Høgskolen i **Hedmark**

LUNA

Hans-André Pedersen

Bachelor Thesis

The English as a Lingua Franca and English as a Foreign Language paradigm

Engelsk som Lingua Franca og Engelsk som fremmedspråk paradigmet

English lector – Class of 2013

2015

Samtykker til utlån hos høgskolebiblioteket   JA ☒   NEI ☐

Samtykker til tilgjengeliggjøring i digitalt arkiv Brage   JA ☒   NEI ☐

Table of content

Norsk sammendrag

ELF VS. EFL: SHEDDING FURTHER LIGHT ON MICHAEL SWAN AND HENRY G. WIDDOWSON'S DEBATE ON DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES.

Hans-André Pedersen

2015

Hamar

Engelsk Lektor

Sammendrag

Målet for denne bacheloren har vært å svare og diskutere om ELF og EFL betyr det samme ved å belyse pragmatiske objekter i debatten mellom Michael Swan og Henry G. Widdowson. Selv om det stilles et ja nei spørsmål om de er det samme eller ulike, består paradigmet også av andre viktige temaer. Hovedfokuset for denne bacheloren har vært på tanken om feil i morsmål og ikke-morsmål normer og lokalsamfunn i Engelsk, men andre temaer har også blitt diskutert på grunn av sin pragmatiske rolle i henhold til ELF vs. EFL paradigmet. Engelsk språklæring, språk status, læring og bruk av Engelsk og Global Engelske modeller er debattert enten positivt eller negativt av lingvister, lærere, professorer og eksperter i deres respektable felt. Dette har blitt gjort ved å gjennomgå litteratur og kilder fra Barbara Seidlhofer, Jennifer Jenkins, Michael Swan, Henry G. Widdowson, debatter, symposier og elektroniske artikler. Konklusjonen i denne avhandlingen er at ELF og EFL er forskjellige og bør ikke bli sett på som like, men som ambassadører for Engelsk og Global Engelsk som fungerer på sin måte. Det er mange temaer som trenger videre forskning for å kunne trekke flere konklusjoner, og eldre etablerte måter å vise Global Engelsk på kan trenge ytterligere oppdatering for å være relevant for denne debatten.

Nøkkelord: (Engelsk, Engelsk som et lingua franca (ELF), Engelsk som et fremmedspråk (EFL), feil, normer, språk, bruk og læring)

Engelsk sammendrag (abstract)

ELF VS. EFL: SHEDDING FURTHER LIGHT ON MICHAEL SWAN AND HENRY G. WIDDOWSON'S DEBATE ON DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES.

Hans-André Pedersen

2015

Hamar

English lector

Abstract

The purpose of the thesis is to answer and discuss if ELF and EFL are different by highlighting pragmatics in a debate between Michael Swan and Henry, G. Widdowson. Although it is a straight forward question about whether they are the same or different, does the paradigm also contain other important subjects. The main focus for this thesis has been on the notion of mistakes within native speaker and non-native speaker norms and communities, but other subjects have also been discussed because of their pragmatic role to the ELF vs. EFL paradigm. English language teaching, language status, learning and using English and Global English models are debated either positively or negatively by linguists, teachers, professors and experts in the respectable fields. This has been done be reviewing literature and sources from Barbara Seidlhofer, Jennifer Jenkins, Michael Swan, Henry G. Widdowson, debates, symposiums and online articles. The conclusion of this thesis is that ELF and EFL are different and should not be viewed as the same, but as ambassadors of English and Global English that work in their own way. There are many subjects that need further research in order to draw further conclusions, and older established ways of viewing Global English may need further update in order to be relevant for this debate.

Keywords: (English, English as a lingua franca (ELF), English as a foreign language (EFL), mistakes, norms, language, using and learning)

1. Introduction

Today, people from all over the world use English or a variety of English to communicate. There are 320-380 million people who speak English as a first language, 300-500 million people who speak English as a second language, and nearly one billion people who speak English as a foreign language, or as a lingua franca. (Crystal, 2003). People, who speak English as a first language, come from countries where English is used as a native language, which makes them native speakers of English. People who learn English as a foreign language or use English as a lingua franca, often comes from other geographical areas where English is not the native language. If we were to look through Kachru's Three Circle Model, as mention in *Introducing Global Englishes 2015 version*, then the native speakers would be placed in the Inner circle as the norm-providing countries, and the people who use English as a foreign language or lingua franca would be placed in the Expanding circle, as the norm-dependent countries. However, this is not the case for both terms in the expanding circle as some linguists and teachers say they tend to differ from each other even though they seem quite similar, as Barbara Seidlhofer describes in *Understanding English as a lingua franca 2011 version*: "The acronyms are treacherously similar, but the concepts are quite different" (Seidlhofer, 2011). As Seidlhofer points out, these two seemingly similar terms are different in their own unique way, which will be explored further in this paper. Michael Swan, a teacher and English language teaching specialist, has written an article which was included Journal of English as a Lingua Franca called: *ELF and EFL: are they really different?* Henry G. Widdowson, a retired professor in applied linguistics, and language teaching, chose to respond Swan by writing an article called: *ELF and EFL: what's the difference? Comments on Michael Swan.* Where Widdowson sets out debate Michael Swan and challenges him on his conclusions and assumptions, as well as asking new questions. The purpose of this bachelor thesis is to answer and debate: ELF vs. EFL: shedding further light on Michael Swan and Henry G. Widdowson's debate on differences and similarities. In the next chapter I will explain in my methodology; how, what, and why I'm going to answer my bachelor thesis.

2. Methodology

The purpose for this thesis: ELF vs. EFL: shedding further light on Michael Swan and Henry G. Widdowson's debate on differences and similarities. The reason for this is that the two terms ELF and EFL have been in a heated debate between two linguists and I seek to explore the debate further. Therefore, this paper will debate if English as a lingua franca and English as a foreign language, henceforth (ELF) and (EFL), are different, what makes them different, and if they share any similarities. To do this I will focus on Michael Swan, and Henry G. Widdowson's debate about differences and similarities in ELF and EFL, and also debate other terms that have close ties with the ELF vs. EFL paradigm. The debate between the two authors will be used during my paper by further exploring their point of argument for this debate, because the arguments used during this debate are what the ELF versus. EFL paradigm is mainly about when discussed by linguists as well as professors and teachers.

Further this debate will explore the two terms: ELF and EFL by using textbook references and statements by other linguists, this will be done to show different definitions of the two terms. But one must not forget to question the researchers. The reason for this is the need for establishing an overview for the two terms without being subjective and trying to say there is only one true definition. Furthermore I will explore the notion of mistake regarding ELF, EFL, and nonnative speakers (NNS) in this debate. I've chosen this because this seems to be one of the pragmatics connected to Swan and Widdowson's debate. It's a field where opinions are divided around the negative and positive sides regarding the NS norms as a standard for ELF. Further I will discuss how ELF and EFL are learned and used? What are the purposes of ELF and EFL in context of use? This is done to determine if ELF and EFL are similar or different in the way they are used, this will be done by comparing literary findings from linguists. I will also discuss English language teaching (ELT) for natural reasons since it is closely tied with both EFL and ELF, and also NS and NNS. To do this the paper will include sources from linguists as Barbara Seidlhofer and Jennifer Jenkins, and articles from other sources in the field of ELF, EFL, ELT, NS and NNS, to shed further light on the debate. Debates and symposiums on the topic of ELF and EFL will be used to showcase different and similar opinions. Definition of different terms will be provided by individual persons, textbooks, and also online dictionaries. My main focus during this paper will be on ELF versus EFL, as well as the notion of 'mistake, since I can't go in depth on every subject that has close relations to this topic.

3. Theory

The two acronyms, ELF and EFL will be the main focus for this paper. In this chapter I will start by presenting my findings for each term in their own section, without comparing them to each other, but I will consider the notion of NS and NNS. This is done to try and define the two terms in order to understand what they mean, and will be used as a reference for discussion later. But it must be taken to a consideration that there are divided opinions regarding ELF and EFL, so the aim here will be to research if there is any common ground in the research. This will be done by using secondary sources from linguists, text-books with competence in the field of ELF and EFL, and dictionaries.

3.1 English as a Lingua Franca

ELF is an acronym for English as a lingua franca, and a Lingua Franca is defined by Macmillan dictionary as "a language that people use to communicate when they have different first languages" (Lingua Franca, n.d.). This means that a lingua franca is a bridge language people use when they can't communicate through their native language. ELF related research didn't started before the early 90's, and now, two decades later, it has developed into a vibrant field of research in the field of linguistics. This is Barbara Seidlhofer's thoughts about ELF: "as any use of English among speakers of different first language for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option (Seidlhofer, 2011 p. 7). Cambridge Dictionaries Online defines ELF as "the type of English used by speakers of other languages as a way of communicating among themselves" (ELF, n.d.). The reason for using these two definitions, were to draw a comparison regarding the term ELF. The common ground found in these definitions is that a lingua franca is a so called bridge language between two or more people who don't share a first language, and therefore have to communicate through a common adoptive language, this is ELF according to Cambridge Online Dictionary and Seidlhofer. As mentioned before, Kachru's three circle model (Galloway & Rose, 2015, pp. 18-19), labels English speakers in three different circles. The inner, outer and the expanding circle, here we will be focusing on the inner and expanding circle. Where, the inner circle consists of the norm-providing native-speakers of English, e.g. American, Australian, British, Canadian, and New Zealand etc. And the norm dependent expanding circle is where we find the people who have a different first language but uses English for communication situations, either globally or regionally. The third

expanding circle is where we find one of the groups in the vast majority of English speakers, namely those who use ELF.

The goal for ELF speakers is to use the English language for communicative purposes with a mutual intelligibility with the person or peers they are communicating with. ELF speakers do not speak fluent native English or with an accent from the NS countries, but with their own idiolect. The vast majority of English speakers are not NS, but rather ELF and EFL speakers. As described earlier in the text from David Crystal's findings, there are now over 1 billion people whom speak ELF, and 300-500 million people who speak ENL. That means the interaction possibilities for people who speak English are at an all-time high, and still evolving. Seidlhofer describes in her book: "English has reached truly global dimensions" (Seidlhofer, 2011 p. 7). This can be connected to what Crystal says about how many people speak ELF. Like Barbara Seidlhofer states in her book, "ELF has taken on a life of its own" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 8). This means that ELF has developed into a self-living entity, where it lives on through people, and is formed through communication; this could be one way of looking at it. The reason why we can say ELF has taken a life on its own is because it is: "in principle independent to a considerable degree of the norms established by its native users, and this is what needs to be recognized" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 8). Without norms, or rules, we could say that ELF becomes normless, almost like an outlaw, owned by no one, but still owned by all ELF speakers. Brumfit states that, "the ownership (by which I mean the power to adapt and change) of any language in effect rests with the people who use it" (Brumfit, 2001, p. 116). If we were to focus on mutual intelligibility and moving away from the NS norms, ELF can move more freely and continue to develop on its own. Without interference from NS norms the lingua franca's goal becomes much clearer, and that is mutual intelligibility through communication. This is one way of looking at ELF, and is certainly one of the more dominant ways of describing ELF, since we can find these statements reproduced in textbooks e.g. *Introducing Global Englishes,* and other literary sources available.

3.2 English as a Foreign Language

Another group found in Kachru's three circle model that also belongs to the norm-dependent Expanding Circle is English as a foreign language, also referred to as EFL. The norm-dependent part that comes along as a member of the Expanding circle, are a bit different for

the people who speak EFL, since their learning process are often founded on and measured up to NS standards. This is what Andreasson (1994) says about the expanding circle:

> In the expanding circle…the ideal goal is to imitate the native speaker of the standard language as closely as possible. Speaking English is simply not related to cultural identity. It is rather an exponent of one's academic and language-learning abilities (p. 402).

Andreasson points out that the goal for expanding circle members is to *imitate* the native speaker's standard language as closely as possible, and is a result of the user's ability to learn. Barbara Seidlhofer share similar views. "when you learn and use English as a foreign language, you are encouraged to strive to do 'as the natives do', you accept their authority as distributors of their language" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 17). EFL are measured up to standards of a codified version of English. This means that EFL has closer ties with the NS standards in terms of correctness in grammar, pronunciation, etc. This means that there must be a system or an institution that can correctly assert the terms for correctness. Barbara Seidlhofer states that: "conceiving of English in this way is the obvious option for learners and users of English who have a particular interest in (one of the) English-speaking cultures, and wish to identify with the community that speaks it" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 17). Galloway and Rose define EFL in their book as, "The use of English in a context where it has no official status and is not widely used in the local community, and thus is limited to special contexts like classroom" (Galloway & Rose, 2015, p. 253). If we look at a the definition in a dictionary like, Cambridge Dictionary Online, it states that EFL is, English as taught to people whose main language is not English and who live in a country where English is not the official or main language (English as a foreign language, n.d.). The reason I chose to use a dictionary definition and compare it to Galloway and Rose, is to show that words like *classroom*, and, *taught*, make the case that EFL is primary associated with school or teaching. This can be evidently shown in, *the Key data on Teaching Language at School in Europe 2012 report*, as it highlights that English is the most taught foreign language in nearly all European countries. The report continues to show that in 2009-10, 73 percent of primary school students in Europe were learning English, with over 90 percent learning it in lower secondary and general upper secondary schools (Galloway & Rose, 2015, pp. 128-129). We can therefore conclude that EFL is primary associated with school and classroom context, where it mainly appears in teaching form, where students are being measured up to NS standards.

4. Discussion

In this chapter I will start discussing if ELF and EFL really are different by presenting the arguments used by Swan and Widdowson during their debate to highlight the pragmatics around this debate. I will start off with a short discussion on Seidlhofer's table 1.1 from her book, *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*, because her table is reproduced in text-books like *Introducing Global Englishes* by Galloway and Rose. This is done because she is a renowned linguist and her arguments are cited by both Swan and Widdowson. After this I will be discussing the notion of *mistake*, which has been outlined by both writers to be a primary topic when referring to NNS that include both ELF and EFL. I chose to do this because it will help the purpose of this paper, which is to shed further light on differences and similarities when comparing ELF and EFL. Furthermore will I discuss ELT, and if it is possible to teach ELF, this will be done by reviewing different literature and debates containing linguists and professors. This is done to show the relevance of ELT in order to answer the thesis stated earlier. This is the discussion part of the chapter where I will debate differences and similarities when comparing ELF and EFL as well as discussing ELT, this will be done by using literature from linguists, including: Jennifer Jenkins, Barbara Seidlhofer, Michael Swan, Henry G. Widdowson, David Crystal, and even some pedagogical specialists. I chose to include the debate between the two authors, because they have to some degree stated their opinions on these subjects in written forms of books and or articles. Why I have chosen them, is because they all agree and disagree on this topic in some way, and are therefore contributing to the discussion.

4.1 Discussing Seidlhofer's table

Barbara Seidlhofer presents a table in her book, *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*, called, *Table 1.1 Conceptual differences between EFL and ELF* (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 18). She offers a way to separate these two acronyms. This model is also re-produced in the text-book, *Introducing Global Englishes*, in the introduction part of Chapter 7, *English as a lingua franca* (Galloway & Rose, 2015, p. 148). Here she states that the linguacultural norms for EFL are: pre-existing, re-affirmed, and for ELF she states: ad hoc, negotiated. Where she states as previous that EFL follows already established norms, like the English NS norms, and ELF do not follow a certain set of norms but rather create norms for each individual reason they have to communicate, in order to find common ground of communication with

the person they are communicating with. Seidlhofer writes in her table that the objectives for EFL are: integration and membership in NS community and the objectives in ELF is intelligibility, and communication in a NNS or mixed NNS-NS interaction. Here she states that EFL speakers is trying to integrate or join a NS community where English is the main language. And the objectives of ELF speakers are to interact with a NNS or mixed NNS and NS through successful communication. Seidlhofer writes that this is done through the process of: imitation and adaption for EFL speakers and through accommodation and adaption for ELF speakers. This means that EFL speakers are trying to imitate their speaking skills by comparing it to natives-speakers, and by adapting to their way. While ELF speakers have to adjust to the situation they are currently in. It is questionable that Galloway and Rose have not offered an alternative model to Seidlhofer's table included in their text-book.

Kachru's model was used in chapter 3.1 and 3.2 to describe both ELF and EFL. The reason ELF was placed in in his model is because they are the vast majority that speaks English in the world according to Crystal. But if we look at how Seidlhofer describes the process for EFL speakers in her table, and look at Andreasson's definition of the expanding circle, then we find the keyword, *imitation*, in both authors work. This quality is not mentioned in Seidlhofer's table when talking about ELF, but instead we do find words like: accommodation and adaption, when describing the process of ELF. Then by comparison, does this mean that Kachru's model needs to adjust or add another circle since we can't put both ELF and EFL in the expanding circle? According to Andreasson's conclusion, expanding circle member's objective is to imitate the native speakers as closely as possible, and since we have established that EFL is a member of the expanding circle. Then an option would be to question ELF's membership in the expanding circle? This is an interesting topic and this paper encourages further research.

4.2 Mistakes regarding NNS English

Michael Swan's chapter from his *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca 2012*, which covers page 379-389, starts with the title, *Do NNS of English make mistakes?* (Swan, 2012, p. 380). Here Swan seeks out to explore if NNS of English make mistakes in form of grammar, pronunciation, word order etc. He then wants to determine if these mistakes should be considered when viewing ELF-speakers and EFL-speakers. As he states: "is there indeed a case for saying that some non-native usages are not really mistakes at all, but perfectly valid

forms which simply do not happen to conform to NS norms?" (Swan, 2012, p. 380). Swan considers mistake to be a part of the NS codification, and not a factor to regard when talking about NNS of English. Widdowson's reply to Swan has an entirely different view on the notion of mistake: "this is a term that applies to failures by EFL learners to conform to a NS norm. Why should it not equally apply to similar failures on the part of ELF users?" (Widdowson, 2013, p. 187). Widdowson's reply asks if EFL speakers are to conform to the rules of natives-speakers of English, then why shouldn't ELF speakers conform to the same rules of a codified version of English. He states that there is already an existing set of rules to codified versions of English, and says that if you are to speak a version of English, then why not conform to one of these already existing version? This is one way of looking at it according to Widdowson. Swan (2012) explains the situation of many ELF users, where they disregard the NS norms in terms of correctness like this:

> However, many lingua franca English speakers are certainly unconcerned about emulating NS norms of correctness except in so far as these are likely to serve their communicative purposes, and are perfectly satisfied with approximations that are transparent and effective. For such speakers it seems quite reasonable to say that the forms they use have their own validity, and should not in principle be judged by NS norms or labeled 'mistakes'. (p. 381)

As covered in chapter 2 through 2.1-2.2, a way to describe ELF is to say that it's used for communication purposes, a self-living entity, and a form of English that is owned by no one. It's a dynamic and fluid form of English that focuses on mutual intelligibility between NNS. EFL was described is a well-established form of English education in NNS countries and areas, that abides by the NS norms of English during the learning process. All of these statements were covered in chapter 2 with different source. We can clearly see that they have a different method of working according to these sources, and that it would be un-natural to regard the notion of mistake, or failure, within NS norms to apply for ELF usage. But we must still consider that ELF still carries the word *English* in the first letter in its three-letter acronym, and therefore does not have unlimited free boundaries, and must to some extent uphold parts of the English language. But when can we regard NNS usage of English as a mistake? In the case of ELF, it will be when there is no mutual intelligibility, as this is the primary goal for ELF users, as discussed in section 2.1 ELF.

All norms have an origin, something we can trace it back to. In this case, English native-speaker norms come from a Standard English, a codified linguistic map used in teaching that tells learners if they are projecting correct forms of the English language. Learners may end up not always using the correct form of what is taught, but this is an agenda for what teachers need to teach their learners. Widdowson puts it like this: "As such, it, of course, serves as a secure framework of pedagogic reference: teachers know what they have to teach and what they have to get learners to learn." But he is quick to follow up with answer that defends what he calls reality of the situation: "This may not represent the reality of how users actually use the language, nor indeed what language learners actually learn, but nevertheless prescribed as what teachers need to teach" (Widdowson, 2013, p. 189). Widdowson points out that there is maybe another way of looking at mistakes, rather than looking at what kind of English learners produce, one can also consider that the teachers are reliable for what is being taught among their learners, and that the notion of mistake should be regarded as the teachers fault. (Widdowson, 2013, p. 191) We cannot regard this as an answer for every case when a learner makes a mistake, but it opens up the debate for other alternatives rather than it is just the learner's mistake.

While comparing learning how to ski, play the piano and how to play chess to learning English, Swan argues that: "People who are learning complex skills rarely get everything right from the outset" (Swan, 2012, p. 380). Carrying such a strong word as *everything* in context of correctness and learning, Swan lays himself open for criticism. Widdowson points out: "But in the case of English, as Swan concedes, it is not just from the outset that they rarely get everything right. They rarely ever get everything right, but keep getting things 'wrong' all the time" (Widdowson, 2013, p. 188). While Swan means that people rarely get everything right when learning a new language, Widdowson argues that they will most likely *never* get everything right. This is a response to Swan's comparison between learning English and playing the piano, where most people will never learn how to play without mistakes, and will keep making mistakes. When can we say that a person get everything right in terms of using a learnt language, can we measure it somehow, or do we acknowledge that a person has reached a certain level of proficiency where you are no longer a learner? If this is the case, then using Modiano's Centripetal Circles of International English would be an alternative when we can talk about the main focus of the model which is *proficiency,* instead of using *everything* when talking about correctness in terms of language. (Galloway & Rose, 2015, p. 24). In Modiano's model we have a center of Proficient in International

English, a second circle of Native and foreign language proficiency, a third circle of learners, and everything outside this little galaxy contains people who do not know English. This is one way of looking at the terms of correctness, but may not be the answer to the whole problem, as there are other models that explain International and World Englishes in different ways.

When talking about learning and using English, Swan and Widdowson have different views. While Swan expresses his fully sympathy for the ELF call for tolerance of NNS English, does he also say that expressions like "discuss about," or "using an infinitive after the word *enjoy*" is wrong, and should be regarded as a mistake, in other words, this level of mistake should also regard ELF usage. Here Swan seems to think that there are being made mistake when regarding ELF talk, even when he manages to argue against himself by saying that ELF users "find and negotiate one-off solutions to problems, accommodate, innovate and so on" (Swan, 2012, p. 382). As we covered earlier, when there is no intelligibility between speakers, then we can regard the speakers produced output as mistakes. But how does using the phrase "discuss about", or "using an infinitive after the word *enjoy*", disturb intelligibility when talking ELF? If a sentence is produced and reads: *I really enjoy to run*, then we have an infinitive after the word enjoy. This is a sentence that most people will classify as intelligible, and even though the correct form would be: *I really enjoy running*, two key words will make it easier to break down the sentence, and understand what it's about, *I* = me, *enjoy* = happy feelings, *running* = fast walking as an exercise. Swan argues that by allowing this form of tolerance extension will result in conflating two different contexts, learning and using (Swan, 2012, p. 384). Does Swan make a reasonable argument that ELF speakers should conform to this level of correctness, or does he simply think that the two Acronyms, ELF and EFL should be bound and share the same norms as NS?

Widdowson suggests an alternative to Swan's theory on that one should not conflate the two terms. Widdowson states that the research shows how using and learning are "dynamically inter-related" (Widdowson, 2013, p. 192). It is questionable why Widdowson refers to this ELF study as common knowledge and does not provide any sources when stating this fact. But nonetheless his argument is valid for this discussion as a counter argument to what Swan claims. Widdowson follows up his statement by saying that learning is not only determined by teaching (Widdowson, 2013, p. 192). Swan's call to not regard using and learning as the same function, does call for a bit of clearing. If we first look at the two words, learning and using. Then we can clearly see differences, you can't use something you haven't learned, or

discovered yet, as complicated as e.g. a language. But you can learn by using what you have learned so far to expand your knowledge, by speaking to other people in the language you are learning and be corrected or learn through cognitive learning process and make strategic use of the linguistic resources that user currently possesses, as John Dewey, a psychologist, philosopher and an educational reformer, said: "Give the pupils something to do, not something to learn; and the doing is such a nature as to demand thinking; learning naturally results" (Goodreads n.d.). Dewey suggests that by giving the learners a task they will analyze the task, and cognition will naturally result in learning. Dewey's quote does not bring enough of a conclusion to determine that Swan is wrong in his argument, but simply adds another perspective to the debate about learning and doing.

Widdowson comments that: "learning is apparently seen as something that is confined to the classroom context and induced by teaching, which is seen as essentially a matter of getting learners to conform to prescribed norms" This sounds like the criteria for EFL as presented in chapter 2.2, where the learners seek out to conform to NS norms. But Widdowson quickly follows up by stating: "But this they frequently, indeed usually, fail to do, and, as the argument goes, when in contexts of use this imperfect learning makes its appearance, one can call it ELF, and be quite tolerant about it" (Widdowson, 2013, p. 190). If EFL is what is taught in classrooms, does that mean what is being taught is usually what is being produced by the learners? Does EFL teaching sometimes lead to ELF speaking EFL learners? Seidlhofer's view on ELT is a bit different from what Swan expects from learners, she states that: "The end product is clearly not the English that has been taught, but the English that has been learnt." (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 186). Seidlhofer argues that you cannot expect that learners will produce a hundred percent of what is being taught, and that some interference and misunderstandings will lead to a different version of what is being originally taught. Is it possible that English teaching and classroom teaching does not only produce EFL but that some level of ELF will also be the outcome from the learning process?

4.3 Teaching ELF, and ELF as a language

ELT is a well discussed topic around linguists and teachers, because this in one way that the English language spreads around the world today, both locally and globally. Katy S. Davies, a teacher of EFL and ELF enthusiast, and Laura Patsko, a linguist and a teacher, has written an article on the, *British Council* website, with the following headline, *How to teach English*

as a lingua franca (ELF). In the article Davies and Patsko writes a how to manual by listing up the four main areas of the lingua franca core (LFC), which are; most consonant sounds, appropriate consonant cluster simplification, vowel length distinctions, nuclear stress. As well as additional pronunciation features which are not included in the LFC, and what features to leave out that can end up having negative impact on ELF intelligibility, which are; vowel reduction like schwa and weak forms, and certain features of connected speech like linking, assimilation, coalescence. The article describes a process where you need to conduct an analysis to find out if your learners need to use ELF or integrate in an English-speaking country. Then map out the language background of each learner in order to be able to accommodate to these learners (Davies & Patsko, 2013). By following this guideline, Davies and Patsko means that one can find out what the learners goals are at an early stage, and can accommodate accordingly to their needs by focusing on the LFC, and thus teach ELF.

However, some linguists argue that you cannot teach ELF. A symposium was conducted at the University of Verona in 2013, where Barbara Seidlhofer, a linguist in the field of English, and Anna Mauranen, the Dean of the faculty of Arts at the University of Helsinki and project director of the English as an Academic Lingua Franca (ELFA) appeared as keynote speakers. Seidlhofer stated during a question about ELF in school, she said: "And I think that's what I meant that you can't say we'll teach ELF all nicely packaged, and instead of slotting in the usual patterns we'll slot in some other patterns and sounds because that doesn't make sense" (Franceschi & Corrizzato, 2013). Her co keynote speaker Mauranen agreed to Seidlhofer's statement by saying: "I fully agree we can't teach ELF, because we can teach about ELF, we can show what it is like, and so we can increase awareness, like my colleague Barbara was just saying" (Franceschi & Corrizzato, 2013). Both Mauranen and Seidlhofer agree that you cannot teach ELF, but you can present ELF and create awareness, while Davies and Patsko argue for their method as a way of teaching ELF. Mauranen argues that it's: "Because it's not a variety that anybody would have described, it's not stabilized in any particular way yet, and may do so or may never do so" (Franceschi & Corrizzato, 2013). So what are the reasons that cannot teach ELF? Is it as Mauranen says, that it is not stabilized, or a variety that anybody would have described? If so, is it because ELF is too fluid and dynamic, that it constantly changes from person to person and never settles? Jenkins has bit of a different view than Seidlhofer and Mauranen, in that she argues that ELF *is* or may become codifiable at some point (Jenkins, 2007, p. 238). One must not conclude

that when Jenkins says the word *is*, that it means ELF is already codified, but it can *be* codified because it is codifiable. If we look at the definition provided at Cambridge Dictionaries Online, then it says that codification is: "the act or process of arranging something, such as laws or rules, into a system" (Codification, n.d.). Galloway and Rose define codification in their book as: "The process of standardization and making a norm for language through recording linguistic features" (Galloway & Rose, 2015, p. 252).

If this is the case, and we focus on Jenkins suggestion that ELF is already codifiable, then it means that ELF can be put into a system where it will reach a status as its own language or variety of a language. If ELF can become codified, then the notion of ELF being fluid and dynamic may come to a point where it will stabilize. And as we discussed earlier, EFL is often associated with classroom context and learning, and by following a set of English NS norms. If ELF were to become codified, then the we could conclude that the two acronyms have become more similar by following a certain set of rules or norms to determine appropriate language and mistakes, furthermore they would both have a pedagogical approach to learning by following the set rules. Swan says it's hard to see how ELF can be considered a language or a set of language varieties (Swan, 2012, p. 385). Widdowson says he understands why Swan argues that ELF is not a language or a variety in, since it does not provide a teachable model that learners can follow, but he adds that if this is the view that we should conform to when thinking about ELF we would be right to do so(Widdowson, 2013, p. 192). He does not say that this is the only and right way think about ELF. But even though it becomes codified, does that still mean people are going to learn this codified version of ELF? Is ELF going to lose its purpose, as we discussed earlier, as a tool to communicate with others when they don't share a common first language? Will it still be called English as a lingua franca, or will it lose its lingua franca part and be named something else? Will there be a new form of ELF that will replace the 'old' but newly codified version of ELF? And will there be more than just one version of a codified ELF.

Swan states that the ELF focus on lingua franca communication is, and will continue to bring benefits to teachers and learners of English. His opinion is that when language learning fails to execute its goal, it's because perfectionism is pushed upon learners, and ELF researchers can help prevent this (Swan, 2012, p. 388). Swan clearly states that he want to distinguish ELF from language and EFL. His previous statement on that ELF is not a language is re-affirmed by him stating that: "ELF is not a language, either in opposition to EFL or otherwise" But he clearly points out that EFL follows such norms of a codified

version English, a criteria he says need to be established, for it to be considered as a language, norms and rules. Widdowson's reply to this is that it it's a language that has been "de-foreignized" to the extent that it's become common property (Widdowson, 2013, p. 193). Here the two authors are in a disagreement, Jenkins argues that it is or can become codifiable, as we established earlier, but this does not mean that this is the form of English we should teach, and rule out NS English. Swan states that learners of EFL may lead to a situation for ELF purposes, he says that: "In this sense, EFL leads to ELF" (Swan, 2012, p. 388). It's odd that Swan draws a conclusion that clearly states that EFL can become ELF so quickly, when EFL is conformed to norms and rules, even though he clearly wants to separate these two terms from each other as much as possible, as discussed earlier in the discussion part. Does he mean that EFL learners can switch between ELF and EFL as they want, or do they simply just do this without any cognition? But there is one thing that both Swan and Widdowson can agree on, and that is to not set up false opposition between the two terms (Widdowson, 2013, p. 193) and (Swan, 2012, p. 388). But as we have reviewed, they disagree on what is false about the opposition between ELF and EFL.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to answer and debate the thesis: ELF vs. EFL: shedding further light on Michael Swan and Henry G. Widdowson's debate on differences and similarities. This paper has tried to establish an overview for differences and similarities within the ELF vs. EFL paradigm by reviewing Michael Swan and Henry G. Widdowson's debate. The findings in Chapter 3 shows that ELF is a communicative device used by non-native speakers, and EFL is primary associated with school or teaching, but this are one of the more dominating ways of looking at it among ELF and EFL scholars. Chapter 4 discusses the ELF vs. EFL paradigm by researching Seidlhofer's table, the notion of mistake within non-native speakers and comparing this to ELT. The discussion of Seidlhofer's model shows that scholars in Global English have different opinions on what defines ELF and EFL, but the notion of *imitation* is confined to EFL, even when both acronyms are placed in Kachru's expanding circle. The Discussion on the notion of mistakes within non-native speakers shows that Swan and Widdowson disagree if ELF should confine to NS norms as EFL does, but Swan has shown signs of arguing against himself. The discussion shows that what English NS view as mistakes should not regard ELF in the same way it does EFL, because ELF does not conform to any English NS models, but adjust their situation, but they should never go so far that what they produced in English, or ELF to some, becomes unintelligible.

In the discussion part about learning and using English, with a focus on ELF, Swan argues that these terms must not be conflated, while Widdowson argued that learning and use is "dynamically inter-related" (Widdowson, 2013, p. 192). The discussion shows that both learning and use are a part of learning, and that cognition is often the result that lays ground for further learning and use. Michael Swan's background as an ELT specialist and Henry G. Widdowson's background as a professor in applied linguistics made for an interesting debate, since both authors relied heavily on using Barbara Seidlhofer's material as a reference for their arguments.

The article on the British Councils website by Katy S. Davies and Laura Patsko, suggested that it is possible to teach ELF, a how to guide that explains the process for teaching ELF by focusing on the Lingua Franca Core. While the symposium conducted at the University of Verona in 2013 with keynote speakers Barbara Seidlhofer and Anna Mauranen, states that

ELF cannot be taught because it's an indescribable unique way of communicating and have not been stabilized yet. Jennifer Jenkins states that ELF can become or is already codifiable, and therefore can become a language. The discussion continues to argue if ELF is a language or can become a language. Swan argues that it is hard to see how ELF can be considered a language or a set of language varieties. Widdowson states that he understands Swans argument, by saying there are no teachable model provided yet for ELF, even though Davies and Patsko have published a suggestion. On this note, ELF is not yet codified, while EFL already is.

Are ELF and EFL really different? The conclusion for this bachelor thesis is that ELF and EFL are different. Swan's wish for ELF to conform to NS norms shows intolerance for language use by lingua franca speakers, but his call for ELF tolerance in ELT shows progress that, if followed up, can lead to change in NS and NNS communities where English is taught. While the two terms have considerable differences to how they are functioning in the society today, both terms work in the same field but are to no extent in opposition. They are both active ambassadors of the English language and English as a global language, they two sides of the same coin.

Bibliography

Brumfit, C, J. (2001). *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching: Helping Learners to Develop a Dialect of their Own*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Codification. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionaries Online*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/codification

Crystal, D (2003*). English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, K, S. & Patsko, L. (2013). *How to teach English as a lingua franca (ELF)*. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/how-teach-english-lingua-franca-elf

ELF. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionaries Online*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/elf

English as a foreign language. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionaries Online*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/english-as-a-foreign-language

Franceschi, V. & Corrizzato, S. (2013). *Interview with professors Anna Mauranen (University of Helsinki) And Barbara Seidlhofer (University of Vienna)* Retrieved from http://www.iperstoria.it/joomla/numeri/16-interviste/88-interview-elf

Galloway, N. & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Goodreads. (n.d.). *John Dewey*. Retrieved from http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/659346-give-the-pupils-something-to-do-not-something-to-learn

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

Lingua Franca. (n.d.). In *Macmillan Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/lingua-franca

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

Swan, M. 2012. ELF and EFL: are they really different? Seidlhofer, B. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*. (Volume 1, Issue 2. pp. 379-389). Vienna: De Gruyter.

Widdowson, H, G. 2013. ELF and EFL: what's the difference? Comments on Michael Swan. Seidlhofer, B. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*. (Volume 2, Issue 1. pp. 187-193). Vienna: De Gruyter.