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Abstract
As repeatedly pointed out recently, with the acceleration of globalization English is increasingly used by people from different lingua cultural backgrounds as a lingua franca (ELF) often as the only option in that specific interaction (Seidlhofer, 2011; Widdowson, 2013). After briefly introducing what is happening in the use of English, or rather ELF, the world over, this paper specifically focuses on the use of English in the Japanese context from both academic and business perspectives by introducing some findings from the author and her colleagues’ on-going research. The paper then discusses a discrepancy still often observed between the realities of language use and pedagogy. Finally, implications of the findings for language pedagogy are discussed.

Keywords: ELF, language policy, native-speakerism, language teaching, EMI

Introduction
It is increasingly recognised that English is currently used as a major lingua franca the world over, where people from different linguacultural backgrounds get together and carry on their daily business in academic, business, diplomatic and private spheres as the preceding contribution by Widdowson (this volume) and also Seidlhofer (2018a) clearly state. In a similar vein, the relationship of the globalizing world with English used as an international lingua franca was also pointed out in the past, for example, by Crystal (1997, 2003) and Graddol (1997, 2006) in their often quoted books and reports, and thereafter also frequently requoted by various linguistic, applied linguistic and English language teaching (ELT) scholars and practitioners or language policy makers and administrators alike in order to support their opinions about the spread of English, and as a consequence, the importance of the teaching of ‘English’ or ELT. Among these scholars are those whose focus is on the different contexts and purposes for which English is used as a lingua franca, ELF. That is to say, the majority of ELT practitioners and scholars, for example, refer to Crystal (1997, 2003) and Graddol (1997, 2006) in promoting ELT in the traditional English as a foreign language (EFL) context, thereby emphasizing the importance of introducing native English speaker (NES) models and norms. Whereas, although ELF scholars also often refer to these publications in order to describe the spread of ‘English’ the world over, the similarity ends there as they only refer to this in order to elaborate on the background of the extensive use of ‘English’ (or rather ELF), their real objective lying elsewhere. In other words, ELF scholars
refer to these publications, if they do at all, as part of a preliminary remark before introducing the reality of English use, namely, what kind of people are using it and in what ways, as their main aim is to describe the actual use of ELF on the basis of empirical data (see Seidlhofer 2001, 2004, 2018a) and to further point out the gap between what is happening in these actual contexts of use and what is taught and assessed in most of the EFL classrooms worldwide (see Jenkins 2009, 2014; Jenkins and Leung, 2015; Mauranen, 2012; McNamara, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011). So despite the fact that English is increasingly and overwhelmingly used among so-called non-native English speakers (NNESs) in their own communication, often not including NESs at all, EFL teaching is still conducted under the assumption that their students’ future interactions will be with NESs; and thus, as Seidlhofer (2018a) also very succinctly points out, they need to acquire NS competence to communicate with NESs. It is now well attested that the ratio of NES populations, compared to that of NNESs the world over is shrinking, the total of China and India’s populations alone reaching nearly 2.8 billion, which is more than one third of the world population. Thus, if we are to nurture students’ communicative ability in English to cope with this globalized world, we naturally need to investigate the realities of English use our students most likely to face in their future career or personal communication. This is the reality we also have to face and explore as ELT professionals. Accordingly, in this paper, I will, in line with the theoretical foundation laid by the preceding contribution by Widdowson (this volume) and the ELF related-research by the author and her colleagues, discuss the issue in relation to our local Japanese ELT context.

Before moving on to the exploration into the local context of ELF use, however, a brief theoretical background to ELF research is called for.

**Background to ELF Research: its theoretical underpinning**

The nature of ELF research, what ELF means and its implications for language teaching are still often misunderstood (see Seidlhofer, 2018a), and this also applies to the Japanese context, although the tendency is slowly changing being faced with the reality of globalization, and of course, thanks to the role the informed organization like JACET is playing, for example, by holding the summer seminar specifically dedicated to deepening understanding of the nature of ELF and its research, on which this paper is based.

In this section, I will clarify some of the misconception which is still widely subscribed to or observed in the local context of Japan. The misconception is largely based on the partial understanding or misunderstanding of the results of earlier research on ELF published in the first few years of the 21st century (see, for example, Jenkins, 2000, 2002; Seidlhofer, 2004), and clinging to it when ELF research and its conceptualization are rapidly evolving with very productive research by an increasing number of prominent ELF scholars. In its earlier empirical research, Jenkins’s lingua franca core (LFC) invoked a lot of discussion and interest, not only among ELF and world Englishes (WE) researchers but more so among scholars in the neighbouring linguistic and applied linguistic fields such as phonology and second language acquisition. However, the scholars from these fields tended to focus only on the ‘core’ features, but not necessarily on the main objectives of listing and discussing such features, either phonological (Jenkins, 2000, 2002) or lexico-grammatical (Seidlhofer, 2004). This tendency is often maintained particularly by those who do not regard themselves as ELF
MURATA, K. The realities of the use of English

scholars, their main research interest lying elsewhere, and also partly because not all the
scholars duly follow the development of ELF research thereafter. ELF being a relatively new
field of research and evolving constantly, the research field constantly requires attention to its
development. In a sense, this is a healthy academic process in that there always exist
constructive exchanges of opinions on the basis of which new perspectives are often
introduced, modifying earlier understandings or strengthening theoretical bases by
incorporating new findings and paradigms into the existing ones. Accordingly, if we are to use
Jenkins’s (2015) categorization of ELF research into three phases, it is progressing from the
earlier period of the dawn of ELF research, in which, in search of what ELF communication
looks like, characteristics of communicative features, including phonological, lexical,
grammatical or pragmatic ones are often listed or pointed out, one of which is Jenkins’s (2000,
2002) LFC. This period of ELF research is termed Phase 1 by Jenkins (2015).

If we are to keep using this categorization for a while, Phase 2 is characterised with the
development of the compilation of ELF corpora, such as VOICE (the Vienna Oxford
International Corpus of English) led by Barbara Seidlhofer, ELFA (ELF in Academic Settings)
and WrELFA (Written ELF in Academic Settings), both led by Anna Mauranen and ACE
(Asian Corpus of English) led by Andy Kirkpatrick (see Kirkpatrick, 2016; Mauranen, 2012;
Seidlhofer, 2011, 2018a). This has brought about fresh evidence of the use of ELF and the
nature of ELF communication, for example, the fluid, dynamic and accommodating nature of
its interactions. However, the development of ELF research, which foregrounds the
multilingual nature of ELF interaction, is not necessarily well understood, particularly by
scholars whose main interests lie in the fields outside ELF research. This is also partly
because this more recent research incorporates relatively newly established fields of
linguistics and applied linguistics as well as research methods and approaches closely
associated with them, such as corpus linguistics, pragmatics, discourse and conversation
analyses as well as ethnographic investigation, compared to well established, traditional fields
of linguistics, such as phonetics, syntax and semantics, or SLA and testing, for that matter, and
thus, are not necessarily largely subscribed to by linguists, applied linguists or language
teaching professionals. In particular, interdisciplinary perspectives, incorporating some of
these approaches in research, and furthermore, considering them from the perspectives of
language teaching and learning, are relatively unknown. Therefore, in addition to the fact that
ELF itself is a relatively new field of research, the fact that research methods and theoretical
frameworks it deploys are also relatively new and unfamiliar to EFL professionals further
exacerbates the understanding of the nature of ELF and its research. Consequently, quite
often even when the perspective of ELF is incorporated in linguistics and language-teaching
related research, it usually stays at the Phase 1 level, in particular, focusing on the
investigation into phonological and lexico-grammatical features, in which the original LFC
research was located. The classification of ELF research into Phases 1–3 is useful to
understand its current state and development, it however is not necessarily equally shared
with or appreciated even among established ELF scholars as clear demarcation between the
different phases is not necessarily possible, particularly in chronological order, as, depending
on the special interest of ELF researchers, the focus of their research varies. Furthermore,
quite a few ELF scholars point out that the multilingual nature of ELF was recognised from
the very beginning phase of ELF research (see, for example, Seidlhofer, 2009; Hülmbauer and Seidlhofer, 2013), not necessarily a special characteristic of Phase 3. At all events, it is the case that ELF scholars maintain that multilingualism is deeply and naturally ingrained in ELF communication, or according to how it is most recently conceived, the phenomenon of translanguaging. (see, for example, Cogo, 2016a, b, 2018; cf. Kohn, 2018; Wei, 2016, 2018).

On the other hand, it is also true that ELF research was, to a certain extent, misunderstood in the past by traditional scholars in the field of multilingualism as they quite often reacted against the nature of ELF and its spread, misunderstanding that it replaces other languages, particularly, minor or endangered ones, by promoting English and its related cultures (see, for example, Phillipson 1992, 2009). Even when they do not subscribe to this discourse, they are quite often ambivalent about ELF research, misconceiving its real objectives (see Seidlhofer, 2011; see also Murata, 2012 for more detailed discussion on this).

Another development of ELF research is that, although it started with the same questioning of the validity of NS norms as did scholars of world Englishes (WE), these areas of research are now clearly differentiated. WE research is seen as focusing more on investigating characteristics of English use in a specific speech community, thus searching characteristic features for different varieties of Englishes based on the traditional sociolinguistic research paradigm (Widdowson, 2016a). ELF research, on the other hand, is based more on investigating the dynamic interaction between people from different linguacultural backgrounds, thus the nature of investigation is more pragmatic (see Widdowson, 2016a for an explanation of this differentiation between the two, see also Jenkins, 2017; Seidlhofer, 2009, 2018a).

Among the ELF and ELF research-related issues discussed above, the most relevant for the purpose of the present paper, is the understanding of the nature of the ‘E’ of ELF in relation to English language teaching (ELT) or TESOL, which is still widely conducted within the paradigm of EFL, thus very much NS-norm oriented as discussed by Widdowson (this volume), as is English-medium instruction (EMI), which is now widely conducted in Japan as well as other parts of the world. (see Jenkins and Mauranen (eds.), forthcoming).

The nature of the ‘E’ in ELF and EMI

In Japanese academic contexts ELF is most likely to be used in EMI (English-medium instruction) contexts. However, to what extent stakeholders in EMI settings are aware of the need to give critical consideration to the nature of ‘E’ in this context, is still an unexplored territory. Before delving into the discussion on the ‘E’ of EMI, therefore, it is pertinent here to deepen our understanding of ELF, briefly reviewing some of its definitions. As discussed in the preceding section, in this globalized world English is more likely to be used as a lingua franca (ELF) than as a native language (ENL) as a ‘communicative means among people from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds in a range of international contexts’ (Seidlhofer, 2011, 2018a; Widdowson, 2013, this volume). This largely describes the characteristic nature of ELF as it is defined, for example, by Seidlhofer (2011) as ‘any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option’ (p.7, my emphasis), or by Widdowson (2013), ‘ELF is the communicative use of linguistic resources, by native as well as non-native speakers of English,
when no other shared means of communication are available or appropriate’. (p. 190, my emphasis). Overall then, we could define ELF as being used among ‘speakers from different first languages’, often when it is ‘the only option’. Although these are prototypical definitions of ELF, more recently ELF researchers are increasingly emphasizing the multilingual or/ and translingual nature of ELF as already briefly touched on in the preceding section (see, for example, Cogo, 2016a, b; Hülmbauer and Seidlhofer, 2013; Jenkins, 2015; see also Wei, 2016, 2018). It has recently also been revealed that people use ELF even when they have other options as seen, for example, in Pietikäinen’s works on ELF couples’ talks, where couples who have a few shared languages still resort to ELF as their communicative means (Pietikäinen, 2014, 2018). Or, by contrast, there are also research results which report that in some contexts, particularly in East Asian contexts, other languages rather than English are reported to be used more as lingua francas, depending on the local communicative situation (see, for example, Kubota 2016), when English is not ‘the only option’ as Seidlhofer (2011) clearly states the possibility in her definition.

More recently the fluid and transient nature of ELF communication (Cogo, 2016a, b, 2018; Pitzl, 2018) has also been more emphasized as also illustrated in Pitzl’s notion of transient international group (TIG) (Pitzl, 2016, 2018), whereas previously, ELF interaction was more often described in the paradigm of Community of Practice (CoP) (see, for example, Ehrenreich, 2009, 2011, 2018; Seidlhofer, 2011, 2018a; Smit, 2010, 2018). Both are, however, not exclusive to each other as some TIG situations could develop to CoP-type ELF communication, when participants in ELF interactions come to form such communities of practice.

**ELF Interactions in EMI settings**

Bearing all these recent developments in ELF research in mind, we will now explore the interrelatedness between ELF and EMI, particularly in the specific context of Japanese higher education. EMI was promoted and introduced in a large scale in the past decade in Japan, partly because of the government’s initiative in, for example, conducting such projects as the Global 30 and Top Global University Projects (MEXT (the Ministry of Education, Culture, Science, Sports and Technology) 2011, 2014), which encouraged the introduction of EMI education to attract more international students as well as to make Japanese students ‘global’ human resources by providing universities with special funding to make this happen, although there already existed some university courses and programmes run in EMI even prior to these projects (see Murata & Iino, 2018). This tendency, of course, is observed not only in Japan, but also, for example, in European and East Asian countries, which have also experienced or are experiencing a drastic increase of EMI programmes (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Jenkins, 2014; Kuteeva, 2018; Mauranen, 2012; Murata, 2018; Park, J-K, 2009, 2018; Smit, 2010, 2018; Wong, 2018). This was mainly motivated by the globalization of economy, which has promoted ELF use in a range of international contexts, not only academic, but also business, diplomatic, personal, and various workplace settings.

Under these circumstances, the use of ELF in academic contexts in Japan is most conspicuously observed in EMI settings, where international students and faculty learn and teach together with L1 Japanese teachers and students in English. One of the characteristics
of EMI courses and programmes in Japan is the fact that often the ratio of Japanese students and academic staff is quite high (see D’Angelo, 2018; Hino, 2018; Iino & Murata, 2016; Murata, Iino & Konakahara, 2017; Murata, Konakahara, Iino & Toyoshima, 2018; Murata & Iino, 2018). Accordingly, Japanese students tend to retain their familiar EFL mentality even when attending EMI programmes, particularly at the outset of the programme at university level. This is because they are usually educated to be good EFL learners at secondary level, where teaching is very much constrained by NS norms and correctness, particularly in coping with university entrance examinations. There is therefore already a gap between the actual use of English as a lingua franca in the EMI setting, which is one example of the use of English in the real world, and English taught as a foreign language in educational settings (see also Widdowson, this volume). The tendency is also applicable to business settings, where business people often find the smooth transition from EFL learners to ELF users in the real world challenging as we will explore later in this paper.

The discrepancy between the actual use of English in business settings and teaching in educational settings is persuasively illustrated in Otsu (2017), where she very appropriately compares these two typical situations, although the educational setting in her example is located in an in-house intensive English course for business people. The strength of Otsu’s research is, she investigates the same business people who received the intensive course in their actual overseas workplace settings, to which they were dispatched and conducted daily business, using English as a lingua franca. I will now briefly introduce one of Otsu’s examples in the academic setting, where an in-house intensive course teacher (NES) is teaching four business people before they are dispatched to their assigned destinations in South East Asia. In this specific example, the students and the teacher are exchanging information on what the students did over the weekend as a kind of warming-up activity at the beginning of the class:

(quoted from Otsu 2017:110, Extract 2)

C: Chris, (a British teacher of the in-house English training programme for Company X)
T: Tatsuro (a Japanese architect in the Design Department of Company X, but a learner in this specific context)

21 T: ahem (0.2) but I (0.7) couldn’t (0.4) make good i good score
22
23 C:→ ah I couldn’t (0.8) NOW [wha]
24 T: > [I ] couldn’t make it<
25 C:→ (0.3) yeah wha what’s the verb with score
26 (6.4)
27 C: the verb is to mmm a good sco[re]
28 T: [to ge]t?=
29 C: = GEt well done
30 C: (0.6) so you couldn’t get a good score
31 T: yeah (from Otsu 2017:110, Extract 2, my emphasis)
The above example clearly indicates how this teacher enthusiastically clings to teaching the ‘right’ collocation based on his own native English norm, sacrificing the natural flow of the exchange by trying to teach the student the correct verb which collocates with the word ‘score’. Only when the student gave the ‘right’ verb in line 28 after some trials, did the teacher respond to the student’s original statement in line 21 despite his having understood T (Tatsuro)’s communicative intention from the outset. This is a typical example of classroom student and teacher interaction, in this case, specifically that of repair sequences, where the teacher pays more attention to the ‘correct’ use of the language rather than the natural flow of conversation, focusing on the understanding of meaning. This example beautifully exemplifies what Widdowson (this volume) states in the preceding contribution as follows:

|______, the orthodox focus on teaching competence and the insistence on conformity have the effect of inhibiting the natural capability for learning and using language as a communicative resource (Widdowson, this volume, p.5) |

With the accumulation of such learning experiences, students often lose confidence in their ability to use English. This tendency is also detected in our investigation into the use of English in an EMI setting, where the current author and her colleagues conducted classroom observation, interviews and questionnaire surveys (see Iino and Murata, 2016; Murata and Iino, 2018; Murata, Iino and Konakahara, 2017, forthcoming; Murata, Konakahra, Iino and Toyoshima, 2018). The following two examples are from some of our earlier interview data, where the interviewees are voicing their experience in the EMI setting:

Example 1
I was __constraint__ed by NS norms. I was __ashamed__, comparing myself with NSs and returnees. I was sometimes too __ashamed__ to speak up because __I did not want to make mistakes__. (2-4F9)

Example 2
I sometimes __feel ashamed when I speak with NSs__, because the level of English is so different and I’m __not confident at all if my English is “correct”__. (2-4M13)

(see also Iino & Murata, 2013, 2016)

These students explicitly state how they are concerned about the correctness of their utterances to the extent that they hesitate to give opinions in case they made mistakes in their utterances. This can easily be assumed to have resulted from the accumulation of experiences in being repeatedly corrected in the process of learning in EFL classrooms as clearly shown in the Otsu’s (2017) example discussed above. The keywords which appear in the above-quoted interviewees’ utterances are ‘ashamed’, ‘not confident’, ‘make mistakes’ and ‘correctness’. The students feel ashamed, thinking that they might make mistakes and are not confident about the correctness of their utterances. Part of the reason for this is EFL education, in which ‘standard’ native speaker norms (SNSNs) are strictly and rigidly promoted and followed as also pointed out by Widdowson (this volume):
— it is this standardized, idealised version of the language that is taken to the E in TESOL, and teaching it involves getting learners to correctly or accurately conform to its rules (Widdowson, this volume, p.2).

That is, students are constrained by their earlier EFL learning experience, which is often knowledge-based or ‘ideal native speaker competence norm [-based]’ (Widdowson, this volume, p.5) and, on this basis, correctness-orientated. On the other hand, they are also affected in the process of socialization, which could also include the influence from the media with the enhancement of the hidden assumption about the supremacy of SNSNs, to which we now turn.

**Consolidation of standard native speaker norms (SNSNs) in the media and students’ voices**

The media often subliminally influence the viewers' formulation of native speakerism. For example, a series of TV commercials for a language school repeatedly advertise the advantage of studying there by emphasising that students would be taught by native speakers, who are described to have the ‘right’ English, which students aspire to achieve. The advertisements overemphasize, for example, a student’s (an actor's) ‘deficient’ pronunciation by comparing it with that of a native speaker’s, the caption on the screen stating that

Native’s “Either this” is difficult

Here a student character (actor) is described as having difficulty producing native-like /ɒ/ sound, repeating it many times after a native English-speaking (NES) teacher, who repeatedly corrects her pronunciation, where the above caption appears on the screen.

Or similar firm belief in SNSNs often subconsciously appears in newspaper reports as seen in the following one on synthesizing native-like pronunciation in intercultural communication for the sake of communicative efficiency:

**[English]Native-like Pronunciation**
- NTT succeeds in synthesizing sound using AI -

NTT has developed a technique to convert Japanese English to native-like one. — This will enable those Japanese who are not good at English pronunciation to communicate more fluently.

*(The Nikkei, p.11, 7 Aug. 2017, my translation and emphasis)*

**発音ネーテイブらしく**

*英語で NTT, 音声合成にAI

NTT は日本人の英語をネーテイブに近い発音に変換する技術を開発した。—英語の発音が苦手な日本人でも、円滑なコミュニケーションを取りやすくなる。

（日本経済新聞、p.11、2017年8月7日、強調筆者）

Reading this report, a question arises as to whether ‘native-like pronunciation’ makes
speakers more ‘fluent communicators’ in the globalized world, where people from various
inguacultural backgrounds communicate with each other, using English as a lingua franca
(ELF). Here, it is worthwhile to consider what is meant by ‘communicative capability
(capacity)’ (Seidlhofer, 2011; Widdowson, 2003, 2008, 2013, 2016b) not communicative
‘competence’, which is, according to Widdowson (2008, this volume), ‘native-speaker-norm
based’.

The above newspaper report continues as follows:

If English spoken by non-Japanese could also be converted to native-like
pronunciation with this new technology, it could be utilized, for example, at conferences,
where people from diverse regions and countries get together.

(The Nikkei, p.11, 7 Aug. 2017, my translation and emphasis)
新技術で日本人以外が話す英語もネーテイブに近い英語に変換できれば、様々な国や
地域の人が参加する会議などに利用できる。

The international conferences quoted above could be a typical example of ELF
communication situations with people from diverse linguacultural backgrounds exchanging
opinions. However, the hidden assumption here is that it would be difficult for the participants
to understand non-native English, that is, ELF speakers’ pronunciation, but, that this new
technology might be able to convert interactants’ diverse pronunciations to ‘native-like’ one in
the future, making understanding and communication easier.

Thus, the assumption here is that interactants on both sides can readily understand native
speaker (or native-like) pronunciation, thus non-native or not-native like pronunciation should
be ‘converted to the ‘native-like’ one to make communication easier. This hidden assumption
reflects EFL practices and belief in educational settings, where ‘standard’ native-speaker
norms (SNSNs) are rigorously taught and pursued despite the fact that what is meant by
‘native speaker (NS)’ is also becoming increasingly blurred (Davies, 1991, 2011). Here,
scientists are reported to be inventing this kind of technology, believing that it will contribute
to the betterment and efficiency of international communication, but without realizing it is
simultaneously disregarding the diversity of communicators. Or on the basis of just
superficially interpreting and understanding the meaning of diversity, they might have
believed that reducing the degree of diversity in pronunciation by converting it to unified
‘standard’ native speaker (or native speaker–like) one would make communication smoother.
Thus, these scientists are prioritizing a communicative efficiency over diversity under the
assumption that the efficiency derives from the conformity to SNSNs. This is ironic in that the
technology is invented or being invented to cope with the diversifying world as a result of its
appreciation and promotion. In coping with the challenging issue arising from it, however, the
scientists have chosen to eradicate one aspect of diversity, that is, language. There is no
concern for speakers’ identity in this line of argument or solution. Is this a futuristic scenario,
where everybody conducts their communication in a robot-like manner in a unified way for
the sake of ‘communicative efficiency’, ignoring the fact that this efficiency crucially depends
on recognizing diversity?

The same tendency was also observed in a more recent news report, in which, in fact, a robot called Musio is described to be assessing high school students’ pronunciation in an interactive manner. The report, which discusses the introduction of technology into education (called Edtech), illustrates a scene in a high school classroom as follows:

When students talk to it [Musio] in English, it replies to them

in native-like natural English conversation.

(The Nikkei, 14 May 2018, p.15, my translation and emphasis)

生徒が英語で話しかけると、ネーテイブ同様の自然な英会話を
返してくれる。

(日本経済新聞、p.15, 2018年5月14日、筆者強調)

Here again, it is appreciatively reported that the advanced technology reproduces native-like natural English conversation (pronunciation), combining IT (information technology) and AI (artificial intelligence), where native-like conversation is described as natural. However, what is meant by natural here is debatable, as in actual communication in the globalized world where students’ future communication is most likely to take place, it would be very rare for them to communicate being immersed in this ‘idealized’, ‘standard’ (Seidlhofer, 2018a, b; Widdowson, this volume) ‘native’ speaker pronunciation.

In sum, the above-discussed TV commercials and newspaper reports could influence viewers/ readers at a subconscious level, and their accumulated influence could also lead to the enhancement of the hidden SNSN-based assumption. Because of the assumed or taken-for-granted ‘E’ as that of NESs’ as often observed in the ELT/ EFL contexts, students often simultaneously suffer from the feelings of inadequacy and an inferiority complex, comparing their performance with that of NESs or near-NESs, or they try to make utmost effort to make their English sound like NESs’, as seen in the following students’ voices from our questionnaire survey (see Murata, Iino and Konakahara, 2017) and interview (see also Iino & Murata, 2016):

**Examples of students’ voices**

Example 3: from the author and her colleagues’ questionnaire survey

Native speakers’ English is correct and thus I can imitate their way of speaking as well as pronunciation.

「英語母語者の英語は正確で、話し方や発音などを真似することができる」


and from an interview:

Example 4: from our interview data

Most of other students are returnees and international students, so I feel ashamed of

my jun-Japa English pronunciation, that is, Japanese English. (1M2)
These results of the investigation into the media discourse and students’ voices indicate that there is a hidden SNSN-based curriculum and also deep-seated and pervasive native-speakerism in society at policy, practice, and individual users’ levels. Students’ voices also often reveal that they are directly and indirectly influenced by ELT practices at secondary and tertiary levels, EMI-receiving students and EMI-educated business people not being an exception. They are often constrained by the notion of correctness, which often makes them hesitant to actively give opinions and participate in discussion. That is, they are mostly educated on the basis of competence-based teaching, which aims at the achievement of NS or NS-like ability, but not capability-based one, which accommodates ELF interaction, where interactants put utmost importance on the negotiation of meaning and understanding the other party’s communicative intention, but not necessarily on whether their English is ‘correct’ or not on the basis of NES norms (Seidlhofer, 2011, 2018a; Widdowson, 2003, 2012, this volume).

On the other hand, a bright side of the picture is that there are also ELF-oriented students, particularly among those who have actually experienced ELF communication with people from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds either in EMI programmes or in their study abroad experiences. They often show appreciation of diversity and intercultural awareness as the following example from the responses to our 2016 questionnaires indicates (see also Murata, Konakahara, Iino and Toyoshima, 2018):

Example 5
It is interesting to be exposed to diverse English because my classmates are from various countries and regions as well as from various educational and family backgrounds.
みんな様々な国や地域から来ており、またこれまでの教育環境や育ってきた環境も様々なため、多様な英語に触れることができ、面白い。
(2016, Q5-EMI_P19-SILS-U4-JP(jpn)- 海外滞在 (Yes)- 学校 (Yes) )

The above example illustrates the respondent’s awareness of the benefits of exposure to linguistic and cultural diversity. This tendency was also observed in the results of questionnaires administered to business people, who are mainly graduates of the EMI programme at the same school. The results showed the business people’s awareness of the necessity for exposure to linguistic diversity on the basis of their experience in conducting business with people from diverse linguacultural backgrounds as stated in the following example:

Example 6
[I need to] improve [my] ability to listen to not only American English but also varieties of English. […]
It is also necessary to train [myself] to communicate in English with Asian people. (Q9: BP8-20-U-JP(jpn)-C(F)-BT(N-N/A)-BS(N-N/A)-SA(Y-SE1y))

(see also Konakahara, Murata, and Iino 2017, p.140)

As can be seen in the above examples, necessity for the exposure to more diverse English is often explicitly stated by business people through their experience in actual use of English in business settings, and on its basis they also often point out the importance of and necessity for more exposure to linguistic diversity while at university.

As to actual examples of the use of ELF in business settings (BELF), another example from Otsu (2017), this time from a workplace setting, also demonstrates the extent to which the actual use of English in the real workplace setting is different from a classroom reality as follows:

An example of language use in a workplace setting (from Otsu 2017)

T: Tatsuro (a Japanese architect in the Singapore office of Company X,
A: Ahmad (a Malaysian hotel employee)
1 T: an(d) (0.3) is he taking a holiday?
2 A: ° takin[g holiday°]
3 T:→ [Sunday? ] only Sunday? how about Saturday?
4 A:→ every day he working
5 T: hhh. every day?=
6 A: =EVERY day he working

(from Otsu 2017:112, Extract 3)

Here, the same Tatsuro, who, in the preceding example in a classroom setting, couldn’t engage in a natural sequence of conversation with his instructor, having constantly been interrupted and corrected until he formulated the ‘correct’ version of his question, engages in a meaningful conversation with a Malaysian hotel employee, each of them requesting clarification where necessary to engage in information exchanges as well as enjoying their conversation itself, while T is being driven to his worksite by the Malaysian employee. Their exchanges are marked with ‘irregular’ use of language from a SNSN perspective, but from the viewpoint of the nature of conversation sequence, show a very natural development and contrast well with the one in a classroom setting, which was ‘correct’ from a SNSN-based lexico-grammatical point of view, but pragmatically showed a very unnatural development particularly from a real world conversation exchange perspective. This clearly exemplifies what Widdowson (this volume) states in the preceding contribution as follows:
When learners leave the confines of the classroom, they find that occasions arise when they can put their learning to actual practical use, can expediently exploit the language they know as a communicative resource – in many cases the very language that when they produced it as learners would have been marked as deficient. (Widdowson, this volume, p.5)

The above example of the business people communicating, deploying available linguistic resources, thus shows how communicative effectiveness in real world conversation is very different from the correctness-based classroom reality as Seidlhoder (2018a), introducing the results of empirical research on ELF during the period of 2000 to 2010, also clearly states in the following:

— communicative effectiveness clearly does not depend on conforming to correctness or the norms of usage of native speakers. (Seidlhofer, 2018a, p.13)

The disparity between the correctness-based classroom reality in educational settings and the real world context of use is often pointed out by business people, an example of which can be seen in a business person’s opinion in the following questionnaire result:

(from the 2016 questionnaire data, see also Konakahara, Murata and Iino, 2017; Murata, Konakahara, Iino and Toyoshima, 2018)

Example 8:

[...]

Although clients from Southeast Asia speak English that sounds like non-native – grammar is obviously wrong –, [we] don’t have any problems in communication because their message is conveyed among us.

「 [...] 東南アジアの国だと英語が母国語でないのが分かる英語（文法が明らかに間違っているなど）をよく見聞きしますが、コミュニケーションを取るもの同士で内容が伝わっているので全く問題ありません。[…]」

(Q6: BP14-20-U-JP(jpn)-C(J)-BT(N-N/A)-BS(N-N/A)-SA(Y-US4.5y,CA1y))

(from Konakahara, Murata & Iino 2017, pp.138–9)

Although the above respondent is still subconsciously constrained by a SNSN to a certain extent as the inserted part, ‘grammar is obviously wrong’ (文法が明らかに間違っている) indicates, overall, s/he is more concerned about communicative efficacy than grammatical correctness and appreciates her/his interactants' communicative ability.

The similar tendency is often observed in business people’s attitudes. While these business people are very appreciative of linguistic diversity and communicative ability of their business partners, they often simultaneously and subconsciously show deep-seated native-speakerism, which often characterises their past SNSN-based EFL learning experience.

Thus, although business people’s awareness is gradually changing, it takes time and great effort to eradicate their deep-seated unconscious assumption about SNSN-based correctness.
This tendency is also observed and enhanced at academic institution level. We can, for example, still find the extent to which stakeholders in the Japanese higher education context still tend to cling to native-speakerism for various reasons, to which we shall now turn.

**Reiterations of the traditional NS-based value at policy level and the gap between shifting students’ attitudes**

Reiterations of the traditional NS-based value at policy level are seen, in particular, in the field of English teacher recruitment. It is not difficult to find classified ads still explicitly stating that one of the requirements for the post is that an applicant should be a native speaker of English (NSE). The examples of advertisements listed below were posted in the mailing list of a large English language teachers’ organization in Japan:

Classified Ad. Example 1 – advertised on 25 August 2017
Title of the message: Call for a full-time five-year contract position at A
2. Field: English education
5. Applicants must:
(3) be a native or near native speaker of English
(4) be able to participate in administrative duties in Japanese

Classified Ad. Example 2 – advertised on 23 August 2017
JOB OPENING at B University
2. No. of positions: 1 native English speaker with an MA in TESOL, TEFL, TESL, applied linguistics or language-teaching related area

These two examples clearly state that the posts are open for a ‘native or near native speaker of English’ and for a ‘native English speaker’ respectively. They are not exceptions, but many universities still put up the similar types of advertisements. This tendency has resulted from the above-discussed orientation towards SNSN-based teaching, and for that matter, testing. The logic goes, if you cling to SNSN-based teaching, and as a consequence, testing, then, NES teachers are in great demand, - although not all of them are speakers of ‘standard’ English as this is an ‘idealized’ construct (see Seidlhofer 2018b, Widdowson, this volume) - ; thus, why not recruiting NESs? Certain changes, however, also seem to be slowly taking place as can be seen in the following example:

Classified Ad. Example 3 – advertised on 12 May 2017
Job opening for Full-time Contract Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor at Z University
4) Other Qualified applicants need English abilities for teaching and research supervision as well as Japanese abilities for daily duties.

Despite these changes, there still remains strong native-speakerism in the academia due to the wide-spread SNSN-based teaching, while things are also slowly changing at the level of students who have experienced EMI programmes/ courses. It is revealed that they often
utilise available linguistic resources to achieve effective communication. For example, we have found in our classroom recorded data that some students in EMI programmes/courses are communicating effectively in ELF, using linguistic resources available, deploying linguistic diversity and also using Japanese as a lingua franca strategically (see Murata, Iino and Konakahara, forthcoming). Young business people’s interview data has also revealed their awareness of the diversity as one of the business people states, reflecting on her experience in the EMI programme:

Example 9:
Through my experience of study in Italy, I started to recognize other varieties of English [i.e., Italian English] and think that English does not necessarily mean American and British.

「イタリアに留学して、あ、こういう英語もあるんだって思って、別になんか、アメリカとかイギリスとかだけが英語じゃないんだって思うようになりました。」

(GI-BP4-F-JC-EL)

Although the above respondent specifically refers to the importance of recognizing varieties of Englishes on the basis of her folk understanding of WE, not clinging to the unified SNSNs, what she really means here is a revelation she had through her experience in communicating in ELF. Thus, it is clear from both students and business people’s voices that more exposure to diversity heightens the awareness of the importance of understanding the real nature of communication in the globalized world. As extensively discussed in the preceding contribution by Widdowson (this volume), awareness of the nature of the ‘E’ in the EMI programme is essential to understand the real use of English as a lingua franca in EMI classes. It has also been revealed that those who are exposed to diversity in their communication deepen their intercultural awareness, although it has simultaneously been revealed that native-speakerism is deep-seated at the core part of the business people’s mind even some years after their SNSN-based (most probably) formal education. This implicates that ELF-informed education is essential from an early stage, to which we shall now turn.

Concluding remarks and pedagogical implications
The results of the existing ELF research clearly indicate that a paradigm shift from SNSN-based correctness-oriented native-speakerism to more ELF-informed and -oriented practice and policy-making at individual, institutional and governmental levels are essential. Furthermore, it is also effective to provide students with opportunities to actually use English in ELF environments in their educational settings as it enables them to meet and study together with international students and faculty from diverse linguacultural backgrounds. The experience will make them deepen their understanding of diversity and simultaneously give them opportunities to communicate with students and teachers from diverse linguacultural backgrounds, using English as a lingua franca, constantly negotiating meaning to successfully communicate with each other. Only by experiencing such diverse communication, do they realise the importance, difficulty and joy of communicating across cultures.

As Widdowson (this volume) aptly states in the preceding contribution, in the light of
globalisation and subsequent changes in the world order, changes are also taking place at both governmental and policy levels; however, to understand the extent to which these are still firmly based on a SNSN-based teaching perspective, but not a learners’ one, and to act upon it on the basis of understanding are also great challenges for us JACET members to tackle in years to come.
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**Notes**

1World Population http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/ accessed 15 June 2018

2The symbol 2-4F9 stands for, 2 - the 2nd interview group, 4 – a 4th year student, F – female, 9 – the interviewee’s number. The system applies to other interview examples unless stated otherwise.

3The symbol Q6-CE:SilS30-M2-CN(chi)-Y_JP2 after the colon represents the following information in this order: 1) school the informant belongs to, 2) the number of the specific informant, 3) female or male and her/his year 4) her/his nationality (using country codes), 5) her/his first language (using the first three letters; but using “jpn” for Japanese), 6) whether s/he has experienced stay abroad (i.e., Y for yes and N for no), 7) where s/he stayed (using country codes), and 8) how long s/he stayed there.
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