



Turkish EFL Teachers' Awareness about ELF and the Underlying Ideologies Behind Their (Non)-Awareness

Fetamet Aydın

Birikim Primary School

Ali Karakaş

Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University

ABSTRACT

English has undergone several transformations recently. One of them is the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) among its linguistically diverse speakers. Many studies have been conducted on ELF in different settings, including Turkey. However, most studies were concerned with pre-service language teachers. Thus, this study explored 40 EFL teachers' beliefs and perceptions about ELF. The data collected through an open-ended survey questionnaire was subjected to content analysis and descriptive statistics. The findings revealed that most teachers are not aware of ELF as a notion. Those who are aware of it see it as a tool for communication among non-native English speakers mostly and attach importance to effective communication and intelligibility. However, most teachers had awareness about the lexicogrammatical features of ELF and had positive perceptions about them in spoken interactions, yet did not see ELF accents favourably. It appeared that several dominant ideologies shape teachers' beliefs and perceptions and a few teachers developed counter ideologies against the hegemonic ones. The findings offer implications for teacher education programs, EFL teachers, language learners and material developers and curriculum designers. Further research is suggested to investigate ELF awareness across different cities and the effects of various variables, such as overseas experiences, on ELF awareness.

INTRODUCTION

English is used in many domains, including economical, medical and educational sciences. While it is taught in many countries as a foreign language, it is also used as a contact language with people from all around the globe. Kachru (1985) symbolized the use of English across the world in his three concentric circle model. In this model, countries that use English as their native language constitute the Inner Circle, e.g. America, the United Kingdom. Countries that use English as the second language, such as India, Nigeria, Philippines are in the Outer Circle, and countries that use English as a foreign language, such as Turkey and Germany are in the Expanding circle. Additionally, the sociolinguistic profile of English speakers predominantly consists of those who speak English as an additional language. Arguments about the ways speakers use English inside the Outer and Expanding circles have led to the emergence of the concepts of World Englishes

(WEs), and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). At its simplest, Jenkins (2009) defines ELF by referring to English being used by non-native speakers of English (NNEs) from the Outer and Expanding circle. ELF communication might also include native English speakers (NESs) but their norms do not dominate communication in interactions. Besides, more modern views see ELF as a discourse which does not have standard but dynamic forms (variations) in situ and which is used among NNEs predominantly (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015).

Moreover, Seidlhofer (2005) described this term as a way of referring to “communication in English between speakers with different first languages” (p. 339). ELF supports diverse use of Englishes based on effective communication. Thus, any kind of English is acceptable in its own terms. Moreover, in terms of ownership of English, as Rajagopalan (2004) argued, in the understanding of ELF, “English belongs to everyone who speaks it, but it is nobody’s mother tongue” (p. 11). Thus, ELF strips the ownership of English from NESs and does not point to NESs as the target model in ELF pedagogy.

Even if this term has been around for almost 20 years, still there are language teachers who are unaware of ELF (e.g. İnceçay & Akyel, 2014; Soruç, 2015; Toprakoğlu & Dilman, 2017). Due to the lack of teachers’ awareness, ELT pedagogy fails in terms of preparing students for real-world English communication. It is because traditional pedagogy in most countries is grounded in traditional practices in which NESs are regarded as the target model (Jenkins, 2007) and standard English norms are enforced on students in schools with a heavy emphasis on accuracy. The following table summarizes the differences between the paradigms to which ELF and EFL (traditional ELT) belong in language teaching pedagogy.

Table 1. Comparison of traditional EFL and ELF principles (Adapted from Galloway & Rose, 2015, p. 208).

Traditional (EFL) ELT (Modern Languages Paradigm)		ELF (Global Englishes Paradigm)
Target speaker	(Educated) NESs	Any English user (both NESs and NNEs)
Ownership	NESs	Any English user (both NESs and NNEs)
Target culture	Essentialist view (NES cultures)	Fluid view
Ideal teachers	NES teachers and NNE teachers with the same L1	NNE teachers with the same and different L1s and NES teachers
Norms	Standard Native English	Diverse, flexible and multiple forms
Role model	(Educated) NESs	Expert (skilled, competent intercultural) users/communicators
Source of materials	ENL countries featuring NESs	ENL and non-ENL countries with relevant English speaking societies
The view of students’ L1 and own culture	Deficit view: Regarded as a barrier and cause of interference	Regarded as a linguistic resource

ELF researchers have investigated different aspects of language pedagogy and language use so far, ranging from perceptual and attitudinal studies to pragmatic, corpus-based studies and studies into ELF phonology (e.g. Jenkins, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2004). ELF attitudes and perceptions of English language learners, teachers and English users have been also among the widely investigated areas (e.g. Erling, 2007; Jenkins, 2007; Ranta, 2010; Seidlhofer, 2011). In Turkey, researchers have mostly done studies on pre-service teachers’ perceptions and attitudes about ELF (e.g. Biricik-Deniz, Özkan & Bayyurt, 2016, 2019; Kemaloğlu-Er & Bayyurt, 2019), on EFL

instructors at tertiary levels (e.g. Ceyhan-Bingöl & Özkan, 2019), on high school language division students (e.g. Yücedağ & Karakaş, 2019). Overall, these studies indicated an emerging awareness of ELF among pre-service teachers and instructors, yet there are still certain barriers for ELF-aware teachers to shape their teaching practices in accordance with ELF principles. Among several barriers cited in the studies are the lack of ELF-friendly teaching materials, the traditional ELF-oriented school curricula, the failure of teacher education programs in terms of offering courses on sociolinguistic issues around the spread of English and certain language ideologies.

Silverstein (1979) describes language ideology as widely held assumptions about language itself and how it should be used. One dominant ideology is the standard English ideology. Milroy (2007) states that standard English is coded in dictionaries, grammar books, pronunciation guides and these codifications draw on a national variety of English. Various studies (e.g. Jenkins, 2014; Karakaş, 2016; Pilkinton-Pihko, 2013) have shown that whether someone's English is good or not depends on how correctly they use English according to this ideology. Another interrelated ideology is the native speakerism. Holliday (2006) states that the "native speakerism as an ideology is characterized by the belief that the 'native speaker' teachers represent a 'Western culture' from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology" (p. 385). It sees NESs as experts in language teaching. Another ideology is authenticity. Jenkins (2014) states that this ideology supports the ideology of native-speakerism, too. In this ideology, to be considered an authentic speaker, someone should be identified with a particular location and speech community. Woolard (2008) states that to sound authentic, one must capture the nuances and the tones of that speech community's members. For those under the influence of this ideology, the ultimate goal is to have a native-like accent with no grammatical errors.

Particularly, the previous studies often showed that pre-service teachers, instructors and language learners were negative about ELF accents and the accents of their co-nationals, with a desire to identify their English accents with that of NESs, predominantly British English and American English (e.g. Coşkun, 2011; Ishikawa, 2016; Karakaş, 2019a; Üresin & Karakaş, 2019; Yücedağ & Karakaş, 2019). Although such perceptions and attitudes were found to be influenced by hegemonic language ideologies, most researchers did not consider them as a variable that might underlie their participants' perceptions and awareness about the notion of ELF and its principles.

Similarly, in Turkey, the number of studies on in-service EFL teachers' perceptions and beliefs about ELF is still limited (e.g. İnceçay & Akyel, 2014; Toprakoğlu & Dilman, 2017; Üresin & Karakaş, 2019). Most importantly, the existing research on teacher perceptions and beliefs about ELF did not seem to consider the role of language ideologies as a factor that might guide teachers' perceptions and beliefs in certain directions. Therefore, this study aims to fill the research gap in this area by answering the following research questions:

1. What kind of English are high school English language teachers oriented to?
 - a) Do high school language teachers have any awareness of the concept of ELF?
 - b) What is the most acceptable standard English according to the teachers?
 - c) What are high school English language teachers' views about their own accents and other ELF accents?
2. What are the language ideologies that might influence teachers' awareness and perceptions about ELF?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative case study research design which is inductive and ungeneralizable but focuses on the insiders' perspectives (Steckler et al., 1992). The qualitative research method was used to ensure that the beliefs and perceptions of the participants are obtained through rich data. There are various types of case studies such as single, multiple, collective, instrumental, intrinsic and descriptive. This is a descriptive case study aiming to understand the beliefs and perspectives of EFL teachers about ELF and its implications for language teaching pedagogy in the real-life context in which it occurred (Yin, 2003).

Participants

The study was conducted in the fall semester of 2018-2019 academic year at 16 high schools in Antalya province. The schools were chosen for their convenience as one of the researchers lives in the same district. The reason for choosing high schools was because the issues around ELF are more concerned with teachers who work with adult learners rather than young learners as adult learners have more opportunities to use English outside school environments. 40 EFL teachers participated in the study. Random sampling was used for recruiting these teachers. The detailed information about the participants is given below:

Table 2. Characteristics of the Participants

Gender	Number (n/N)	Percentage (%)
Female	26	65
Male	14	35
Age		
21-25	0	0
26-35	8	20
36-45	10	25
46+	22	55
Experience of teaching English		
1-5 years	0	0
6-10 years	5	12.5
11-15 years	9	22.5
16+ years	26	65
Experience of being abroad		
Yes	27	67.5
No	13	32.5

Data Collection and Analysis

The data was collected through an open-ended survey adapted from the questionnaires of İnceçay and Akyel (2014) and Topkaraoğlu and Dilman (2017). Open-ended questions were

available asking about the participants' ideas and perceptions about standard English, their knowledge about ELF, what they think about various English accents as well as their own accents and their co-nationals' (other Turkish people's) accents. Open-ended questionnaires were limited to a couple of YES/No questions and multiple-choice questions which were asked to determine certain issues around ELF, such as whether they believe in the existence of standard Englishes.

Qualitative content analysis was chosen as the analytical framework of data analysis. This type of analysis can both be used in an inductive or deductive way. They both inquire three main phases: preparation, organization and reporting the results. For the analysis, Dörnyei's (2007) suggested steps for content analysis were followed: (1) transferring the data into word files in accordance with each item in the questionnaire, (2) pre-coding and coding, (3) growing ideas and (4) interpreting the data and drawing conclusions. To code the data and create themes, the responses to the same items were compiled into a single file and the content was read carefully to see the relevance between responses and then codes were created which were finally clustered around certain major themes. To present the data to YES-NO questions in the questionnaire, descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and percentages were used. These descriptive statistics were useful to understand the qualitative data better as they showed teachers' overall perceptions and beliefs about ELF.

RESULTS

The results of the questionnaires are presented in the order of the research questions. Whenever needed, the quantification of data has been done to give a better insight into teachers' perceptions and beliefs about ELF.

EFL teachers' orientation to particular varieties of English

To answer this main research question, three sub-research questions were formulated. Each of these questions is addressed separately and a general conclusion is drawn about teachers' overall tendency towards the kind of English they favour for themselves and for teaching purposes.

Awareness of the concept of ELF

Out of 40 teachers, 30 (75%) reported having 'no idea' about the concept of ELF. It is likely that some of these teachers might be aware of its principles but lack the terminological knowledge about ELF. Five teachers (12.5%) noted that their level of knowledge about ELF is 'not much but they have heard the term.' From these findings, one can conclude that most teachers had no awareness of the term 'ELF' at the time of the study.

The minority having some degree of awareness were asked to explain what comes to their mind about ELF in a follow-up question. Below are their responses to the follow-up question in the questionnaire:

T10: I just know, people speaking English with other people whose mother tongue is different.

T29: I think it is about speaking English without minding about the rules so much. The main attention, the focus is on communication.

Only a few teachers believed that ELF is communication-oriented. They are also aware that standard grammar rules are often disregarded in ELF interactions at the expense of effective

communication. However, the majority (n=32, 80%) aligned their teaching context with ‘intranational-multicultural teaching in which English is considered to be taught for using it within Turkey and across other countries for communicative purposes. That is, many teachers are aware of the fact that English is mostly used by NNEs in their own context and their students’ primary target communicators are non-native speakers and/or Turkish learners of English. Only, five teachers saw their teaching situation as an EFL context, which was at odds with the ELF paradigm.

Finally, the last measure taken to examine teachers’ perceptions of ELF was related to certain ELF features in oral and written English usages. Teachers expressed their opinions on the acceptability of divergent ELF features. The following table summarises teachers’ acceptance of the lexico-grammatical ELF features.

Table 3. Acceptance of lexicogrammatical ELF features in written and oral communication

Sample usages	WRITTEN					ORAL							
	+		-		?	+		-		?			
	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	
He look very handsome.	10	4	90	36			100	40					
A car who I drive	20	8	80	32			100	40					
I must go to hospital	67.5	27	30	12	2.5	1	97.5	39			2.5	1	
They should call me, isn't it?	30	12	70	28			95	38	5	2			
How long time?	40	16	60	24			92.5	37	7.5	3			
Furnitures , hairs..	10	4	90	36			100	40					
I want that we talk about my future plans.	30	12	70	28			95	38	5				
h. Her daughter is at university.	50	20	50	20			100	40					
I haven't got any....	80	32	20	8			100	40					
The commission are deciding...	20	8	80	32			95	38	5				
Students have agreed the teacher`	40	16	60	24			92.5	35	7.5				
I am reading English at university.	60	24	40	16			97.5	39	2.5	1			
There`s five students in my class	20	8	80	32			92.5	37	7.5	3			
using /s/ or /t/ instead of /θ/ (e.g. tick instead of thick)			-		-		97.5	39	2.5	1			
using /z/ or /d/ instead of /ð/ (e.g. /dɪ/ instead of the)	-		-		-		100	40					
stressing the last syllable instead of first syllable	-		-		-		97.5	39	2.5	1			
adding a vowel between two consonants (e.g. filim instead of film)	-		-		-		100	40					
pronouncing the long vowels short (e.g. /kul/ instead of cool /ku:l/)	-		-		-		100	40					

mistakes resulting from - - - 100 40
 diphthongs (e.g.
 confusing /ei/ (pay) with
 /ɛ/)

(+): acceptable; (-): unacceptable; (?): uncertain

Table 3 shows that most teachers are strict about ELF features in written English. However, almost all teachers were more tolerant about using divergent lexico-grammatical features in spoken English. From these orientations, one can conclude that most teachers are aware of such divergent features.

The most acceptable standard English according to the teachers for teaching and using English

Teachers were asked to express their opinions about the existence or non-existence of a so-called standard English. Many teachers (n=31) did not believe that there exists a standard variety of English spoken all across the world whereas the rest (n=9) believed in the existence of such a variety. Teachers' responses were tabulated as follows:

Table 4. Teachers' belief in the existence of a standard English variety

Belief in the existence of a standard English variety (N= 40)	
NO (n=31)	YES (n= 9)
Idiosyncratic use of English in non-English dominant contexts due to its global spread (n=20)	Equated with school English –taught at schools (n=6)
Impacts of L1 features and cultures (n=5)	Sameness - survival despite minor differences (n=3)
Evolving nature of languages and creativity (n=3)	
Not applicable to spoken English but used in exams (n=2)	
Regional and geographical differences in ENL countries (n=1)	

As stressed by most participants, a globally spread language like English cannot have a standard type because of its diverse speaker profile based at geographically different locations. Furthermore, these teachers believed that in non-English dominant contexts, the notion of standard English is out of the question since speakers tend to use English in their own ways. The extracts from the data summarise these themes below:

T1: NO/When I am in the class, I don't see any standard English. Each student has their own understanding; we can't make standard English in foreign countries.

T23: NO/If English was started as a standard language, then only English people would be speaking it. It is the world's language that is why it is not standard.

A few teachers accounted for their disbelief by stating that individual linguacultural backgrounds influence the ways people use English. To them, this situation makes it impossible for people to use a standard version of English.

T9: NO/There is not just one English, every country has their own cultural effects on English. It is impossible I think.

T18: NO/There is no standard English because the whole world is using it and every nation or country is adding their own culture and language rules into the English language.

Teachers' responses in the third sub-category gathered around the issue of evolving and creative nature of languages. They did not see language as a fixed entity, yet a dynamic, flexible and fluid one, which changes over time.

S10: NO/There is no standard language at all. Rules can be changed and adapted according to the speaker.

S28: NO/I don't believe because the English rules we have been teaching 10 years ago, has changed. It is changing with the World and peoples.

In the fourth sub-category, two teachers associated standard English with written English only. Arguing that teaching standard rules are important and necessary for measuring students' knowledge of these rules, they did not mind violating the conventions of so-called standard English in spoken form.

S2: NO/ English is only standard in university entrance exams or YDS, TOEFL and etc. The English that my students use in the class is not standard.

T7: NO/There are standard rules that we teach but there is no standard English when it comes to speaking.

In the final sub-category, showing an awareness of how English is used across the globe, especially by its NESs, one teacher said that non-standard English use is also common among NESs. In this respect, the teacher commented:

S25: NO/I don't believe that the English we speak is standard. Forget about us, even native speakers in the movies are not using the standard rules. They are playing with the grammar, making vocabulary look different.

When we return to those who believed that *English has its standard version*, it appears that six teachers associated standard English with school English. They also perceive that the curriculum they use in their teaching practices mandates them to use standard English. The following quotes clearly illustrate teachers' views:

S21: YES/I don't know all around the World, but there is a standard English that we teach in classes in Turkey.

T30: YES/I believe that there is a strong standard English, which peoples in States or Canada use, that is the English that followed up to these days.

High school English language teachers' views about their own accents and ELF accents

17 teachers perceive that they have an AmE accent while seven teachers consider their accents to be more like BrE. The majority of the remaining 16 teachers reported not having any accent. Of them, four remarked that their accents are Turkish-influenced. Here are some accounts of these teachers:

T19: I use basic Turkish accent.

T20: I use my Turkish accent.

Moreover, a considerable dissatisfaction among most teachers (n=33) regarding their perceived accents was observed. A small minority (n=7) reported being satisfied with their English accents. To further elaborate on their views on accents, their views on the importance of accents in the use of English were examined, too. It emerged that more than three-fourths (n=33) consider ‘NES accents’ unimportant while using English whereas the rest (n=7) consider NES accent to play an important role in speaking. Their opinions on the importance of accents are summarized in the following table.

Table 5. Teachers’ beliefs in the importance of NES accents in communication

Belief in the importance of (NE) accents in speaking (N= 40)	
NO (n=33)	YES (n= 7)
Intelligibility matters over having an accent (n=13)	Authenticity and perfectness (n=3)
Unnecessary in the local context (n=10)	Teacher identity –a role model for students (n=2)
Prestigious and aesthetic but not prerequisite for communication (n=8)	Professional, prestigious and cool 10, 9
The priority of writing and grammar over speaking in schools (n=4)	

As shown in Table 5, the teachers who did not perceive having a native-like accent important in communication alluded to four lines of arguments. With respect to these arguments several teachers explained their views as follows:

T4: NO/ As long as its understandable, I am ok with my and other peoples accents. [sub-theme: intelligibility matters more than NES accent]

T7: NO/Because in the country that we live, the accent doesn’t matter. We are not in England, this is Turkey and we can speak in the way we want to [sub-theme: unnecessary in the local context].

T11: NO/We can understand each other, we don’t need an accent. But accent looks aesthetic. It is optional. [sub-theme: prestigious and aesthetic but not prerequisite]

T22: NO/Turkey’s education system does not require a native accent so it doesn’t matter for me [sub-theme: priority of writing & grammar]

The teachers who perceive NES accents to be important in speaking came up with three arguments. They take NESs as the role models to imitate while learning and using English. A few contended that accents matter in speaking and thus, as teachers of English, it is their responsibility to set a good model for students. Finally, two teachers referred to the connotative repercussions of having a native-like accent by associating NES accent with being professional, prestigious and cool.

T31: YES/because if we are to use a foreign language such as English, I would love to do it in the best perfect way possible [sub-theme: authenticity & perfectness]

T29: YES/If we are using a language, as a role model we have to have a good accent. So that students will be willing to use English [sub-theme: teacher identity & role model]

T9: YES/Because when you have an accent, you look Professional with the language [sub-theme: professional, prestige and cool]

Attitudes towards accents

To explore teachers' attitudes towards ELF accents, the questionnaire included two dominant Inner Circle countries (i.e. the UK, the USA), two Outer Circle countries (i.e. India, Singapore) and six Expanding Circle countries (i.e. Turkey, China, Egypt, Greece, France, Thailand). These countries were selected based on their geographical distribution, having a border with Turkey (familiarity), and distinctive features of L1 use, such as in the case of Thailand. Teachers' attitudes towards these accents are presented in the following table.

Table 6. Teachers' perceptions about NES and ELF accents

Speakers from	Negative		No idea		Positive	
	%	f	%	f	%	f
1. China	82.5	33	12.5	5	5	2
2. India	75	30	15	6	10	4
3. Egypt	72.5	29	22.5	9	5	2
4. UK	0	0	0	0	0	40
5. Greece	17.5	7	65	26	17.5	7
6. France	20	8	62.5	25	17.5	7
7. Turkey	75	30	15	6	10	4
8. Singapore	60	24	27.5	11	12.5	5
9. Thailand	67.5	27	27.5	11	5	2
10. the USA	2.5	1	0	0	97.5	39

Table 6 indicates that most teachers were negative about the accents of the Chinese, Indians, Egyptians, Turks, Singaporeans and Thais. That is, they felt negative about the accents of the Outer and Inner Circle countries, which are relatively far away from ENL countries and mainland Europe. The teachers have the least awareness about Greek and French accents. What is surprising is teachers' pejorative attitudes towards their co-nationals' accents, i.e. Turkish-accented English. However, not surprisingly, when it comes to NES accents, almost all teachers expressed positive views about them. This was in stark contradiction with their overall perceptions of the native-like accent, which most teachers considered not to play a major role in communication.

The language ideologies underlying teachers' awareness and perceptions about ELF

To answer this research question, their responses to three open-ended questions in the qualitative questionnaire were analysed. The questions were about the rules of standard English and the characteristics of the native language of non-native speakers of English and cultural issues around language teaching. It was found that most teachers hold the dominant ideologies in the ELT profession and some generated counter ideologies that go against the dominant ones. These ideologies and the factors shaping them are summarised in the following table.

Table 7. Language ideologies likely to shape teachers' perceptions and awareness about ELF

Ideologies observed in teachers' responses to the statements in the questionnaires			
StE Ideology	Flexible use of English	Ownership of English by its global speakers	Nativeness and Authenticity

What lies behind teachers' ideologies	Rules needed	Communicative effectiveness	The global spread of English	Matters: Purity of English	Does not matter: In teaching local contexts
	Prevention of complications and unintelligibility	Mutual intelligibility	Importance of local & international culture	Their language and their conventions – (Them-US distinction) Expert language users & teachers	

A closer examination of teachers' statements revealed that most support that without rules, it will not be the English they were taught (i.e. School English) any longer. Using English in conformity with the rules is considered to ensure wider intelligibility for speakers of different languages. When violated, many perceive that there might be severe communication breakdowns. Below are some of the points raised by the teachers who seem to act under the ideology of StE.

T6: We should of course have rules while speaking the language but adopting the rules may be confusing.

T36: The language has rules. All of them has rules. If we adopt its rules to every speaker of the English language than there would be no English.

A counter ideology mandates that what lies at the core of language use is to communicate in an effective manner. For them, as long as communication is at stake and mutual intelligibility is maintained, there is no harm in using English by deviating from its conventional rules taught at schools.

T9: Rules do not matter if you are not living in the culture of that language, you just use it to communicate.

T25: For me, there is no standard English that's why it would be better to adopt the rules so that there won't be any standardization. Everyone can use it easily.

Another counter ideology ascribed the ownership of English to anyone who has invested time, effort and budget to master it over a long period. The idea that triggered this ideology is the current reality of the global spread and use of English.

T7: English cannot protect its standard rules anymore. Because this language has opened up to the whole world.

T13: English is spoken all around the world and of course its rules will be changed according to the regions where it is spoken.

Another dominant ideology is the ideology of native-speakerism and authenticity according to which NESs are the authentic speakers of English and any deviations from the ways they use English will bring damage to its authenticity and purity.

T27: As we say it's standard English if we are to adopt the rules to the written language than there would be no more English but we can adopt it when it comes to speaking.

T30: if all the rules are going to be adopted, then what will be left to English? It will be changed and one day we won't have a language called English.

It also emerged from that native-speakerism and authenticity pervade the minds of teachers most when it comes to spoken English, especially its relevant elements such as ‘accent’ and ‘pronunciation’:

T3: I think, there is an advantage for native speakers, if you are born as native you can also teach well.

T4: even if you are a master with the second language, there still might be some things that we [NNEs] don’t know about.

However, the counter idea against authenticity and native-speakerism is about the irrelevance of native-speakerism and standard English norms in teachers’ teaching situations where the presence of NESs is rather limited and their cultural norms have little relevance. In this respect, several teachers highlighted the advantages of being a NNEs and sharing the same L1 and culture with their students.

T7: Not any native speaker understands the other non-native speaker. That’s why they cannot find a common point to learn or teach the language.

T18: Native speakers don’t know how they acquire this language that’s why they won’t be as good as those who learned this language after their native language.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study aimed at exploring a small group of Turkish EFL teachers’ perceptions and beliefs about ELF and, more specifically, its principles for teaching pedagogy. The findings indicated that the majority had no conceptual knowledge about ELF. A few teachers reported to hear about the term from the books and academic papers and agreed that it is communication-oriented. Despite their lack of conceptual awareness, around 80% were aware of the sociolinguistic reality of English, i.e. it is used and taught by NNEs to communicate mostly with NNEs.

One reason for lack of conceptual awareness might be that the teachers in this study graduated from teacher education programs a long time ago and thus they did not recall much from undergraduate studies and most likely they did not take courses on sociolinguistics and ELF. Thus, what lies behind their non-awareness of ELF might be their previous educational experiences. Research in Turkey provides evidence that there were no such courses on teaching regional and international dialects of English to make student-teachers raise their awareness about different varieties and uses of English (e.g. Karakaş & Ergül, 2018). In this sense, Krajka (2019) maintains that “[i]n the rapidly changing world of today, the role of English as a global language is not to be left unnoticed in pre-service teacher training” (p. 28). Another reason might be the lack of curricular support from the Ministry of National Education as the current curriculum rarely refers to ELF principles (Karakaş, 2019b). The lack of ELF awareness was also previously reported among student-teachers and EFL teachers (e.g. Bayyurt et al., 2019; Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015; Griffiths & Soruç, 2019; İnceçay & Akyel, 2014). These researchers also pointed to some other factors as the potential source of non-awareness about ELF, such as assessment, which draws on standard English norms. Finally, the teachers’ lack of contact with diverse speakers may be another reason because, as Fang (2016) argues, people can have heightened ELF awareness “when they have more contacts with people from different cultures” (p. 76).

Many teachers did not admit the existence of standard Englishes for several reasons. Only eight teachers believed in the existence of a standard English. They identified their own English with American English largely. Earlier studies indicated a strong attachment to the standard (native) version of Englishes among teachers who supported the use of standard varieties in the

school contexts, as well (İnceçay & Akyel, 2014; Üresin & Karakaş, 2019). These teachers might have preferred to identify their English because of “the exposure to the American and British cultural media, such as TV series and movies, [which] to a certain extent has shaped their preferences” (Kung & Wang, 2018, p. 6).

The findings on EFL teachers’ perceptions of ELF and NES accents broadly support the work of other studies in this area. Studies with teachers and pre-service teachers as well as language learners corroborated the finding that even if participants are aware of ELF and some of its principles, most desired to acquire native-like accents (e.g. Ceyhan-Bingöl & Özkan, 2019; Coşkun, 2011; Ishikawa, 2016; Snow et al., 2005; Timmis, 2002). However, there were some studies in which there was an acceptance of students’ deviant use of English (e.g. Ceyhan-Bingöl & Özkan, 2019). Some scholars even argue for an intelligibility principle, clear thinking, confident self-expression and good uses of one’s linguistic resources rather than nativeness (Greenbaum, 1985).

As for the pejorative attitudes towards ELF accents, teachers’ perceptions are most likely affected by their unfamiliarity with those ELF varieties and by their previous education experiences at schools. Previous studies also mentioned the impact of educational experiences on EFL teachers’ lack of ELF awareness (Üresin & Karakaş, 2019; Karakaş, 2019b). Jenkins (2007) argued that most participants in previous studies were negative about NNEs and their accents as they made judgments on their accents “on the basis limited familiarity” (e.g. 186).

Most teachers who lacked ELF awareness were under the influence of hegemonic language ideologies, such as standard English ideology, native-speakerism, authenticity and the ownership of English by NESs. The reason may be that all these ideologies elevate the hypothetical construct of the native speaker and standard language since most EFL teachers believe that a standard English variety should be the norm in communication, in writing particularly. According to Rajadurai (2007), these beliefs about NESs are nothing but myths. Such ideologies were rather prevalent particularly among those involved in educational domains (i.e. students, EFL pre-service and in-service teachers, see, e.g. Fang, 2016; Ishikawa, 2017a, 2017b; Jenkins, 2007; Karakaş, 2016, 2017). Previous studies demonstrated that previous educational experiences, the materials used and most importantly the ways students are assessed are major elements involved in the construction of such ideologies (Karakaş, 2016; Kaur & Raman, 2014; Kung & Wang, 2018; Syrbe & Rose, 2018; Vettorel, 2013).

However, the findings also pointed to the emergence of counter ideologies against the hegemonic ones. A few participants believed that a global language like English cannot be owned by a particular speech community. This emergent ideology was previously found in studies with participants in non-language related domains, such as business and service sectors (e.g. Karakaş, 2016; Smit, 2007; Pilkinton-Pihko, 2010; Rogerson- Revell, 2007). Since their main focus was not mastering English as an end itself, they took an instrumental approach towards English and thus did not pay high regards to using standard or native-like English. According to this instrumental view of English, “effective communication does not only occur through linguistic correctness or mimicking the way NESs use language but is mostly realized when speakers have shared knowledge of the content of communication or field knowledge when they can perform a wise adaptation to their interlocutors’ language use, and when they avoid using slangs, idioms and jargons that are not stored in each speaker’s “linguistic inventory” (Karakaş, 2017, p. 492).

The findings offer several implications. It is important that contemporary courses such as World Englishes and ELF should be introduced to pre-service teachers. As the findings show, the current EFL teaching materials do not have an ELF component. Thus, it is important that ELF-

friendly teaching resources should be designed by materials developers. EFL teachers can bring in their own materials, such as TED talks, movie clips, songs, TV commercials by NNEs to increase students' level of ELF awareness. The Ministry of National Education can also incorporate ELF pedagogy into its ELT curricula because the current curricula adopt traditional concepts of communicative competence (Karakaş, 2019b). Additionally, Hall (2014) insists that the shift in assessment should move towards students' languaging, i.e. "what they [can] do with the language in specific situations" (p. 383). It is because linguistic correctness is subordinated to effective communication in ELF communication, which is fulfilled with the implementation of appropriate communicative strategies (Björkman, 2011).

The study also suffers from some limitations. First, the teachers were working at a different high school in the province of Antalya at the time of the study. Future studies can explore ELF teachers working at primary and secondary levels. Next, the teachers' perceptions and beliefs were elicited through a qualitative questionnaire consisting of predominantly open-ended questions. It is likely that if different methods of data collection had been collected (e.g. observations, interviews or close-ended surveys), the results could have been different. Therefore, further research can be carried out with a larger group of participants with a broader range of methodologies and research designs. Also, as this study only involved teachers in a particular context, the results cannot be extrapolated to other contexts. However, various stakeholders can benefit from the results. In this sense, more research with different stakeholders of the ELT profession, such as curriculum writers, materials developers and policymakers, should be carried out concerning ELF research.

REFERENCES

- Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. C. (2015). ELF-aware in-service teacher education: A transformative perspective. In *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 117-135). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Biricik-Deniz, E. B., Özkan, Y., & Bayyurt, Y. (2019). ELF-awareness in pre-service English Language Teacher Education: A Case Study from Turkey. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(2), 270-284.
- Biricik-Deniz, E., Özkan, Y., & Bayyurt, Y. (2016). English as a lingua franca: Reflections on ELF-related issues by preservice English language teachers in Turkey. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 16(2), 144-161.
- Björkman, B. (2011). The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca in the international university: Introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 923-925.
- Ceyhan-Bingöl, Z., & Özkan, Y. (2019). EFL Instructors' Perceptions and Practices on English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(2), 86-102.
- Coşkun, A. (2011). Future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 6(2), 46-68.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erling, E. (2007). Local identities, global connections: Affinities to English among students at the Freie Universität Berlin. *World Englishes*, 26(2), 111-130.

- Fang, F. (2016). Investigating attitudes towards accents from an ELF Framework. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 68–80.
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Greenbaum, S. (1985). *The Oxford English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Griffiths, C., & Soruç, A. (2019). Contextual differences regarding students' perceptions of English as a lingua franca according to subject major and nationality. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 9(1), 53-69.
- Hall, C. J. (2014). Moving beyond accuracy: from tests of English to tests of 'Englishing'. *ELT Journal*, 68(4), 376-385.
- Holliday, A. (2006). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- İnceçay, G., & Akyel, A. S. (2014). Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(1), 1-12.
- Ishikawa, T. (2016). Japanese university students' attitudes towards their English: Open-ended email questionnaire study. In N. Tsantila, J. Mandalios & M. Ilkos (eds.), *ELF: Pedagogical and interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 87-94). Athens: Deree –The American College of Greece.
- Ishikawa, T. (2017a). Japanese university students' attitudes towards their English: Conversational interview study. *Waseda working papers in ELF*, 6, 110-125.
- Ishikawa, T. (2017b). Japanese university students' attitudes towards their English and the possibility of ELF awareness. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 6(2), 237-263.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitudes and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200–207.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university. The politics of academic English language policy*. Abingdon, GB: Routledge.
- Kachru, B. (1986). *The Alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Karakaş, A. (2016). *Turkish lecturers' and students' perceptions of English in English-medium universities. (PhD dissertation)*. Southampton: Southampton University.
- Karakaş, A. (2017). Students' perceptions of 'Good English' and the underlying ideologies behind their perceptions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 487–509.
- Karakaş, A. (2019a). Preferred English accent and pronunciation of trainee teachers and its relation to language ideologies. *PASAA Journal*, 58, 264–293.
- Karakaş, A. (2019b). An analysis of the high school English curriculum in Turkey from an ELF perspective. *i-Manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 9(2), 1–10.
- Karakaş, A., & Yavuz, E. (2018). A Comparative Analysis of English Language Teacher Education Programs in Turkey and Malaysia. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 7(3), 287–306.
- Kaur, P., & Raman, A. (2014). Exploring native speaker and non-native speaker Accents: The English as a lingua franca perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 155, 253–259. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.288>

- Kemaloglu-Er, E. & Bayyurt, Y. (2019). ELF-aware pre-service teacher education: Teaching practices and reflections from Turkey. In L. Cavalheiro (Ed.), *Preparing English language teachers for today's globalized world* (pp. 47-63). Lisbon: the University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies.
- Krajka, J. (2019). Teacher language awareness and world Englishes – where (corpus) linguistics, digital literacy and teacher training meet. *A Journal of English Studies*, 25, 28-51.
- Kung, F. W., & Wang, X. (2018). Exploring EFL learners' accent preferences for effective ELF communication. *RELC Journal*, 1–14. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218765306>
- Pilkinton-Pihko, D. (2010) English as a lingua franca lecturers' self-perceptions of their language use. In A. Mauranen & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Helsinki English Studies, HES Special Issue on English as a Lingua Franca*, 6, 58–74.
- Rajadurai, J. (2007). Intelligibility studies: A consideration of empirical and ideological issues. *World Englishes*, 26(1), 87-98.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of 'World English' and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 111-117.
- Ranta, E. (2010). English in the real world vs. English at school: Finnish English teachers' and students' views. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(2), 156–177.
- Rogerson-Revell, P. (2007). Using English for international business: A European case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(1), 103-120.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT journal*, 59(4), 339-341.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The Elements: A parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: Chicago Linguist. Soc.
- Smit, U. (2007). ELF (English as a lingua franca) as medium of instruction – interactional repair in international hotel management education. In C. Dalton-Puffer and U. Smit (Eds.) *Empirical Perspectives on CLIL classroom discourse* (pp. 227-252). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Snow, M. A., Kamhi-Stein, L. D., & Brinton, D. M. (2006). Teacher training for English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 261.
- Soruç, A. (2015). Non-native teachers' attitudes towards English as a lingua franca. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 30(1), 239-251.
- Steckler, A., McLeroy, K. R., Goodman, R. M., Bird, S. T. & McCormick, L. (1992). Toward integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: An introduction. *Health Education Quarterly*, 19, 1–8.
- Syrbe, M., & Rose, H. (2018). An evaluation of the global orientation of English textbooks in Germany. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(2), 152-163.
- Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 240-249.
- Toprakoğlu, M., & Dilman, H. (2017). ELF awareness in English language education. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 5(5), 39-58.

- Üresin, F., & Karakaş, A. (2019). Investigation of Turkish EFL teachers' views about standard languages, dialects and language varieties through the lenses of English and Turkish. *The Literacy Trek*, 5(2), 1-24.
- Vettorel, P. (2013). Is there ELF in ELT coursebooks? *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(4), 483–504.
- Woolard, K. A. (2008). Language and identity choice in Catalonia: The interplay of contrasting ideologies of linguistic authority. In K. Süselbeck, U. Mühlischlegel, & P. Masson (Eds.), *Lengua, nación e identidad: La regulación del plurilingüismo en España y América Latina* (pp. 303–323). Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). Designing case studies. *Qualitative Research Methods*, 359-386.
- Yücedağ, Z., & Karakaş, A. (2019). High school language division students' perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca. *Focus on ELT Journal (FELT)*, 1(1), 27-42.
<https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.2019.00003>

Fetanet Aydın is an Akdeniz University graduate with a BA in ELT and Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University graduate with an MA in ELT. She is working as an EFL teacher at Birikim Primary School in Antalya. Her research interests include ELF, language teacher education and language ideologies.

Email: fetanet_aydn@yahoo.com

Ali Karakaş is an associate professor at the English Language Teaching department of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey. He teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in teacher education and second/foreign language teaching methodology. His main research interests include Global Englishes, ELF, language policy and planning, English-medium instruction and language teacher education. He has recently coedited a book entitled 'English as the Medium of Instruction in Turkish Higher Education: Policy, Practice and Progress' to be published by Springer. He is in the process of editing a volume on 'The Construction of Nativeness and Non-Nativeness in Non-Anglophone Contexts' to be published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Email: akarakas@mehmetakif.edu.tr