a useful tool for the design of language courses and materials but it is certainly not a set of guidelines to be strictly followed. It has decidedly evolved considerably between the original publication and the current revision. If the descriptor scales were modified appropriately, implementing the suggestions from the theory section of the Companion (e.g. Council of Europe 2018: 157f.), the CEFR could provide an ideal basis for the creation of ELF-informed curricula, teaching materials and assessment. However, McNamara (2011) cautions that the general trend towards standardisation and accountability fundamentally endangers the flexibility necessary for successful ELF communication.

7. Textbook Analysis

In this chapter, the listening comprehension tasks in each textbook will be analysed in detail. As mentioned in chapter 4.3.3, there are some handy general guidelines for the assessment of textbooks, e.g. Lopriore & Vettorel (2019). However, this study mainly focusses on a very specific aspect of each textbook, mainly the pronunciation of the speakers in the audio materials supplied with the books and to some extent the compatibility of the pronunciation sections with the lingua franca core (Jenkins 2000).

Three textbooks approved for Austrian secondary schools with publication dates between 2000 and 2018 (Davis et al. 2000; Soars & Soars 2009 and Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018) were chosen in order to provide an overview of the synchronic development during the author's path from pupil to teacher. Two of the books (Davis et al. 2000 and Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018) were specifically designed for the Austrian market, while the third (Soars & Soars 2009) was designed for the worldwide market and slightly adapted for the use in Austrian schools, introducing a diachronic aspect to the study. Detailed criteria for the selection are explained in chapter 4.3.3.

Each series of textbooks includes a set of CDs for classroom use. The amount of audio materials supplied varies among the three books. Davis et al. (2000) is accompanied by three CDs containing a total of 58 tracks and 3:06 hours of playing time. Soars & Soars (2009) comes with the same number of CDs, containing 129 tracks and 3:47 hours playing time. Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018 includes a set of four CDs, containing 35 tracks, running for 3:30 hours. Furthermore, a CD for learners is included with the book. It contains a selection of tracks from the classroom CDs. In the following sub-chapters, each of these books will be analysed in detail. Based on the findings of Jenkins (2009: 11) and Allinger (2015) as well as the curriculum analysis in chapter 5, a dominance of Received Pronunciation or at least native-speaker English is to be expected.

7.1. Davis et al.: Make Your Way with English 7

7.1.1. Overview

The beginning of the author's journey from pupil to teacher is marked by Make Your Way with English by Robin Davis, Günter Gerngroß, Christian Holzmann, Herbert Puchta and Michael Schratz (Davis et al. 2000). Davis et al (2000) is part of a series of four books for general upper-secondary education in Austria published by ÖBV. There are also adaptations for vocational schools. Information about the authors is partly difficult to find, especially about the late Robin Davis.

According to Urteil Landgericht München I. 10 Nov. 2005. Az. 7 O 2370/05 (2005: 3), the late Robin Davis mainly offered his expertise as a native speaker. According to Trim (1996: 96), Davis was a teacher and/or teacher trainer at Bell College of Saffron Walden, UK (Over

60 years of teaching expertise - Bell English). His professional life will be discussed in detail later.

Günter Gerngroß was an Austrian scholar, who held a degree in education, and a teacher educator at both the Pädagogische Hochschule Graz and the University of Graz (Günter Gerngroß - Cambridge University Press, Traueranzeigen für Günter Gerngroß - trauer.kleinezeitung.at). He was also the author of various textbooks for primary and secondary education (Günter Gerngroß - Helbling).

Christian Holzmann is a retired Austrian secondary school teacher and former teacher educator at the University of Vienna. He co-authored several English Language Teaching textbooks (Christian Holzmann - Helbling), including the vastly popular The New You & Me series for lower-secondary education, which at one point had a market share of 97 per cent (Urteil Landgericht München I. 10 Nov. 2005. Az. 7 O 2370/05 2005: 4).

Herbert Puchta is an Austrian teacher, teacher educator and has been Professor of English at the Pädagogische Hochschule Graz (About Herbert Puchta - Herbert Puchta, Lilo Autoren). He has also co-authored various textbooks for primary and secondary education (ELT resource books and coursebooks - Herbert Puchta).

This means that four of the five co-authors were likely native speakers of German and spent most of their academic career in Austria. Therefore, it could be assumed that they are familiar with the challenges of Austrian learners of English. However, at the date of publication the term "English as a lingua franca" had not even been coined, therefore it would seem unreasonable to expect too much in this regard. Furthermore, Davis was a teacher and or teacher trainer at a rather conservative British language school, which is mainly aimed at learners of English as a second language living in the UK (Over 60 years of teaching expertise - Bell English). Therefore a certain bias towards Native British English seems somewhat likely.

The series offered the following components for each year: a textbook, a teacher's handbook (Davis et al. 2000a), a set of three CDs, and a (no longer accessible) online resource page. In this analysis, all three items will be covered, although the main focus is on the audio recordings.

The introduction to the Teachers' Handbook (Davis et al. 2000a) already shows a clear bias towards "target culture" and native speakers, stating the aim of enabling the competent non-native speaker to make use of the language in the relevant cultural circles. In chapters for each unit of the textbook, the Teachers' Handbook offers solutions to all exercises and large amounts of background information and additional resources, e.g. literature, films and web sites but no explicit input on pronunciation. This strong focus on the target language community is an explicit contradiction to the requirements of an ELF-informed pedagogy as outlined in chapter 3.2.8.

The textbook contains individual sections labelled *Focus on words,* which are dictionary-style word lists with only English explanations of each term. Only for a select few items, phonetic transcription is given. All transcriptions use the British variety of the IPA and represent RP. A very small number of terms is translated into German, either in addition to the English explanation or instead. Occasionally, the book addresses specific issues of Austrian learners of English, mainly lexical (false friends, e.g. Davis et al. 2000: 31; 51). Other than the sparse transcriptions, there is no information on pronunciation and the book does not include an IPA chart.

7.1.2. Audio Analysis

Make Your Way 7 (Davis et al. 2000) is the oldest book in the analysis, the starting point of a development over 20 years. As mentioned above, it was published as the concept of ELF was still in its infancy. The three audio CDs supplied with the book contain three hours and six hours of recordings, ranging from short monologues and dialogues to speeches, presentations, interviews and songs. All recordings are credited to Studio Soundborn, Vienna, Austria on the booklet in the CD box but the individual speakers are not credited.

Each track on these CDs was carefully analysed to determine the accent of each speaker. The results were then entered into a table in order to be able to calculate per cent values for each accent attested in the recordings. The same table was used for all three textbooks, i.e. one set of CDs does not necessarily include all accents in the table, some columns may be empty.

One masculine announcer, who has an RP accent, guides the listeners through the entire CD set. This announcer is not included in the figures. For a quick overview of the detailed figures, see Table 1.

Table 1. Make Your Way 7: Distribution of accents

	Speakers	RP	Near-RP	Other English	GA	Irish	Scottish	NNS
Sum	115	13	48	4	26	3	10	11
%	100	11.3	41.7	3.5	22.6	2.6	8.8	9.6

The audio CDs include production from 115 characters. Of these 115 speakers 13 (11.3 per cent) spoke Received Pronunciation, 48 (41.7 per cent) can be classified as near-RP, four (3.5 per cent) spoke other English varieties, 26 (22.6 per cent) spoke General American, three (2.6 per cent) spoke Irish English, 10 (8.8 per cent) spoke Scottish English and 11 (9.6 per cent) had non-native accents. That means that over half the speakers spoke with a highly prestigious British accent and a further almost 15 per cent spoke other varieties of English from the British Isles. General American is spoken by less than a quarter of the participants. However, for such an early example, the number of non-native speakers is surprisingly high at almost ten per cent. Considering that understanding non-native speakers had not been required by the curriculum at the time of publication (see chapter 5), the listening comprehension component in Davis et al. (2000) is surprisingly useful in an ELF context, relatively speaking of course.

7.2. Soars and Soars: New Headway AHS 7

7.2.1. Overview

The second book in this analysis is the only one that has not been specifically designed for the Austrian market. New Headway by Liz and John Soars (Soars & Soars 2009) is a series of textbooks published by Oxford University Press. The original series consists of six levels from Beginner to Advanced. Oxford University Press advertises the book as “The world's best-selling English course - a perfectly-balanced syllabus with a strong grammar focus, and full support at all six levels” (New Headway - German - Oxford University Press) and emphasises the use of “authentic material” as well as “real-world speaking skills”. As discussed in chapter 3.2, “*authenticity*” is a rather problematic concept in language teaching,

as authentic, native-speaker language is not suitable as input for language learners (Widdowson 1998: 331).

The authors, Liz an John Soars, are respectively were British native speakers, who spent extended periods of their career in Britain, working as teachers and teacher trainers at International House in London and Oxford University Press (cf. Greenal et al. 2012; Liz and John Soars: Oxford University Press). They also spent some time teaching in Tanzania and France (cf. Liz and John Soars: Oxford University Press). Based on this information it can be reasonably concluded that their professional careers were firmly rooted in and around Britain. In an interview (An interview with Liz and John Soars 2011), Liz Soars only refers to native-speaker teachers when asked for advice to aspiring textbook writers, possibly indicating a native-speaker bias. On the other hand, the editorial of the same issue of International House Journal (Scott 2011) indicates a neutral to positive stance towards an ELF-informed pedagogy at International House.

The third edition was adapted for use in Austrian secondary schools under the title “New Headway AHS edition” by Veritas. Allinger (2015: 56) compared the original edition and the adaptation for year five and found the two books to be nearly identical, except for an appendix with additional materials (NB: Allinger (2015: 56) refers to the book as “New Headway 3 Pre-Intermediate” (sic!), the correct title is “New Headway 5 Pre-Intermediate” (Soars, Soars & Wheeldon 2007)). This thesis focuses on the analysis of the book for year seven (Soars & Soars 2009 and accompanying materials).

The full package offered by Veritas for each year consists of a textbook (referred to as “Student’s Book” (Soars & Soars 2009), a Workbook, a set of three audio CDs, a Teachers’ Handbook (Soars et al. 2009), an Austrian Teachers’ Handbook (Sayer et al. 2009) and a CD-ROM. This chapter is concerned with the pronunciation aspect of the Student’s Book, additional information in the teachers’ handbook and the recordings on the CDs. Therefore, the CD-ROM has not been included in the analysis.

According to Allinger (2015: 51) Soars, Soars & Wheeldon (2007) contains individual pronunciation sections. She also found that several pronunciation sections have a specific focus, e.g. politeness (ibid. 57). Soars & Soars (2009) also contains specific pronunciation sections but unlike in Soars, Soars & Wheeldon (2007), no transcriptions of words are given.

Instead, the sections labelled “Vocabulary and pronunciation” mainly focus on intonation and stress as well as meaning, giving words and their German translations. According to Jenkins (2000: 132f.), intonation is particularly hard to teach in a classroom context, therefore the strong focus in this book seems somewhat counter-intuitive.

Apart from the explicitly named pronunciation sections, the book also contains sections called “The music of English”, dealing with intonation, stress and rhythm (e.g. Soars & Soars 2009: 15). They require the learners to listen to the recording and repeat. All those tasks were analysed along with the listening comprehension tasks and the results are included in those numbers. The results show a very strong focus on British English. Compared to Soars, Soars & Wheeldon (2007), fewer pronunciation sections focus on politeness but the topic does occur (e.g. Soars & Soars (2009: 43), see Allinger (2015: 57)). Again, this is not part of the ELF core (see chapter 4.3.3).

In total, less than half the units include a pronunciation section. This seems to indicate that pronunciation was not considered particularly important by the authors. There is a chart of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) on page 210, which uses the British variety of the IPA and contains exclusively British pronunciation. However, the pronunciation tasks throughout the book contain hardly any phonetic script at all, therefore rendering the IPA chart relatively useless, considering any dictionary the learners might use will come with its own IPA chart and might use a different variety of the phonetic alphabet.

Only a meagre three exercises in the entire book make use of phonemic transcriptions. Tapescript 6.5/6.6 and 6.7/6.8 are in fact two tasks, each of which is repeated once on the CD, i.e. four tracks on the CD) on page 60 are exercises on word stress. Exercise 6 on page 84, an exercise on homophones. The latter is probably the most useful application of the IPA in the entire book, while the former only use transcriptions as eye-catchers in the heading and instruct learners to use the transcriptions in a dictionary. The question arises, why the IPA chart was even included if the book itself makes so little use of it, as there is only one single task that actually requires pupils to use the IPA.

Soars & Soars (2009) also contains vocabulary sections. However, unlike in Soars, Soars & Wheeldon. (2007), the individual items are not transcribed but only translated into German

(cf. Allinger 2015: 56). Therefore, these sections are not relevant to pronunciation and have been excluded from the analysis.

Basically, almost all tasks focus on supra-segmental features of speech, with the exception of Tapescript 6.5/6.6 and Tapescript 6.7/6.8. This means that the majority of pronunciation tasks are not concerned with core features of ELF, making the book not very useful for ELF learners. Perhaps unsurprisingly, these findings are very similar to Allinger's (2015: 62). Allinger (2015: 63) suggests that a book suitable for ELF-informed teaching should focus considerably more on aspects such as vowel length and consonant quality, rather than stress and intonation, particularly supra-segmental stress since these features are considered unnecessarily difficult to learn (see the section on Jenkins' (2000) ELF core in chapter 4.3.3). However, it should be noted that Soars & Soars (2009) is designed for more advanced learners than Soars, Soars & Wheeldon. (2007).

The Austrian edition of the Teachers' Handbook (Sayer et al. 2009) contains a general introduction to each unit, solutions for each task, all tapescripts and additional factual and didactic information (Sayer et al 2009: 5). The entire handbook, apart from the sections that refer directly to textbook contents, is written in German. Pronunciation is largely glossed over, briefly mentioned in the chapters on the textbook's vocabulary and pronunciation sections (e.g. Sayer et al. 2009: 15). Some tasks do focus on supra-segmental stress, which is part of the ELF core (e.g. Soars & Soars 2009: 15, T1.12) but the suggested solutions in Sayer et al. (2009: 17) seem unnecessarily complicated and hard to follow, placing equal stress marks on several, sometimes up to all parts of an utterance, e.g. "Let me see. […]". Generally, pronunciation plays an even more limited role than in the textbook. It can only be concluded that these materials leave the individual teacher largely alone regarding pronunciation teaching, except for strongly suggesting British pronunciation in all transcriptions, which is the radical opposite of an ELF-informed classroom setting as outlined in chapter (3.2.8).

The original Teacher's Book (Soars et al. 2009) is generally similar to the Austrian edition but occasionally seems harsher and more focused on accuracy, e.g. referring to "howling mistakes" (Soars et al. 2009: 4). Such a negative attitude seems hardly suitable for helping teachers create an open and positive atmosphere in the classroom, providing room for creative language use. Pronunciation plays a very limited role, similar to the Austrian edition. Some

pronunciation tasks only include a single introductory sentence, e.g. “The aim of this section is to introduce compound nouns and adjectives. It also practices stress and intonation.” (Soars et al. 2009: 14). These passing remarks do not seem to be any help to teachers at all.

Both books (Sayer et al. (2009) and Soars et al. 2009)) are rather similar in content. Generally speaking, the series provides teachers and learners with little input on pronunciation, particularly concerning core features of ELF. There is a strong underlying focus on British English as a native language.

7.2.2. Audio analysis

New Headway AHS 7 is the only example in this study that was not originally designed for the Austrian school system but rather designed for a global market by British authors, with very limited involvement of non-native speakers. Therefore, one could suspect even beyond the findings of Jenkins (2009) that British English might be dominant.

The books are accompanied by three CDs containing 144 tracks, three hours and forty-seven minutes of audio. Four of these tracks with a total length of 19 minutes are songs, which were excluded from this analysis. There is only one set of CDs for both the original edition and the AHS edition, which leads to the speculation that the CDs were recorded in Great Britain for Oxford University Press. However, neither speakers nor the recording studio are credited in the booklet. One masculine announcer guides throughout the CDs, speaking with an RP accent. As in the previous analysis, the announcer is not included in the figures. For the figures see Table 2 below.

Table 2. New Headway AHS 7: Distribution of accents

	Speakers	RP	Near-RP	Other English	GA	Irish	Scottish	NNS
Sum	862	76	696	5	52	3	19	11
%	100	8.8	80.7	0.6	6.0	0.3	2.2	1.3

As indicated by the number of speakers, the individual recordings are much shorter than those in Davis et al. (2000), resulting in 862, i.e. over seven times as many speakers, although the total playing time of the CDs is similar. Many exercises consist of very short utterances. Of those 862 speakers, 76 (8.8 per cent) spoke RP and 696 (an overwhelming 80.7 per cent) near-RP. Only five speakers (0.6 per cent) spoke other English accents. Even fewer, three (0.3 per

cent) spoke with an Irish accent, while 19 (2.2 per cent) spoke Scottish English. Only eleven (1.3 per cent) were non-native speakers. In total, an incredible almost 90 per cent of the speakers had a highly prestigious British accent and another 5.7 per cent spoke other dialects from the British Isles, meaning that the United Kingdom makes up for over 90 per cent of the total numbers. General American featured much less prominently than in Davis et al. (2000) at only six per cent and non-native speakers were barely represented at all at 1.3 per cent.

As expected, the book produced almost entirely in Britain has a very strong focus on British English. The CDs were not adapted for the Austrian school system and the choice of speakers does little to comply with the curriculum's requirement for non-native input. On the contrary, the figures suggest a strong native-speaker bias. Considering these weaknesses, this book seems less than ideal for an ELF-informed classroom as outlined in chapters 3.2.8 and 4.3.3. Even American English, which Austrians are quite likely to encounter in the media, is vastly under-represented in the recordings.

7.3. Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar: Prime Time 7

7.3.1. Overview

The third and newest book in this analysis is Prime Time 7 (Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018) , which is part of a series published by ÖBV in Vienna under licence of Klett in Stuttgart. The series covers all eight years of Austrian general secondary education. Prime Time 7 was written by Georg Hellmayr, Stephan Waba and Heike Mlakar. Allinger (2015: 80; 82) briefly covers the book in her analysis but does not provides any details, as the book does not contain any pronunciation sections. She looked at the book for the 5th form and found that the book itself is mostly centred around British English as the few transcriptions of particularly difficult words that are given are all British (Allinger 2015: 82). However, she notes that the recordings are much more diverse and contain a range of different accents, both native and non-native, making the book suitable for an ELF-informed classroom (ibid.). It remains to be seen whether the book for the 7th form is as promising.

Two of the three authors are active teachers or teacher trainers, while the third is a language scholar. Professor Mag. Georg Hellmayr is currently a lecturer at the Kirchliche Pädagogische

Hochschule Wien/Krems and the Pädagogische Hochschule Tirol, two Austrian teacher-training institutions (Georg Hellmayr - u:find; Visitenkarte von Hellmayr, Georg; Mag. Prof. - PH Online Pädagogische Hochschule Tirol).

Stephan Waba is an Austrian teacher and teacher trainer, currently working at the Austrian Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung [Ministry of Education, Science and Research], focussing on digital media in general education (Stephan Waba: Virtuelle PH).

Heike Mlakar is a researcher at the German University of Hildesheim and has been involved in the publication of several textbooks for the Austrian market (Universität Hildesheim - Fachbereich 3: Sprach- und Informationswissenschaften - Institut für englische Sprache und Literatur - Team - Dr. Heike Mlakar).

Based on the available information, all three authors were likely socialised in a predominantly German-speaking environment and most certainly live and work in one. Therefore, they are likely familiar with the specific challenges that native speakers of German face learning English. The book was also developed specifically for the German-speaking market. While there is no information available, one could guess that none of them are native speakers of English.

For each year, the following materials are available: a course book with an audio CD (containing 12 recordings in MP3 format), a set of four audio CDs containing additional recordings, a workbook, that focuses exclusively on writing and a Teachers' Handbook (Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2017).

Allinger (2015: 51) already analysed Prime Time 4 by the same authors and discovered that the textbook does not cover pronunciation at all and neither does Prime Time 7. While the book includes minimal vocabulary in small boxes under various tasks, no information is given on pronunciation, nor is there any phonetic transcription available. It is unclear whether the authors considered pronunciation unimportant or whether they expect the learners to acquire it by osmosis.

At the end of the book (Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018), there is a vocabulary section of 20 pages that contains phonemic transcriptions for some items, presumably those considered more difficult. All these transcriptions use the British variety of the IPA and represent

Received Pronunciation. Apart from the transcription, an English explanation and a German translation are provided. There is no IPA chart in the book. This matches Allinger's (2015: 82) findings for the 5th form mentioned above.

The teachers' handbook consists of a brief introduction (Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2017: 3) that mainly lists the changes from the previous edition and details on the tasks in the course book. The latter section consists exclusively of transcripts of the audio recordings and solutions to tasks, sometimes German translations of the instructions for the learners. Each chapter also contains a brief German introduction, mostly concerning the contents of the units. Rarely (e.g. Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2017: 19) the handbook also includes directions or guidelines for teachers how to use the textbook materials, e.g. the sequence of tasks or suggestions for additional resources, such as online dictionaries and various web sites.

Generally, there seems to be an extremely strong focus on reading and writing, with occasional speaking and listening tasks. Grammar also seems to have been considered rather important, which is surprising at such an advanced level, while vocabulary and lexis play only a limited role. Pronunciation plays no role at all. One of the most frequently recurring items is standardised testing, which is even mentioned in the introduction (Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2017: 3). It seems that the main aim of the book is to prepare learners for the centralised school-leaving exams after year 8 [*Neue Reifeprüfung*]. It would be interesting to compare this book to other, similarly recent ones and see whether they also have such a strong focus on testing.

7.3.2. Audio Analysis

Prime Time is supplied with one Audio CD, which is included with the textbook, and a set of four CDs that are sold separately, i.e. it is the only book in the study that gives pupils free access to at least some of the audio recordings. For all other books, pupils have to buy the CDs if they want to have them. According to Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar (2018: 207) the bundled CD is supposed to contain 22 audio tracks with a total duration of 106 minutes. The four-CD set designed for teachers contains those 22 tracks plus an additional 13, totalling three hours and 30 minutes. However, the bundled CD (Prime Time 7, Prime Time OS SB-

CD/DVD 7, 978-3-209-08650-1), at least the copy available at the Department of English Library at the University of Vienna, only contains 12 MP3 files with a total length of 70 minutes. There are no audio tracks on the CD either, i.e. the CD can only be played on computers and a limited number of stand-alone CD players that support MP3 files. The tracks 12 to 22, i.e. the self-check tasks for learners, are missing entirely. If that is the case with all CDs, this renders the entire self-check section for learners utterly useless!

The separate CD set consists of four CDs containing 35 tracks running for three hours and thirty minutes. All recordings are credited to Soundborn, Vienna, Austria (the same studio as in Davis et al. 2000) and to a list of individual speakers. Due to the standardised test format, most recordings are included twice in one track, considerably reducing the total content time compared to the older textbooks. The recordings also include breaks for the learners to read the task description, up to 45 seconds per task, further reducing content.

While the curriculum does require practice of these standardised tasks, it seems questionable whether it is pedagogically useful to reduce listening comprehension to this standardised script almost entirely. Unlike the previously discussed sets, these CDs do not have one single announcer but several different voices, both masculine and feminine. The majority of tasks are announced by the same feminine voice. Oddly, this speaker usually has a General American accent but occasionally a British accent, in one instance apparently that of an American attempting to imitate a British accent. Some tasks are not announced at all. For a brief overview of the detailed figures, see Table 3.

Table 3. Prime Time 7: Distribution of accents

	Speakers	**RP**	**Near-RP**	**Other English**	**GA**	**Irish**	**Scottish**	**NNS**
Sum	52	8	19	4	14	2	4	1
%	100	15.4	36.5	7.7	26.9	3.8	7.7	1.9

The number of speakers in these recordings is by far the smallest, less than half as many as in Davis et al. (2000) and less than one tenth of those in Soars & Soars (2009). The difference is due to both the length of the individual tasks, which are longer than those in Soars & Soars (2009) and to the repetition, which effectively halves the recording time. The relative number of RP speakers is by far the highest of all books in this study at 15.4 per cent (8 speakers). Another 19 speakers (36.5 per cent) of speakers have a near-RP accent and four (7.7 per cent)

other English accents. Only two speakers (3.8 per cent) speak Irish English and four (7.7 per cent) Scottish English. A total of 14 participants (26.9 per cent) speaks GA. Finally, only one (1.9 per cent) non-native speaker was included in the entire recordings! RP and near-RP account for slightly over half the accents, a figure comparable to Davis et al. (2000). Another 19.2 per cent of speakers had accents from the British Isles.

General American is slightly more prominent than in Davis et al. (2000) at 22.6 per cent and much more so than in Soars & Soars (2009) at six per cent. The relative weight of non-native speakers of 1.9 per cent in Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar (2018) is slightly higher than in Soars & Soars (2009) at 1.3 per cent but much lower than in Davis et al. (2000) at 9.6 per cent. Furthermore, the number of RP speakers is the highest in Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar (2018). These findings are similar to Allinger's (2015: 82) for the 5th form concerning native-speaker accents but totally opposite regarding non-native speakers. Therefore, Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar (2018) can not be considered suitable for ELF-informed teaching.

This leads to the conclusion that the two main prestigious accents, RP (and near-RP) and GA still play a very important role in textbook production, as Jenkins (2009) and Allinger (2015: 46) also discovered. Unsurprisingly, the balance of the British production (Soars & Soars: 2009) tips more in favour of British English, almost entirely excluding American speakers. The other two books (Davis et al. 2000, Hellmayr, Waba & Mlakar 2018) are also predominantly British but only by a comparably small majority.

Perhaps the most surprising, if not slightly disappointing finding is that the representation of non-native speakers did not improve but rather almost disappeared over the past 19 years. It seems that even almost 20 years after the introduction of ELF to the research community, the concept has had very little impact on teaching materials, despite all efforts (as small as they may have been, see chapters 5 and 6) of the designers of the curricula and the CEFR. Further research is necessary to determine whether other current offerings on the Austrian markets are more suitable for English teaching in a globalised world.

8. Conclusion

Over the past 40 years, the worldwide role of English has changed considerably. From the native language of a relatively small number of countries it has gone on to become a worldwide lingua franca, much more widespread than even Latin. In a globalised world of instant, almost-free communication, English is used as a shared medium of communication in all aspects of life and by vastly diverse groups of people, from asking for directions to a local monument to negotiating billion-Euro business transactions and political issues, e.g. in the UN, from teenagers playing online games with peers from all over the world to highest-rank diplomats. This fundamental change has shifted weight from the concept of native-speaker language ownership to an entirely new concept of language, which is much more fluid and spontaneous, while still conforming to a system of underlying rules, which clearly mark any utterance as belonging to - in this example - English or not. This view of language also defeats any threats of linguistic imperialism. If the native speakers no longer own the language, they have no power over its users, neither linguistic nor political.

The main benchmark in ELF is no longer correctness by native-speaker standards but communicative success. Strict adherence to those standards is no longer perceived as a guarantee for successful communication but as unnecessary, possibly even a hindrance. Much more weight is given to flexibility and adaptation to local contexts, local referring to the current communication situation rather than larger geopolitical or social units.

Therefore, an ELF-informed language pedagogy has entirely different priorities than traditional foreign-language teaching. While ELF itself cannot be taught, only acquired by using it, many important strategies for ELF communication can and should be. On the other hand, many aspects of traditional language teaching, especially aspects of pronunciation, are considered an unnecessary burden for ELF users, perhaps optional for the select few who actively decide that they want to extend their knowledge to English as a native language rather than mandatory for everyone.

This study sought to trace the development of English teaching in relation to English as a Lingua Franca over the past 18 years, the author’s educational journey from pupil to teacher. It sought to discover whether the research paradigm shift from English as a foreign language to English as a Lingua Franca has been incorporated into legal frameworks and teaching

materials by analysing the Austrian curricula, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and three textbooks with their accompanying audio CDs.

One could assume that almost 20 years after ELF was established within the scholarly community, it might have had some impact on teaching practice. The study found this to be partly true. The curricula have required the inclusion of non-native speaker input since 2004. More recently, the curriculum even mentions lingua francas.

The CEFR, particularly in its first iteration (Council of Europe 2001a, 2001b), on the other hand placed a strong focus on native-speaker standards and did little to encourage or even require an ELF-informed teaching approach. The second edition (Council of Europe 2018) is more promising but still somewhat problematic. It seems that frequently the only change was to replace the term "native speaker" with "competent speaker", involving little conceptual change and not providing any alternative models.

The textbook analysis proved to be, frankly, disappointing. Three textbooks – equally distributed across the time frame (published in 2000, 2009 and 2018) – were chosen, two specifically designed for the Austrian school systems by mainly Austrian authors, one designed for the international market by British authors and a British publishing house, the latter in order to also allow for synchronic comparison. All textbooks favoured varieties of English from the British Isles. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the book published in Britain did so by far to the largest extent, containing over 95 per cent accents from the British Isles.

The two other books were more moderate at around 60 per cent accents from the UK and Ireland. These books featured considerably more speakers of American English than the British production. The number of non-native speakers of English was very low in all three books, lowest in the British book but all below 10 per cent. A large majority of speakers had highly prestigious and traditional accents, RP/near-RP and General American, i.e. even variety among native speakers is under-represented.

Perhaps most disappointingly, the number of non-native speakers did not increase over time. On the contrary, Hellmayr et al. (2018) includes considerably fewer non-native speakers (only 1.9 per cent) than Davis et al. (2000) despite the fact that the inclusion of non-native input had not even been required at the time of publication of the latter textbook! Further research is

recommended to find whether other textbooks currently on the market are more suitable for ELF-informed teaching, but the fact remains that the most recently published textbook at the time of writing was even less suitable than the oldest one from BE ("Before ELF"). Considering the still-growing importance of English as a worldwide medium of communication, one can only hope that the near future will see ELF integrated into the Austrian school system, for the sake of both pupils and teachers.

9. References

About Herbert Puchta - Herbert Puchta. http://www.herbertpuchta.com/about/ (11 Dec. 2019).

ACE 2014. *The Asian Corpus of English*. Director: Andy Kirkpatrick; Researchers: Wang Lixun, John Patkin, Sophiann Subhan. http://corpus.ied.edu.hk/ace/index.html (9 Mar. 2018)

An interview with Liz and John Soars - IH Journal. 2011. http://ihjournal.com/an-interview-with-liz-and-john-soars-2 (11 Dec. 2019).

Allinger, Sara Maria. 2015. *The role of pronunciation in textbooks and the ELF factor.* Diploma thesis, University of Vienna.

Artner, Paul. 2013. *Ready for ELF? Possible implications of ELF research findings for Austrian grammar schools*. Diploma Thesis, University of Vienna.

Beneke Jürgen. 1991. "Englisch als Lingua Franca oder als Medium internationaler Kommunikation". In Grebing, Renate (ed.). *Grenzenloses Sprachenlernen: Festschrift für Reinhold Freudenstein*. Berlin: Cornelsen. 54-66, quoted in Seidlhofer, 2011: 2)

British Council. Learn English Online - British Council. https://learnenglish.britishcouncil.org (28 Jan. 2020).

Brumfit, Christopher. 2002. "Global English and language teaching - has everything changed?". *English Teaching* 57(4), 27-40.

Burke, Peter. 1993. *The Art of Conversation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bybee, Joan; Hopper, Paul. 2001. "Introduction to frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure". In Hopper, Paul J.; Bybee, Joan L. (eds.). *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-24.

Cenoz, Jasone; Gorter, Durk. 2012. "Language policy in education: additional languages". In Spolsky, Bernard (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 301-319.

Christian Holzmann - Helbling. https://www.helblinglanguages.com/int/en/person/christian-holzmann (11 Dec. 2019).

Council of Europe. 2001a. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Strasbourg: Cambridge University Press

Council of Europe. 2001b. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Structured overview of all CEFR scales.* https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168045b15e (12 Dec. 2016).

Council of Europe. 2013. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf (12 Dec. 2016).

Council of Europe. 2018. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion Volume with new descriptors.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton, Christine; Seidlhofer, Barbara. 1994. "Is Pronunciation Teaching Desirable? Is It Feasible?". In Sebbage, Sue (ed.). *Teaching and learning English in a multi-cultural Europe : teacher development and action research ; fourth international NELLE conference jointly with TEA (Teachers of English in Austria) and English Department, University of Innsbruck, September 1994.* Hamburg: T + S Team, NELLE, 26-27. Facsimile Reprint in Seidlhofer 2001c, 120-121.

Davis, Robin; Gerngroß, Günter; Holzmann, Christian; Puchta, Herbert; Schratz, Michael. 2000. *Make Your Way with English.* Wien: ÖBV & hpt.

Davis, Robin; Gerngroß, Günter; Holzmann, Christian; Puchta, Herbert; Schratz, Michael. 2000a. *Make Your Way 7 Teacher's Handbook*. Wien: ÖBV & hpt.

Dewey, Martin. 2009. "English as a Lingua Franca: Heightened Variability and Theoretical Implications". In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 60-83.

Edwards, John. 2012. "Language management agencies". In Spolsky, Bernard (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 418-436.

Ehrenreich, Susanne. 2009. "English as a Lingua Franca in Multinational Corporations – Exploring Business Communities of Practice. In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 126-151.

ELFA 2008. *The Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings. Director: Anna Mauranen.* http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/elfacorpus (9 Mar 2018).

ELT resource books and coursebooks - Herbert Puchta. http://www.herbertpuchta.com/books/ (29 Jan 2020).

Georg Hellmayr - u:find. https://ufind.univie.ac.at/de/person.html?id=62645 (11 Dec. 2019).

Globish.com. About Globish. http://globish.com/?page=about_globish&lang=en_utf8 (10 Mar. 2018).

Greenall, Simon (ed.); Krum, Jeff; Gairns, Ruth; Wilson, Ken; Raman, Georgie. 2012. "Tributes to John Soars MBE". *International House Journal of Education and Development* 33(2). http://ihjournal.com/tributes-to-john-soars-mbe (11 Dec. 2019).

Günter Gerngroß - Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/bs/cambridgeenglish/authors/gerngross (11 Dec. 2019).

Günter Gerngroß - Helbling. https://www.helblinglanguages.com/int/en/person/gunter-gerngross (11 Dec. 2019).

Haenisch, Hans. 1982. *Lehrpläne auf dem Prüfstand. Schule und Weiterbildung Band 15*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Halliday, Michael. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Edward Arnold.

Hellmayr, Georg; Waba, Stephan; Mlakar, Heike. 2017. *Prime Time 7 Teacher's Handbook.* Wien: ÖBV.

Hellmayr, Georg; Waba, Stephan; Mlakar, Heike. 2018. *Prime Time 7 Coursebook*. Wien: ÖBV.

Horvath, Barbara M.. 2004. "Australian English: phonology. In Kortmann, Bernd, Schneider, Edgar W. (Eds.). *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 625-644.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. "On communicative competence". In Pride, John.; Holmes, Janet (eds.). *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

House, Juliane. 1999. "Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility". In Gnutzmann, Claus (ed.). *Teaching and learning English as a global language*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 73–89.

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

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2009. "(Un) Pleasant? (In) Correct? (Un) Intelligible? ELF Speakers' Perceptions of their Accents". In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 10-36.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2009a. *World Englishes - A resource book for students*. London, New York: Routledge.

Jones, William. 1999. *Images of Language. Six essays on German attitudes to European languages from 1500 to 1800*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Kachru, Braj. 1985. "Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle". In Quirk, Randolph; Widdowson, Henry (eds.). *English in the*

World: teaching and learning the language and literatures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11-30.

Kaur, Jagdish. 2009. “Pre-empting Problems of Understanding in English as a Lingua Franca.” In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 107-123.

Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane. 2002. Approaching Lingua Franca Communication. In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua Franca Communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 9-28.

Kohn, Kurt. 2019. “Towards the Reconciliation of ELF and EFL: Theoretical Issues and Pedagogical Challenges“. In Sifakis, Nicos C.; Tsantila, Natasha (eds.). *English as a lingua franca for EFL contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 32-49.

Lilo Autoren. https://www.helbling.at/?pagename=autoren-klasse-2-4 (11 Dec. 2019).

Liz and John Soars. Oxford University Press. https://elt.oup.com/bios/elt/s/soars_lizjohn?cc=de&selLanguage=de (11 Dec. 2019).

Lopriore, Lucilla; Vettorel, Paola. 2019. „Perspectives in WE- and ELF-informed ELT Materials in Teacher Education“. In Sifakis, Nicos C.; Tsantila, Natasha (eds.). *English as a lingua franca for EFL contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 97-116.

Mackey, William Francis. 1965. *Language Teaching Analysis*. London: Longman, Green & Co.

McNamara, Tim. 2011. “Managing learning: Authority and language assessment“. *Language Teaching* 44(4), 500-515.

McNamara, Tim. 2012. “English as a lingua franca: the challenge for language testing“. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1), 199-202.

Mill, John Stuart. 1859. *Considerations on Representative Government*. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/5669/5669-h/5669-h.htm (12 Dec. 2016).

Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2013. *New Perspectives on English as a European Lingua Franca*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Mr. Ed. 2011. *Mikrofonvorverstärker Für Peiker TM 110 (ID 766955)*. https://forum.electronicwerkstatt.de/phpBB/Elektrische_Probleme/mikrofonvorverstaerker_fuer_peiker_tm_110-t115249f6_bs0.html (9 Mar. 2018).

New Headway - German - Oxford University Press. https://elt.oup.com/catalogue/items/global/adult_courses/new_headway/?cc=de&selLanguage=de (10 Dec. 2019).

Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum (ÖSZ). 2007. *Der schulische Fremdsprachenunterricht in Österreich. Erste Ergebnisse einer Studie zum Schuljahr 2004/2005*. http://www.oesz.at/download/publikationen/Schulischer_FSU_in_OE_2007.pdf (29 Jan 2020).

Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum (ÖSZ); BMUKK; BMWF (eds.). 2008. *Language education policy profile: Länderbericht; Sprach- und Sprachunterrichtspolitik in Österreich: Ist-Stand und Schwerpunkte*. https://rm.coe.int/

sprach-und-sprachunterrichtspolitik-in-osterreich-landerbericht/16807b3b46 (29 Jan. 2020).

Ogden, Charles Kay, 1932. *Basic English. A general introduction with rules and grammar.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trubner.

Over 60 years of teaching expertise - Bell English https://www.bellenglish.com (12 Dec. 2019).

Quirk, Randolph. 1981. "International Communication and the Concept of Nuclear English" In Smith, Larry E. (ed.). *English for Cross-cultural Communication*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 151-165.

Quirk, Randolph. 1985. "The English language in a global context". In Quirk, Randolph; Widdowson, Henry (eds.). *English in the world: Teaching and learning the languages and literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-6.

Rajagopalan, Kanavillil. 2009. "World English and the Latin analogy: Where we get it wrong". *English Today* 25(2). 49–54.

Rechtsinformationssystem des Bundes. Wien: Bundesministerium für Digitalisierung und Wirtschaftsstandort. http://ris.bka.gv.at (19 Feb. 2019).

RIS - Allgemeine Informationen. Wien: Bundesministerium für Digitalisierung und Wirtschaftsstandort. https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/UI/Info.aspx (18 Feb. 2019).

Sam2. 2009. *Lichtschalter im Treppenhaus: Kreuz- oder Wechselschalter? (ID 586145)*. https://forum.electronicwerkstatt.de/phpBB/Elektroinstallation/lichtschalter_im_treppenhaus_kreuz_oder_wechselschalter-t90483f17_bs0.html (9 Mar. 18).

Sayer, Mike; May, Peter; Spielauer, Martina; Sturm-Petritsch, Gabriela. 2009. *New Headway 7: Serviceteil für LehrerInnen.* Linz: Veritas.

Schulbuchliste Allgemein bildende Höhere Schulen Unterstufe, Oberstufe. https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:53f09628-c6ed-4914-8408-3dcb3d5daf26/1920sbl_1000-1100.pdf (8 Dec. 2019)

Scott, Andrew G. 2011. "Editorial". *International House Journal of Education and Development* 30(1). http://ihjournal.com/editorial-7 (11 Dec. 2019).

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 1996."'It is an undulating feeling…'. The importance of being a non-native speaker teacher of English." *Vienna English Working Papers* 5(1&2), 63-80.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 1999. "Double Standards: teacher education in the Expanding Circle". World Englishes 18(2), 233-245.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2000. "Mind the gap: English as a mother tongue vs. English as a lingua franca". *Vienna English Working Papers* 9(1), 51-68.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. "The shape of things to come? Some basic questions". In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 269-299.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001a. “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. 2001b. “Pronunciation”. In Carter, Ronald; Nunan, David (eds.). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56-65.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001c. *English: Native Tongue, Foreign Language, Lingua Franca. An Applied Linguistic Enquiry*. Habilitation, University of Vienna.

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

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005. “Key Concepts in ELT. English as a lingua franca” *ELT Journal* 59(4), 339-341.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2009. “Orientations in ELF Research: Form and Function” In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 37-59.

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

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2012. “The challenge of English as a lingua franca“. *Anglistik, International Journal of English Studies* 23(1), 73-86.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2015. “ELF-informed pedagogy: from code-fixation towards communicative awareness“. In Vettorel, Paola (ed.). *New Frontiers in teaching and learning English*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 19-30.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2018. “Standard English and the dynamics of ELF variation.“ In Baker, Will; Dewey, Martin; Jenkins, Jennifer (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of English as a lingua franca*. London: Routledge, 85-100.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. Breiteneder, Angelika; Pitzl, Marie-Luise. 2006. “English as a lingua franca in Europe.” *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26, 1-34.

Seidlhofer, Barbara; Widdowson, Henry. 1998. “Applied Linguistics, pragmatics and language pedagogy”. In Beaugrande, Robert de (ed.). *Language policy and language education in emerging nations : focus on Slovenia and Croatia and with contributions from Britain, Austria, Spain and Italy*. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 3-14

Seidlhofer, Barbara; Widdowson, Henry. 2001. “Making it real - on the sources of authority and expertise in language teaching”. In Sellner, Manfred B. (ed.). *Fremdsprachendidaktik & Zweitspracherwerb im Kontext*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 65-76.

Seidlhofer, Barbara; Widdowson, Henry. 2019. “ELF for EFL: A Change of Subject?”. In Sifakis, Nicos C.; Tsantila, Natasha (eds.). *English as a lingua franca for EFL contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 17-31.

Shaw, Philip; Caudery, Tim; Petersen, Margrethe. "Students on Exchange in Scandinavia: Motivation, Interaction, ELF Development.". In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 178-199.

Soars, Liz; Soars, John; Wheeldon, Sylvia. 2007. *New Headway 5: The AHS edition, Student's Book Pre-Intermediate.* Linz: Veritas.

Soars, Liz; Soars, John. 2009. *New Headway 7: The AHS edition, Student's Book Upper Intermediate.* Linz: Veritas.

Soars Liz; Soars John; Sayer, Mike; May, Peter. 2009. *New Headway Upper Intermediate, Teacher's Book.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spolsky, Bernard. 2012. "What is language Policy?" In Spolsky, Bernard (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-15.

Stephan Waba: Virtuelle PH. https://www.virtuelle-ph.at/referent_in/stephan-waba/ (11 Dec. 2019).

TAB. 2012. *Birnchen für Skalenbeleuchtung Gesucht .. OSRAM 12V 3 Watt .. (ID 808366)* https://forum.electronicwerkstatt.de/phpBB/topic120500_f6_bxtopic_timexDESC_by1_bz0_bs0.html (9 Mar 2018).

Thir, Veronika. 2014. *PPOCS 1 revisited: exploring the implications of ELF for English pronunciation teaching*. Diploma thesis, University of Vienna.

Traueranzeigen von Günter Gerngroß - trauer.kleinezeitung.at. https://trauer.kleinezeitung.at/traueranzeige/guenter-gerngross (11 Dec. 2019).

Trim, John (ed.). 1996. *Apprentissage des langues et citoyenneté europénne - Rapport final (1989-1996)*. Strasbourg: Edition du Conseil de l'Europe.

Trudgill, Peter. 2005. "Native-Speaker Phonological Models and the English Lingua Franca Core" in Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, Katarzyna; Przedlacka, Joanna (eds.). *English Pronunciation Models: A Changing Scene.* Bern: Peter Lang, 77-98.

Universität Hildesheim - Fachbereich 3: Sprach- und Informationswissenschaften - Institut für englische Sprache und Literatur - Team - Dr. Heike Mlakar. https://www.uni-hildesheim.de/fb3/institute/institut-fuer-englische-sprache-und-literatur/team/dr-heike-mlakar/ (11 Dec. 2019).

Urban Dictionary: Kamelåså https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Kamel%C3%A5s%C3%A5 (22 Mar. 2017).

Urteil Landgericht München I. 10 Nov. 2005. Az. 7 O 2370/05. https://ec.europa.eu/competition/antitrust/national_courts/655254.pdf (12 Dec. 2019).

Virkkula, Tiina; Nikula, Tarja. 2010. "Identity construction in ELF contexts". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 20(2), 251-273.

Visitenkarte von Hellmayr, Georg; Mag. Prof. - PH Online Pädagogische Hochschule Tirol. https://www.ph-online.ac.at/pht/visitenkarte.show_vcard?pPersonenId=05DA2A0F25F7DF71&pPersonenGruppe=3 (11 Dec. 2019).

Weinreich, Max. 1945. “The YIVO Faces the Post-War World”. *YIVO Bleter* 25(1), 3-18.

West, Michael. 1953. *A general service list of English words: with semantic frequencies and a supplementary word-list for the writing of popular science and technology.* London: Longman.

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

Widdowson, Henry. 1998. “Skills, Abilities and Contexts of Reality”. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 18, 323-333.

Widdowson, Henry. 2003. *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, Henry. 2009. “The linguistic perspective“. In Knapp, Karlfried; Seidlhofer, Barbara (eds.). *Handbook of Foreign Language Communication and Learning*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 193-218.

Widdowson, Henry. 2012, “ELF and the inconvenience of established concepts”. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1), 5-26.

Wilton, Antje. 2012. “The monster and the zombie: English as a lingua franca and the Latin analogy”. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(2), 337-361.

Wright, Roger. 2004. “Latin and English as world languages.” *English Today* 20(4). 3–13.

Wright, Sue. 2012. “Language Policy, the nation and nationalism”. In Spolsky, Bernard (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 59-78.

Yule, George. 2010. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

63. Verordnung: Änderung der Lehrpläne der allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen [63rd decree: Alteration of the curricula for the general secondary schools]. BGBl. 63/1989. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, 623-968.

133. Verordnung: Änderung der Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen; Bekanntmachung der Lehrpläne für den Religionsunterricht an diesen Schulen [133rd decree: Alteration of the decree on the curricula for the general secondary schools; publication of the curricula for religious education in these schools]. BGBl. 133/2000. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, 983-1118.

163. Verordnung: Erlassung von Lehrplänen für die Unterstufe des Gymnasiums, des Real-gymnasiums, des wirtschaftskundlichen Realgymnasiums für Mädchen und des Bundesgymnasiums für Slowenen sowie für die I. bis III. Klasse des musisch-pädagogischen Realgymnasiums; Bekanntmachung der Lehrpläne für den Religionsunterricht an diesen Schulen. BGBl. 163/1964. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, 967-1060.

219. Verordnung: Änderung der Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der allgemein bildenden höheren Schulen; Änderung der Bekanntmachung der Lehrpläne für den Religionsunterricht an diesen Schulen [219th decree: Alteration of the decree on the curricula for the general secondary schools; Alteration of the publication of the curricula

for religious education in these schools]. BGBl. 219/2016. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht.

242. Bundesgesetz über die Schulorganisation (Schulorganisationsgesetz) [Federal Law on the Organisation of Schools (School Organisation Law)]. BGBl. 1962/242, 1178-1200.

275. Verordnung. Änderung der Lehrpläne für die allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen in den Schuljahren 1970/71 bis 1974/75 [275th decree: Modification of the curricula for general secondary schools in the school years 1970/71 to 1974/75]. BGBl. 275/1970. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, 1455-1570.

277. Verordnung: Änderung der Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der allgemein bildenden höheren Schulen; Bekanntmachung der Lehrpläne für den Religionsunterricht [277th decree: Alteration of the decree on the curricula for the general secondary schools; publication of the curricula for religious education in these schools]. BGBl. 277/2004. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht.

295. Verordnung: Neuerliche Abänderung der Verordnung, mit der Lehrpläne für die allgemein- bildenden höheren Schulen erlassen werden, hinsichtlich der Gymnasien, Real- gymnasien und Wirtschaftskundlichen Realgymnasien für Mädchen sowie des Bundesgymnasiums für Slowenen; Bekanntmachung der Lehrpläne für den Religionsunterricht an diesen Schulen. BGBl. 295/1967. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, 1705-1866.

644. Verordnung: Änderung der Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen [644th decree: Alteration of the decree on the curricula for the general secondary schools]. BGBl. 644/1995. Wien: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, 7625-7671.

10. Appendix

10.1. Abstract

Over the past four decades, the role of English has shifted away from a native or foreign language in ways only comparable to Latin and certainly on an unprecedented scale. Non-native speakers far outnumber native speakers and English has become a worldwide lingua franca (English as a Lingua Franca, ELF), disconnected from the English of native speakers. Unlike traditional foreign language teaching, ELF-informed teaching does not assume that students learn a language mainly in order to communicate with its native speakers but with other non-native speakers of various linguistic backgrounds. The main aim of ELF communication is not correctness by native-speaker standards but communicative success. According to ELF research, adherence to native-speaker standards is not a suitable means of ensuring successful communication in ELF interactions but may actually impede communication.

Austrian learners of English are most likely to participate mainly in ELF encounters rather than encounters with native speakers. Therefore, English language teaching (ELT) should prepare them for such communication situations. Teaching should be informed by ELF research, particularly the Lingua Franca Core (LFC). However, as this study found, Austrian ELT is still deeply rooted in a native-speaker centred approach.

In order to determine the influence of ELF research on Austrian ELT, textbooks for upper-intermediate learners (seventh form of Austrian general secondary school) and particularly the listening comprehension tasks on the CDs supplied by the publishers were analysed. The analysis of the surrounding theoretical and legal framework (the curricula and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) and of the pronunciation sections in the textbooks, teacher's supplements and audio material audio materials shall provide insights into the degree of implementation of ELF research into Austrian ELT.

The findings indicate that ELF research appears to have had little impact on Austrian ELT practices, despite efforts in the curricula to at least partly move away from native-speaker supremacy. However, assessment of learners is still largely based on native-speaker models and therefore textbooks tend to err on the side of caution and largely ignore ELF. Considerable efforts are still needed to align the conceptualisation of ELT with the reality of English in the 21st century. In conclusion, it can be said that teaching materials should be revised if the aim is to educate and produce successful ELF users.

10.2. Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Die Rolle der englischen Sprache hat sich in den letzten Jahrzehnten enorm verändert, von der Familiensprache (früher Muttersprache) einiger weniger Länder zur weltweiten internationalen Lingua franca (ELF), unabhängig vom Englisch jener Länder. Anders als im klassischen Fremdsprachenunterricht nimmt ELF-bezogener Unterricht nicht an, dass Lernende eine Sprache hauptsächlich zur Kommunikation mit Familiensprachlichen erlernen, sondern zur Kommunikation mit anderen Fremdsprachigen mit den unterschiedlichsten linguistischen Hintergründen. Hauptziel der ELF-Kommunikation ist nicht die Fehlerfreiheit, gemessen an familiensprachigen Standards, sondern die erfolgreiche Kommunikation. Die ELF-Forschung

hat ergeben, dass strikte Einhaltung familiensprachiger Standards Lingua-Franca-Kommunikation nicht fördert, sondern im Gegenteil eher stört.
Englischlernende in Österreich werden mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit nicht hauptsächlich mit Familiensprachigen kommunizieren, sondern in ELF-Kontexten. Daher sollte ein ELF-informierter Sprachunterricht sie entsprechend vorbereiten. Unterricht sollte von Prinzipien der ELF-Forschung, insbesondere des Lingua Franca Core (Kernaspekte der international verständlichen Aussprache) geleitet werden. Die vorliegende Studie ergab jedoch, dass der österreichische Englischunterricht bis heute stark in traditionellen Modellen verharrt.
Um den Einfluss der ELF-Forschung auf den Unterricht zu ermitteln, wurden Schulbücher für die 7. Klasse AHS (11. Schulstufe) und insbesondere die Hörverständnisübungen analysiert. Die Analyse der rechtlichen Rahmenbedingungen (Lehrpläne) und theoretischen Konstrukte (GERS), der Ausspracheübungen in den Lehrbüchern, der Lehrerhandbücher und der Tonaufnahmen soll zeigen, in welchem Ausmaß ELF den Unterricht beeinflusst.
Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass die Forschung noch wenig Einfluss auf die Unterrichtspraxis zu haben scheint, trotz Bemühungen in den Lehrplänen, sich teilweise vom Primat der Familiensprachen zu entfernen. Unglücklicherweise erfolgt die Leistungsbeurteilung weiterhin hauptsächlich nach familiensprachigen Maßstäben. Daher neigen Lehrwerke dazu, nicht-familiensprachige Aspekte weitgehend auszublenden. Um die Realität des Sprachunterrichts jener der englischen Sprache im 21. Jahrhundert anzupassen, wird noch erheblicher Aufwand nötig sein. Lehrmittel sollten deutlich adaptiert werden, wenn das Ziel ist, erfolgreiche Lingua-Franca-Sprechende auszubilden.