JACET ELF SIG Journal

Volume 1

March 2017

Issued by
The Japan Association of College English Teachers
Special Interest Group on English as a Lingua Franca
**JACET SIG on ELF Planning and Steering Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td>MURATA, Kumiko (Waseda University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair:</td>
<td>HINO, Nobuyuki (Osaka University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members:</td>
<td>GILNER, Leah (Bunkyo Gakuin University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISHIKAWA, Tomokazu (Southampton University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KONAKAHARA, Mayu (Kanda University of International Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASWANA, Sayako (Ochanomizu University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOGAMI, Yoko (Matsuyama University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAKINO, Miyuki (St. Margaret’s Junior College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations:</td>
<td>FUJIWARA, Yasuhiro (Meijo University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GILNER, Leah (Bunkyo Gakuin University) – AILA Ren liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting:</td>
<td>ISHIKAWA, Tomokazu (Southampton University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webmasters:</td>
<td>KONAKAHARA, Mayu (Kanda University of International Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOGAMI, Yoko (Matsuyama University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUZUKI, Ayako (Tamagawa University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing List:</td>
<td>KONAKAHARA, Mayu (Kanda University of International Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISHIKAWA, Tomokazu (Southampton University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOGAMI, Yoko (Matsuyama University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JACET SIG on ELF Publication Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editors:</td>
<td>NOGAMI, Yoko (Matsuyama University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KONAKAHARA, Mayu (Kanda University of International Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Advisory Board:</td>
<td>MURATA, Kumiko (Waseda University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HINO, Nobuyuki (Osaka University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board:</td>
<td>GILNER, Leah (Bunkyo Gakuin University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASWANA, Sayako (Ochanomizu University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NG, Patrick (University of Niigata Prefecture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTSU, Akiko (Daito Bunka University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAKINO, Miyuki (St. Margaret’s Junior College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THOMPSON, Alan (Gifu Shotoku Gakuen University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**JACET ELF SIG Journal** Volume 1    March 2017

**Contents**

**Foreword**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I ELF Teacher Reflection and Pedagogy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELF Reflection: A Journey to the establishment of a university ELF program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masaki Oda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II Research Paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating backchannel behaviour, negotiating turns, and sharing culture in ELF communication</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya Ike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III Short Reports on ELF-Related Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shorts Reports on Five ELF-Related Events in the Academic Year of 2016</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Gilner, Paul McBride and Tomokazu Ishikawa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foreword

It is our greatest pleasure to announce the inaugural volume of the JACET ELF SIG Journal. JACET Special Interest Group (SIG) in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) was established in April 2016. It serves a network of researchers and teachers with a strong interest in ELF, ELF-related research and pedagogy. Together, we aim at exploring ELF and making use of ELF-related research in education in Japan.

The JACET ELF SIG Journal is annual, peer-reviewed online publication for the ELF SIG of the Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET). The journal seeks to publish research papers, articles regarding teaching practice, teacher reflection and pedagogy, book reviews and reports with reference to the ever-growing phenomenon and research field of ELF in Japan as well as a range of international contexts. Its aim is firstly, publishing selected papers from SIG regular meetings and ELF-related events, and eventually, more widely publishing peer-reviewed ELF-related articles. It strives to provide a forum for researchers and educators to share their expertise and experience with a wider audience, facilitating better understanding of English used as a common language to connect people of different linguacultural backgrounds.

The first volume of this journal includes two articles based on JACET ELF SIG Meetings held at Tamagawa University on April 23rd, 2016 and Chukyo University, July 23rd, 2016, followed by short reports on some of the ELF-related events in the academic year of 2016. The first contribution, Oda’s article, reports his personal journey from a young EFL learner to the director of an ELF-informed English language program at a Japanese university. His enthralling narrative tells a story of him as a learner, teacher trainee, postgraduate student, and language teacher often simultaneously being a victim of native-speakerism, which may resonate with experiences of any readers who have learned and/or taught a foreign language. With his past experience in his arm, the author persuasively states his mission as an English language educator as well as the director of the Centre for English as a Lingua Franca (CELF) at Tamagawa University. Moreover, the article also highlights the process of establishing an ELF-informed university-wide program and everyday practice at the CELF, which is very informative to educators, policymakers and practitioners, who are planning to introduce such practice.

The author of the second paper, Ike, informed by the World Englishes paradigm, explores backchannel behaviour of Japanese (JE) and Australian English (AusE) speakers in both intra-cultural (JE-JE and AusE-AusE) and inter-cultural (JE-AusE) settings. Through a multimodal analysis of the three types of dyadic conversations of university students, she first reveals different features and functions of backchannel behaviour in each of the two varieties
of English. She then examines whether and how the same interactants adjust their backchannel behaviour to successfully show acknowledgement, build rapport and negotiate turns in an intercultural setting. The very detailed analysis of verbal and non-verbal aspects of the inter-cultural interaction shows that the speakers of the different varieties of English accommodate each other’s behaviour by exploiting their own resources of backchannel cues and backchannels. The paper reveals cultural differences in and accommodation strategies for turn-taking from the perspective of World Englishes, using interactions that include native variety of English speakers. Thus, the paradigm slightly and superficially reminds us of a pre-ELF paradigm of native-nonnative interaction in comparison with respective NS interactions, but the study is innovative and useful in terms of the method, which could be applicable to the investigation of more typically-observed types of ELF interactions among people from various linguacultural backgrounds.

The third section presents short reports on five ELF-related events held in the academic year of 2016 that were written by Gilner, McBride and Ishikawa, which respectively illustrates and critiques the events in a detailed manner and are very informative and helpful, particularly for those who, for some reason, were unable to attend them.

Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to the chair (Prof. Kumiko Murata) and the vice-chair (Prof. Nobuyuki Hino), the members of the editorial board and the reviewers who gave their valuable expertise needed for compiling this volume, the JACET ELF SIG Journal, Volume 1.
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Part I

ELF Teacher Reflection and Pedagogy
CELF Reflection: A Journey to the Establishment of a University ELF Program

Masaki Oda

1. Introduction

On April 1st, 2014, Tamagawa University established Center for English as a Lingua Franca (CELF) which provides a campus-wide English language program for its students. It is perhaps the first university English language center with ELF in its name, which symbolizes the mission of the program. The program has replaced the existing English classes administrated by each of the eight colleges. As a campus-wide program, we set up a rough guideline of performance by the students’ levels of proficiency. We usually mix the students from different academic departments and/or different year of entry, as long as their levels of proficiency are similar. In this way, we reinforce our students’ awareness of diversity and train their tolerance for accepting differences. At the same time, we try our best to provide the students with exposure to various situations, including varieties of English as well as teaching styles. If a student were required to take four semesters of our English as a lingua franca (ELF) classes, it would be quite normal that the students would have been taught by four different teachers of four different first languages, both female and male, and with different types of teaching experience. Even though there is a limit of what we can do within an established culture of the institution, we strongly believe that these attempts would help our students change their attitudes to learn ELF positively. It has been more than three years since CELF was established. As the founding director of the center, I will first introduce the activities of CELF. Then I will reflect on a long journey we have been through, highlighting some of the critical incidents in my life which has affected the formation of my beliefs about teaching English and eventually the foundation of the program.

2. English Language Program at Tamagawa

The ELF Study Hall at Tamagawa University, which houses CELF was completed in March 2016. Since its establishment in the spring semester of 2016, all ELF classes have been conducted in this building. Currently, CELF has about 30 small-sized classrooms each of which has approximately 25 seats. The rooms are equipped with a projector, a speaker as well as a large white board. Unlike many classrooms in typical Japanese universities, the classrooms are designed for the teachers and the students to rearrange seats easily even during

---

1 The paper is written based on a lecture with the same title given at the 1st JACET ELF SIG inaugural meeting at Tamagawa University on April 23, 2016.
classes to encourage active participation of the students. On the ground floor, there is a large lounge with different types of seats. The lounge is divided into an active learning zone in which students can work and talk in groups and a self-study zone designed primarily for those who want to work individually in a quiet space. Many parts of the building have been designed by the students of fine arts including pictures on walls, windows and columns.

At the time of writing, there are 12 full-time instructors including myself and about 30 part-time instructors with 12 different first languages (Bulgarian, Chinese, English, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Macedonian, Portuguese, Tagalog, Thai and Turkish). Out of approximately 7,000 students in the entire university, about 2,500 students are taking ELF courses in 2016.

The teachers are constantly recruited through job postings on JREC-IN, a government sponsored portal as well as through professional organizations. The minimum requirement for the candidates are to 1) hold an MA degree in TESOL/Applied Linguistics, 2) have experience in teaching Japanese-speaking students and/or in Japan, and 3) have experience in learning a second/foreign language to the advanced level. Unlike many other Japanese universities, we explicitly state that whether the candidate is a native speaker of English or not does not matter at all. In addition, we value the candidate’s experience as a learner, which would facilitate him/her when s/he encounters students facing difficulties in learning English at various stages. The basic principle behind the hiring criteria is not new; it follows Rampton’s (1990: 98-100) notion of “Expert”, which includes those in language teaching, language learning and language use. I will elaborate this issue later in this paper.

In order for the ELF program to come to what it is now, we had to go through several steps. In its 85 years of history, Tamagawa has been very active in international education. The school has sent its wind orchestra to Taiwan and Germany, theater groups to Mexico and U.S., and gymnastic team to Denmark. Needless to say, teaching foreign languages including English has been an integral part of the institution. English programs were administrated within each of the eight colleges in order to meet the specific needs. In 2011, however, the university administration decided to centralize the administration of English program, and I was appointed by the president of the university as the chair of the special committee. The committee’s responsibility was to set up an ELF-informed curriculum. However, the establishment of ELF was met with various constraints such as regulations, resources, and facilities. The most challenging issue was to customize the program to fit in the curricula of all the eight different colleges, which had already been approved by the authority. At the same time, we had to make a plan to gradually transform the existing program to the new program. This was a big challenge because the aim of teaching English had to be changed radically from the incumbent program. The biggest change was that, in the new program, we clearly set
the goal of the program would be to make our students achieve a level of proficiency required for international communication in the area of their study, as opposed to the achievement of “native speaker” proficiency. The colleges have gradually joined the program, and as of 2016 academic year, all but one department in the College of Arts are participating in the program. Each department requires a certain number of credits from the ELF program required for a degree, and the students are enrolled accordingly.

In the program, each class meets 200 minutes per week (100 minutes twice a week is the standard, although there are other variations) and carries 4 credits. In compliance with the law, the students are required to complete out-of-class assignments equivalent to 400 minutes per week in order for the four credits to be given. In order to facilitate the students’ out-of-class studies, we provide tutors at the self-study zone of our ELF lounge. The tutors are selected from our part-time instructors and assigned to stand-by at the lounge where the students can sign-up in advance or walk in to meet them. The service is very popular and about 90% of total available slots are utilized to support their out-of-class studies.

In the next section, I will step out of the current issue for a while, and reflect on my past experiences which have contributed to the shape of the ELF program at Tamagawa University.

3. My Journey to CELF

3.1. Experience, Self-concepts and Beliefs

When I look back my journey to what I am doing at present, I can identify several critical moments which have contributed to my beliefs as a language teaching professional. While a part of this section has already been included in my recent publication on language teacher identity (Oda 2017), I will focus on those that are particularly relevant to the foundation of the ELF program at Tamagawa.

Overall, I believe that the formation of my beliefs is a combination of self-concepts (e.g. Mercer 2011) derived from different stages of my experience as a learner, a classroom teacher, a teacher trainer and an administrator. In addition, my experience outside school such as my personal experiences in working for international academic organizations has added perspectives on the English language teaching (ELT) profession.
Masaki Oda

Fig. 1 My Language Teaching Journey

Fig. 1 above illustrates how I have been involved with ELT by specifying the roles I played at each stage. As I reflect on my continuous involvements with learning and teaching of English for many years, I realize that every aspect of my experience in learning and teaching English has affected how I view ELT in a Japanese university, consequently, what I need to do in order to run the program here at CELF. In the following sections, I will discuss how some critical incidents at different stages of my life have influenced the foundation of the program.

3.2. Experience as a Learner

In Oda (2014), I reported my pilot study on learner beliefs. In that study, I interviewed three college students who had reflected on their experience as learners of English. Among the many findings, I concluded that the influence from their parents on their attitudes towards learning English was prominent, particularly in the earlier stages of their lives. Perhaps, this would apply to my own case. Like a majority of Japanese people in my generation, I started learning English as a school subject in the 7th grade.

At that time, I also started interacting with people in English not knowing it was actually the same language I was learning at school. My school was located adjacent to a residential area of Atsugi U.S. Naval Base, and during a break, Japanese students and American kids around our age were exchanging words with each other over the fence in-between. The exchange had started as simple greetings, but it lasted for nearly three years including the trading of chocolates as well as baseball cards.

A few years later, I got an amateur radio operator license and began to operate amateur radio until I graduated from the university. I enjoyed conversing with radio operators in English through noises. Because North to South propagation is usually better than East to
West, I mainly talked with operators in Australia and Indonesia. I was fortunate to have been able to practice talking with people from different countries, both so-called native speakers and non-native speakers, using English as our lingua franca. I remember that Indonesian operators always end their talk with “Thank you, terima kasih”. It was, however, much later when I realized that terima kasih was ‘thank you’ in Bahasa Indonesian. For me, the conversations with American kids as well as those on amateur radio were something very enjoyable. By contrast, I did not like English lessons at school. I was not able to see any connection between English taught at school and English used to converse with American kids as well as amateur radio operators overseas.

When I was young, my parents kept telling me that learning English would open the door to the world. They encouraged me to participate in a summer study-abroad program to the U.S. when I was 13. In that trip, I realized that English: something I had been trying to use when I communicated with American kids behind the fence and on amateur radio, would be useful. Yet, I was not able to make any connection between this kind of English and the English I was learning at school.

Looking back my experience as a learner in secondary schools, I have found good reasons for using English for international communication. In addition, I was fortunate to have been exposed to different varieties of English, and thus I have become tolerant to the varieties in language use including pronunciation. At the same time, I failed to realize any connection between English taught at school and English to which I had been exposed outside classroom. Nevertheless, my interests in learning English increased so rapidly during this period. My motivation was high enough to decide that I would major in English at university and to enroll in a secondary teacher training program.

3.3. Experience as an Undergraduate Student and a Teacher Trainee

In 1980, I entered Tamagawa University. In the university, I continued to play the role of a learner of English. At the same time, I became a teacher trainee. Therefore, I became more interested in how to teach English rather than how to learn English myself as a learner. Therefore, I began to observe the ways my teachers taught the language.

A big difference between English classes at secondary schools and the university was that in the latter, we had English conversation classes conducted by so-called “native” English teachers. At that time, I reacted rather positively to these classes, assuming that the aim of these classes was to improve the skills useful for out-of-class activities I had enjoyed. Apparently, the aim of the classes was not what I had thought it would be, but to achieve “native speaker” competence in English; however none of the teachers believed if anyone would ever reach the goal. We students worked hard, but in many occasions in these classes,
the teachers enforced monolingual, English only policy. While they told us that it was to maximize our opportunity to use English, I later realized that it was simply because a majority of these native English teachers in my university were monolingual English speakers some of whom had never tried to learn Japanese. When the students encountered difficulties and asked them questions in English, we often received a statement: “We (native speakers) don’t say it.” or “Grammatically correct, but native speakers don’t say it.” The verdict concerning language use was always in native speakers’ hands. I remember that many of us gradually lost our confidence to become teachers of English. The next step I took was, however, to improve my English. My parents were supportive and financed me to pursue an MA degree in TESOL in the U.S. to receive further teacher trainings while improving my English in the environment in which I would take advantage of interacting with more native speakers.

3.4. Experience as a Graduate Student in the U.S.

I went to do my MA in TESOL at St. Michael’s College in Vermont where I received further training in order to become a teacher. I had far more opportunities to try out my English, and I also realized that we could not simply distinguish between English used by native speakers and that by non-native speakers. As a matter of fact, I had classmates from Greece, Lebanon, Indonesia, Malaysia, Quebec, Venezuela as well as those from different parts of the U.S. The MA program was relatively small in size and non-native speakers were majority at that time; therefore, I never had any negative experience at St. Michael’s because of my language and cultural backgrounds. I gradually realized that there were varieties in English not only in pronunciation and vocabulary, but also in communicative styles. Moreover, I found that there would be more opportunities to interact in English with someone whose first language is not English. This coincided with the time when the notion of World Englishes (cf. Kachru 1982) has emerged in applied linguistics, which I will discuss later.

I then continued to pursue Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics in Georgetown University. This was the time when I began to consider myself as a researcher while my identity as a learner and a teacher-trainee still remained intact. The program was far larger in its size than the MA program at St. Michael’s, and there were also a large population of students who came from different parts of the world. Until the half way into the program, everything just went normal: attending classes, gaining knowledge and experience and interacting with people with different backgrounds. I decided that I would get involved in ELT in Japan by sharing the knowledge and experience with my future students a few years later. However, there were two critical incidents at Georgetown which have significantly affected my beliefs about English language teaching later.

As a Ph.D. student in applied linguistics, we were required to take written preliminary
tests in order for the linguistics department to determine whether we could proceed further to write a Ph.D. dissertation, or not. Applied linguistics majors had to take a test in applied linguistics and two electives which I chose theoretical linguistics and English linguistics (this was actually de facto required subject for non-native speakers). Each test was read by three faculty members, and we were required to receive an average of B+ for the major, in my case, applied linguistics, and B in other two electives. I did fine with the electives, but I failed in applied linguistics and thus I had to retake the test again next semester. Six months later, I took the exam again and got the same result. As it was my second time failing the exam, my candidacy to Ph.D. was subject to termination, and thus I would lose my status as a student. This would eventually make me leave the U.S. The initial comment from the department office was that my English was so bad that one of the professors, who gave F to my exam on both times, was not even able to figure out what I was talking about. However, the fact I had passed my elective subjects and informal feedback received from other professors, I believed that my English must not have been that bad.

Then I found out that I had a problem in a particular question item in the exam. It was a question on English phonology in which we were expected to transcribe sentences and explain various phonological processes, e.g., vowel reduction or assimilation involved. The problem was that the sentences were presented in print, and the direction was to “[t]ranscribe the utterance below in IPA symbols as a native speaker of standard American English would pronounce. Then discuss the phonological processes involved.” Therefore, I argued against the department, questioning the validity of this question as a part of the applied linguistics exam. I wanted to know 1) what it means by “standard American English”, 2) how non-native speakers can find out how “native speakers” would pronounce and 3) how the department justify the validity of this question without presenting the sentences in audio if it were designed to test our ability to transcribe them in IPA symbols.

Following the advice from some of my professors as well as colleagues (some of whom also failed), I decided to stay on until I have been officially asked to leave and continued to prepare myself as an ELT professional in the future. A few months later, the department decided not to terminate my candidacy on the condition that I would receive an extensive tutoring in English pronunciation by a native English-speaking teaching assistant, a first year MA student, and would have my spoken English tested at the end of the semester. Although it was a very insulting decision, I decided to stay in the program after seeking advice from the professors and colleagues who had supported me all the way. The next semester, the department decided to abandon the written preliminary exam and replace it by the defense of research proposal. I should also mention that my spoken English was never tested. As a student at that time, I did not know what exactly happened in the department; nevertheless, I
was pleased that, at least, the department recognized that the situation was not what it should be and thus needed to change.

While I was waiting for the verdict from the department concerning my status mentioned above, I continued to take some courses. Despite the results of the written preliminary exams, I was doing fine in most of the subjects and maintained a good GPA. In one of the classes, the professor, who was well known for his involvement in international organizations in ELT, always told us to speak up in classes. I followed his advice and tried my best to become an active participant of the discussion. One day, however, the situation changed. When the professor started a class by asking us if we had any questions related to the previous class, I immediately raised a hand and asked a simple question to clarify a terminology, something like “Is A different from B?” The professor looked very irritated, and he asked me to repeat the question. I clearly repeated the question and a moment later, the professor reacted instantly. Instead of looking at me, he looked at the other direction and asked the class, “Is there any native speaker who can rephrase what he is trying to say?” After a moment of silence, a native English speaker repeated my question almost exactly, and the professor gave his answer. This was a moment in which I realized that just being a non-native speaker of English could result in having to give up his/her right to participate in discussion and/or asking questions in class, because the professor restricted my participation (see van Dijk 1996). I still wanted to learn English and become a language teacher. However, I realized the reality that being a native speaker would overrule other qualifications and experience.

3.5. Experience as a Language Teacher: A Native Speaker Fights Back

During the time when I was suffering from being a non-native speaker of English, I was also teaching Japanese for undergraduate students. I had originally been invited as a teaching assistant by the Japanese department due to the increasing number of enrolment. I was assigned to teach a section even though my past training was in TESOL. The situation was awkward. In the linguistics department, I was treated as though I had not been qualified to be there. In contrast, just being a native speaker of Japanese gave me carte blanche to go to the classroom to teach the language in the Japanese department in the same institution even though I had not had any formal training in teaching Japanese.

Enjoying the privilege of being a native speaker, I committed what any language teachers should never do. In one of my Japanese 201 classes, a student asked me the difference between Yama ni noboru ‘to climb up to the top of the mountain’ and Yama o noboru ‘to climb the mountain’ which is discussed extensively in some books in Japanese linguistics. She wanted to know if there is a situation in which one is acceptable but the other is not. According to Kuno (1973: 97), the former means that someone climbs the mountain, and the
goal, the top of the mountain is important. The latter, on the other hand, focuses more on the fact that someone climbs the mountain and s/he is continuously in contact with the surface of the mountain (i.e., walking or driving a car but not flying on a helicopter) while climbing. I understood that I had always distinguished between the two, but I was not able to explain it. As a result, I did exactly the same as the professor in linguistics did to me in his class. By abusing a privilege given to native speakers, I just said to the student, “We don’t say it.” In fact, the short utterance was strong enough to end her question. Looking back the incident, I realized that I had done exactly the same as my linguistics professor had done to me, and the student and perhaps other classmates must have felt the same negative way as I had experienced in the linguistics class mentioned earlier.

3.6. Back to Japan: Resisting Native-speakerism

I came back to Japan after completing my Ph.D. in 1990. My first appointment at Tamagawa University was Assistant Professor of English at then the Department of Foreign Languages. I was responsible for teaching various English classes. I was pleased to come back to the place where I had studied English and been trained to become an English teacher. In comparison with the time I was a student several years ago, the university upgraded facilities and brought a wider variety of English classes and more classes taught by non-Japanese faculty members.

The reality, however, was disappointing. First of all, there was a clear de facto distinction between those English classes supposed to be taught by Neitibu, presumably native speakers of English from what Braj Kachru calls Inner Circle countries (Kachru 1982) and those taught by Nihonjin ‘Japanese nationals’. In other words, there was no place for teachers who were neither native speaker of English nor Japanese nationals, regardless of qualifications. Native speakers were normally assigned to teach courses in English titled “conversation” or “communication”, whereas Japanese nationals were assigned to teach “reading” or “writing”. I deliberately use the term Japanese nationals rather than Japanese-speaking teachers in order to illustrate the situation in which the Japanese teachers are often grouped together based on nationality, whereas Neitibu often means Caucasian (see Grant and Lee 2009; Haque and Morgan 2009).

One incident which illustrates the issue took place when I was an academic coordinator of the department. In the fall semester of 2002, I was trying to place students into three sections of “English Communication” for the third year students. One section was taught by an experienced native English-speaking teacher of Asian origin, with a British passport, while the second section was taught by myself. Due to the popularity of the course at the pre-registration stage, we decided to add another section, but were only able to hire a novice
teacher from northern Europe, who had just completed her MA in the U.S. a few months ago and had never taught at a Japanese university. We expected that the experienced teacher and I would be able to help her if necessary. What turned out, however, was that the newest teacher’s class was the most popular, and the most experienced teacher’s class was the least popular. We tried to balance the distribution of the students by moving some around. Nevertheless, some students in the newest teacher’s class refused to move until the last minute citing that they did not want teachers with accents. What I can tell from the incident was that the students believed the new teacher was a Neitibu, and the experienced teacher as well as myself were not, and thus they believed that we were not qualified to teach the course.

Sadly speaking, this corresponded with the native-speakerism discourses prevailed among the Japanese general public. They include “native English speakers mean Caucasian”, and “non-native speakers have accents which would hinder communication”. For many students during the period when the incident took place, whether a teacher was a Neitibu or not was more important than teaching experience and qualification s/he had. This corresponds with one of the fallacies discussed in Phillipson (1992) that only native English speaking teachers are regarded as ideal.

4. Developments in Applied Linguistics and the Shift of Paradigm

In the previous sections, I have presented a series of my personal narratives in order to illustrate how my experiences as a language learner, a teacher-trainee, a graduate student and a language teacher have contributed to the formation of my beliefs about English language teaching. Since I started learning applied linguistics as an undergraduate student and then at the graduate programs, the academic discipline has also changed. Consequently, the goal of teaching and learning English has also been shifted as illustrated in Fig. 2 below.
By the early 1980s, so-called the native speaker model was considered as the only option for ELT professionals when they tried to set a goal of a program. As discussed earlier, the students were expected to learn English in order to become as proficient as native speakers, but it was the goal nobody could achieve. With an emergence of World Englishes (Kachru 1982), some ELT professionals have attempted to leave from the native speaker model, by recognizing different varieties of English. In fact, the plural form Englishes suggests that there is no variety of English that is the standard.

The notion of World Englishes (WE) has made a great contribution to the field of ELT by encouraging us to recognize the fact that English is used world-wide regularly both by native and non-native speakers, and thus English used by ideal native speakers is not necessarily be an appropriate model, especially in international contexts (Kachru 1982; Bokhorst-Heng and McKay 2008). Nevertheless, the native/non-native dichotomy is still prevailing in the ELT profession. In addition, WE scholars tend to discuss Englishes based on geographical varieties, such as American English, Indian English, and Singaporean English. While it may be useful for certain studies in linguistics, it would not be productive if program administrators started discussing which English should be the model for their program. It would potentially create another A team (dominant) vs. B team (dominated) dichotomy (see Skutbabb-Kangas 2000) which would make some varieties of English inferior to others as it is the case of native speakerism.

Considering the reality, we at Tamagawa went on a step further to set up the goal of the program. ELF, that is, “[a]ny use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice” (Seidlhofer 2011: 7), was where we
have arrived. Some have actually pointed out that Tamagawa reinforces its English program at the expense of other foreign languages. Due to the availability of time slots allocated to each student to register, the number of foreign language classes other than English, which the university offers had to decrease. Although it does not mean that we undermine the importance of multilingualism, a practical strategy would be to teach ELF to start with, while making the students aware of the importance of accepting diversity in languages and cultures (see Honna 2005). This corresponds with the fact that around 70-80 percent of the users of English are in the Expanding Circle, where English is not the primary language of the community (see Graddol 2006 etc.). In other words, those of us in the Expanding Circle use English primarily as a lingua franca to communicate with others because the language is the only option, at least before we were given opportunities to learn other languages. This has led us to decide the goal of our English program. In our English language program, we teach each of our students English to make him/her become an expert user of ELF in each student’s area of specialty. In addition, experience in learning and using ELF will help the students to learn additional languages in the future.

5. Tamagawa’s Challenge

Before we started our pilot program, we decided to proceed with the project step by step. We often make a brilliant plan and enthusiastically try to put it in place in a short term. The stakeholders often want to see an immediate outcome. At the same time, we always have limited financial and human resources, facility and more importantly, experience. It was, therefore, important for us to prioritize the issues we would need to deal with in order to run probably the first ELF program at Japanese universities. The top priority was human resources. We wanted to build a solid team of people who understand why we are aiming at ELF in our program. With a few exceptions, we have recruited our full-time teachers through JREC-IN, a government sponsored portal as well as through professional organizations as mentioned earlier. ELT position announcements in Japan still contain “native speaker” or “native like proficiency” explicitly, even though such descriptions were eliminated from job advertisements run by international ELT organizations such as TESOL as early as in 1991 (*A TESOL Statement on Non-native speakers of English and Hiring Practices* 1991). In fact, the native/non-native dichotomy would be meaningless if our program were aimed at teaching ELF. Therefore, we decided to value one’s academic and teaching backgrounds, intercultural competence and experience as a language learner.

Since I became interested in the ELT profession, I have accumulated my knowledge and experience in order to use them to help learners, particularly those in Japan. For a long time, I have believed that the primary objective of teaching and learning languages is to facilitate
understandings among people and consequently it would lead to a peaceful world. As we can tell from my narratives above, the native/non-native dichotomy in the ELT profession is a big obstacle which would prevent the profession from developing further by insistence on the unnecessary division without any valid principle. What a mid-sized institution like Tamagawa can do is, therefore, to explicitly eliminate the dichotomy in the hiring practices of English teachers, and make both teachers and students aware of the fact that such a distinction will no longer be necessary if you are to learn ELF.

At this point, we are fortunate to have 12 full-time instructors including five women and seven men, six native speakers, six non-native speakers, which look fairy balanced. This is just a result of us selecting the most qualified teachers among many applicants. It is true at CELF that we do not care who is a native speaker and who is not. The team of 12 full-timers in addition to more than 30 part-timers with various nationalities and linguistic backgrounds has made the university community, including faculty members, students and administrators, impossible to categorize English teachers according to the prevailing the native/non-native dichotomy. After four years since the beginning of the pilot program, we rarely hear students labeling a teacher as native or non-native speaker.

The program has a long way to go. What I can tell you from our experience in the first few years of CELF is that a constant reflection is always very important (see Farrell 2015). Based on reflections, we carefully plan a long-term goal and the steps to reach the goal by taking various factors such as finance, human resources, facility, rules and regulations as well as the culture of the institution into consideration (see White 1988). There is no standard procedure for how to make a good English program. However, we are certainly convinced that we can help each other by sharing our experiences, which could also be applied to other programs.

6. Conclusion

We believe that ELF is what English programs in Japanese universities should focus on. We need to help our students develop their proficiency of English to the appropriate level so that they can do something using English in real situations. Widdowson (1994: 384) cogently argues, “[r]eal proficiency is when you are able to take possession of the language, turn it to your advantage, and make it real for you.” This quotation is currently highlighted on the wall in our self-study lounge at Tamagawa University. It is important for the teachers and administrators to provide the students with programs in which they feel the learning of English is real for their lives.
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Part II

Research Paper
Accommodating backchannel behaviour, negotiating turns, and sharing culture in ELF communication

Saya Ike

1. Introduction

Backchannel behaviour across English varieties differs in frequency, types, contexts, and initiation strategies. In Japanese English, backchannels can be either elicited by the speaker or initiated by the listener, and quite often such backchannels are followed by an acknowledgement by the speaker, forming a sequence of backchannel exchanges. In particular, extended backchannel sequences have a rapport building function in Japanese and Japanese English\(^1\) (JE), in which participants sympathise with each other and negotiate turns without threatening each other’s face. While these backchannels are also observed in Australian English, speaker initiated backchannels are predominant and extended backchannel sequences are rare.

In an English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) conversation where participants exhibit different backchannel behaviour and thus have different expectations from each other, negotiation and accommodation of such behaviour are necessary. It is true that the definition of ELF is diverse (for more discussion, see Önen 2015), and ELF is often defined as a “contact language” among non-native speakers of English (Firth 1996: 240; House 1999). However, as Seidlhofer (2011) points out, speakers of Inner Circle countries and regions can also be involved in ELF interaction. Following Seidlhofer’s (2011) definition, an English interaction between speakers of different first languages is considered ELF in this paper, and it presents characteristics of backchannels in Australian English (AusE) and JE, and analyses how the speaker and the listener accommodate (Jenkins 2000) their backchannel behaviour in ELF conversations\(^2\).

Through a multimodal analysis of backchannel sequences and turn taking strategies, this paper provides further insight into our understanding of the functions of backchannel behaviour in both intra-cultural (JE-JE and AusE-AusE) and inter-cultural (JE-AusE) ELF communication settings.

2. Multimodal analysis of ELF interactions

\(^1\)“Japanese English” in this paper means English spoken by Japanese L1 speakers who can communicate in ELF interaction with little difficulty, and “Australian English” means English spoken by speakers who grew up as an L1 English speaker in Australia.

\(^2\) But it has to be borne in mind that despite native speakers (NSs) being included in ELF interaction according to most of the recent ELF researchers’ definitions, there is often reference to the ratio of NSs per interaction (see, for example, Seidlhofer 2011).
Analysis of ELF interactions is often based on audio-recorded data, as is the case in large-scale corpora such as the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English which started in 2005 (VOICE 2013) and the Asian Corpus of English that was established in 2009 (ACE 2014). While video-recording was sometimes supplementally made but not necessarily analysed in earlier research (e.g., Matsumoto 2014), extensive multimodal analysis of ELF communication is fairly new (but see Konakahara 2016). Diemer, Brunner, and Schmidt (2016) argue for the importance of incorporating computer-mediated communication in building more naturally occurring less formal conversations, and currently a multimodal interaction corpus called Corpus of Academic Spoken English (CASE forthcoming), which exclusively compiles a range of informal yet academic English as a Lingua Franca conversations via Skype communication, is under construction by them.

One of the key issues in dealing with video-recorded data, as several scholars have pointed out (Diemer et al. 2016; Sauer and Ludeling 2016), is the complexity of transcribing process and annotations. Transcribing speech itself is a painstaking process. Conversation analysis started in the 1970s, primarily by the work of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). Through constant additions and modifications (which unfortunately results in rather confusing and several versions of transcription symbols and principles), the transcription conventions are now fairly well established (for a summary of transcription conventions, see Du Bois 2006). However, there have not been any established multimodal interaction transcription conventions to date, and thus Diemer et al. (2016) argue for the need of a standard transcription model for multimodal analysis. Sauer and Ludeling (2016) discuss the work on building a corpus with multi-layered annotations so that the speech content and all the other actions involved in the interaction are visible in the transcripts. However, they claim that any format of transcription inevitably loses part of information. Thus, researchers need to make decisions of what elements of interaction to transcribe in multimodal analysis.

In analysing one of the discourse behaviours, backchannels, Ike (2016) and Ike and Mulder (2016) worked on establishing a framework for backchannel analysis using an annotation software ELAN (http://tla.mpi.nl/tools/tla-tools/elan/). They propose that multi-layered annotation of speech, nodding, eye gaze movement, and other body movements including gestures allows researchers to analyse what triggers and/or initiates a backchannel, and how backchannels are produced in interaction. This paper analyses the backchannel behaviour in ELF interactions using this framework.

3. Backchannels: Types and functions

Definitions of backchannels (BCs) widely vary, and the question of what is to be included in BCs remain somewhat controversial (for more discussion on backchannel
definitions, see Ike 2016), and this perhaps stems from a long-standing view of BCs as a listener’s behaviour in interaction. However, it is argued that backchanneling is a collaborative interaction management strategy that is realised by the efforts and cooperation of both the speaker and the listener, thus it should be analysed in relation to both of the participants in interaction (Ike 2016; Ike and Mulder 2016).

Using the framework they propose, Ike and Mulder (2016) identify two types of BCs: speaker-elicited backchannel (S-BC) and listener-initiated backchannel (L-BC). The most frequently used type of BC both in AusE and JE is the S-BC. The primary speaker (i.e., floor holder) gives a range of backchannel cues (BC cues) to elicit a BC from the primary listener. In other words, the speaker invites the listener to produce a BC. BC cues seem to be culturally diverse; eye gaze shift has been reported to be the primary cue in varieties of English such as American English, Canadian English (Bavelas, Coates and Johnson 2002), and Australian English (Ike 2010), while nodding is the primary cue in Japanese (Maynard 1997) and Japanese English (Ike 2010). To such BC cues, the listener responds with a BC which are also culturally diverse in terms of preferred form (e.g., Cutrone 2005; Ike 2010; Tottie 1991). The second type is the “listener-initiated backchannel (L-BC)”. In this case, the listener orients to an intonation unit ending and voluntarily offers a BC, often smaller in volume and degree of movement. L-BC seems to be far less frequent in AusE, but relatively frequently observed in JE.

In Japanese, a BC can elicit another BC-like response from the interlocutor and form a “loop” sequence (Iwasaki 1997: 662), and often results in simultaneous nodding between the conversation participants (Kita and Ide 2007). Ike and Mulder (2016) also identify such phenomena in English conversations, and focusing on the function of each action, they term the instance as “backchannel sequence (BC sequence)”. That is, the sequence is not in a form of “loop” in a sense that the series of BCs between the participants bring them back to the place where the loop started, but rather, the sequence moves the conversation forward to the next sequence in interaction. A BC sequence consists of at least one BC from the primary listener and a response from the primary speaker (minimal BC sequence). In this case, the primary speaker’s response seems to function as an acknowledgement of the listener’s BC. In JE conversations, a minimal BC sequence often further develops into a series of simultaneous exchanges of BCs (extended BC sequence). Through detailed analysis of JE conversations, Ike and Mulder (2016) argue that there are two other functions in addition to the acknowledgement function in an extended BC sequence: rapport establishment and turn negotiation function.

In particular, rapport building is argued to be an important component of Japanese conversation (Otsuka 2012), and it is established by a preferred discourse style
“co-construction” (Mizutani 1983). Co-construction is realised by both participants being actively engaged in conversation, most often by means including BCs (Kurosaki 1995; Otsuka 2012, 2015). There are several levels of co-construction in conversations (Kurosaki 1995). The listeners can actively be involved in the speech content of the speaker and offer to complete the speaker’s utterance, or as Otsuka (2012, 2015) and Morita (2008), as well as Bavelas and Chovil (2000) state, the listeners can offer reactive tokens (i.e., BCs) to show their involvement and thus co-construct the interaction without overtly interfering the speech content. Further, Morita (2008) points out that Japanese speakers co-construct their interaction orienting to much smaller units than turn construction units (Sacks et al. 1974). Kita and Ide (2007) also note in discussion of the simultaneous nodding sequences in Japanese conversations that, simultaneous nodding contributes to rapport establishment as evident in smiling expressions of both participants. Thus, both the frequent use of BCs and co-building BC sequences facilitate rapport establishment in Japanese and JE conversations, and this further suggests that Japanese speakers hold “rapport enhancement orientation”—a desire to strengthen their personal harmonious relationship—as opposed to “rapport maintenance orientation”—keeping their relationship as it is—(Spencer-Oatey 2008) in interacting with each other.

Based on the above discussion, the multimodal analysis of three conversations is presented in the following sections. The original corpus consists of dyadic ELF conversations between AusE speakers and JE speakers and intra-cultural English conversations between AusE speakers and between JE speakers (cf. Ike and Mulder 2016). The recording took place in Melbourne between 2007 and 2012, and participants were provided (but not limited to) a topic of comedy films, TV programs, comics, or children’s books. In order to describe frequently occurring BC instances in the two varieties of English, this paper examines a JE-JE conversation between Ruiko and Yumi—both had spent a few years in Australia and held a score of IELTS 6.0 or above at the time of recording, and an AusE-AusE conversation between Liz and Beth—both had been enrolled in graduate study courses. Then, an ELF conversation between Beth and Yumi is examined to illustrate BC behaviour in ELF conversations.

4. Backchannel behaviour in Australian English and Japanese English

The first excerpt3 below, also provided in Fig. 1, is an excerpt from a conversation between JE speakers Ruiko and Yumi. The primary speaker (Ruiko) is starting to share her experience of teaching in Taiwan with the primary listener (Yumi). In this 6-second segment,

---

3 Speech content was transcribed according to intonation units, adopting Du Bois, Chafe, Meyer and Thompson (2000), and the transcription conventions are provided in Appendix.
there is an S-BC, L-BC, and extended BC sequence. The speech content is provided in Excerpt 1, and multi-layered ELAN transcript\(^4\) is provided in Fig. 1. The audible BC instances are indicated by the arrows in the transcript, and the sequential number indicates the start of each BC corresponding with the annotation number in the figure.

**Excerpt 1** [Japanese dramas, 1-12, 00:51:854-00:58.756]

1. RUIKO; anyway,
2. uh[m,
3. \(\rightarrow\) YUMI; [yeah.]
4. RUIKO; u]h ^when I was in Taiwan [\(\rightarrow\) I was t]eaching Japanese?
5. \(\rightarrow\) YUMI; [\(\rightarrow\) yeah.]
6. \(\rightarrow\) YUMI; ^o[sh right.]
7. \(\rightarrow\) RUIKO; [\(\rightarrow\) and all my] stude[\(\rightarrow\)nts,]
8. \(\rightarrow\) YUMI; [\(\rightarrow\) yeah,]
9. \(\rightarrow\) RUIKO; [\(\rightarrow\) (H) they wa]tched,
10. \(\rightarrow\) YUMI; [\(\rightarrow\) yeah yeah.]
11. RUIKO; .. Japanese dramas?
12. YUMI; yeah,

![Fig. 1](multi-layered transcript: Japanese dramas)

\(^4\) In each ELAN transcript, both Ruiko’s and Yumi’s behaviours including speech (SPCH), eye gaze (EG), body movement (MV), head movement (NOD), as well as the analysis of their backchanneling behaviour such as BC-cues and BCs, are annotated in separate tiers. Also, each BC instance is annotated according to its type (L-BC, S-BC, and BC-Seq).
As Ruiko starts talking, she hesitates for a moment, uttering *uhm* in line 2 and she shifts her eye gaze on Yumi, which functions as a BC cue. Yumi immediately reacts with multiple nods and vocal BC *yeah* in line 3 (Annotation 1). Ruiko takes her eye gaze off Yumi right after Yumi’s vocal BC, and starts telling her experience in line 4. Yumi’s next BC is offered without any obvious BC cues in line 5, overlapping Ruiko’s speech (Annotation 2). However, a closer look reveals that her L-BC is carefully placed at the end of a grammatical completion point (Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki and Tao 1996), *when I was in Taiwan*. Although this was not the end of the intonation unit, it is the end of semantically meaningful utterance, and thus is a transition relevance place (Schegloff 2007). Ruiko then gives another BC cue as she finishes her utterance with a rising intonation in line 4, and Yumi responds with a new combination of vocal (*oh right*) and non-vocal (nodding) BC (Annotation 3). This S-BC is acknowledged by Ruiko with a tiny nod as she continues on (Annotation 4), opening up a sequence. Yumi sees Ruiko’s acknowledgement, and further develops the sequence into an extended sequence by giving another series of BCs. Although Ruiko does not join Yumi’s nodding in the sequence, Ruiko displays smiling expressions as she continues to talk in line 9, and thus it can be interpreted that rapport is being established in the sequence.

BC sequences in JE are worth observing in detail. The next example illustrates the three phases—acknowledgement, rapport establishment and negotiation—in an extended BC sequence. Excerpt 2 is approximately two minutes after the previous example, continuing on the topic of Japanese dramas and cartoons. In this example, Yumi is the primary speaker and talking about her roommate.

**Excerpt 2** [Japanese cartoon, 1-10, 02:52.369-02:57.774]

1. RUIKO; oh ok[ay],
2. YUMI; *Yeah and then,*
3. She lo:ves Japanese culture,
4. cart[oon dramas],
5. RUIKO; *Yeah,*
6. yea@h@ @
7. YUMI; *and then she,*
8. introduced me [@@
9. RUIKO; [@yeah@]
10. YUMI; *Japanese drama* (H)
Ruiko, the primary listener in this segment, starts nodding as a BC as Yumi utters *she loves* in line 3. As shown in Fig. 2, it is a little difficult to determine whether Ruiko’s BC (5 nods, Annotation 1) is an S-BC (elicited by Yumi) or an L-BC. Although Yumi’s eye gaze is off Ruiko, Yumi starts shaking her head prior to her utterance in line 3, and it can be argued that the head movement functioned as a BC cue. Another possibility is that the emphasis on the word *loves* in line 3 may have triggered Ruiko’s BC, in which case it is an L-BC. Regardless of how it started, Yumi acknowledges Ruiko’s BC with a nod while continues talking in line 4 (Annotation 2), and in response Ruiko gives another nod with a vocal BC *yeah* in line 5 (Annotation 3). This is followed by a big nod from Yumi (Annotation 4) and another series of nods and a vocal BC with a laughter element from Ruiko in line 6 (Annotation 5). It is argued that through the exchanges of BCs, the participants build rapport between themselves (cf. Kita and Ide 2007) and affiliate with each other without interrupting the flow of conversation. It is also interesting that Yumi observes Ruiko’s BC in line 6 and as she herself gives another non-vocal BC (Annotation 4), she takes her eye gaze off Ruiko and claims her speakership again, by uttering *and then she* in line 7. Therefore, this last set of BCs appear to be the negotiation phase where participants negotiate the speakership and select the

Fig. 2 [multi-layered transcript: Japanese cartoon]
next speaker. In many such extended BC sequences, there are distinct three phases of acknowledgement, rapport establishment, and negotiation, in JE conversations.

On the other hand, AusE data shows quite a different BC behaviour. The next example shows two instances of S-BC in AusE conversation between Liz and Beth. Liz is describing a funny scene from a movie she had seen to the primary listener Beth.

**Excerpt 3** [Vegan, 1-6, 02:52.909:854-03:02.001]

1. Liz; there’s the ^funniest bit,
2. (0.2)
3. was one of the,
4. ^exes,
5. is a vegan?
6. → -1 Beth; okay[@@
7. Liz; [and this gi]ves him some kind of magical super power?
8. → -2 (0.2)

**Fig. 3** [multi-layered transcript: Vegan]

As Liz starts describing the scene and gives a piece of new information ...*exes is a vegan*? Liz shifts her eye gaze on Beth, and finishes her turn with a clear rising intonation. These two elements work as a BC cue, to which Beth responds with a continuer BC *okay[@* with laughter elements in line 6 (Annotation 1). As soon as Liz hears Beth’s BC she continues her narrative of the story without acknowledging the BC. Also, while Liz continues to explain the scene *and this gives him some kind of magical super power?* she again uses a rising
intonation accompanied by hand gesture and a slight head movement (leaning forward and back) to elicit Beth’s second BC, two nods in line 8 (Annotation 2). Although this is not the only type of BC instances, S-BCs are predominantly employed in AusE conversations and acknowledgement of a BC seems to be rare. Sacks et al. (1974) define BCs as “continuer”, and Otsuka (2015) further notes that BCs are used to elicit more information in AusE. The claims by Sacks et al. (1974) and Otsuka (2015) seem to be supported in this example, as well as in the overall data for this study.

When a BC sequence does occur, the functions of each BC element seem distinctively different from that in JE conversations. Excerpt 4 below is from the same conversation and occurs approximately 20 seconds after the previous example, where Liz describes the violent nature of the film and Beth attempts to claim the speakership.

**Excerpt 4 [Vegan Cont’d, 1-11, 03:22:491-03:30.528]**

1. **LIZ;** funny thing about i- this violent is no,
2. blood?
3 -1 **BETH;** hmm,
4 **LIZ;** So[:,
5 -2 **BETH;** [yeah ^okay]
6 **LIZ;** it seem]s [i so much,
7 **BETH;** [i so it's,]
8 **LIZ;** cos it]'s more comic bookie,
9 -3 **BETH;** [iyeah,]
10 **LIZ;** [i so it see]ms much more permissible,
11 **BETH;** So is it,
Fig. 4 [multi-layered transcript: Vegan cont’d]

Fig. 4 shows a rather complicated, and to some extent confusing (at least from a Japanese point of view) BC instances. The BC instance starts with a simple and clear S-BC; Liz gives a BC cue when she utters *blood* with a rising intonation in line 2, slightly turning back and shifting her eye gaze on Beth. In response, Beth gives a soft vocal BC in line 3, nodding at the same time (Annotation 1). Liz does not acknowledge this BC and tries to continue her speech, but she hesitates for a moment by prolonging her next utterance *so:* in line 4. At that moment, Beth gives her next set of BC *yeah ‘okay* with three nods in line 5 (Annotation 2), and uses this BC to claim the next speakership. However, this attempt results in an overlap in lines 6-7, as Liz resumes her story while Beth BCs. Liz’s head movement (shaking) and hand gesture may have then worked as the next BC cue and Beth provides a series of nodding and a vocal BC *yeah* in line 9 (Annotation 3). This is followed by two tiny nods by Liz (Annotation 4), forming a minimal BC sequence. However, the video analysis indicates that Liz is using these two nods to confirm her speakership and to emphasise the speech content, rather than acknowledging Beth’s preceding BCs. Furthermore, instead of joining Liz’s nodding to form an extended BC sequence, Beth waits to the end of Liz’s utterance *so it seems much more permissible* in line 10, and again claims the speakership by uttering *so is it* in line 11. Notice that this utterance is almost identical to her previous attempt in line 7, except it is in an interrogative form this time to clearly show that she has the right to speak and to require additional information. Therefore, the acknowledgement phase and rapport establishment phase which can be observed in JE conversations are absent in this BC
sequence in AusE conversation, and the existence of the remaining turn negotiation phase is also questionable.

Although there exist both minimal and extended BC sequences in AusE conversations, extended BC sequences are much less frequent and much less coordinated. That is, simultaneous nodding rarely occurs, and even in an extended BC sequences BCs seem to be offered consecutively rather than simultaneously by each participant. What this segment suggests is that AusE speakers are not using BCs to collaboratively build rapport, but to align their stance to each other (Ike and Mulder forthcoming) in interaction, and as a powerful tool to claim the next speakership. One may argue that the turn negotiation function exists in their BCs, however, their competing speakership claims are so strong that the negotiation often seems to fail and result in overlaps. Therefore, it is argued here that another function of BCs in AusE is the speakership claim (i.e., turn taking strategy), not speakership “negotiation”. Although the analysis is still in an early stage for AusE conversations, the data indicate several BC instances are followed by a speakership competition and overlapping turns.

The above four examples demonstrate different BC behaviours in two varieties of English, and illustrate different functions of BCs in each variety. The discussion of BC sequences in JE and AusE conversations in this section suggests that BC sequences have a distinct role in establishing rapport and negotiating the next speakership in JE interaction. Although BCs in BC sequences are both used for stance taking (Du Bois and Karkkainen 2012), Ike (2017) claims that rapport establishment (FitzGerald 2002) and stance affiliation—in other words, in-group social affiliation (Englebretson 2007: 74)—may not be an essential element in AusE interaction. In fact, the examination of AusE conversations suggests that stance alignment (Du Bois 2007) may be the foundation of interaction in AusE. To borrow Spencer-Oatey’s term, AusE speakers may hold “rapport maintenance orientation”, indicating that they do not necessarily see the need for social bonding through this type of interaction.

5. Backchannel accommodation in ELF interaction

In ELF conversations where participants inevitably have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, negotiation and accommodation are necessary not only at lexical and grammatical levels as often reported (e.g., Cogo and Dewey 2012; Kirkpatrick 2010) but also at paralinguistic levels such as BC behaviour. In this section, how accommodation and negotiation are realised in such ELF settings is described with special focus on BC sequences.

As has been documented elsewhere (e.g., Ike 2010) and discussed earlier, the frequency of BCs in JE conversations is remarkably higher than that in AusE conversations and other varieties of English. An earlier study on Japanese-American communication in English
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(White 1989) shows that American English speakers increase their use of BCs when their interlocutors are Japanese. This means that the speakers of different varieties of English modify their use of BCs in ELF interactions. Looking specifically at ELF conversations between JE speakers and AusE speakers, Ike (2016) shows both an instance of “failed” accommodation and an instance of “successful” negotiation in eliciting and producing a BC from and to the interlocutor. She concludes that, when JE speaker is primarily speaking, overt and explicit BC cues by the JE speakers and closer monitoring by the AusE speaker can be efficient accommodation strategies in ELF conversations.

The below example is from an ELF conversation between the AusE speaker Beth, and the JE speaker Yumi, and Yumi is the primary speaker finishing off the narrative story of a documentary program she has recently seen on TV.

Excerpt 5 [SBS documentary, 1-30, 04:34:996-04:53.401]

1 YUMI; and then,
2 they,
3 filmed,
4 uh,
5 ..(%) some (TSK),
6 .. weird creature which,
7 people ca- h-,  
8 people have never watched,  
9 ne- never seen,  
10 -1 BETH; okay.
11 -2 YUMI; hm hm hmm,  
12 %(H) yeah,  
13 BETH; [y- ye-],  
14 YUMI; [I th-],  
15 I like,  
16 watching,  
17 .. documentary i-,  
18 in SBS/  
19 -6 BETH; ye[ah,  
20 -5 YUMI; [yeah,]  
21 BETH; [sea there are som]e good ones,  
22 YUMI; [yeah,]  
23 BETH; aren't there.
In Excerpt 5, it should be noted that Yumi efficiently uses a range of BC cues to elicit BCs from Beth, and two S-BCs (both non-vocal nodding) are observed while Yumi is talking through lines 1 to 8 (although not the primary focus of this paper and thus the multi-layered transcript is not provided). As Yumi completes her self-correction by uttering *ne-never seen* in line 9, Yumi opens her eyes to gaze on Beth and nodds twice. This serves as a BC cue and Beth promptly responds with a combination of vocal (*okay*) and non-vocal BC in line 10 (Annotation 1). Yumi immediately acknowledges Beth’s BC by starting a series of nods, and also utters *hm hm hmm* in line 11 (Annotation 2), as if trying to develop the mutual understanding and thus establish rapport.

As shown in Fig. 5, on the other hand, while Beth does nod back to Yumi (Annotation 3) there is no smiling expression to indicate that the rapport has been established as Kita and Ide (2007) suggest. Therefore, it seems that Beth’s nodding functions as a continuer and by giving
such action Beth seems to be encouraging Yumi to keep talking. Also, the third phase, turn negotiation is not successful as they both start talking at the same time in lines 13 and 14.

In the immediately following segment (Fig. 6), Yumi tries longer to establish rapport by giving consecutive nods and vocal BCs after opening up a BC sequence.

Yumi gives a BC cue by nodding and moving her head towards Beth as she completes her story with the final assessment statement that she likes watching documentaries in line 17. Beth gives multiple nods (Annotation 4), and Yumi finishes off her speech by adding in SBS (one of the TV broadcasters in Australia) in line 18 while at the same time acknowledges the BC by nodding back (Annotation 5). This can be identified as the acknowledgement phase and the start of rapport establishment phase, and there is simultaneous nodding between them for approximately 1.4 seconds (Annotations 5 and 6). Beth also offers a supportive comment there are some good ones, aren’t there, which receives another series of agreement BCs in line 24 (Annotation 7). However, after Beth offers this additional comment, she does not continue nodding to Yumi except giving a tiny nod (Annotation 8), and rapport establishment seems to end there. Instead, Beth offers another BC yeah in line 25 (Annotation 9), which seems to encourage Yumi to talk again. When this utterance is immediately followed by Yumi’s yet another vocal BC yeah in line 26 (Annotation 10), Beth takes her eye gaze off Yumi and decides to take the floor, starting to talk in line 28, while Yumi is still offering a BC that’s right in line 27. It is true that the floor change results in an overlap, but considering the fact that Beth is observing Yumi’s movements closely and takes her eye gaze off Yumi

Fig. 6 [multi-layered transcript: SBS documentary BC sequence 2]
when claiming the speakership, it can be argued that they have successfully negotiated the next speakership in this BC sequence.

The fact that Beth stops nodding in line 25 while Yumi continues to nod may be another example of the different rapport orientations between the two. Beth is content since she has offered an agreement BC and a supportive comment, which she considers sufficient actions to maintain the rapport. Yumi, on the other hand, holds the rapport enhancement orientation and tries to form social affiliation with Beth in the sequence. Although the analysis is still largely intuitive, it is worth investigating in more detail.

In terms of eliciting and producing BCs in this ELF conversation between Yumi and Beth, the accommodation strategies discussed in Ike (2017)—overt and explicit cues and close monitoring—are employed and working well. It is clear that Beth’s frequency of BCs is much higher than when she is involved in the AusE conversation with Liz. Furthermore, Beth seems to use BCs not only as a continuer but also as an encouragement when Yumi is the primary speaker. Initial observation of the data indicates that Beth is careful not to interrupt Yumi by waiting for her to finish by herself, rather than offering to co-construct the dialogue by completing the utterances or speech content. This may have resulted in more frequent BCs as well. From a BC behaviour analysis perspective, this patience also works favourably for JE speaker Yumi in receiving BCs. However, most of the BC sequences are minimal in this ELF conversation. In other words, Beth’s BCs are acknowledged by Yumi, but her acknowledgement BC does not necessarily elicit Beth’s further collaborative BCs in building rapport. When it does, the functions of BCs in an extended BC sequences seem to be different on each side.

6. Accommodation strategies and further research directions

From the detailed analysis of both intra-cultural and inter-cultural ELF interactions, what can be argued is that speakers of both varieties of English can adjust their BC behaviour within their own repertoire. Displaying BC cues and BCs explicitly is a good example of accommodation that is achievable, as they have access to their own repertoire of BC cues and BCs. Beth’s waiting strategy producing more BCs when conversing with Yumi may be a result of her awareness that the conversation partner is using English as an additional language. Thus, it can be said the encouragement function of BCs is also in the repertoire of AusE speakers. Likewise, Yumi shows the waiting strategies when Beth is the floor holder but offers to co-construct the dialogue when conversing with Ruiko, another JE speaker.

What can be achieved in JE-AusE ELF interaction as a result of accommodation by both parties, then, is that AusE speakers respond to the JE speakers’ attempt to establish rapport by aligning their stance and offering encouragement BCs. What seems highly challenging, if not
impossible, is to adopt something that does not exist in their own linguistic and paralinguistic behaviours. As examined in the examples, rapport establishment is not a function of BCs in AusE, and thus forming extended BC sequences is difficult unless the speakers are actively negotiating turns. When a JE speaker is the floor holder (primary speaker), there are a number of minimal BC sequences, but when they are the primary listener, their BCs are rarely acknowledged. Meanwhile, claiming the next speakership without negotiation or rapport establishment by producing a single BC may be a little challenging for JE speakers as well.

Whether such behavioural differences indeed affect their satisfaction in ELF interactions remains unclear at this point. Considering the amount of content information BCs carry and the level of differences in their forms (not in frequency or functions but preferred forms), one may doubt if the differences negatively affect the level of satisfaction. Nevertheless, BCs carry cultural meanings and social values especially for Japanese speakers. Indeed, however subconsciously, the participants in the ELF interactions observed in this study modify their behaviours and accommodate each other. It is thus argued that subtle interactional elements such as BCs, and the notion of stance alignment and rapport establishment need to be taken into consideration. Backchanneling behaviour is a pragmatic aspect of each variety of English, and it deserves closer attention in ELF research.

In order to do so, however, Ike and Mulder (forthcoming), as well as Ike (2017) argue for the need of closer analysis and finer definition of rapport in interaction. Here, it is also argued that stance needs to be redefined. Although there has been substantial amount of research done in the field of stance, there have not been fine distinctions among stance affiliation, stance alignment, and rapport orientation. The terms seem to be sometimes interchangeably used, and yet to mean somewhat different notions and phenomena in interaction. In addition, the notion of stance discussed in this paper does not only mean the participant’s position in relation to the speech content of the interlocutor, but also mean a psychological status that is formed through interaction, especially within a BC sequence. Therefore, in addition to whether or not they produce BCs and co-construct the particular sequence, facial expressions such as smiling elements and laughter, participants’ posture, and the degree of movement, need to be taken into consideration in analysing the stance in interaction. This has been proven challenging, as the concurrent movements are hard to be adequately transcribed in the multi-layered analysis framework employed in this study, and determining the phases and functions of BC instance, as well as the degree of intimacy between the participants, is still in hands of the researchers and remains subjective. Further, as it was the subject of discussion in this study, the meaning in action can be culturally assigned and may have different meanings to the interlocutor.
Despite the limitations of the current study, this paper provides further insights into multimodal analysis of ELF interactions using JE-AusE conversations as a case study, and describes accommodation strategies that are employed by the speakers of different varieties of English. A new direction of research may be integrating cultural differences in paralinguistic behaviour such as gestures and facial expressions, and metalinguistic elements such as stance taking. Both are largely affected by cultural beliefs in politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987), yet play significant roles in face-to-face interaction. It is also believed that the deeper understanding of cultural value, accommodation and negotiation in ELF interaction can only become possible when intra-cultural interactions are finely analysed and the prototype behaviour is established. Further development of multimodal analysis framework, as well as the construction of large scale corpora, is sincerely hoped for.
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## Appendix: Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>NAME;</td>
<td>semicolon following name in CAPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td>left to right order marks temporal sequence (Intonation Unit (IU))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td>top to bottom order marks turn sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>[word]</td>
<td>left square brackets aligned vertically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap (second)</td>
<td>[2word]</td>
<td>Backchannel starts at the marked utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pause, timed</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>pause duration in seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-breath</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>audible inhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhale</td>
<td>(Hx)</td>
<td>audible exhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh pulse</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>laughter element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laughing word</td>
<td>wo@rd</td>
<td>laughter element within an utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottal stop</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>glottal sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottalised word</td>
<td>w%ord</td>
<td>glottal sound within an utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosody</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary accent</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>stressed utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation Unit</td>
<td>LINE</td>
<td>one new line for each Intonation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>intonation signals finality (period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>intonation signals continuation (comma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intonation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>intonation signals appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-vocal event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodding</td>
<td>NOD</td>
<td>head nodding marked with upward/downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiling</td>
<td>TILT</td>
<td>slight head movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head movement</td>
<td>TURN</td>
<td>visible head movement marked with back/away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaking</td>
<td>SHAKE</td>
<td>backchannel head shaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III

Short Reports on ELF-Related Events
Shorts Reports on Five ELF-Related Events in the Academic Year of 2016

This section introduces the following five ELF-related events held in the academic year of 2016:

1. Reports on the 1st ELF SIG Meeting (April 23rd, 2016)
2. Reports on the 6th Waseda ELF International Workshop hosted by the ELF Research Group Waseda and the JACET ELF-SIG (November 11th and 12th, 2016)
3. Reports on the special lecture: Cognitive perspectives on ELF by Professor Chris Hall, York St. John University (December 14th, 2016)
4. Reports on the special lecture: Language Choices for Corporate Work in Non-English-Dominant Asia by Professor Ryuko Kubota, University of British Columbia (December 16th, 2016)
5. Reports on the 2nd EMI-ELF Workshop hosted by the ELF Research Group Waseda (February 25th, 2017)

The reports were originally circulated through the English as a Lingua Franca Research Network (ELF ReN) member’s’ network. As to the report on the First ELF SIG Meeting, it was originally published in the JACET Chubu Newsletter No. 36 on May 20th, 2016.

1. Reports on the First ELF SIG Meeting (by Leah Gilner)

The first JACET ELF SIG meeting was held on April 23rd, 2016 at the newly inaugurated ELF Study Hall which houses the Center for English as a Lingua Franca (CELF) at Tamagawa University. The event included a tour of the CELF facilities and a talk by Director of the Center, Prof. Masaki Oda.

Upon entering the ELF Study Hall, it soon becomes clear that creating a comfortable learning environment was given priority in its design. The building contains classrooms equipped in ways that facilitate flexible arrangements and multimedia presentations, gathering areas that invite casual and relaxed interaction, and decor that reflects inspired and thoughtful student collaborations.

As Director Oda explained in his talk, entitled CELF Reflection, the center represents a reorganization of the general English language programs at the university. The CELF team is currently responsible for providing English instruction for 2,500 students in all but one
department, a total of 147 classes. In addition to class-based learning, a tutoring system which provides students opportunity for individualized advising has been implemented.

The establishment of CELF embodies a shift in teaching philosophy and vision. Classroom practices are described as ELF-based in that they are guided by the desire to promote a multicultural disposition and awareness of communication strategies that have practical and useful application in real world situations. Central to the pursuit of these goals has been the adoption of employment policies that engender a multicultural workplace through the hiring of teachers who can share their experience as ELF users with their students.

As with any project of its size and scope, the opening of the center has not been without challenges. One of the biggest tasks ahead, according to Prof. Oda, is encouraging a mental switch from E-F-L to E-L-F among the university community. In this regard, the ELF Study Hall stands as a monument to commitment, at the institutional level, to innovation in ELT in Japan.

2. Reports on the 6th Waseda ELF International Workshop (by Leah Gilner)

The 6th Waseda ELF International Workshop took place November 11th and 12th 2016 at Waseda University. The theme of the workshop was written ELF for academic and business purposes. The first day featured special lectures by Prof. Maria Kuteeva from Stockholm University and Prof. Anna Mauranen from the University of Helsinki. The events on the second day included several individual presentations and a panel discussion.

The special lectures made apparent the impact of input and exposure on communicative practices. Prof. Kuteeva’s talk illustrated how academic writing is shaped by field-specific concerns which novices absorb through contact and interaction with the discourse of more experienced community members. These observations were further corroborated by the interplay of cognitive, microsocial, and macrosocial factors depicted by Prof. Mauranen. Listening to these two presentations, one could not but acknowledge the need to adapt writing instruction to the range of disciplinary disciplines represented by particular students, implying that instructors need a cross-disciplinary awareness of rhetorical conventions and devices shaping academic publication.

The panelists provided stimulating perspectives related to various aspects of academic writing. Prof. Saori Sadoshima (Waseda University) described how the Waseda University Writing Center, established more than 10 years ago, embraces an inclusive, multilingual
approach in training its tutors and advising its visitors. Prof. Tim Stewart (Kyoto University) shared his experiences as editor on various international journals and his observations on how media and technology are influencing traditional views related to the way academics disseminate information. Prof. James D’Angelo (Chukyo University) imparted insights regarding the integration of ELF-aware perspectives into the management of an international academic journal, suggesting a delicate balance between preserving writers’ voices and maintaining accepted standards.

The 6th Waseda ELF International Workshop provided participants with a myriad of ideas worthy of further consideration and empirical study. For further details, including abstracts of individual presentations, please refer to the workshop program available at the ELF Research Group Waseda website.

3. Reports on the special lecture: *Cognitive perspectives on ELF* by Professor Chris Hall, York St. John University (by Paul McBride)*

On December 14th, 2016, Prof. Hall of York St. John University gave a special lecture entitled *Cognitive perspectives on ELF* at Tamagawa University. Prof. Hall pointed out that a cognitive perspective brings to the study of ELF research findings about the processing, development and mental representation of L2 Englishes in bi- or multilingual minds. He said that no empirical studies of processing in “ELF mode” have yet been conducted, and that his specific interest is in what a cognitive perspective on ELF can reveal about the nature of English across the NS/NNS divide.

Prof. Hall observed that a speaker’s first language (L1) and other acquired languages will affect the rate and the way in which a subsequent language (L2, L3, etc.) is learned. The *Parasitic Model* of the multilingual mental lexicon (Hall and Schultz 1994; Hall 1996, 2002; Ecke and Hall 1998, 2000; Hall and Ecke 2003; Sills and Hall 2005; Hall et al. 2009; Hall and Reyes 2009; González Alonso 2012) compares L2 to a mistletoe plant which relies for its own development on an L1 host tree. The model deals with three stages involved in the development of individual L2 lexical items: (1) the establishing of a form representation, (2) the building of connections to L1 syntactic frame and concept representations, and (3) the strengthening and automatization of representations and access routes. The model posits that initial L2 learner frames which come from L1 may be followed by a shift to L2 frames for advanced learners, but that many L2 users will maintain L1 frames.

Using a cosmic analogy, Prof. Hall suggested that English from a cognitive perspective
could be thought of less as a planet (single, bounded, uniform, and stable) and more as a galaxy (coalescing, variable, and dynamic). He agreed with Pennycook’s criticism (2007, 2009, 2011) of monolithic views of English, but not with Pennycook’s criticism of cognitive approaches, saying the “plurilithic” approach is entirely compatible with cognitive views of English, including ELF. He said plurilithic Englishes as L1 are developed in communities and come to reflect community norms, but as L2 they are developed as similects through instruction and cross-linguistic influence (CLI) from a common L1 (Mauranen 2012).

Prof. Hall employs Usage-based Linguistics (UBL) (e.g., Langacker 2000; Tomasello 2003; Goldberg 1995; Ellis 2008) as a framework for addressing the cognitive dimensions of ELF. Under such a framework, in L1 development grammatical rules emerge bottom-up as observed regularities. Under a UBL framework, in L2 development, constructions typically develop as regulations associated with instruction based on standard NS models, however regularities also emerge through usage inside and outside the classroom, as well as through CLI. Prof. Hall said that in ELF what is shared are communicative principles for social interaction, rather than language norms. He believes that to understand ELF fully we need to bridge sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics to provide a combined sociocognitive account.

He associated L2 English regulations learned through deliberate study, with (accuracy-oriented) declarative memory in the temporal lobe of the brain, whereas he associated L2 English regularities, automatically acquired through usage, with (fluency-oriented) procedural memory in the frontal lobe of the brain. In L2 English learning, he theorized, declarative “knowledge that”, about “Standard” NS English, yields in usage to the formation of procedural “knowledge how”, about effective NNS English, which becomes entrenched and automatized.

In L1 language learning on the other hand, he noted that in the process of education the tendency is for the order to be reversed: procedural knowledge of home varieties is displaced by declarative knowledge of “standard varieties”. He concluded that L2 users need to become more sensitive to effective communicative principles, freeing themselves from the inhibitions provoked by instruction (which focuses on regulations before regularities).

On the basis of the cognitive evidence, he suggested teachers might want to maximize opportunities for learners to interact in English with users of different L2 Englishes, for communication rather than learning (i.e. ELF), so that effective language resources become entrenched and communication strategies become automatized. He also suggested teachers might want to deprioritize accuracy (of form) as a goal, because it is almost exclusively
measured against NS Standard English norms, and although it is learnable through deliberate study, it is effectively not able to be acquired through usage.

Concerning implications for teachers, Prof. Hall views the following statements as consistent with both sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic evidence about ELF: (1) “pursue a realistic goal of producing competent speakers with adequate communicative ability or an unrealistic goal of producing imitation native speakers” (Kumaravadivelu 1994: 42) and (2) If we believe that L2 programs [should reflect] the functional use of language embedded in local communicative situations, then the goal L2 learners and teachers need to pursue in most cases "should be intelligibility and acceptability rather than native-like perfection” (Stern 1992: 116).

*This report was compiled mostly by quoting from Prof. Hall’s PowerPoint slides and Ecke & Hall (2014) as well as by incorporating feedback on the draft of this report by Prof. Hall. Please refer to “Ecke, P. and C. J. Hall 2014. The parasitic model of L2 and L3 vocabulary acquisition: Evidence from naturalistic and experimental studies. Fórum Linguístico 11(3), 360-372.” for references.

4. Reports on the special lecture: Language Choices for Corporate Work in Non-English-Dominant Asia by Professor Ryuko Kubota, University of British Columbia (by Leah Gilner)

On December 16th, 2016, Prof. Ryuko Kubota of the University of British Columbia gave a presentation on the topic of language choices in globalized workplace scenarios. Prof. Kubota described an investigation into the role of English and other languages in international business settings and the kinds of competencies that workers associate with successful practices. Data was gathered through qualitative interviews with transnational Japanese company employees who had experience working in Asian countries, specifically, China, South Korea, or Thailand.

Findings revealed how individuals deploy and adapt their multilingual linguistic repertoires depending on local, situational demands. In the China and South Korea locations, for example, the Japanese language served as a shared vehicle of communication since most local employees could speak it. In the Thailand setting, though, local employees were more likely to use English than Japanese so English was generally used as the link language. Regardless of language choice, informants indicated that they prioritize meaning over form.
and recognize the importance of adapting linguistic encodings to suit who they are talking to, what they want to convey, and the pool of shared resources available to the participants. Responses also revealed that professional competence is more highly valued than linguistic abilities. Although, importantly, some knowledge of local languages seemed to be associated in the minds of the respondents with greater professional success.

These findings were discussed in light of the *dispositional dimension of communication* proposed by Prof. Kubota. This dimension encompasses a range of affective and attitudinal factors which appear to contribute to successful communicative outcomes such as willingness to communicate and accommodate, persistent and determined efforts to understand and be understood as well as signaling empathy and respect. The talk closed with a more general contextualization of the dispositional dimension within the entrepreneurial plurilingual habitus at play in border-crossing communication.

5. Reports on the 2nd EMI-ELF Workshop (by Tomokazu Ishikawa)

The 2nd EMI-ELF Workshop was held on February 25th, 2017 at Waseda University, organized by Prof. Kumiko Murata, Chair of the JACET ELF Special Interest Group, with the support of funding from Waseda University’s Institute for Advanced Studies in Education. This Workshop included:

1. A special talk given by Prof. Andy Kirkpatrick, Griffith University, entitled *EMI in Higher Education in East and Southeast Asia: Challenges and Proposals*.
2. A report on a survey on EMI at Waseda University given by Prof. Kumiko Murata, Waseda University; Prof. Masakazu Iino, Waseda University; Dr. Mayu Konakahara, Kanda University of International Studies and Dr. Noboru Toyoshima, Waseda University, entitled *ELF Experience in EMI and Business Settings: Changes of Attitudes towards ELF*.
3. Three individual presentations, all focusing on EMI in Japanese HE: 1) medical students’ perceived support needs (Dr. Sayaka Sugimoto, Juntendo University), 2) applied linguistics students’ English speaking anxiety and academic tasks (Prof. Tetsuo Harada and Shuhei Kudo, Waseda University), and 3) instructors’ perceived demands of training students as bilingual scholars in mathematics and science (Prof. Yasuyo Sawaki, Waseda University). The workshop ended with the panel discussion EMI practices from an ELF perspective, in which Prof. Kirkpatrick kindly served as a discussant.
The reports on Prof. Kirkpatrick’s and Prof. Murata’s talks are provided below.

(1) *EMI in higher education in East and Southeast Asia: Challenges and proposals:*

Special talk given by Professor Andy Kirkpatrick

Prof. Kirkpatrick explained how EMI in higher education (HE) was like the elephant in the classroom. He gave three examples as follows:

*Hong Kong:* More EMI courses in HE have been introduced to attract high-fee paying international students and improve university rankings. This, in turn, leads to the washback effect of providing more classes in English at secondary schools. Interestingly, the Education University of Hong Kong has a policy which encourages classroom code-switching and aims to graduate its students as “functional trilinguals” (i.e., Cantonese, Putonghua and English).

*Malaysia:* EMI was introduced for mathematics and science from Primary 1 in 2002, only to be abandoned after seven years, due to unsuccessful children from poorer and rural backgrounds and the shortage of content teachers with adequate English proficiency. This policy reversal created another problem: the monolingual Malays graduating from public universities were unemployable except in the civil service. Although Malaysia now provides more opportunities to learn science-related content through English in HE, no real national language policy exists, university-level policies are ambiguous, and stakeholders are not consulted.

*Myanmar:* In terms of official language policy, EMI is default in HE as well as for mathematics and science in the final two years of high school, despite the generally low proficiency level of both teachers and students. Apart from a number of suggestions for school education, Prof. Kirkpatrick argued that English and Burmese should be treated as complementary languages of education and scholarship, and that EMI must only be introduced within an ELF and multilingual framework.

Prof. Kirkpatrick concluded that EMI should be accompanied with a coherent language policy developed by all stakeholders and in view of multilingualism, sufficient English proficiency
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as well as ongoing language support for students and pre/in-service professional development for teachers, and appropriate materials. He also stressed the need to research how beneficial or inimical EMI would be in developing students’ English proficiency and/or content knowledge.

(2) ELF experience in EMI and business settings: Changes of attitudes towards ELF by Professor Kumiko Murata, Professor Masakazu Iino, Dr. Mayu Konakahara, and Dr. Noboru Toyoshima

The presenters reported the findings from questionnaires and interviews (conducted in 2016) targeting students in non-EMI faculties (N=197) and an EMI faculty (N=41) as well as business people who were recent graduates of the EMI faculty (N=25), from one university in Japan.

Students in both EMI and non-EMI faculties indicated a perceived lack of English proficiency among students and some instructors. In particular, those in the EMI faculty were not satisfied with some of their instructors’ use of English. Such being the case, students in both types of faculties experienced difficulty in comprehending lectures and/or acquiring profound knowledge, thereby feeling demotivated. The presenters called for more effort and research for ensuring the comprehension of targeted academic content.

Unlike students in the EMI faculty, those in non-EMI faculties tended to question the necessity of EMI since the vast majority of students and instructors were Japanese and the rest had Japanese proficiency. In turn, they most often perceived available EMI courses as an opportunity to improve their English. At the same time, their comments were generally concerned with the ability to communicate effectively, unlike the cohort surveyed in the previous year. This appeared to suggest a gradual change of students’ attitudes through more ELF experience in ever increasing EMI courses. This is a particularly interesting finding since most of the students in non-EMI classes were all Japanese. Furthermore, the presenters argued that more linguistic diversity among students and instructors should be introduced across EMI courses in order to promote content learning through ELF. This perspective was reinforced by the fact that students in the EMI faculty evaluated diversity in classmates’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds positively.

As might be expected, recent graduates of the EMI faculty reflected on their ELF experience in business and saw adherence to ENL norms as a real problem among their more senior colleagues. Respondents indicated that this adherence resulted in a lack of confidence
in using English as well as a hesitation to express themselves. It was reported that senior members often called upon these recent graduates to handle English-related matters. Their experiences may well be a valuable resource for students to learn about ELF.