



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

„Ready for ELF?
Possible implications of ELF research findings for
Austrian grammar schools”

Verfasser

Paul Artner

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magister der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2013

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 190 344 350

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

UF Englisch, UF Italienisch

Betreuerin:

Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Seidlhofer

Acknowledgements

At the beginning of my thesis I would like to thank all the people who made my studies an unforgettable experience for me.

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Seidlhofer who offered her continuous advice and encouragement throughout the course of this thesis. I thank her for the valuable support and her time to make this thesis possible. Moreover, I want to thank her for her inspiring work which offered a completely new perspective on English language teaching to me.

I would like to express my thanks to Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Rosita Schjerve-Rindler for the systematic guidance in the course of a very interesting and stimulating seminar as well as for the great effort she thereby put into training me in the scientific field.

Furthermore, I want to thank my friends and colleagues for the help and support, the fun time, their care and precious friendship during the course of my studies. Special thanks go to Silvia for the hours in the library spent together discussing thesis related problems and sorrows.

My very grateful thanks go to my aunts Gerti and Jutta as well as to my uncle and godfather Toni and to Reini for their parent-like support, unconditional friendship, generous care, the fun and the home feeling whenever I was in need during my time in Vienna. Especially warm-hearted thanks go to my aunt Marianne for sharing her flat with me for the last three years and for the great time we spent together.

Finally, I take this opportunity to express the profound gratitude from my deep heart to my family, especially to my beloved parents, grandparents, late great-grandmother, my sister Johanna and my brothers Florian and Xaver for their love and continuous support – both spiritually and materially. I would not be where I am today without your help and support.

Table of contents

Introduction	1
1. The situation of English	4
1.1. The ownership of English	5
1.2. Nativeness in ELT	6
1.2.1. The non-native teacher	8
1.2.2. The students' perspective	11
1.3. The phenomenon of ELF	13
1.3.1. Critique of ELF implications for ELT	16
1.3.2. Challenges to ELF	19
2. ELF in the classroom	21
2.1. Underlying assumptions of an ELF-informed pedagogy	21
2.2. Successful ELF communication and its implications for ELT	25
3. Research findings	28
3.1. Pronunciation	29
3.1.1. Results	30
3.1.2. The LFC for Austrian learners of English	33
3.1.3. ELF pronunciation in ELT	34
3.2. Lexicogrammar	38
3.3. Pragmatics	40
3.4. Code-switching	44
3.5. Culture in the ELF classroom	46
3.6. Testing and assessment	49
4. Research methodology	52
4.1. Category system	57
5. Context	58

6. Analysis of the curriculum	62
6.1. General aspects concerning the curriculum	62
6.2. Reference to scientific research in the curriculum	63
6.3. Didactic aspects of the curriculum	64
6.4. Structure: Content, topics, and possible realisations	67
6.5. Goals in the Austrian curriculum	68
6.6. The learners' role in the curriculum	71
6.7. Demands of the Austrian curriculum	72
6.8. Testing and assessment in the Austrian curriculum	72
7. Discussion of the results	74
7.1. The focus of the curriculum	74
7.2. Parallels and differences between ELF research findings and the Austrian curriculum	79
7.3. The role of ELF in the Austrian curriculum	83
7.4. Taking specific research findings into consideration	87
7.5. Outlook on further developments	95
Conclusion	100
Bibliography	
Appendix	
Intrinsische Curriculumevaluation according to Haenisch	
Complete analysis of the curriculum in German	
Complete analysis of the curriculum in English	
Abstract	
Deutsche Zusammenfassung	
Curriculum vitae	

List of abbreviations

BELF	English as a lingua franca in business settings
CEFR	Common European framework of reference for languages
CLT	Communicative language teaching
EFL	English as a foreign language
EIL	English as an international language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELT	English language teaching
ENL	English as a native language
ESL	English as a second language
GA	General American
L1	First language
L2	Second language
LFC	Lingua franca core
NS	Native speaker
NNS	Non-native speaker
RP	Received pronunciation
SLA	Second language acquisition
SLUB	Strategic language use behaviour

Introduction

Just as it was once claimed that women should speak like men to succeed in business, Black children should learn to speak like White children, and working-class children should learn the elaborated language of the middle class, so L2 users are commonly seen as failed native speakers. (Cook 1999: 195)

The quotation by Cook gives a broad insight into the idea of this paper. In fact, it refers to the common belief that learners of a language should speak as if they were native speakers of this language. In the course of this investigation it will be seen that this is exactly how a lot of Austrians, including parents, students and teachers, think about this issue. This was also the way the author thought about it in the first place. The consequence of this mindset was that the outlook of becoming a teacher of English was always connected to a feeling of failure.

To me it seemed that a university degree in English is still not enough for society to accept a non-native speaker (NNS) teacher as a competent person to teach this language. By and large, I accepted this idea and thought that it is necessary to learn to live with it. However, during my studies I encountered research into English as a lingua franca (ELF) which is very prominent at the department of English and American studies in Vienna due to Professor Seidlhofer's work.

The investigation into ELF, the use of English among speakers of various first language backgrounds (Seidlhofer 2011: 7), offers alternative perspectives. In fact, it sees every user of the language as equally legitimate (Jenkins 2002: 85). In this sense no one is regarded as a failed speaker due to her or his first language. Instead, the focus is on the ability to communicate successfully. As languages depend on intelligibility (Alptekin 2007: 267), it seems that ELF grasps this defining general aspect of the concept of language.

Thus, the basic idea of this field of research seemed very appealing. In looking for a topic for my diploma thesis I read a lot of texts about specific investigations of ELF and at results they offer. This provoked very interesting considerations. In fact, it became clear to me that the very deeply ingrained idea of a native speaker (NS) competence is not even desirable for the most prominent use of English nowadays.

Further examination of research findings revealed that most of the users do not speak English primarily with native speakers. Consequently, learners in their future lives will not do so either. It was surprising then that very specific findings from research into this use of the language are already available. In more detail, there are features, typical of ELF communication, which were found to be commonly used by speakers from various lingua-

cultural backgrounds. Interestingly enough, even if those features deviate from NS norms, they still work perfectly well for making oneself understood.

Thus, fascination for this area of research grew and it came to my mind that these results have to be considered in teaching. In fact, as it is imagined that most learners will or do already use the language primarily with speakers from various first languages (L1s), the overt presentation of those regularly found features was imagined to be able to facilitate English language learning.

As a future teacher I have the wish to equip learners in the best way for their future lives as English speakers. Therefore, after reading various studies dealing with the phenomenon of ELF, the question arose as to how this great amount of new and useful information can be taken into consideration. Looking out for answers it was found that there are already a lot of ideas of how those findings can inform teaching practices, even if there is no complete ELF syllabus.

Thus, it seemed to me that ELF can relatively easily be included in classrooms. However, possible problems came to my mind when I started thinking about restrictions. In fact, a teacher has to consider the curriculum in deciding what can and what cannot be part of language teaching in one's country and/ or school type. In more detail, the question I asked myself was if it will be possible to include ideas of research into ELF in actual English language teaching in Austria. Hence, in order to get an answer to this question the idea of investigating curricula came to my mind.

As not all of the curricula can be looked at in one paper, the curriculum of grammar schools will be analysed as a first example. The reasons why this school type is chosen are provided in the course of this thesis. Due to the considerations presented above, the research question with which this document is approached is: "To what extent can findings from research into ELF be included in language classrooms in Austrian grammar schools?"

In order to deal with this topic there are some issues that need to be discussed first. To begin with, the arguments which lead to the idea of this project have yet only been presented in terms of personal considerations based on a variety of texts. In order to scientifically argue for the necessity of a change in the perspective of English, a look at the situation of the language as a communicative means in the world is needed. As will be seen, the function of English as an international language has a lot of consequences for its users which necessitates a changed perspective on English language teaching (ELT).

Secondly, if research findings should be respected, the question that comes up is which results are available and could be included in teaching. Further questions in this context

are why those findings are useful, how they can be presented to learners and how English language teaching in general needs to be seen if the lingua franca function of the language is taken into account. The second chapter thus looks at the assumptions of an ELF-oriented pedagogy, whereas the third part reviews which research findings may be most relevant to language classrooms.

After a theoretical argumentation of reasons and the presentation of relevant findings, the question comes up as to which results can inform ELT. Considerations above showed that in order to deal with this question an investigation of the curriculum is needed. However, this cannot be done arbitrarily. Therefore, Chapter 4 presents the research methodology employed for this endeavour. Before the results obtained from this analysis will be presented in Chapter 6, a short introduction to the linguistic situation of Austria in general as well as to the Austrian school system will be given.

The discussion can finally be found in the last part of this thesis. There, the ‘raw data’ from the curriculum analysis will be reviewed in order to answer the overall research question presented above. Thus, to find possible answers there will be a closer look at the underlying approach of the Austrian curriculum as well as at parallels and differences between the general assumptions of ELF research and those underlying the curriculum.

This is followed by a discussion of which role ELF might generally play in grammar schools in Austria. In more detail, there will then be an attempt to find ways and possibilities to take specific findings into consideration. In sum, in the discussion theoretical considerations will be related to the ‘raw data’ of the analysis in order to see which results can already play a role and which aspects have to be ignored according to the curriculum.

Therefore, in the end it will hopefully be possible to see if, how and to what extent the implications of ELF can inform teaching practices in Austrian grammar schools. However, in order to understand why this may be desirable, the basic assumption is that there is an urgent need to change the way we regard and teach the English language. This is the overall topic of the first chapter.

1. The situation of English

The purpose of this thesis is to show if and to what extent research findings from research into English as a lingua franca can inform English language classrooms in Austria. Without prior knowledge one might think that the endeavour of this project is not valuable at all. However, considering the role of English as an international means of communication it becomes clear that the language is strongly affected by this function.

Therefore, the first chapter investigates the role of English in the world and the consequences this role brings about. As will be seen, the use of English as the global lingua franca changes the language itself. This change has clear implications for the speakers, learners and teachers of the language and a reconceptualisation taking account of those implications is therefore necessary. The linguistic concept of ELF, as follows, is able to take these implications into account. Hence, the first chapter offers background information which argues for a different approach to ELT as well as explains why ELF can be seen as a useful alternative to existing perceptions of English.

To begin with it will prove beneficial to have a look at the emergence of English as an international language (EIL). In this context one finds that English is closely linked to globalisation. In fact, social and economic developments brought about a need for a common means of communication (Alptekin 2002: 60). This argument is further elaborated by other authors who show that globalisation lead to a more interconnected world causing an interrelation between local, regional, and global contexts (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 303). Moreover, the exchange of culture and people grew immensely, which was only possible due to the fact that a common contact language was available (ibid.). Thus, English took over this function and became the global lingua franca. Consequently, ELF can be seen as the facilitator and as an inherent part of globalisation (ibid.).

A rather recent worldwide development that might be seen as another factor which helped English in affirming its role as **the** international language can be found in the new media. The networks created a global community and, as Seidlhofer (2011: 85f.) reports, this community “[...] can no longer be defined in terms of territory and this network is in need of a lingua franca.”

The relationship between ELF and globalisation is therefore very strong. However, the lingua franca function of English challenges traditional views of languages. In fact, it suggests that the focus should rather be on “English as a fluid, flexible, contingent, hybrid and deeply intercultural” language (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 284). Such a viewpoint has

consequences for the speakers of the language, whether native or not. Therefore, the next sections focus on some of the consequences for the users of English.

1.1 The ownership of English

“For the first time in the history of the English language” (Jenkins 2000: 1), people who speak English as a native language (ENL) are in the minority, that is, they are “a minority in the English-using world” (Leung 2005: 133). Prodromou (2003: 82) talks about 300 million speakers of English for whom it is not the first language. This fact, as recognized by others (e.g. Widdowson 1994 & Seidlhofer 2001), also entails that more and more communication in English takes place without the presence of native speakers (Jenkins 2000: 1). Thus, English is nowadays mostly used as an international language (Jenkins 2000: 74).

Important to note then is that, “[...] once the language goes global, it necessarily loses its domestic L1 status” (Widdowson 2003: 158). That is, the spread of the English language brings with it “a transfer of ownership” (Seidlhofer 2011: 67). One could state it as provocatively as Widdowson (2003: 43) does in the following:

How English develops in the world is no business whatever of native speakers in England, the United States, or anywhere else. They have no say in the matter, no right to intervene or pass judgement. They are irrelevant. The very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it.

As Widdowson (2003: 42) shows, “English, like any other vital language, is continually being renewed and altered to suit its surroundings”. Bearing in mind the fact that English nowadays is used more often by users who do not have it as their L1, it has to be stated that those speakers are similarly taking part in this process of constant “renewing and altering”. The surroundings to be suited, however, seem to be different as they are global in their nature, and no longer bound to a nation state.

Therefore:

It is becoming increasingly apparent that real communicative behaviour ought to be redefined in relation to the reality of English as an International Language, entailing not only the uses of English that are real for its native speakers in English-speaking countries, but also the uses of English that are real for its nonnative speakers in communities served by languages other than English. (Alptekin 2002: 61)

Thus a redefinition of English as used in international contexts will be needed and will follow in the last section of this chapter. Before that, however, it is necessary to look at the consequences the transfer of ownership has for ELT.

To begin with, a first consequence has to be the acceptance of the fact that people who regard themselves as competent users of English change the language and consequently have authority over it (Higgins 2003: 617). The owners of the language become those who use it effectively and, as was found, the users of English are by far more people who do not have it as their L1. This acknowledgement will consequently affect English language teaching.

In fact, in this context appropriate attention needs to be given to the primary reason for which English is learned nowadays, that is, to equip learners with a language which enables them to communicate with people from various other first languages (Jenkins 2000: 11). What is more, the focus should no longer be on the ability to be understood by native speakers alone. Instead, one should pay attention to the perspective of the listener who, in most cases, does not come from an ENL background (ibid. 69).

For ELT this implies that attention should be paid to second language (L2) use of English rather than to ENL realisations. Therefore, we find ourselves confronted with the necessity to reconceptualise the language itself as well as the way it is taught. However, this is not a simple endeavour as traditional language teaching is very strongly focused on a native speaker idealisation. What this entails is the topic of the following subchapter.

1.2 Nativeness in ELT

In the last section it was found that anyone who uses the language effectively can be seen as an “owner” of it. However, traditionally L1 users are seen as the owners of a language. In this sense the concept of native speaker is problematic. Therefore, it becomes necessary to define the “native speaker” and see what this concept means in the light of the current function of English.

Referring to the literature one finds that a distinctive element of this concept is that “[...] [a person is a native] speaker of the language learnt first” (Cook 1999: 187). Elaborating on this basic meaning, Cook goes on to state that L2 students cannot be turned into native speakers, as it is impossible to change this “biodevelopmental” fact (ibid.).

Furthermore, Pölzl (2003: 4) demonstrates that “[i]t would indeed seem out of place if ELF users tried to pretend to be English and to belong to a particular ‘national’ English speaking culture when they obviously do not”. Hence, drawing on Cook’s definition, we have to accept that once one has a native language, that is, once one acquired a language, the possibility of becoming a native speaker of another language does no longer exist, neither is it necessary or adequate to do so.

As straightforward as this simple and basic element of the concept might be research into SLA is often concerned with specifics of the relation between the L2 learner and the native speaker (Cook 1999: 189). A native speaker competence still is the ultimate goal of ELT (Jenkins 2012: 491) and interactions with NS seem to be the preferred option whereas, the opposite situation, the more common ELF encounter, is ignored (Firth & Wagner 2003: 184). However, taking into account the uniqueness of a native language in one human mind, we cannot assume that adding another language will result in a second native language.

In not respecting this fact, as well as the fact that effective users of the language have the same authority over it as native speakers, the discipline loses track of reality (ibid. 184). Thus, it becomes clear that SLA theories need to change in order to account for the function ELF fulfils. Lang (2003: 211) in a similar vein says that “[...] a broader, context-sensitive, participant sensitive, generally sociolinguistic orientation might prove beneficial for SLA research”.

In fact, adhering to a native speaker model has severe consequences, i.e. that students as well as teachers “see L2 learning as a battle that they are fated never to win” (Cook 1999: 204) and that “L2 learners’ battle to become native speakers is lost before it has begun” (ibid.). This point is also raised in the citation at the beginning of the introduction.

Additionally, Cook (1999: 196f.) states that “[o]nly if the native speaker is the sole arbiter of language, can L2 learners be seen as failures for revealing the social groups to which they belong”. Instead, he proposes the following:

In contrast to *native speaker*, the term *L2 user* refers to someone who is using an L2. The L2 user is further distinguished from the *L2 learner*, who is still in the process of learning the L2. The point at which an L2 learner becomes an L2 user may be debatable because of the difficulty in defining the final state of L2 learning; moreover, some learners are regularly users whenever they step outside the classroom. (Cook 1999: 187f)

The alternative we are given now is to refer to the competent NNS as L2 user, thus avoiding to declare the former as “failed” native speaker and granting her or him the right to be a competent speaker of the language even if she or he is still learning it. Seeing L2 users in their own right acknowledges their “multicompetent minds”, which, knowing two languages, are qualitatively different from those of monolingual native speakers (Cook 1999: 191).

Clearly, multicompetent people differ from monolinguals in many ways. L2 users are different kinds of people. Not just monolingual native speakers who happen to know another language. The native speaker-based goal of language teaching cannot be achieved in part because the students, for better or for worse, do not remain unchanged by their new languages. (Cook 1999: 194)

Hence, a first step made is to recognise the unique case of the L2 user/ learner, which cannot be compared to the native speaker for more than one reason. As was found, nativeness is something unique in each person and cannot be reproduced in another language. What is more, a monolingual native speaker cannot be compared to a speaker of more than one language. Cook (1999: 196) summarises this as follows: “The logical consequence of the arguments raised above is that language teaching should place more emphasis on the student as a potential and actual L2 user and be less concerned with the monolingual native speaker”. Thus, these arguments prove the hypothesis that a rethinking of concepts in ELT is needed, especially in the light of English being more often used by non-native speakers.

This need even becomes stronger regarding the situation of the NNS teacher. It is obvious that being measured against NS norms may be especially problematic for them. Therefore, the following section focuses on the role of this rather special NNS and looks at the consequences the international role of English has for them.

1.2.1 The non-native teacher

English teachers nowadays find themselves in a position in which they are teaching an international language no longer belonging to any one nation or culture (McKay 2002: 118). Hence, the recognition of the lingua franca function of English will prove especially beneficial for this group (Seidlhofer 2001: 134f.). The reason for this is that the majority of English teachers worldwide, and Austria might most probably be no exception, do not have English as their first language (Seidlhofer 2001: 134f.). Thus, the role of the non-native teacher in this discussion seems to be rather special and needs particular treatment. As will be seen, the L2 teacher might even be the better choice for students, however, only if the role of ELF will be taken into consideration.

In fact, the adherence to the belief that English is still the property of its native speakers is very frustrating for NNS teachers. As Jenkins states: “The perpetuation of the native/ non-native dichotomy causes negative perceptions and self-perceptions of ‘non-native’ teachers and a lack of confidence in and of ‘non-native’ theory builders” (Jenkins 2000: 9). Although this might seem obvious, it appears to be important to briefly state what the problem of the NNS teacher is. As Seidlhofer (1999) shows, the foreignness of teachers who are NNS is seen as something defective. The native teacher on the other hand is assumed to be inherently and undisputedly a better teacher than the NNS (Cook 1999: 200).

A reason for teachers' belief in NS as the benchmark for ELT can clearly be traced in ELT literature (Jenkins 2007: 58). In fact, Jenkins found that the ideology of the native speaker as the role model is very prominent in ELT publications (ibid.). This prominence can be seen as the main argument which convinces teachers of the "superiority" of NS English. Consequently, NS of English are seen as experts in the language and in teaching it (ibid.).

This perception of NNS teachers is a big issue among teachers of English in Austria as well. In fact, the findings of a study with 100 participants carried out in 1996 revealed that this self-image is very prominent. As Seidlhofer (1999: 241) reports, 57% stated that being a non-native speaker made the teachers feel insecure, whereas only 27% reported that this fact makes them feel confident.

In fact, if we have a look at studies dealing with teachers' attitudes we find more evidence for this argument. Research reports that NNS view L1 accents negatively (Jenkins 2007: 89) and that NNS teachers believe in the primacy of NS English as well as they feel the need to approximate it (ibid. 203). They are still convinced of the supremacy of a NS accent, whereas they consider a NNS accent as bad (ibid. 217). Those who were not unhappy about their L1 accent in English still show a strong desire for an NS English accent (ibid. 212). In sum, all of Jenkins' participants believe that NS accents are superior to NNS accents (ibid. 221). Thus, we see how deeply ingrained the NS ideology in teachers' minds is.

Hence, constant exposure to NS ideology seems to have left a trace in NNS English teachers' minds. If being a perfect teacher is always measured against a level which cannot be achieved, the self-image of the NNS teacher cannot be positive. However, if we view the non-native speaker as a competent user, the self-perception might change for the better. Adopting an ELF perspective, the idea of foreignness becomes something positive and does no longer play down "[an] important element of their professional identity" (Seidlhofer 1999: 241). Seidlhofer (ibid. 235) explains this positive aspect in the following way:

Non-native EFL teachers are *double agents*. They are at home with the language(s) and culture(s) they share with their students, but they also know the relevant terrain inhabited by the target language, be that a certain use of ESP/EAP, EIL or maybe English as spoken by native speakers in their communities. This makes non-native teachers uniquely suited to be agents facilitating learning by mediating between the different languages and cultures through appropriate pedagogy.

In fact, NNS teachers can also be seen in a completely different light, that is, not only as competent users but also as the real experts when it comes to ELT. Reasons therefore are various, as for example, they may be privileged in that they share the same culture with their students. That is, they know what their students are going through during their learning process as they experienced language learning from the same starting position (Jenkins 2000:

219 & Seidlhofer 2001: 134f.). This is a clear advantage NNS teachers have over NS teachers. In addition, a NNS teacher is at least bilingual, which does not have to be the case with a NS teacher (Jenkins 2000: 219).

As Seidlhofer (1999: 236) puts it:

It is precisely with respect to such different traditions that non-native teachers can be *double agents* in the positive sense of the term: as insiders of the culture in which they teach, they are in a position to exploit materials and methods in a way which is meaningful in their setting and enhances their students' learning.

This finding might be especially relevant to our context, as we suspect that most Austrian teachers do not have English as their L1. Neither does the majority of the students have it as their first language, thus, they may, especially in rural areas, share the same language and largely the same culture with their students.

In this sense, one could even go so far as to say that the bilingual teacher can offer students a model of a good language learner “relevant to their own social and cultural experiences [that no] language teacher from another culture can ever provide” (McKay 2002: 45). However, this is not how teachers perceive themselves. On the contrary, sharing a culture and a language with their students often determines the insecurity of teachers as English speakers (Seidlhofer 1999: 241).

Therefore, “[o]nly when the native speaker fallacy is put aside can a full exploration of such strengths of bilingual teachers be undertaken” (McKay 2002: 44). Furthermore, if English is taught as a foreign language, the NNS teacher is more competent than the NS “who has no experience of English as a foreign language” (Widdowson 2003: 156) and it seems that it is high time to make teachers aware of this fact.

There are more reasons why a NNS teacher should be favoured. One of them is that students might prefer a reachable model instead of a NS model which might overwhelm or discourage them (Cook 1999: 200). Another reason is that native speaker intuition is no longer an advantage for the students as they are most probably going to use the language in international settings where NS/ENL intuition is not an advantage (Jenkins 2000: 220). Last but not least, it seems to be impossible to have NS teachers of English all over the world given the number needed (Kachru 2003: 21). Thus, NNS teachers have a number of advantages over NS teachers, especially in contexts where they share the same first language and the same culture.

Obviously, what seems to be needed is a reconceptualisation of English to such an extent that teachers can see the advantages of their role as “double agents”. In fact, it appears to be up to the teacher to rethink their perception of English and at the same time their self-

image as ELT professionals. Not doing so, would mean to ignore recent findings in linguistics and this goes against the idea of the teaching profession (Carter & McCarthy 2003: 85).

Although, it still appears to be a long way to go, as English in ELT is still almost exclusively referred to in terms of NNS norms (Seidlhofer 2001: 135), teachers are moving away from the native speaker ideology faster than their students (Timmis 2002: 248). Therefore, if a change in the perception of English is desired, and its need was proved, we have to regard another factor.

Although this is slowly changing, teachers are still largely concerned with the traditional notion of the standard. However, they are not the only ones who will need to change their minds. In fact, Timmis (2002: 249) talks about two dilemmas for teachers:

While it is clearly inappropriate to foist native speaker norms on students who neither want nor need them, it is scarcely more appropriate to offer students a target which manifestly does not meet their aspirations. [...] In that case, how far is it our right or responsibility to politically re-educate our students? When does awareness-raising become proselytizing?

Hence, the teacher has not the sole say in ELT and, as will be seen in the empirical part, they have a lot of issues to bear in mind. Additionally, the students' choice seems to play a crucial role in this discussion. In fact, even though the assumption that accounting for ELF in ELT is not an aspiration can definitely not be accepted, the quotation clearly shows that learners may still strive for a native speaker model. However, as was found, this is neither necessary, nor achievable. Therefore, the next section will deal with the perspective of the students and the implications ELF has for them.

1.2.2 The students' perspective

We found that the acknowledgement of the role of ELF is beneficial for its users and its teachers. It became clear that teachers slowly recognise this fact; however, regarding the dilemma mentioned in the last paragraph, we have to ask whether the students are aware of the role of ELF too. Moreover, it will be necessary to consider what they want to learn.

The current situation is that students achieve a level which enables them to communicate effectively in international settings (Widdowson 2003: 113). In addition, they do not generally try to become members of native speaker communities (ibid.). Thus, if we accept this goal as the purpose for learning English for most of the students, it demonstrates clearly that a rethinking of English away from ENL norms is valuable and even necessary.

As Widdowson stated, and Prodromou (2003: 84) argues similarly, students will mostly take part in ELF situations rather than in ENL encounters. However, one cannot deny that there might still be people who learn the language in order to become members of a “native speaker” community (ibid.). Thus, this purpose cannot simply be ignored and the possible wish to approximate a NS competence has to be respected.

Therefore, we must not forget about one important aspect in this discussion, namely the students’ preference. Indeed, as Jenkins (2007: 21) states, “ELF is a matter of choice”. So, if we want to have a look at which research findings could be integrated, the question of what learners would choose arises (Jenkins 2002: 101). As this question was raised and is important in ELF we will briefly discuss findings of research into learners’ attitudes towards English.

Critics sometimes raise the issue that learners want to strive for the native speaker model (Cook 1999: 196). Indeed, this is also found in relatively recent studies (Timmis 2002: 248). Interestingly enough, this is not only true of those who expect to use English for communication with NS, but also for those who are well aware that they will need English mostly in order to be able to communicate internationally (ibid.).

Furthermore, the native speaker norm is particularly the desired model when it comes to pronunciation and grammar (ibid. 244). Reading through these results, one may get disillusioned and may give up the whole endeavour of thinking about changing the way English is taught in schools. However, it was found that nativeness as a target is not adequate. Moreover, these are not the only findings one comes across.

Kormos, Kiddle, and Csizér present a different attitude among learners. As those three researcher come from motivation research they investigated what motivates students to learn English. They came up with the emergence of a new language-learning goal which they call “international posture” (Kormos, Kiddle & Csizér 2001: 496). They explain this concept in the following way: “International posture describes the students’ intention to use English as a lingua franca and communicate with other people in the world.” (ibid. 510)

Thus, we now encounter that students at least to some point are aware of the changed situation of the English language in the world. In fact:

[...] [T]he most important learning goal of the surveyed students was related to the status of English as a lingua franca, and the wish to use English as a means of international communication had a strong direct relationship with students’ future self-guides. (ibid. 513)

Interestingly enough, for secondary school students this motivating factor was stronger than for any other group investigated (ibid. 513). Hence, the picture that students are still completely focused on NS norms does not seem to be completely true, especially for the

group focused on in this paper. Having found both students who recognise the advantage of learning English as an international language and those who still strive for NNS norms, we are now left with the question what this means for the context of Austria.

Because of the fact that ELF is a matter of choice, we have to look at the learner as a reflective person who should have a say in the question of what she or he wants and/or needs to learn (Belcher 2006: 137). Indeed, this can be a solution and would foster the students' ability to critically reflect the situation of English in the world (ibid.). Of course, this cannot mean that students decide for themselves what they are going to learn as will be seen in the last part of this paper.

Still, students should be involved in the design of the course and should be able to bring in their beliefs of what they will need (Prodromou 2003a: 88). According to the findings of this "collective needs analysis", "a selection has to be made from the infinite possibilities of modern English" (ibid.). Therefore, teachers should give students a say in what will be presented and also have to do so as will be seen in the analysis of the curriculum.

What research into ELF suggests for this matter is to put students into a position to be able "to make an informed choice" (Jenkins 2007: 22). In more detail, it is necessary to confront them with the sociolinguistic, sociopsychological, and sociopolitical reality of English in the world (ibid.). Even though Jenkins talks about adults and university students in this context, international posture is a goal also mentioned by learners in schools as was seen above. Therefore, this kind of awareness raising needs to take place in school classrooms as well.

We found how the changed situation of English in the world influences the role of its speakers, teachers and learners. Consequently, we can once more state that a reconceptualisation of English is necessary as students, as well as teachers are slowly becoming aware of the changed situation of English in the world. How this new situation can be described linguistically and what this means for the language will be seen in the next subchapter. As will become clear, by introducing the concept of ELF, it is possible to take into account the issues raised in these first sections.

1.3 The phenomenon of ELF

The last few subchapters showed that English has changed considerably. Beginning with the ownership of the language we found that the situation of English as a global language in

today's world brought with it the necessity to rethink the concepts of learner, speaker, and teacher. Consequently there is a need to change teaching practices too. Considering all of these changed concepts, one may now ask if there is a broader term that helps to deal with this changed situation of English and its implications.

We find an answer to this question in the concept of English as a lingua franca. In order to see what this research area can do for our specific purpose and how it encompasses the developments described in the last few subchapters some of the major developments in the field are going to be presented. However, one has to be aware of the fact that not all the issues related to ELF can be touched upon as it is a much researched field at the moment. Therefore, we will restrict ourselves mainly to issues relevant to teaching.

To begin with, the terms ELF, EIL, and English as a global language have already been mentioned relatively often in the last sections. Looking for a definition of ELF one finds that English as an international language (EIL) can be seen as a synonym for ELF (Jenkins 2007: xi). Thus, a large part of what has been discussed so far can already be seen as part of research into ELF. Still, to find a general definition of ELF does not seem to be as straightforward as one might expect it to be.

However, in trying to find a basic meaning one can imagine “[...] ELF as *any use of English among speakers of different languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option*” (Seidlhofer 2011: 7 – italics in the original). Additionally, Jenkins (2007: 1) states that ELF is a very hybrid contact language for speakers of different L1s. Another important issue is that it is “far removed from its native speakers’ linguacultural norms and identities” as Seidlhofer (2001: 133f.) shows. In sum, we can say that ELF is hybrid, used as a medium of choice or as the only option by speakers of different languages and is removed from native speakers’ lingua-cultural norms and identities.

Therefore, we can now come back to the discussion of ownership we had and refer to English in the world as a common property of speakers of many different first languages who make use of it. Thus, ELF accounts for this new situation of English in the world.

To summarize, then, ELF is the preferred term for a relatively new manifestation of English which is very different in concept from both English as a Second Language (ESL)—the label frequently given to outer circle Englishes, and English as a Foreign Language (EFL)—the traditional, if to a great extent anachronistic, label for English in the expanding circle. Unlike ESL varieties, it is not primarily a local or contact language *within* national groups but *between* them. And unlike EFL, whose goal is in reality ENL (English as a Native Language), it is not primarily a language of communication between its NSs and NNSs, but among its NNSs. (Jenkins 2007: 4)

Why this definition fits perfectly for our purpose becomes clear with reference to the discussion in the preceding subchapters. As one can see, in the sense Seidlhofer and Jenkins understand the phenomenon it not only takes account of the changed ownership of English, but it also refers to the independence of NNS as users of English. Thus, the definition given in the last two paragraphs seems to be an adequate response to the issues raised in the first sections of this paper.

Nonetheless, there are other issues concerning research into ELF which cannot be left out. First of all, it appears to be utterly important to mention that it is a descriptive field of research (Seidlhofer 2011: 152). Secondly, one could have the impression that ELF ignores native speakers completely; however, this impression is misleading. On the contrary, referring to Seidlhofer's basic definition, any user of English can be an ELF user. Thus, native speakers are also ELF speakers in encounters with speakers of other languages where English is the medium of choice or the only option. In ELF research settings however, it should be avoided that NS outnumber NNS (Jenkins 2007: 2f.).

Nonetheless, ELF may still be seen as a threat to NS use of the language. However, it is important to bear in mind that thinking about English as a language that is rooted in "a particular territory" seems to be the most important cause for problems of this kind (Seidlhofer 2011: 83). Indeed, as was stated above, the idea of nation-states with distinctive languages is no longer valid for English. Therefore, we have to state clearly that ELF is not a threat to ENL but should be seen as something that complements it (Seidlhofer 2001: 145).

In order to be able to follow this line of argument, however, one has to accept that English as realised by those who use it as an L1 "is just *one* kind of reality" (Seidlhofer 2001: 138) and indeed one that does not seem to be extraordinary relevant to those who use it as a lingua franca (ibid.). "It is almost too obvious to point out that ELF is a natural language, not an attempt at linguistic engineering [...] and is certainly not the result of a sort of plot" (Cogo 2012: 103). Thus, ELF must not be seen as an enemy of ENL, but as something which tries to capture the most common use of the language worldwide.

[...] [I]t is the actual vitality [...], as evidenced from its widespread and continuing use, that makes it autonomous, separate from native speaker English, and [...] a phenomenon in its own right, with its own status as an international means of communication (Seidlhofer 2011: 171).

This conception of the phenomenon is also beneficial for its native speakers as it might prevent the feeling that their L1 is something "abused" by users worldwide, employing distinctive and diverse features of realisations (Seidlhofer 2001: 151f.). In conclusion to this

debate Seidlhofer (2004: 229) summarises the advantages of an ELF perspective in the following way:

[...] [I]t may be worth emphasising some important social and psychological advantages that a proper conceptualization of ELF is bound to have for the actual speakers involved. For ENL, and ENL speakers, the option of distinguishing ELF from ENL is likely to be beneficial in that it leaves varieties of native English intact for all the functions that only a first language can perform and as a target for learning in circumstance where ENL is deemed appropriate, as well as providing the option of code-switching between ENL and ELF. This takes pressure off a monolithic concept of English pulled in different directions by divergent demands and unrealistic expectations, a state of affairs frustrating for speakers of both ENL and ELF.

Therefore, the biggest advantage of separating ENL from ELF can be seen in the fact that it solves the native – non-native speaker dichotomy for learners, teachers and speakers, as discussed in the beginning. Due to this fact it is stated again that ELF seems to be the appropriate way in order to take the global role of English into consideration. How results from research into ELF can inform teaching practices as well as the ways in which this can be done will be discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. Before that, it is important to note that even if it was shown that ELF recognises the most common use of English, there is still some critique of it. For a complete discussion of the concept this cannot be ignored.

1.3.1 Critique of ELF implications for ELT

As the changed situation of English in the world was discussed, it was found that ELF is adequate for the reconceptualisation of English as used in a globalised world. However, as one can imagine, there is also resistance against the concept. Thus, the following section will provide a short overview of the main points of critique.

An interesting aspect to begin with is that, in criticising ELF, researchers who otherwise do not necessarily conform with each others' ideas, seem to have become somehow united (Jenkins 2007: 16). Their critique is that ELF research investigates a deficient variety of the English language (ibid.). Thus, we can say that one point of critique is that ELF does not constitute a legitimate 'variety' for those researchers.

What can be understood by 'deficient variety' in this context remains rather unclear, however, there are voices specifying their critique. A more concrete point of criticism is that "[a]n ELF description would inevitably result in a qualitatively and quantitatively reduced version of ENL [...]" (Kuo 2006: 216). Kuo goes on to state that ELF is primarily focused on intelligibility and does not take account of competences such as reading and writing (ibid.).

The conclusion she draws is that ELF is not able to replace native speaker based descriptions for ELT (ibid.).

In response to that, one may ask how Kuo knows that ELF is not able to be part of ELT. Moreover, it is necessary to bear in mind that ELF has to be seen as a descriptive field of research which does not prescribe content but rather seeks to complement existing practices. What is more, if ELF was a ‘deficient variety’, it would be one that works perfectly well for its users as will be seen in the course of this thesis. Furthermore, research into ELF is far from being at a point where one could say it has terminated, rather it seems we are only facing the first momentum of it.

Consequently, it has to be accepted that there are areas in which ELF research may up to now not be able to provide a lot of findings. One of those aspects mentioned by Kuo is writing. True, ELF research, as it focuses primarily on spoken communication, has hardly anything to offer about formal writing (Sowden 2011: 95). However, it is not the case that no research in this area has been done; on the contrary, writing seems to be a rather particular case.

Since ELF is very much concerned with mutual intelligibility, writing obviously for the sake of it, adheres pretty much to native speaker norms (Seidlhofer 2004: 223). A possible reason for this fact might be that in written communication the possibility for reciprocal negotiation, as it is a distinctive feature of spoken discourse (see Chapter 2), is not given (Seidlhofer 2004: 223). Thus, since ELF seems to be a rather recent phenomenon, it might be the case that the written domain yet has not been much altered by the users of English who do not have it as their L1.

Moreover, for the context of Austria, speaking can be said as an important starting point for the introduction of ELF implications in teaching. The reason for this is that companies demand that students should be better prepared for oral communication (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 59). Still, one could say that there is a need for further research into this domain.

Other aspects of language where ELF is said to be lacking results are literacy, register, style, aesthetic concerns, and social functions such as self representation (i.e.: self-image, self-identity and personal voice) (Kuo 2006: 215). This assumed lack of research might only be true to some extent, as, at least for attitudes towards ELF, Jenkins’ 2007 monograph offers a lot of results. In addition, Pölzl (2005) provides interesting insights into this field. Nonetheless, ELF researchers themselves state that “[t]here are still some major gaps [...]” especially in domains which appear to change more slowly (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011:

309). Although the authors refer to writing and testing here (ibid.), one might also say that registers, styles, aesthetic concerns, literacy and social functions also belong to this category.

Furthermore, Sowden (2011: 93f.) goes on to claim that if there was a possibility for students and teachers to choose between institutions that take account of ELF and others teaching NS norms they would generally decide to attend schools with a focus on NS norms. He goes even so far as trying to argue that the “better” or more competent teachers and students would strive for NS norms, whereas the rest would “learn ELF” (ibid.). Here it seems that Sowden talks about a pure ELF syllabus which, as will be seen, is not available, nor can be expected. Still, Quirk (2003: 15) argues in a similar vein by saying that “[...] all the students know perfectly well that [...] their command of Standard English is likely to increase their freedom and their career prospects”.

The critique Sowden and Quirk express here is rather harsh and based on misconceptions as was seen, however, we can also say that it is not really justified. In fact, as far as known up to now, no institution has yet included ELF findings (Seidlhofer 2001: 140). Thus, it would be necessary to prove this argument. What is more, one issue for ELF in teaching settings is that it is about students’ choice as was seen. Even if this may be oversimplified, in order to have a choice, it is necessary to, at least, make students aware of the phenomenon ELF.

In other words, if people will not be informed about what ELF means, for what it stands and what it tries to describe, people might never accept it, let alone strive for it. Thus, it seems that what is needed is a chance, that is, students should be able to have an informed choice. In fact, learners already do recognise that they will communicate in ELF settings rather than using English with NS, as was seen. However, if researchers criticise the alternatives before they have even seen them, an objective informed choice might not even be given a chance.

Nonetheless, it might be the case that critique as raised by Quirk, Sowden and Kuo helps at least in making ELF more prominent. In fact, the discussion of it shows that it is an issue which is worth arguing about. Another form of critique, namely just ignoring it as a whole would be even worse for the discussion of ELF and possible implications for teaching (Jenkins 2007: 32).

Finally, a risk that is mentioned with regard to ELF is that due to the hybrid character the possible danger arising is that “many different and autonomous Englishes” (Widdowson 2003: 53) may appear and stop it from being able to function as a means of international communication. However, “[t]he key point is that since the very *raison d’être* of ELF is to

mediate meaning to establish common understanding, this will quite naturally regulate diversity in the interest of intelligibility” (Seidlhofer 2011: 196). Therefore, ELF is not likely to split into mutually unintelligible varieties.

Still, we saw that critique is at least to some point justified due to outstanding research findings in some linguistic fields and domains. Therefore, we will now briefly look at what research into ELF has to deal with in the near future.

1.3.2 Challenges to ELF

What will be seen throughout Chapters 2 and 3 is that research into ELF is very vital and that it has come up with a lot of interesting findings. Still, a recurring issue will be that for certain aspects there are yet few results. Thus, research into ELF cannot be seen as completed. Moreover, the mindset of researchers such as Kuo, Quirk and Sowden will have to change for ELF to be given a chance to be able to inform ELT practices. This section will therefore give a brief overview of which issues ELF in general will have to face in the near future.

First and foremost, the task of ELF will be to argue that its existence has implications for ELT. As was found, this is an issue important for students and teachers. In connection to that, ELF is in need of a higher prestige, because otherwise it might never inform ELT (Jenkins 2007: 231). In fact, teachers are concerned with teaching good language (Ur 2010: 90). However, if ELF is still regarded as a ‘deficient variety’ the consequences of its existence will never inform pedagogic practices. Still, its implications might facilitate the learning of ‘good’ language (in the sense of enabling successful communication), as will be seen, Therefore, if the important function of ELF will not be recognised in the educational field it might never become part of curricula and consequently never lead to a change in the perception of English.

The findings presented in Chapters 2 and 3, however, clearly point to the fact that ELF is already used and that certain regularities help in employing English as an international language. Thus, to ignore those findings means to ignore theoretical work in the subject which is taught. However, the teacher has to include findings from theory (Widdowson 1999: 29) and findings of research in linguistics should provide points of reference for the way the language is taught (ibid. 74).

Consequently, ignoring research findings will clearly be a violation of one of the maxims of the teaching profession. Therefore, teachers will have to take account of the most commonly used realisation of English with its inherent variation. In order to facilitate this task

for English language teaching professionals, teacher education also needs to take ELF into consideration (Jenkins 2012: 492). Hence, in addition to awareness among the general population, institutional awareness is an issue ELF has to cope with.

A first step towards the recognition of ELF would be to regard English as a special case when it comes to language teaching in general. However, the opposite is predominant. English is still seen as the prototypical L2 to be learned (Jenkins 2007: 239). However, due to the lingua franca function, it cannot be equated with any other language that is currently taught (Seidlhofer 2005b: 27). Therefore, it will be necessary to recognise the international role of English and pay respect to its function as a lingua franca in the curricula.

However, this might not be as easy as it sounds, and, as we found, this means that a lot of work will need to be done. First of all, it will be necessary to further investigate the phenomenon of ELF and its characteristics in order to be able to argue for its unique status and independence of ENL.

Further research into the characteristics of ELF is needed. Thus, this will be one of the most pressing problems of ELF research in the near future. Finally, as was mentioned above, acceptance must be created and this will involve a lot of work in order to inform L1 and L2 users, as well as institutions, about the advantages of ELF. This is also a big issue for the context of Austria, as will be seen in the last chapter.

2. ELF in the classroom

In the last chapter we learned that the role of English in the world has changed unprecedentedly due to its function as a lingua franca. Native speakers are by now no longer the most numerous users of the English language and as a language changes according to its functions, this change needs to be reflected in the way we regard its users and the language itself.

Consequently, the teaching of English cannot remain unaffected by these changes. Thus, rethinking the concept of the language we also have to reconsider the ways we teach it (Seidlhofer 2011: 193). Hence, it is time to have a closer look at how ELF can inform ELT practices. However, it has to be clear that there is no complete description of ELF and no complete syllabus has been elaborated (Jenkins 2007: 22). Indeed, due to the fact that ELF is a hybrid contact language this is very unlikely to ever be available.

Nonetheless, it is suspected that there are aspects which might inform ELT. To begin with, however, we need to briefly review how research into ELF regards the concept of “language” in general, how successful ELF communication works, and which implications and consequences these insights might have for English language teaching. Therefore, the following section considers what might lie at the heart of an ELF-informed pedagogy.

2.1 Underlying assumptions of an ELF-informed pedagogy

Bearing in mind the discussion in the first chapter about L1 and L2 users of English, it is important to state that ELF users function communicatively competently without adhering to ENL norms (Seidlhofer 2011: 109).

However, as was briefly mentioned in Chapter 1, the independence of the L2 user is not recognised in current SLA research. On the contrary, by and large the native speaker remains the benchmark (Cook 1999: 190f & Seidlhofer 2001: 140) even for English. It is clear that such a view cannot be part of an ELF-informed pedagogy. Instead, every ELF speaker, independent of his or her L1, needs to be seen as an equally legitimate speaker of English (Jenkins 2002: 85).

Rather than measuring learners against ENL norms, they should be measured against what they can do with the language and against how they communicate in English (Seidlhofer 2011: 187). Thus, an English language classroom which takes ELF into account has to be

competence, or capability as we will refer to it, oriented, that is, it should look at what the learner can do, not at what she or he cannot do with regard to ENL norms. In doing so, learners will be liberated from the feeling of being failed native speakers (Cook 1999: 200). Another consequence of such an approach will be a positive view of the students' achievements, rather than the common focus on their deficiencies. Therefore, competence/capability in this context is seen as a neutral term (Cook 1999: 190), describing what the speaker is able to do and what linguistic knowledge he or she possesses.

After establishing capability orientation as a basic principle of an ELF-oriented approach to teaching, there is another aspect regarding the learners' knowledge that needs to be discussed. In fact, speaking in terms of conventional thinking about ELT, a central question for an ELF-informed pedagogy is which variety should be the point of reference or should be "known" by the learners (Leung 2005: 128).

As should be clear by now, no native speaker variety can function as a necessary and realistic target for ELF. This is also due to the fact that particular ENL features, in being identity markers, are not acceptable worldwide (Ur 2010: 88). On the other hand, models in which the language is stripped down¹ lexically, syntactically and morphologically, may be too reduced and might therefore not be useful for the communicative processes for which an international language is needed (Sewell 2012: 6). One could say that we find ourselves in a deadlock now, unless one reconsiders the notion of language as we are used to it.

With regard to the discussion about the influence of globalisation in Chapter 1 it can be said that dealing with English as an international language, we are facing a concept that needs to be deconstructed (Seidlhofer 2001: 135). In connection with ELF therefore it is most important to accept the "variability (even instability) of human language" (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 306). Viewing language as something hybrid helps understanding the character of ELF, however, it leaves us in a problematic situation when it comes to teaching.

Due to its online variability ELF on its own cannot be considered a "variety" in the traditional sense (Jenkins 2012: 490) and can thus not be taught as such. Instead ELF can be seen as "a set of practices" (Seidlhofer 2011: 87) and its speakers as forming part of "communities of practice" (ibid. 87f.) rather than speech communities.

Therefore, one might ask whether an ELF perspective means that there is no clear idea of what is taught. Still, as ELF is learner focused, a clear reference point can be found in the goals of the students; that is, what they need and want to achieve informs the content of teaching.

¹ For a further discussion see also Seidlhofer 2011 Chapter 7

ELF is about awareness and choice—making students aware of different ways of speaking English, of language variability and change—and about offering choice to them, i.e. they can choose to speak like native speakers when and if they want to, but they may want to speak² ELF and in certain situations, this may even be more appropriate. (Cogo 2012: 104)

Indeed, a sound examination of the learners' projected needs for English in the future with respect to their own lingua-cultural background should determine the learning goals (McKay 2002: 41). This means that bearing in mind the students' L1 in terms of discourse, conventions, interactional styles, etc. (Seidlhofer 2011: 111), we have to imagine future situations in which they will need English. As this might be not so easy for a group of students with probably very different future needs, a very broad definition of those needs will be necessary. Still, ELF will definitely be an issue for most, if not all, of them. In this sense, thinking about the future English speaking selves of the students, alongside with what they want to learn and achieve, will help the teacher to make decisions about what to include in actual teaching.

What learners should achieve anyway is the “best level of English they can, with a thorough mastery of the forms and meaning of English that are currently used [...]” (Ur 2010: 87). This mastery of English cannot be restricted to L1 users, but what should be aimed at is “the fully-competent ELF user” (ibid.). For the purpose of this paper this is understood as being able to use English successfully in various settings and encounters. This can consequently be seen as the point of reference.

The primary goal should therefore be to foster the learning process as well as to include the learners' reality in teaching (Seidlhofer 2011: 198) and the learners' reality is an L2 reality. The impression one could get now is that including ELF in teaching equals an “anything goes mentality”; however, this is not true. Norms and standards do still play a certain role in an ELF-informed pedagogy, but not mainly due to the reason that students still want to approximate a NS competence.

Rather, to be ELF-oriented means to realise that because there is no *one* set of ‘correct’ language forms and norms of use, the ‘success’ of a communicative encounter always depends on the lingua-cultural composition of its participants, as well as on the purpose and physical setting of the interaction. (Ollinger 2012: 130)

ELF therefore calls for awareness of differences and facilitates learners' future demand to be part of various and changing discourse communities (Sewell 2012: 6). Thus, after finding that ELF has a competence orientation we can say that a second basic assumption of ELF is that

² For the purpose of this paper understood as “using English as a lingua franca”

there is no focus on a single standard, but that all realisations which enable successful communication should be taken into consideration.

What can be done to raise awareness of all those possible realisations is to present the learners with situations in which L2 and not only L1 speakers take part (Cook 1999: 200). Even if critics such as Quirk believe that an exposure to a variety of Englishes may confuse people (Quirk & Widdowson 1985: 6 quoted in: Seidlhofer 2003: 8), making learners aware of differences leads to greater adaptability in international communication. Thinking about a monolingual classroom, one can imagine that especially students in such settings will not be used to variety. Therefore, exposure to different Englishes is likely to be very useful for them (Seidlhofer 2011: 195f.).

So, learners should be confronted with situations in which various Englishes are used (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 306). By including variety one prepares learners for various settings and for the most common use of the English language. For the teacher this means that materials which make provisions for this variety of situations have to be included. The availability of such materials will be discussed in the following subchapters.

So far we can say that presenting a variety of English(es) seems to be a necessity if ELF is accounted for in an English language classroom. Thus, norms and standards are included by presenting ENL realisations. However, as will be seen, they do not have the same importance they have in traditional ENL focused approaches. The focus in an English language teaching setting which takes account of the implications of ELF is therefore less on the norm but stronger on “communicative practices and strategies of effective speakers” (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 306). In fact, the question in ELF communication is not so much what is important in form, but which linguistic features have a “high meaning potential” for mutual intelligibility (Seidlhofer 2011: 188). How this change focus influences teaching will be seen in the empirical part.

By all means, the use of language is looked at in how far it is effective (ibid. 197). The idea that lies behind this mindset appears to be a general focus on intelligibility and communicative success. Indeed, communication in ELF is seen as being successful when the interlocutors understand utterances to a reasonable degree (Ollinger 2012: 25). The ultimate goal of ELF communication is therefore intelligibility, and intelligibility is what is essential to communication in general (Alptekin 2007: 267). Hence, an ELF approach’s ultimate goal is to enable learners to communicate successfully in as many situations as possible.

Last but not least, it is important, if not essential, to note that ELF in ELT needs to be seen as complementary and does not mean to completely abandon every other approach

(Seidlhofer 2001: 145). It does not mean that right from the beginning one should introduce a variety of Englishes without a clearly structured plan. The idea is to present learners with different Englishes as soon as the teacher thinks they are ready for it (Sewell 2012: 5).

In sum, an ELF-oriented approach to ELT requires openness to a variety of realisations. Thus, various Englishes need to be presented in order to prepare learners to be able to communicate successfully in various settings. Moreover, the focus is on capability rather than on deficiencies. Still, this does not mean that norms are completely abandoned. Instead, they are only less important than effective language use. A last important aspect of an ELF-oriented approach to pedagogy is to respect the learner choice.

However, even if variety is included and students are prepared for it, successful communication cannot be guaranteed. This is due to the fact that one cannot expect that ELF speakers will be able to understand every possible realisation of English (Ollinger 2012: 132). In order to overcome this problem research is concerned with strategies and processes employed in successful ELF communication (Cogo 2012: 99). The following section reveals that essentially those strategies make successful communication possible. Therefore, they are overall essential for the teaching of English and will have a prominent place in classrooms which take ELF research findings into consideration.

2.2 Successful ELF communication and its implications for ELT

In the previous section presented the basic underlying assumptions of an ELF-oriented approach to ELT. As not all the speakers will be able to familiarise themselves with all the possible varieties of ELF, communication strategies or strategic language use behaviours (SLUBS) as Ollinger (2012) calls them, come into play. She says that “[...] an ELF-oriented pedagogy necessitates a focus on developing learners’ strategic capabilities to handle the inherent variability of lingua franca English” (2012: 133).

In fact, the importance of those SLUBs makes them stand out. Thus, they are treated as a basic aspect of an ELF-oriented approach to pedagogy and are not included in the section on specific research findings. However, what will be discussed separately are the various realisations of this general aspect of ELF communication. Therefore, we are now going to review how ELF speakers communicate successfully despite various accents, cultural backgrounds, contexts etc.

A defining aspect of spoken language is the negotiation of meaning (Seidlhofer 2004: 223). In order to make this possible, ELF users are said to exploit the language as a resource. That is, ELF speakers use the language in a creative way in making use of whatever is available to them (Seidlhofer 2011: 120). They are, as Seidlhofer states, “*language users*” (ibid. 98). English in this sense becomes a resource that is exploited for the purpose of “functionally appropriate and effective” communication not necessarily in accordance with what is considered “good” English in terms of ENL norms (ibid. 120).

As Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011: 303) put it: “Yet, the use of English in ELF interaction occurs not as the deployment of a particular set of language norms, but rather as a continually renewed, co-operatively modified, somewhat HYBRIDIZED linguistic resource [...]” (capitalisation in the original). These observations tie in with the finding that proficiency concerning the code is only partially responsible for successful communication (Seidlhofer 2004: 222); “[...] [at least as important is a more general communicative capability [...] as well as accommodation skills [...]” (ibid.).

Therefore, in bringing ELF to the classroom, we have to act upon this strategy of ELF communication. Sticking to a NS model would only inhibit such a use of the English language (Seidlhofer 2011: 189). For teaching this means that there is a shift in focus from trying to approximate native speaker norms to foster the learners’ ability to use and exploit the linguistic resource effectively (ibid. 197).

The reason why ELF speakers use the language creatively can also provide an interesting insight for the consideration of ELF in ELT. Oral communication among L2 users is characterised by the fact that it takes place online, that is, it happens at the moment without planning or “in situ” as Jenkins (2012: 490) calls it. Thus, ELF speakers adjust their language use depending on the interlocutor in a process of online negotiation (Seidlhofer 2011:109). This means that the speakers have to accommodate to their listeners immediately.

Consequently, for the purpose of teaching there should be a focus on spontaneous communication rather than on planned language activities in order to provide learners with opportunities to practice online negotiation and accommodation. Such a proceeding would allow for language learning and using at the same time, as it was found to take place (Seidlhofer 2011: 189).

In short, what was identified in this section is that in ELF underlying communicative strategies and processes play a crucial role. Therefore, the focus in an ELF-informed pedagogy, in addition to the assumptions in the preceding subchapter, must be on the purpose

and content of the talk as well as on the capability of negotiating meaning online by exploiting the English language as a resource.

Moreover, accommodation according to the needs of the interlocutor is an essential element. All of these strategies serve mutual intelligibility which is utmost important in ELF, as was seen. How those abilities can be taught or practised will be discussed on the following pages. However, before those findings are presented there are some issues to keep in mind when dealing with results from ELF research.

3. Research findings

We are now turning to features which were found regularly in ELF communication. What is more, these features are not only identified regularly but they were also found to be crucial to intelligibility among participants in ELF interactions (Seidlhofer 2005a: 349). Those findings are therefore important for teaching as they are distinguished from NNS features which do not cause intelligibility problems and consequently are not crucial to mutual understanding (ibid.). As Seidlhofer (2011: 194) states: “If English is really to be taught for international communication, then it would seem to make sense to find out how it is actually *used* for international communication, that is to say how it functions as a lingua franca.”

In fact, the intention of research into ELF is to find “frequently and systematically used forms that differ from inner circle forms without causing communication problems [...]” (Jenkins 2006: 161). The findings are results of empirical studies which are manifestations of what ELF speakers do (Cogo 2012: 99). Therefore, although ELF is not a fixed set of rules, its findings must not be excluded from ELT. In fact, not to include them would mean to ignore an obvious change in the language (Seidlhofer 2004: 224f.).

Thus, what research into ELF suggests is that more classroom time should be used to teach those distinguishing features, whereas the ones which were not found to cause difficulties in L2 communication should not be dealt with in such great detail (Jenkins 2007: 29). Therefore, there is a change in focus. The time which such a proceeding makes available can consequently be used for raising awareness and for the teaching of communication strategies (Seidlhofer 2005a: 340).

What can be found on the following pages, however, is just the state of the art and will hopefully be complemented in the near future. If ELF is continuing to spread, and at the moment there is no reason to believe that it will not, materials which will take account of its function will be needed (Ur 2010: 90). The purpose of the following subchapters is therefore “to help learners [and teachers] [...] by identifying the features that are most important for international communication [...]” (Sewell 2012: 6) as well as to raise awareness of the functions of those features.

3.1 Pronunciation

The first section deals with pronunciation which is the field in which seemingly most results are available. Indeed, with Jennifer Jenkins' book "The phonology of English as an international language", published in 2000, a first model of the pronunciation of ELF, called Lingua Franca Core (LFC), was presented. Although Jenkins stated that additions and fine tuning may be needed, the findings presented in the LFC have not been falsified yet (Seidlhofer 2004: 217). Based on this work, Robin Walker wrote a book entitled "Teaching the Pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca" which will form another basis of this chapter. Thus, there are already some specific results which may be taken into consideration.

First of all, some background information on why there should be a focus on pronunciation and an overview of how Austrians feel about it will be given. As Timmis (2002: 241) shows, pronunciation lies at the heart of the native speaker issue, therefore, it seems to be an important issue for ELF. The reason for the importance of pronunciation lies in the fact that accent seems to be something immediately recognisable. As learners proclaim their identity via the language they use (Cook 1999: 195), accent is an important identity marker.

Nonetheless, Austrian students seem to be very resistant to accept L1 accents. In fact, a study carried out in 1997 revealed that Received Pronunciation (RP) was still by far the most widely preferred accent (Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenboeck & Smit 1997: 120). In fact, two-thirds of the respondents stated to attempt to approximate RP (*ibid.*). What also becomes clear in this study is that students are well aware of the fact that they cannot achieve a NS accent. Thus, especially in the context we are dealing with, a lot of work to challenge this paradigm will be needed.

The reason why teaching is necessary in this field can be found in the importance of pronunciation for intelligibility. In fact, regarding communication breakdowns it was found that, while not being the only reason for breakdowns, problems caused by pronunciation were the most difficult to resolve (Jenkins 2002: 87). This is due to the fact that problems arising from mispronunciation cannot be easily resolved from co- and context (*ibid.* 91). Therefore, an ELF-informed pedagogy will have a strong focus on pronunciation.

Moreover, judging a user's competence on the basis of L1 transfer might be a threat to her or his identity since accent and attitude are very strongly related (Jenkins 2000: 194). Considering this aspect it becomes clear that in a learner centred ELF approach the L1 as an identity marker cannot be seen as something negative. Indeed, Seidlhofer (2004: 215) shows,

that almost all ELF speakers reveal their L1 through their accent to a certain degree. Therefore, it has to be accepted rather than abandoned (Jenkins 2000: 119). However, ELF does not accept every kind of influence in this context. A precondition for L1 transfer to be accepted is that it does not impede intelligibility (Seidlhofer 2011: 128).

At this point one could argue that the acceptance of transfers may lead to confusion. However, Jenkins found that most of the time it did not (2012: 487f.). Instead, students used features influenced by transfer and/ or forms which did not respect ENL standards, but were similarly used by ELF speakers of different L1s (ibid.). Therefore, she argues that students will not be motivated to abandon the pronunciation they use as long as it does not hinder mutual understanding (Jenkins 2000: 120). The task at hand, however, is to draw attention to the features that were found to cause problems and this is what research into ELF pronunciation does.

The learner focus comes in as ELF views features which seemingly cannot be acquired by a variety of learners with different L1 backgrounds as unteachable (Jenkins 2000: 119). A characteristic of such an unteachable feature is that no matter how much time in the classroom is spent on teaching it, learning will not follow (ibid.). Hence, it can be seen as irrelevant to ELF (ibid. 133).

Therefore, the goal of pronunciation research in ELF is to identify features which are teachable and those which are not. Moreover, it looks at features which are important for intelligibility. Thus, what the LFC offers is teachable, allows the user to keep her or his identity and guarantees intelligibility.

Thence, the next section presents findings of the LFC. What we have to take away from this brief discussion here is that “it is crucial to accept L1 phonological transfer as a universal, a fact of life, and for the purposes of EIL to respond to it selectively, as it interacts with intelligibility and teachability” (Jenkins 2000: 105).

3.1.1 Results

After finding that an L1 accent is not at all to be seen as something negative in an ELF approach it is time to investigate what a model of ELF pronunciation should take into account in order to guarantee a maximum of intelligibility.

Before turning to single features which were identified by Jenkins in the LFC it seems necessary to have a closer look at general aspects of pronunciation which impede mutual understanding. In fact, although they are taught, it is demonstrated that features such as

elisions, contradictions, assimilations and weak forms can be a threat to mutual understanding (Jenkins 2002: 84). Therefore, it seems unnecessary to include them in an ELF-informed pedagogy as efforts to teach them do not result in a valuable outcome for international communication. What is more, even though they are taught, weak forms are not acquired by the majority of L2 speakers (Jenkins 2000: 118). Therefore, abandoning those features would free up teaching time for more important issues.

One of those issues is consonant deletion which was found to create intelligibility problems (ibid. 142). In fact, when it comes to consonant clusters it is demonstrated that it is less problematic for intelligibility if a short vowel is added rather than if a consonant is deleted (Walker 2010: 33). However, if we move from the general to the specific there are some other observations we have to bear in mind when talking about consonants.

Such an observation is that it is not really important to focus on the voiced and voiceless “th” sounds. In fact, Jenkins (2000: 106) shows that /ð/ and /θ/ can be considered as unteachable. What she found is that the substitution of those two sounds by /t/ and /d/ is not a threat to mutual understanding (ibid. 137). However, for an ELF approach this does not mean that learners should be discouraged to use them if it is part of the speakers’ L1, neither does it suggest that /d/ and /t/ should replace /ð/ and /θ/ (Walker 2010: 30). Research only says that it is not necessary to spend a lot of time on the native speaker realisation of these sounds as the common substitution does not cause intelligibility problems.

A similar finding is that the ability to produce the dark l sound /ɫ/ is not a decisive criterion for successful communication (Jenkins 2000: 139). Being a typical element of ENL varieties and not causing intelligibility problems it is not essential to ELF (Walker 2010: 31). Therefore, a single realisation of all /l/ sounds as well as the substitution of /ɫ/ by [ɒ] is an acceptable option for ELF speakers according to the LFC (ibid.). Before turning to vowel related issues, there are two other consonant sounds which are open to variation.

The first of these is /r/ for which Jenkins does not state whether the American rhotic realisation or the British version should be taught (2000: 139). However, she states that for teaching purposes it might be easier to opt for the General American (GA) sound as it is consistent and not depending on the context (ibid.). Moreover, the rhotic realisation is more closely indicated by the spelling of “r” so that it might be easier for learners to strive for the GA version (Walker 2010: 32). Finally, one should bear in mind that the L1 of the learner or speaker will have an influence on the realisation of this consonant sound (ibid. 31).

The last consonant which should be treated separately is /t/. Although Jenkins (2000: 140) does not give a clear advice here either, she suggests to teach the British realisation of

the sound as it is always the same and not open to variation as /t/ in GA. Again this is not a prescription, but rather an advice. The British realisation although makes it easier for the learner to acquire features that will make mutual understanding possible with lesser effort than it would take to acquire both realisations of the GA /t/ (ibid.).

The above presented details all dealt with consonant sounds, however, there are also results stemming from research into the vowel system. For monophthongs and diphthongs alike it was found that the quality is not as important as the length (Jenkins 2000: 145). Regarding the quality it is not the native speaker realisation that is important, instead, a consistent vowel quality is essential in order to be intelligible (Walker 2010: 35). Nonetheless, “a good approximation to the native speaker quality of the central vowel /ɜ:/ is recommended” (ibid. 34). Otherwise, the focus of vowels in an ELF-informed pedagogy should be on differences in length (ibid.).

After having presented the findings research into ELF offers for consonants and vowels, nuclear stress is another aspect considered important for international intelligibility. Jenkins (2000: 153) even speaks of nuclear stress as being “the most important key to the speaker’s intended meaning”. In fact, intonation does play a role for transmitting one’s illocutionary force (Ollinger 2012: 105).

Moreover, comprehension is influenced to a significant degree by stress and may even depend on whether rising or falling intonation was used by the producer of the utterance (ibid. 105). Thus the “good ELF user” is aware “[...] that intonation, including key and tone choice, may influence the ‘success’ of a communicative exchange in that these prosodic features may determine how his interlocutors will interpret his utterances” (Ollinger 2012: 126). Therefore, it seems that a focus on intonation will be essential for an ELF-informed pedagogy.

The last few paragraphs presented what research into ELF identified as being important features for international intelligibility concerning phonetics and phonology. One might now wonder what the role of all the other features, called non-core by Jenkins and Walker (2010: 38), is. He presents the following list:

- /θ/, /ð/, and dark /l/
- exact vowel quality
- pitch movement
- word stress
- **stress timing**
- vowel reduction, schwa, and weak forms
- certain features of connected speech – linking, **assimilation, coalescence**” (ibid. – bold print in original)

Walker argues that all of those features were not found to be crucial for international intelligibility and are therefore open to variation (ibid.). This means that the LFC, being non-prescriptive, allows for variety which might be used by the speaker to transmit her or his identity. Variation is not seen as something negative, or even as an “error” as it is in other models (ibid.). Thus, the LFC is used to ensure a maximum of intelligibility while allowing for variation. This also entails that the LFC will be different for speakers from different L1s as some of the sounds might be more difficult to produce with a certain L1 background than with another.

As the purpose of this paper is to investigate the integration of ELF findings into the Austrian curriculum it is important to know about core features which are problematic for speakers of German. The following section therefore gives a brief account of the sounds and features a teacher in Austria will have to focus on in order to foster mutual understanding for Austrian learners in international encounters.

3.1.2 The LFC for Austrian learners of English

Beginning with consonants again, due to similarities between English and German, their realisation is not very problematic for German learners of English (Berger 2010: 107). The /θ/ and /ð/ sound does not exist in German, but as it is not crucial to intelligibility it may be neglected (ibid.)

Voicing of consonants is a different matter since it cannot occur in word-final position in German (ibid.). Therefore, this feature will have to be included in pronunciation teaching because otherwise learners might use [p] instead of /b/ (ibid.), for instance. Moreover, there are no counterparts for the voiced plosives /p/, /t/, and /k/ in Southern varieties of German (ibid.). Thus, Austrian teachers should include these sounds in teaching as well.

Another issue is that /dʒ/ does not exist in German and therefore needs to be trained in order not to be realised as [tʃ] which does exist (ibid. 108). The same is true of /z/ and /s/, as well as /ʒ/ and /ʃ/ (ibid. 108f.). The biggest threat to intelligibility however might be the absence of /w/ in German, therefore, practice of the /v/ and /w/ distinction will be needed in order to prevent communication breakdowns (ibid.).

Regarding the vowel system, the only sound which really seems to need training is /ɜ:/ since it is nonexistent in German (ibid. 110). Apart from that, the German vowel system does not differ significantly from the English one and therefore L1 transfer is not likely to cause problems for mutual understanding (ibid.). However, regarding vowels one thing that should

be dealt with in classrooms is length. For Austrian learners of English quantities may be problematic, therefore, practice with minimal pairs is highly recommended (ibid.). With respect to word grouping and nuclear stress no suggestions are offered as it seems that the English and the German system do not differ significantly (ibid. 107), at least not to such an extent that it could result in problems.

After having presented findings of the LFC and what consequences they have for learners of English with an L1 German, the focus of the next part is on actual teaching activities which can be used to consider ELF pronunciation research findings.

3.1.3 ELF pronunciation in ELT

Walker's suggestion to introduce the LFC is to take over Jenkins' 5 stage model which helps learners to function communicatively effectively in ELF situations. He summarises the model in the following way:

- 1 Addition of core items to the learner's productive and receptive repertoire
- 2 Addition of a range of L2 English accents to the learner's receptive repertoire
- 3 Addition of accommodation skills
- 4 Addition of non-core items to the learner's receptive repertoire
- 5 Addition of a range of L1 English accents to the learner's receptive repertoire
(Jenkins 2000: 209 – 211 quoted in Walker 2010: 45)

What becomes obvious from looking at this model is that the last two stages serve to communicate with English native speakers from different countries and regions. Thus, what is essential to an ELF-informed pedagogy is found in the first three stages. Walker suggests that phase 1 in secondary schools could be applied between the age of 12 and 14 and stage two between 14 and 16; whereas the other phases could then follow. Such a proceeding would ensure that at least productive competence for ELF intelligibility is taught if 16 marked the end of obligatory instruction (Walker 2010: 140).

Therefore, for the Austrian school system in which obligatory education ends at 15 or 16, as will be seen, this means that ELF could be included from the secondary, which begins at the age of 11, onwards. However, this will be discussed in more detail in the empirical part. For the moment, we are turning to teaching methods Walkers sees as valuable in including ELF pronunciation in the English language classroom.

There are various methods which are presented to practice pronunciation as described in the LFC. The first activity which can be used for this purpose is drilling. This method is not being widely used in classrooms nowadays due to its bad reputation in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (ibid. 77). However, it has an important function in automating

certain sounds (ibid.). In fact, the production of sounds is a habit that needs to be developed or changed if it differs from L1 phonological practices (ibid.). Therefore, drilling will serve the formation of these habits which are said to be essential for international intelligibility (Jenkins 2000: 113).

The drills have an especially high value for sounds which seem to be similar to L1 sounds but are not. For these features drilling facilitates automation (ibid. 114). However, this does not suggest that teaching returns to times of the audio lingual method where students were seen as boxes to be filled. Instead, exercises suggested to be used are tongue twisters, chants, songs and rhymes for instance (Walker 2010: 77). Therefore, the use of drills in a playful and interesting way will help learners to develop the habits to produce the essential sounds correctly.

Another suggestion for the teaching of particular sounds, especially for consonants, is to present learners where and how the sound is produced in the mouth (Walker 2010: 78f.). This may also help students in becoming aware of where sounds in their mother tongue are produced and to what extent they differ from the LFC sounds (ibid.). The same can be done with consonant clusters, whereas, with clusters teachers can also present possible combinations and let students find words which contain them (ibid. 81). These activities would help to the students reflect the production of sounds and will hopefully be helpful in learning how to produce them correctly.

Vowels can be dealt with similarly, whereas the long central vowel might get most attention. For vowels as well as for pronunciation in general an utterly important and necessary requirement is of course to be a good role model as a teacher (ibid. 84f.). Together with awareness raising this can be seen as the most important aspect for ELF pronunciation teaching.

Indeed, it appears to be the case that in an ELF-informed pedagogy awareness raising plays a crucial role. It may be the first important step in teaching with an ELF orientation in general. Making learners aware of the international role of English and of how it is used in this way might be a precondition to understand why they learn the language and what they have to focus on.

A good way to raise awareness of differences of the consonants as well as vowels might be the use of minimal pairs. In fact, they are especially valuable for problematic sounds in relation to the learners' L1. An example Walker (2010: 76) presents is the pair "wine – vine", which might be especially important for German learners due to the /w/ - /v/ distinction (ibid.). Moreover, minimal pairs are highly useful in teaching vowel length differences (ibid.).

82). As these were found to be crucial and as minimal pairs help in distinguishing consonant sounds, one can say that the use of them is very helpful and should be highly recommended.

Moving on to the next issue, recommendations of methods for the teaching of nuclear stress are reviewed. As stress placement will not be a major problem for Austrian learners, we will not go into detail here. Nonetheless, it might be valuable to teach some of the rules of stress placement in English overtly (Jenkins 2000: 155). In order to memorize them, exercises like finding the most important word in an utterance or to mark different possible answers according to variation in stress can be used (Walker 2010: 86f.).

Another opportunity is to teach stress placement together with aspects of grammar such as exclamations or negations and show students how important stress is to make sense of an utterance (ibid.). Exercises used to train nuclear stress placement and word grouping can also be used in combination with recordings of speakers from various L1 backgrounds.

The use of such recordings has a number of advantages. First of all, they raise awareness of cultural variation in intonation conventions (Ollinger 2012: 107), a fact which might not be clear to all of the students. Secondly, the use of recordings trains learners' receptive skills developed through exposure to a wide range of different Englishes (Jenkins 2000: 190). Therefore, presenting speakers with different L1 accents might help learners to understand a variety of realisations of ELF which they will most likely encounter in their future lives. Finally, combining activities such as stress placement exercises with the exposure to a wide range of Englishes takes account of the recommendation that pronunciation should not exclusively be taught in isolation (Walker 2010: 144).

Another possible activity to account for ELF pronunciation in monolingual classrooms is to let students record a short text after presenting and practicing certain features (ibid. 94). A possible way to work on with the recordings could be to compare them with conversations from speakers of English with another L1 and to discuss the differences. In fact, contrastive work in this sense is also seen as very important and valuable for habit formation (Jenkins 2000: 190).

Other activities for the teaching of ELF pronunciation listed by Walker (2010: 92) are: "guessing games", "describe and draw", "spot the difference", "information gap activities", and "giving directions". In this sense, activities which are already used in actual teaching can be used to train ELF features as well if they are adapted.

Obviously the activities described here request pair, which, according to Jenkins (2000: 193), is very useful if findings from research into ELF pronunciation are taken into account. Moreover, it should be preferred over group work (ibid.). However, working in pairs

is only useful if reciprocal exchanges are possible, that is, if each partner gives and takes information (Walker 2010: 92).

The role of the teacher in ELF pronunciation teaching, on the one hand, is to present a good role model. On the other hand, where possible, she or he should present the explicit rules for certain features. What is more, the teacher presents input which is used for practice (Jenkins 2000: 188). The work of the students among each others is consequently used to practice the input the teacher has given (ibid.). Therefore, strategies are trained in group or pair work.

Group and pair work are also essential for the teaching of accommodation skills. Jenkins (2000: 189) even suggests student-student dictation as the most adequate method to train this skill. Walker (2010: 89) adds that in a monolingual classroom dictation from speakers with a different L1 background can be done via recordings. Doing so helps to present various accents while at the same time accommodation is practiced.

Other means to train accommodation skills have already been touched upon above. In fact, student-student activities are the only way to practice accommodation skills (Jenkins 2000: 188). In addition, learners need to be told explicitly that there is a need to accommodate and adjust their pronunciation and that they also need to learn to recognise situations in which this is necessary (Jenkins 2002: 100).

Moreover, integrating different varieties is another important way to help learners in acquiring accommodation skills, because:

Lack of familiarity might make people apprehensive about their own abilities, which might lead to their not paying attention to accented speech because they are convinced that they will not understand it. Thus, even listeners who are not biased against L2 speech might be dissuaded from trying hard to understand it. (Munro, Derwing, Morton 2006: 129)

Thus, the most important thing for the teaching of pronunciation in an ELF context is to raise awareness of variety as well as to prepare learners to be willing to accommodate to speakers from various L1 backgrounds.

For teachers it might be a lot easier if publications regarding those aspects were available. Therefore, there is a brief review of teaching materials focusing on ELF pronunciation. First of all, Walkers book can be mentioned again which comes with a CD containing recordings from speakers of various L1s. The advantage of this publication is that the speakers are briefly described and transcripts are included. Moreover, Jenkins (2007: 250) mentions Cauldwell's *Streaming Speech* (2002) which is one of the first publications to take an ELF perspective.

Still, teaching materials with an ELF focus are not available abundantly. For the time being, the small number of publications and the gaps in the existing publications can be overcome by producing one's own materials. Due to availability of texts, recordings and videos online this is relatively easy. However, it might cost some time to contextualise these texts for classroom use.

What can be seen from research findings into ELF pronunciation is that there are very clear results which can help in bringing about a change in focus. Using the findings will probably foster international intelligibility and in course of time change the perception of L2 accents as broken English (Lindemann 2005: 210). Therefore, including ELF pronunciation features helps intelligibility and will hopefully lead to better awareness of diversity. Moreover, such a focus will hopefully contribute to the acceptance of variation which will consequently no longer have the negative prestige it now possesses.

However, as pronunciation is only one aspect of language teaching and as there are ELF findings in other fields of linguistics, we are now going to look at lexicogrammar. As will be seen, this is another field which can offer very specific research findings which might influence teaching practices.

3.2 Lexicogrammar

In order to understand the role of lexicogrammatical features a brief look at another ELF research area presents interesting insights. In fact, in BELF, adherence to grammatical rules was found to be less important than to be able to communicate successfully (Jenkins, Cogo, Dewey 2011: 298). Therefore, we can conclude that successful international communication is not strongly dependent on grammar/ lexicogrammar. In fact, Walker (2010: 26) speaks about grammar as having a “negligible role” in causing communication breakdowns.

However, this view goes against the idea of mainstream ELT which is very much focused on lexicogrammar (Seidlhofer 2004: 219). Even students prefer to adhere to native speaker grammar rules when they have a choice (Timmis 2002: 244). Hence we can say that the ENL model is still deeply ingrained when it comes to teaching grammar. Nonetheless, its role in ELF is not utterly important. Indeed, in not sticking to ENL norms ELF users produce forms which are exceptional and creative (Seidlhofer 2011: 120). Furthermore, as research shows, these forms fulfil the purpose of making oneself understood and enable successful communication (*ibid.*).

Regarding findings from research into ELF lexicogrammar we touch upon the fact that there are not a lot of results to be presented (Seidlhofer 2004: 219). However, this is not to say that there are no results at all. Indeed, the compiling of the VOICE corpus³ enabled researchers to enter this field and to come up with surprising and very influential lexicogrammatical particularities of ELF communication. The findings (if not indicated otherwise all taken from Seidlhofer 2004: 220) can provide an idea of how this research area can influence future English language teaching. In fact, the following features were found as not being decisive for mutual intelligibility.

- ‘Dropping’⁴ the third person present tense –s
- ‘Confusing’ the relative pronouns *who* and *which*
- ‘Omitting’ definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in ENL, and inserting them where they do not occur in ENL
- ‘Failing’ to use correct forms in tag questions (e.g. *isn’t it?* or *no?* instead of *shouldn’t they?*)
- Inserting ‘redundant’ prepositions, as in *We have to study about...*)
- ‘Overusing’ certain verbs of high semantic generality, such as *do, have, make, put, take*
- ‘Replacing’ infinitive-constructions with *that*-clauses, as in *I want that*
- ‘Overdoing’ explicitness (e.g. *black color* rather than just *black*)
- Uncountable nouns become countable (e.g. *furnitures* and *staffs*) (Jenkins 2012: 489)

The question which impact those features have on teaching is not easy to answer. As we found that students’ choice is still the native speaker model it will be necessary to present and teach ENL grammar rules. What this means for the Austrian situation is discussed in the final chapter. For the moment it can be said that those ELF forms were found to occur frequently and as they do not hinder successful communication, there is no need to spend a lot of time on correcting them.

Instead one could spend more time on important issues such as communicative strategies. Those strategies are an important element of ELF, as we found, and are located in the field of pragmatics. Thus, the following subchapter will have a closer look at the importance of pragmatics and strategic language use behaviours in ELF communication.

³ For further information on the VOICE corpus see: <http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/> and Seidlhofer 2004

⁴ PLEASE NOTE concerning the words “dropping”, “confusing”, “omitting”, “failing” etc. that “Seidlhofer always inserts scare quotes around such words to indicate that they are not relevant to ELF, which, unlike EFL, should be considered *in its own right* and not by comparison with an ENL yardstick. Unfortunately, the publisher of Seidlhofer (2004) removed the scare quotes in error, so they have been reinstated above” (Jenkins 2009: 146 – italics in the original).

3.3 Pragmatics

In the last subchapters findings from research into ELF pronunciation and lexicogrammar were presented. What could be seen was that a lot of work is going on in these fields and that there are concrete results due to the fact that pronunciation as well as lexicogrammar can be seen as relatively closed systems. Now we are turning to pragmatics and it will be found that it plays an important role in ELF communication. However, findings are not as specific and consequently more workload will be on the teacher as yet no clear instructions for including them in teaching can be found.

Pragmatic rules are strongly related to cultural and individual identity (Crandall & Basturkmen 2004: 39). Therefore, pragmatics is influenced by a lot of aspects and appears to be highly complex. Indeed, due to the fact that it is influenced by identities one could say that pragmatics cannot be regarded as a closed system. Nonetheless, there are findings which can help to prepare students for their future as L2 users.

Pragmatics plays an essential role for ELF communication. Indeed, pragmatic errors are seen to create bigger problems than grammatical errors (ibid. 38). Thus, even if pragmatic problems do not lead to communication breakdowns to the same extent as do pronunciation problems (Seidlhofer 2004: 217), they still seem to be important for ELF communication.

In fact, the importance of ELF pragmatics has already been mentioned when communication strategies of ELF speakers were discussed in general. Seidlhofer (2011: 98) speaks of communication strategies such as the negotiation of meaning as “entirely pragmatic undertaking[s]”. Hence, it will be seen that they play an important role in keeping communication flowing as well as in creating mutual understanding.

Interestingly enough, research has shown that misunderstandings are less common in ELF encounters than in ENL communication (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 293). This might be due to the fact that NS do not necessarily conform to pragmatic rules such as co-operation, directness, explicitness, politeness etc. (Leung 2005: 132), whereas ELF users seem to do so. Thus, the SLUBs of ELF speakers are essential to international intelligibility and are consequently important to learners who want to engage in ELF conversations.

A first aspect of research into pragmatics which can be looked at is idiomatic language use. Seidlhofer in her book “Understanding English as a Lingua Franca” (2011) presents a lot of interesting findings regarding this issue. First of all, she (2011: 130) demonstrates that “the idiom principle would seem to relate to the least effort principle in that it reduces the language user’s online processing load and so facilitates communication”. Thus, the idiom principle

should help in reducing the effort needed to make oneself understood and to understand one's interlocutor(s).

However, ENL idiomatic language in ELF may hinder successful communication if the interlocutors are not familiar with the expression used (ibid. 134). Nonetheless, in ELT, students are asked to reproduce ENL idiomatic language use instead of being encouraged to exploit the language as a resource (ibid. 119). Idiomatic language use in an ELF setting might therefore only be valuable if it is strongly metaphorical or if it is co-created online (Ollinger 2012: 125). Furthermore, it has to be open to variety, change and non-conformity (ibid. 134). Thus, asking the students to reproduce ENL idiomatic language use might hinder creative language use.

For teaching settings this implies that idiomatic language use from an ENL perspective is not desirable. This is due to the fact that speakers from various backgrounds do not share enough context and are consequently not able to rely on a certain degree of shared understanding (Ollinger 2012: 25ff). Therefore, if speakers are not co-creating idiomatic language use they have to rely on other strategies.

An example of such a strategy is the use of self-explanatory language (ibid.). ELF research found that speakers are often "consensus-oriented, cooperative and mutually supportive" (Seidlhofer 2001: 143). In fact, Ollinger (2012: 96) speaks about the maxim of clarity and explicitness as one of the most important ELF communication strategies. Thus, we are now turning to the strategies ELF speakers use to communicate effectively.

In order to adhere to the maxim of clarity and explicitness ELF speakers employ a wide range of strategies. Examples for realisations of those strategies would be repetitions, reformulations or "repairing" other interlocutors' utterances (clarifying unclear statements) (ibid. 125). In using strategies the speaker tries to cause the listener(s) minimal workload in decoding her or his utterance while trying to convey as much meaning as possible (ibid.). Therefore, ELF communication can indeed be seen as consensus-oriented and mutually supportive.

The attempt of trying to adhere to the maxim of clarity can be seen as a pre-empting strategy. In fact, in trying to avoid any difficulties that could arise beforehand, the speakers signal that they are engaging in a process of meaning making together with the listener(s) (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 293f.). However, despite the use of pre-empting strategies, non-understanding can happen. In order to cope with such situations there are findings from ELF research which demonstrate how listeners signal that they did not understand an

utterance. For this purpose, strategies which request clarification are employed and they obviously play an important role in successful communication.

One way in which speakers show that they do not understand an utterance is through non-verbal behaviour. Indeed, silence, shoulder-shrugging, head-shaking, laughter, coughing or mumbling were found to be signs of mis- or non-understanding (Ollinger 2012: 118). Such clarification requests either follow confirmation checks by the speaker or are uttered by the listener without invitation.

Despite the use of non-verbal behaviour, clarification requests or confirmation checks can take the following forms: a hypothesis stated with rising intonation, repetitions, reformulations, or a summary according to what the listener thinks the speaker intended (ibid. 114). Moreover, question tags such as “You mean” or “Do you mean” are used (ibid.). Therefore, the listener is not passive in an ELF conversation but actively signals his or her (mis-)understanding.

If misunderstanding is signalled more strategies come into play. These can surface in various ways such as: “full/partial repetitions, reformulations, explications or links back to context, which also might include accommodation in terms of intonation or pronunciation” (ibid. 109). At the end of such a sequence, the listener either has to signal that understanding has been re-established or that she or he needs further explanation which then leads back to the above mentioned strategies and/or a combination of them (ibid. 127).

Another strategy used by the listener is guessing. This means that she or he tries to get the meaning out of all features the speaker uses in order to come up with the correct interpretation of an utterance (ibid. 128). Thus, in a school setting it might be essential to train students to get meaning out of context, intonation, as well as non-verbal behaviour.

The signalling of understanding on the other hand quite often happens by the use of a strategy called “backchanneling”. This strategy furthermore helps in creating rapport and a “relaxed atmosphere between interactants” (ibid. 127). Thus, it is a strategy used to support the speaker and might take the form of particles such as “mhm”, “yeah”, “okay”, etc., non-verbal behaviour and repetition (ibid. 107). In order to prepare students for ELF communications it will be important to make them aware of the positive effects of this strategy.

Another strategy reflecting the mutually supportive character of ELF communication is turn-sharing. This strategy, which serves the purpose of co-constructing meaning, often takes the form of completion overlaps, repetition of what the speaker said and/ or the same particles used for backchanneling (ibid. 103). An important precondition for this strategy is

that the speaker knows that signs of turn-sharing do not signal interruption, but “agreement, solidarity, commentary, assessment, or continuation of the original utterance” (ibid. 126). Thus, turn-sharing is another important feature of ELF communication which needs to be presented to learners.

Generally, all those strategies can also serve the purpose of keeping communication going. Nonetheless, there are also specific processes which indicate flow-keeping. Realisations of this strategy are the use of the particle “you know”, self-repetitions, circumlocution, paraphrases, body language and word coinages (ibid. 124). Although it is used by speakers to indicate that they need more time to express the intended meaning and/or to compensate for lacking knowledge of the code or the content, this kind of SLUB affects both speaker and listener(s) (ibid.). Therefore, flow-keeping will also be an important element in an ELF-oriented approach to English language teaching.

After this brief review of strategies employed by successful ELF speakers, the arising question is how they can be included in a language classroom. Again, pair work may facilitate the development of SLUBs. As Jenkins talked about this method as the only way to practise accommodation skills (Jenkins 2000: 188), it can be suspected that this is similarly true of the negotiation of meaning.

Therefore, examples for the ways in which the negotiation of meaning may be practiced can also be found in the field of pronunciation teaching. An option to do so is to prepare a recording and let students intervene when they have the feeling that they do not understand what is being talked about (Walker 2010: 90). In a next step the whole group should discuss and try to come up with a possible idea of what the speaker(s) could have intended (ibid.).

Another possibility to train the negotiation of meaning can be to split a text into sentences and to divide them between a pair of learners (ibid.). Each student should then try to memorize her or his sentences. Thereafter, they have to reconstruct the whole text together (ibid.). Pairs or small groups should be formed for those activities as for training the negotiation of meaning it is necessary for students to feel relaxed and supported (ibid. 91).

Regarding the “teaching” of SLUBs mentioned in this review we are faced with some difficulties. First of all, it seems very hard if not impossible to directly teach those strategies in isolation. Secondly, teaching activities focusing particularly on these issues cannot be found yet. Thirdly, it seems that those strategies are very individual and personal as they appear to be habits that cannot be forced upon students’ communicative behaviour.

Therefore, ways in which they can be taught need to be found. The fact that they were observed to be frequent in international communication in English shows that they have to be included if learners should be prepared for ELF situations. Thus, a possibility might be to include instances in which such strategies are employed. By presenting the learners with examples of conversations in which SLUBs are successfully used, they can be made aware of their existence and their importance. Therefore, awareness raising could play an important role again.

Moreover, guessing games could be played in which students have to infer meaning from context. A discussion of possible solutions might then help learners to see what others do in order to get an idea of the intended meaning. Furthermore, it seems that strategic language use can be practiced in combination with various other activities. For example, comparisons with strategies from the L1 can be drawn in a monolingual classroom. A way to train the use of SLUBs might then be to ask learners to prepare dialogues in which strategies should be used. Still, a lot of work will be required from the teacher if she or he wants to include those findings. However, it seems that there are possible ways and that it is worth doing it.

A rather special strategic language use behaviour can be found in the use of the L1 in ELF communication. As this behaviour seems to be more complex than the above mentioned SLUBS, code switching will be treated separately in the following section.

3.4 Code-switching

A particular aspect of pragmatics is code switching. Despite being a distinguishing feature of multicompetent language users (Cook 1999: 193), code switching is often viewed as a deficiency in language competence (Ollinger 2012: 94). However, it has been proven that it is used extensively by ELF users (ibid. 124).

The functions of code switches are various. They can be employed as a marker of authenticity, an indication that the language is exploited as a resource, as well as a flow-keeper (ibid. 94). Moreover, switching to the L1 is a signal of solidarity with an interlocutor (Jenkins 2012: 489) and it allows to signal group membership as well as a certain L1 identity (Pözl 2003: 20).

One may now argue that code switching hinders intelligibility, especially if the interlocutors do not share the same L1. However, ELF users who employ code switching are

well aware of whether or not it is possible for the interlocutor to infer the intended meaning (Ollinger 2012: 124). If a transfer is not easily understandable a translation or an explanation will be given (ibid.). Therefore, the perception of code switching as something negative has no place in a classroom which respects findings from research into ELF. On the contrary, the role of code switching as an important aspect of language learning has to be acknowledged if an ELF perspective is included.

In fact, the L1 is constantly present during classroom activities anyway. As Cook (1999: 202) states, “[e]very activity the student carries out visibly in the L2 also involves the invisible L1. Hence, it can be said that language learning always happens “cross-lingual” (ibid.). What is more, code switching proves to be beneficial as it helps learners to relate new features from the L2 to existing knowledge of the L1 (Seidlhofer 2011: 188). By doing so the foreign aspect of the language is familiarised (ibid.). Therefore, drawing attention to this process could be helpful for students to get used to certain features and aspects in the L2. Ignoring the L1 is not an option; instead its presence should be made use of.

A possible way of dealing with this fact would be to use translations overtly in the classroom. This would respect the presence of the L1 and the natural learning process of familiarising new information (Seidlhofer 1999: 240). Therefore, translations will be a helpful tool for learners, as the teacher can directly draw attention to differences and similarities in the L1.

This may be especially useful when something new is presented by the teacher or is looked up in a grammar or vocabulary book (Cook 1999: 201). Furthermore, the use of activities which include both the L1 and the L2 might be valuable for language learning. An example for such an activity would be to ask learners to summarise an L1 text in the L2 or vice versa (ibid. 202). However, a precondition for the use of translations is a widely monolingual classroom.

As could be seen, the deliberate use of the L1 can have positive effects on the learning process while it serves as a means to keep communication flowing and as a sign of learners’ identity/ies at the same time. Therefore, the use of the L1 in an ELF classroom should not be discouraged. Instead, its presence has to be exploited by the teacher. In including the L1 as a positive sign the successful L2 user will be promoted and native speaker imitation will not be seen as the ultimate goal any longer (ibid. 204).

The section on pragmatics has revealed very important findings which demonstrate how ELF speakers make use of the language successfully and which strategies they employ. The difficulty we encountered is that teaching those strategies might not be easy and

straightforward. However, it was seen that by awareness raising, the use of guessing games, dialogue preparation and the use of the L1 many findings can be taken into considerations. To what extent this will be possible in Austrian grammar schools will be investigated in the empirical part.

Before approaching this part of the paper however, we have to briefly go back to the beginning of the chapter on pragmatics. There, it was found that pragmatics is very strongly influenced by notions of identity. In fact, pragmatic rules are not the same in every culture (McKay 2002: 127f.). Thus, culture itself can be seen as an important aspect of ELF communication. Therefore, the next section will provide insights into the role of culture as well as into ideas of how to deal with it in an ELF-oriented approach to ELT.

3.5 Culture in the ELF classroom

As was argued throughout this paper ELF looks at English the way it is most frequently used, that is, among speakers who do not necessarily have it as their first language and who mostly come from various lingua-cultural backgrounds. Therefore, English can be seen as a language which has “multi-cultural identities” (Kachru 2003: 26). This fact, however, has implications for the way it has to be taught, since communication breakdowns can occur due to cultural disparity (Widdowson 2003: 68).

Students expect that English will open gates in enabling them to communicate internationally, or in other words, to increase their cultural capital (Norton Peirce 2003: 243). That is, language learning has to result in the ability to communicate with speakers from various backgrounds (ibid.). Therefore, ELT has to include cultural variety and prepare learners in the best way for communication in international settings.

It goes without saying that presenting a single native speaker culture cannot be useful in order to gain such an intercultural competence. What is more, simply knowing about a culture is not sufficient. In fact, it is possible to be bilingual while not being familiar with other cultures than one’s own (Sewell 2012: 3). Therefore, learners need the ability to interact with participants of a culture (McKay 2002: 82), or as in the case of ELF, with various cultures. Therefore, we are dealing with the teaching of an international language with an international culture (Alptekin 2007: 268). This is not to say that there is something like a world culture, but one could imagine something like an ELF culture as a variety of cultures.

In fact, one can see ELF as a way of speaking English liberated from a culture while at the same time transporting a lot of cultures in ever changing constellations (Seidlhofer 2004: 218). Therefore, what seems to be needed is “an increased socio-political and intercultural awareness [...]” (Seidlhofer 2001: 140). The question that one might now ask is how it is possible to deal with such a situation in the language classroom and how various cultures can be integrated in teaching.

A first answer to this question can be found in the person of the non-native teacher. In fact, as already mentioned, the teacher in an ELF context needs to be seen as a good model for students. In this sense, she or he can also serve as a good model for cross-cultural communication as they can present their experiences and their knowledge about the local language and the local culture (Sowden 2011: 95). In being successful ELF speakers they know how to communicate effectively with speakers from various backgrounds and should be able to pass this knowledge on to their learners.

In order to prepare learners for cross-cultural communication teachers might also include activities in which participants from various cultural backgrounds take part. As Jenkins (2000: 74) shows, a wide range of situations in which interlocutors from different L1 backgrounds should be introduced in order to be able to communicate successfully in various ELF encounters. Hence, including a variety of such activities will be an important task for teachers.

The possibilities teachers have to do so are again audio recordings, but also reading texts, videos, pictures etc. in which cultural diversity may lead to misunderstanding. In dealing reflectively and critically with such texts, awareness of differences in encounters with speakers from various backgrounds might be raised. Although there is no information on the availability of teaching materials for cultural diversity, the internet can be seen as a seemingly endless resource to find texts which serve as a means to teach and train intercultural competence.

Therefore, with teaching cultural diversity the focus is again on awareness raising. Furthermore, learners should be able to establish a sense of comity. This means to establish a positive attitude or a friendly relation with other cultures (McKay 2002: 127). The importance of such an attitude becomes clear in another finding. In fact, it is reported that intelligibility depends on whether the interlocutors are willing or unwilling to understand (Seidlhofer 2011: 36). An ELF classroom is consequently not only concerned with linguistic, but also with cultural differences and attitudes towards them.

In this sense, comity is related to accommodation skills. The learners will need to accept that accommodation is not only needed to deal with certain differences in pronunciation but also for coping with various contexts and different cultural norms (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011: 306). This is also true of pragmatic rules, as even they vary from culture to culture (McKay 2002: 127f.). Students consequently need to know how to deal with such differences without acquiring all the culture dependent rules (ibid.). In making students aware of those variations and in preparing them to cope with encounters in which speakers from various lingua-cultural backgrounds take part they will be able to communicate successfully in a wide range of situations.

Specific activities the teacher could include for this purpose are various. First of all it might be valuable to interpret texts critically and to let learners guess what certain behaviours could mean (McKay 2002: 83). Such activities should consequently also be related to cultural behaviours and norms of the local culture (ibid.). Another way of preparing learners for interactions with speakers from different backgrounds is to present encounters in which successful intercultural communication takes place (ibid. 76). Including a variety of examples of such situations presents the students with various models apart from the teacher.

Therefore, a culturally sensitive way of approaching diversity together with a reflective approach to cultural content (ibid. 128) might be the best way to deal with the variety of ELF encounters that learners need to be prepared for. Knowing how to deal with cultural diversity seems to be a central issue of ELF communication as it might be decisive for successful interactions. If students are prepared to deal with cultural differences adequately it can also be a capability which can be exploited (Pölzl 2003: 20). In fact, being able to accommodate to speakers from various backgrounds as well as to show one's own culture can be seen as an essential element of an ELF speaker's identity (ibid.).

As will become clear in the empirical part, intercultural competence is a big issue in the Austrian curriculum too. Thus, ELF research offers a lot of findings which foster this capability. As Seidlhofer (2004: 226) states: "For one thing, a reorientation of English away from the fascination with ENL and toward the cross-cultural role of ELF will make it easier to take on board findings from research into related areas of *intercultural communication* [...]" (italics in original). To what extent research findings presented here can be considered will be seen.

What was found in this subchapter is that learners need to be made aware of cultural diversity which is a fact one has to deal with in ELF encounters. In order to be able to communicate successfully in such situations it is crucial to know how to cope with this

diversity. Reflection and awareness raising activities are very valuable in order to achieve this capability. Furthermore, it is important to present role models which can be found in the teacher as well as in other texts available.

Up to now research findings regarding the content of ELT have been presented. However, as we are dealing with the teaching of English as a school subject we cannot only focus on content. Inextricably linked to school subjects are testing and assessment. Therefore, the next section will briefly review results from research into this aspect.

3.6 Testing and assessment

There is not a lot which can be said regarding testing in an ELF-informed pedagogy. In fact, the issue of testing is referred to as “one of the most pressing problems” (Jenkins 2006: 174) in ELF research. However, the few results there are will be summed up in this short subchapter.

Throughout the review of research findings it was found that ELF is very flexible when it comes to influences from the L1. Therefore, it is problematic to distinguish between a local variety and an error (*ibid.*). With regard to this issue the focus on ENL norms is an essential issue again. In fact, the problem seems to be that the distinction between error and variation depends entirely on the evaluation of a feature by NS (Jenkins 2012: 489). Therefore, sticking to a focus on NS as the ultimate authority will always highlight features which do not conform to the standard as errors even if they do not cause intelligibility problems (Seidlhofer 2011: 29).

Consequently, a focus on ENL norms with regard to such issues cannot work in an ELF-informed pedagogy. In fact, a proficient ELF user can and should not be judged against ENL norms (Jenkins 2007: 21). Still, the problem is that there needs to be something that one can test as this is an inherent characteristic of school subjects. As ELF focuses on intelligibility to a large extent, this might be the goal against which students could be measured. However, the applicability of testing intelligibility is definitely not a straightforward endeavour. Still, there are some suggestions from research that might help in, at least, accounting for it.

In fact, the most straightforward field to test might be pronunciation. As was stated, it is a relatively closed system with clear reference points due to findings from the LFC. In fact, Jenkins argues that in testing situations the core features as well as the willingness and the

ability to accommodate should be taken into consideration (2000: 214f.). Due to the findings presented above, variation in non-core features must not be a decisive aspect in evaluating students' pronunciation skills.

For the application of pronunciation testing Walker (2010: 149) proposes the following proceeding: at the beginning of a course diagnostic tests should be taken to identify the features which students need to focus on. This can be done by the use of recordings or spontaneous speeches (ibid. 149f.). What follows then is awareness raising, as learners should know about the features which are tested and/ or are problematic for them (ibid. 150).

The next step in testing pronunciation is to carry out achievement tests to monitor progress (ibid. 152). After those achievement tests, learners are again made aware of what they have already achieved, and of what they still need to practice. Such a procedure again helps in awareness raising and takes account of the learner focus.

However, so far we have not found ways to evaluate pronunciation. This is what Walker postpones to the third step of assessment. In the end of this three stage process a holistic test should be carried out (Walker 2010: 156). Such a test does no longer focus on isolated features, but, via a communicative task, evaluates the whole impact of a learners' pronunciation as well as his or her ability to accommodate (ibid.). Thus, the goal at the end of teaching pronunciation is intelligibility; the focus on certain features in the beginning leads to this ultimate goal.

In order to assess the overall intelligibility Walker proposes to use given assessment activities and methods which are adapted for the purpose of evaluating pronunciation considering ELF research findings (ibid. 159). Thus, tools such as rating scales can be used. However, the important issue is that the focus shifts from ENL standards to intelligibility with acceptance of variation where it does not hinder successful communication.

What can be seen by the example of pronunciation is that ELF findings can be included in testing. However, as was noted in the beginning, it might be relatively easy for pronunciation testing. Nonetheless, considering findings from pragmatics, the teacher could try to look out for the use of strategies and evaluate if and how successfully learners employ them. Moreover, code-switching will no longer be seen as an error straightaway. Instead, teachers could value if it is used as a flow-keeper or as a sign of cultural identity without causing communication difficulties. Furthermore, comity and cultural awareness may be tested via reflective written or spoken tasks in which students describe how they would or could deal with certain situations.

What becomes clear is, ELF findings can and should change the way language is tested. Even if no specific ELF tests are produced (Jenkins 2007: 244), actually used assessment methods can be adapted in order to allow for variation where it does not cause communication breakdowns. Such an understanding of testing shows that an ELF-informed approach to ELT focuses on the learner and on what she or he actually can do. At the same time it provides feedback on what students need to practice in order to be intelligible in a wide range of situations.

Hopefully, with further progression of research into ELF, availability of teaching materials will follow. For the moment, taking into consideration the findings we can only use available publications in a way that regards results from ELF research. “What is crucial therefore is not *what* teaching materials are used but *how* they are used” (Seidlhofer 2011: 201). Thus, teachers will have to critically reflect on what they can do and not just on what they have to do (Seidlhofer 1999: 240), in order to prepare their students in the best way for their future lives as ELF speakers.

Hence, even if accounting for findings from research into ELF seems to be a difficult task at hand, it is already possible if teachers are willing to do so. However, we cannot disregard what they have to do. In fact, teachers have guidelines they have to follow. The most important of which might be the curriculum. Therefore, we are now turning to the critical analysis of the Austrian curricula for grammar schools in order to see whether they allow for the inclusion of ELF features and, if they do so, to what extent this might be possible.

4. Research methodology

The analysis of a curriculum cannot be conducted arbitrarily but needs to be based on a justified method. However, curriculum analysis is not a very common research methodology and it was not possible to find one standardised tool for such an investigation. However, a grid developed by Haenisch, which can be found in the appendix, might be seen as a possible means for a basic curriculum analysis. Unfortunately, the document is in German; therefore, in the argumentation of the categories derived from the original, the content will be paraphrased in English.

First of all, Haenisch recognises that there is no general model that can be applied to every evaluation and to every curriculum (Haenisch 1982: 184). In fact, he states that for different kinds of analyses adjustments to his grid need to be made (*ibid.*). Thus, for the purpose of trying to find ways to include features from research into ELF in the Austrian curriculum an adaptation of his model will be used. The following section will explain the adjustments made to serve this purpose. The tables present paraphrases of Haenisch's subcategories in English in the left column whereas the right column shows what will be looked at in this analysis.

Haenisch begins with category a) dealing with the accordance of the curriculum with legal requirements. However, the task is not to come up with a completely new curriculum but rather to look at what can be done according to the existing version. Thus, it can be taken for granted that the current syllabus does meet legal, institutional and societal requirements. Therefore, this category will be neglected in the following analysis.

The second category, b) looks at the curriculum with regard to (recent) research findings. Hence, this part of the grid will be relevant in looking at possibilities in order to regard ELF features.

Controversial positions	
Scientific appropriateness	Underlying approach of the curriculum
Inclusion of scientifically not justified goals	
Omission of certain aspects	Acknowledgement of ELF
Inclusion of recent approaches and tendencies	Acknowledgement of ELF
Inclusion of all scientific aspects	Extent to which ELF might be included

As the following analysis does not want to criticise the curriculum in general but looks at a specific aspect, scientific appropriateness is not an issue. Due to the same reason whether or not unjustified goals are included will not be discussed. However, for a basic understanding it might be necessary to have an idea about the general underlying approach of the curriculum.

For the purpose of this investigation it will be furthermore important to look at whether the curriculum omits something, or in this case, whether ELF is acknowledged at all. This question ties in with the analysis of the inclusion of recent approaches and tendencies. Controversial issues are of course also important but will be looked at in the next category. Additionally, in this category it will also be interesting to find out to which extent research findings might be included according to general requirements of the curriculum. Therefore, this will be an issue instead of looking at various scientific aspects which might again be relevant to a general critique of the document.

Category c) focuses on didactic aspects. In this category we will have a closer look at what students should learn for which purposes and in which ways.

Selection and justification of didactic concepts	Underlying didactic principles/ guidelines
Selection and justification of the overall goals	Selection and justification of the overall goals
Selection, justification and determination of the content	Selection, justification and determination of the content
Selection and justification of the learning processes	Selection and justification of the learning processes
Consistency between goals, content and learning processes	Inconsistencies between didactic principles, underlying approaches and goals/ Contradictions

In general this category does not need a lot of changes for the purpose of the following analysis. However, the focus will be slightly shifted to enable a closer look at the underlying didactic principles, as this analysis should serve the purpose of examining whether there can be an alternative to an ENL focus. Moreover, there will be a focus on contradictions.

The following category, d) deals with the structure of curricula. The general idea is to look at the composition of the document.

Consistent structure/ composition	Stages at which ELF features might be included
Relationship between content and suggested topics	Content and suggested topics
Relationship between content and goals	Relationship between content and goals
Sequences of content and/ or goal related elements	Sequences of content and/ or goal related elements
Suggested possible realisations	Suggested possible realisations
Clarity of the structure	

This category is again slightly adapted as, for instance, structural consistency is not a main issue of this investigation. Much more important is it to see at which stages ELF could be included. Moreover, the argumentation for the presented goals, content and related topics will be investigated in order to see whether these aspects allow for a consideration of ELF research findings.

Moving on in the grid, the next category, e) deals with goals and content in more detail.

Relationship between goals/content and learning experiences of the students	
Relationship between specific teaching related goals and overall goals	General goals related to research areas
Binding force of goals and content	Extent to which ELF goals might be taken into consideration depending on the binding force of the goals presented
References to teaching across subjects	References to teaching across subjects
Openness to alternative goals	Alternative goals
Reference to orientation towards the future	Orientation towards real-life situations
Precise formulations of the goals	
Justified underlying concept for the goals	

In this category it obviously makes sense to closely investigate the binding force of the goals to see if they are completely focused on a native speaker competence or whether there is room for alternative ELF goals. What is more, there will be a closer look at teaching across different subjects as including real-life projects and issues from other disciplines might probably open up room for ELF findings, as will be argued.

This goes hand in hand with the orientation of the curriculum on either an idealized native speaker encounter or on real life ELF use in the world. The analysis of the justification of the

goals was included in the last category and will therefore not be discussed again. Similarly, the formulation of the goals will be ignored as this might not reveal interesting results for the purpose of this project.

Category f) looks at the language of the curriculum. The language itself might most probably not reveal any interesting insights into the ways in which ELF could inform teaching practices in Austria and will therefore not be taken into consideration.

The next broad category g), “Anforderungen” (Demands), on the other hand will be relevant to an underlying ENL as well as ELF perspective.

Benchmark levels	Benchmark levels
Reference to possible differentiation on various levels	Reference to possible differentiation on various levels
The extent to which levels can be reached	The extent to which levels can be reached

As can be seen above, the categories here are adequate for this investigation. Adopting an ELF perspective the questions of appropriateness, differentiation and the extent to which demands can be fulfilled are equally valid. Hence, we can take over the categories just the way they are. However, this category will be moved in the structure of the analysis as it might be the case that the next category, h) dealing with the learner perspective, could provide preliminary insights which may help to understand the demands better.

Learner orientation regarding experiences they possibly make	Recognition of ELF experiences the students might probably make
Reference to needs and interests of the learners	Reference to needs, projected future demands and interests of the students
Adequate accessibilities for the learners	Is the approach adequate for L2 learners (i.e. does it respect the student as future competent and independent L2 user)
Promotion of learner-adequate activities	Reference to learner choice
Distribution of different activities for different learner types	
Reference to learning preconditions and prior learning experiences	Reference to prior knowledge/ learning experiences of the students

The presented theory in the first three chapters clearly revealed that there has to be a strong learner focus in an ELF-oriented approach to pedagogy. Hence, this category will be very important for the purpose of this investigation. First and foremost, it will be looked at whether

the special case of the L2 learner as a future competent speaker independent from ENL norms is recognised. This entails if and to what extent future needs and experiences of the learners are included. Moreover, it will be looked at whether or not learners' interests are referred to and if they have a right to state their preferences.

This is seemingly pretty much the same as in the general categories from Haenisch's grid, however, again a slight change in focus was made. The question concerning the account for various learner types, for example, has not been an issue in ELF research yet and will therefore not be treated separately.

Category i), which deals with the application of a new curriculum, will not be included as this is not the task of this analysis. Instead category j), concerning testing and assessment, will again inform the way we analyse the document.

Suggested methods for assessment and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the suggested testing and assessment methods acknowledge L1 influences • Recognition of intelligibility and variation
Diagnostic test	
Testing of all skills and competences	Testing of different skills and competences of the language

Obviously, the analysis will try to find suggested testing methods as well as to what extent they propose diagnostic tests. However, the ELF focus brings about the need to further look at whether there is reference to L1 transfer and if there is a differentiation between variation and intelligibility in the perception of errors, as discussed in Chapter 3. The last two categories dealing with reference to other school types (k) and to general education (upbringing) (l) will not be dependent on whether we take an ELF perspective or not and will therefore be neglected.

Thus, from the adjustments made to Haenisch's grid, categories can be developed which may be used for a curriculum analysis that looks at ways to include ELF features. The system developed for this purpose is presented in section 4.2. The results from the analysis should consequently allow for a comparison with the results from research into ELF presented in the first part of the paper. The following sections will therefore, after briefly introducing the Austrian school system, present and discuss the findings of the curriculum analysis based on the developed category system.

4.1 Category system (Derived from Haenisch 1982: 98-104)

I. Research

- a. Underlying approach of the curriculum
- b. The acknowledgment of ELF
- c. The extent to which ELF might be included

II. Didactic aspects

- a. Didactic principles
- b. Selection and justification of goals
- c. Selection and justification of content
- d. Selection and justification of learning processes
- e. Contradictions

III. Structure

- a. Relationship between content and suggested topics
- b. Relationship between content and goals
- c. Sequences of content and/or goal related elements
- d. Stages at which ELF features can be included
- e. Suggested possible realisations

IV. Goals and Content

- a. Goals related to research areas
- b. Binding force of the goals
- c. Reference to reality
- d. Alternative goals
- e. Teaching across subjects

V. The learner perspective

- a. Acknowledgement of the special case of the L2 learner
- b. Reference to choice
- c. Needs, projected future demands, and interests of L2 learners
- d. Reference to prior learning experiences/ knowledge

VI. Demands

- a. Benchmark levels
- b. Differentiation
- c. Appropriateness

VII. Testing and assessment

- a. Influence of the L1
- b. Intelligibility and variation
- c. Testing and assessment of different skills and competences

5. Context

In the last chapter a tool for the analysis of the Austrian curriculum for grammar schools was developed. Before this tool can be applied it is necessary to get an idea of what is analysed. In fact, in order to understand the findings and the following discussion it is important to know in which context this investigation takes place. Therefore, this short chapter will give an introduction to the linguistic situation, the school-system with reference to language classrooms, and to the curricula in Austria.

First of all, some demographic information is needed in order to understand the situation in Austrian language classrooms. In the last census carried out in 2001 it was found that slightly more than 8 million people live in Austria (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 12). The percentage of foreigners was 9.8% (ibid.). For the linguistic situation of the country this means that in 2001 88.6% of the people stated to use German exclusively (ibid. 13).

Nonetheless, one can say that we face a complex linguistic situation as there are various autochthonous minorities and as the German language varies regionally (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 85). A consequence of this linguistic situation is that, especially in urban areas, quite a number of students do not have German as their L1 (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 183).

Still, the Austrian constitution defines German as the official language (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 22). Due to this status the language of instruction is German as well (ibid. 30). However, this is not binding if local authorities decide to change the instructional language which consequently offers the opportunity to use other languages as working languages in the classroom. (ibid.). Still, German is regarded as **the** medium of instruction.

Regarding the general structure of the Austrian school system it can be noted that school attendance in public schools is free of charge and generally accessible (ibid. 15). The organisation of the schools is regulated nation-wide (ibid.). Still, some of the competences are subject to federal governments (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 85). However, the curricula looked at in this project are defined by national authorities and published by the ministry of education, as will be seen.

Before turning to specific aspects of language learning and teaching in Austria it is important to state that school attendance is compulsory from the age of six onwards and prescribes nine years of school education (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 17). After the first four years, which are spent in primary school, students can decide between “Hauptschule”

(secondary modern schools), “Unterstufe der allgemein höher bildenden Schule” (lower secondary of grammar schools) and schools for learners with special needs (ibid.). After the end of compulsory education students have various possibilities for further education.

First of all, learners can decide to continue with upper secondary grammar schools (AHS Oberstufe) which are focusing on a broad general education and end after four years with the Matura (similar to the GCE A-levels) (ibid.). The alternative is to attend a vocational school (berufsbildende höhere Schule BHS) which lasts for five years and ends with the Matura and a diploma examination (ibid.). Vocational schools are supposed to prepare learners for a certain profession (ibid.). The most frequented types focus on either commercial or technical education (ibid.).

Even if more learners decide to attend a vocational school after the end of compulsory education (ibid. 18), it might be more valuable for the investigation of curricula to look at grammar schools. The reason for this can be found in the focus. As grammar schools should prepare learners for university, they focus on a more general education (BMUKK 2004: 1). Thus, it might be easier to include an ELF approach in this context.

Another reason for this is that in vocational schools it might be more interesting to investigate specific uses of English such as BELF or ESP in general. Last but not least, the curriculum for lower secondary grammar schools and secondary modern schools are the same (BMUKK 2010 & ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 36). Consequently, a focus on this document will be more valuable as it will come up with results affecting almost all students in their 4th – 8th year of education.

After the Austrian school system was briefly introduced and the choice for the curricula for the following analysis was argued, a last aspect that is important for this investigation is the role of English in the Austrian school system. What can be said straight away is that English is very prominent in Austrian classrooms. In fact, Austria was among the first countries to include a foreign language in primary school in 1983 (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 92). In the beginning, foreign languages were mandatory from the third grade of primary school onwards, whereas in 2003 it became obligatory to start foreign language teaching in the first grade (ibid.). This leads to the fact that 93% of all primary pupils have foreign language classes (ÖSZ s.t.: 3). Interestingly enough, English is the most important language in this school type (Felberbauer 2005: 57).

In fact, even if despite English also French and the languages of all neighbouring countries could be taught, in more than 90% of the cases English is chosen (ibid.). English is “therefore THE first foreign language in the country” (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter

2011: 183 – capitalisation in the original). This trend is not restricted to primary schools. In fact, 99% of the students in the lower and 96% in the upper secondary learn English (ÖSZ s.t.: 4). Therefore, English is the dominating foreign language in the Austrian school system (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 40f.). The primary reason for the choice of English, at least in primary schools, is the preference of the parents (Felberbauer 2005: 57).

Furthermore, English is not only dominant in general, it is also the most common working language used. CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is very prominent and an important issue according to the authorities, as will be seen in the analysis. In fact, 90% of the subjects which are taught in a foreign language are taught in English (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 76). On the one hand, this is due to the availability of materials, while on the other hand, one can assume that the reason for the predominance of English is also determined by the recognition of its importance as an international means of communication. This recognition is also implicitly inherent in the Austrian curriculum, especially in teaching across different subjects, as will be discussed in the last chapter.

The last paragraphs demonstrated how school education in Austria is organised and how prominent the English language is in Austrian schools. Therefore, we are now turning to the organisation of the subject English itself by looking at the curricula.

Generally, the curricula have to be seen as prescriptions by law under the authority of the ministry of education (*ibid.* 15). The curricula for foreign languages define the syllabus, which is in accordance with the competence levels of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for languages (*ibid.* 51). As already mentioned, the curricula for lower secondary grammar schools and secondary modern schools are the same. This document became law in September 2006 and since then confirms to the curriculum of the upper secondary, which became valid in 2004 (*ibid.* 38).

The impression one could now get is that curricula are binding documents which allow for no alternatives. If this was the case the whole endeavour of trying to find ways to account for ELF findings could be seen as useless. However, this is not the case. In fact, the curriculum provides areas which can, but do not have to be, defined autonomously by individual schools (*ibid.* 15).

These changes can be made according to local requirements (*ibid.* 50f.). Moreover, teachers can choose methods and materials freely in the design of their teaching (*ibid.* 51). Hence, there might be ways to include more or different things than the curriculum prescribes. Consequently, an analysis of the curriculum makes sense in order to see how some of the pedagogical implications of ELF research could be taken into account. The next section

therefore provides the results from the analysis, whereas these findings will be discussed in Chapter 7.

6. Analysis of the curriculum

The last chapter offered insights into the Austrian school system and the role English plays in it. As the context of this investigation should be clear, the following chapter provides findings from the analysis of the curriculum according to the categories found in Chapter 4. As will be seen, not all the results can be presented in detail. Therefore, the complete analysis is included in the appendix.

The following chapter provides a summary of the most relevant results while it neglects overlaps and repetitions within the categories. Moreover, differences and similarities between the documents for upper and lower secondary are only pointed out if they seem to be relevant to the purpose of this investigation. Before the results are presented some general observations concerning the curriculum need to be made.

6.1 General aspects concerning the curriculum

First of all, the structure of the curricula is an aspect one needs to be made aware of in order to understand the following analysis. The document is subdivided into six sections. The first three sections “Allgemeines Bildungsziel” (general goal of education), “Allgemeine didaktische Grundsätze” (general didactic principles) and “Schul- und Unterrichtsplanung” (lesson planning and school organisation), have been the same for lower as well as upper secondary since 2004 when the document was updated (BMUKK 2010). The fourth part gives the numbers of hours per subject whereas the fifth part contains the syllabi for religious education (ibid.).

The sixth part then provides the syllabi for all the other subjects divided into one document per subject for the lower and one for the upper secondary (ibid.). English for both age groups is included in documents entitled “Lebende Fremdsprachen” (living foreign languages) (ibid.). The following analysis looks at lower as well as upper secondary levels in order to provide an insight into what authorities suggest that learners should achieve in English attending this specific type of school and which ELF findings can be considered in this school type.

Even if towards the end of the last chapter it was found that the curriculum allows for individual changes, for upper as well as lower secondary, it still has to be seen as a mandatory guideline (BMUKK 2000a: 1 & BMUKK 2004: 1). In the first part of the document, it is

defined as the basis for planning and regulation of the teaching process concerning content as well as methods (BMUKK 2000b: 1). Thus, the teacher has to respect what the curriculum asks him or her to do and cannot decide her- or himself what to include and what to ignore.

At the beginning of the curriculum for every subject the main educational and teaching aims are presented, followed by didactic guidelines as well as content areas (BMUKK 2013). What is more, the last section presents which demands students should meet at the end of a certain grade (*ibid.*). After having briefly introduced general aspects of the curriculum, the first aspect that will be looked at according to the category system is research. Therefore, this section looks at the underlying approach of the curriculum and whether the role of ELF is acknowledged.

Please note: Findings are referred to in the following way: The Roman numeral indicates the broad category while the minuscule refers to the sub-category. The Arabic number then indicates where in the table the result can be found. The capital letter indicates whether the statement is taken from the general or basic curriculum for all subjects (B), from the document for the lower (L) or the upper (U) secondary. The following number gives the page of the document at which the quotation can be found. As an example, VIIb1-L2 refers to a result taken from category VII which can be found in the first line of subcategory b and is taken from page 2 of the curriculum for lower secondary grammar schools.

6.2 Reference to scientific research in the curriculum

If we move on to the specific document for languages, we can first of all say that the document regards languages as the expression of culture and lifestyle (Ia1-L1). Here one can already suspect that the focus is on native speaker communities. In fact, category 1a demonstrates that according to the curriculum material used in the language classroom should be as “authentic” as possible (Ia6-U3). Consequently, there should be possibilities to get in contact with native speakers (*ibid.*) and the focus on correctness should increase with progress (Ia5-U). Therefore, it can be said that the curriculum has an underlying focus on native speaker usage, a fact that will become more obvious in other findings of this analysis.

The underlying approach to language learning on the other hand is action-oriented (Ia4-U2). However, scientific justifications or arguments for this approach cannot be found. In fact, even if the curriculum mentions a law which requires that teaching has to be based on scientific findings (Ia2-B2), there are no research findings mentioned in the document itself.

As no clear indications of the approach are given, this issue will be looked at in more detail in the discussion of the results.

The phenomenon of English as a lingua franca as such is not acknowledged. There is only reference made to lingua franca functions of languages in general. Indeed, if the language in question functions as a lingua franca, NNS realisations should also be included (Ib1- U3). This statement was found in the syllabus for the upper secondary, thus, for the lower secondary it obviously is not an issue. Moreover, as the curriculum is valid for all languages, even if it is **the** international language (see Chapter 1) and one might expect reference to it, English as a rather particular lingua franca is not mentioned.

As a consequence, for subcategory 1c no specific possibilities to include ELF were found; still, there might be possibilities to include various things as teachers have to come up with the concrete application of the curriculum as well as a temporal plan themselves (Ic1-B9 & Ic4-B8). Another opportunity to take ELF into consideration can be found in the distinction between “Kernbereich” (core area) and “Erweiterungsbereich” (expansion area) (Ic2-B9). Whereas the curriculum dedicates two thirds of the time to the core area, the rest of the time can be used for other things the teacher has to specify (ibid.).

However, the core-area is not very specific either. Instead the curriculum presents concise abstract overall concerns which have to be put into practice by the teachers (Ic3-B9 & Ic5-B9). Thus, the core area may also allow for the inclusion of ELF elements. How and to what extent this will be possible can be seen in the discussion of the results in the last chapter. Before that, however, we need to look at the underlying didactic principles of the curriculum to see whether they also offer such possibilities.

6.3 Didactic aspects of the curriculum

Generally, I expected that specific content-related statements would be found in this category; however, in the curriculum didactic aspects seem to refer to overall goals. In fact, the first aspect mentioned in the didactic principles is that the curriculum prompts goals (IIa1-B5). Hence, we can speak of a goal-oriented curriculum. One could expect explicit reference to native speaker competence as the ultimate goal now, but interestingly enough this is not the case. Instead, the overall goal of language learning and teaching is described as communicative competence (IIa12-U2 & IIa2-L2).

Consequently, language competence, that is, the ability to communicate successfully, is in the foreground (IIa3-L1). The broad term communicative competence is then further specified. It is stated that competence should be reached in four domains of the language, namely, listening, reading, spoken interaction, oral production and writing (ibid.).

Those competences in different domains of the language should enable students to adequately take part in common situations according to their learning stage as well as to their age (ibid.). Furthermore, they should be practised to an equal extent (IIa4-L2). Hence, the task for the teacher is to design plans by choosing content and methods. Furthermore, she or he has to present learning strategies to reach those goals (IIa5-B5). This should be done in a variety of ways to provide learners with a lot of opportunities to develop those competences (ibid.).

This variety of methods ties in with the didactic principle that there should be a good learning atmosphere (IIa6-L2) and that new knowledge should be related to existing knowledge (IIa7-B7). What is more, the didactic principles request that in language classrooms students should develop socially adequate communication behaviour (IIa8-L1). So it seems that there is a strong focus on the learner, which will be more closely investigated in the analysis of category 5.

Some of the principles which are mentioned concern aspects in relation to the L1. More specifically, the curriculum prescribes the inclusion of as much foreign language as possible (IIa9-L3). German should consequently be used as rarely as possible (IIa10-U2). However, there should also be reflective treatment of the foreign language with reference to the learners' native language (IIa11-U2). One might say that these prescriptions are contradictory to some extent. Bearing in mind that there is no explicit reference to research findings a question which may be asked is how the prescriptions are justified or at least if there is a document on which they are based. A response to that question can be found in the statement that for upper and lower secondary alike the goals are based on the CEFR (IIb1-L4 & IIb2-U4).

As was stated that didactic aspects rather concern general goals, the following prescriptions were found in this category: comprehension of speakers who use standard pronunciation, comprehension of various texts by the use of different reading strategies, the ability to talk adequately to L1 speakers of the language in situations relevant to the learners, as well as correct use of various text types adequate to the recipient (IIb3-L1). Here again a focus on a prospective NS interlocutor can clearly be identified.

Relating the vaguely formulated goals in the didactic aspects to the content it was found that teachers are responsible for the specific realisation of the curriculum themselves.

Therefore, it can be assumed that there are no specific indications for content. In fact, the content is defined with reference to the requested competence levels (IIc1-B9). Hence, the content is determined by the goals. This definition of content is supposed to guarantee possible comparisons between students as well as equal demands for all learners (ibid.). Still, these prescriptions do not give clear ideas of what can and should be taught.

However, there are some specific aspects mentioned such as: the use of learner-adequate technical texts in order to meet future demands (IIc2-L1) and various national language varieties to ensure that comprehension is widely possible (IIc3-U3). In this context the inclusion of non-native varieties is also mentioned but only if this is what students are interested in or will need due to social, occupational or regional reasons (ibid.).

Furthermore, for the core area there are some broad categories which form the basis of content (Ic2-B9 & Ic3-B9). In fact the curriculum prescribes that in order to enhance greatest possible competence a wide range of public, occupational and studying related communication situations in public and private domains have to be included (IIIb1-U4). The topics suggested have to be chosen from broad areas which will be looked at in the next category.

Nonetheless, what can be said already is that a lot of work resides with the teachers, as only very general demands and hardly any concretisations are presented. What is more, the teachers also have to specify which aspects she or he will include to what extent (Ic5-B9). Therefore, this provides interesting findings which will be taken up in the discussion in the last chapter.

The next category, dealing with learning processes, will not play an important part for the integration of ELF and is therefore only briefly reviewed here. Still, it may be interesting to note that the curriculum states that a wide range of learning methods should be presented (IIId1-U2). Furthermore, translations should be used for the presentation of content only minimally on lower levels and sporadically in the upper secondary (IIId2-U2).

Reading through this analysis, one can get the impression that some of the prescriptions are contradictory. This is true at least to some extent, as we found that the L1 should be used reflectively while at the same time as much L2 use as possible has to be included. Furthermore, it is recognised that learners make errors and that they approximate the language via various steps (IIe1-U2). In consequence, errors in the curriculum are seen as constructive elements of language learning (ibid.). Nonetheless, correctness with reference to the target language, that is a native speaker standard, should be approximated (ibid.). Thus, on the one

hand there is a differentiation between accuracy and successful communication, while on the other hand the NS remains the ultimate authority.

This contradiction is also present in the requirement to use authentic material (IIE2U2). With regard to the function of English as an international language, non-native realisations cannot be ignored. However, according to the document NS materials are the authentic texts which should be used (see Chapter 1). The same is true of the demand to use the language authentically in teaching across different subjects (IIE4-L3), as also in this context the lingua franca use of English might be much more common.

What can be inferred consequently is that the curriculum definitely focuses on native speaker realisations of the language, while it demands a focus on the use of the language in “real-life”. The implications of those and other controversies are going to be discussed in the last chapter. Moving on in the analysis, the relationship between content and suggested topics highlights further contradictions.

6.4 Structure: Content, topics, and possible realisations

The structure of the curriculum might reveal interesting insights as there will be a focus on content and topics by which the curriculum assumes that the prescribed goals can be reached. As was found that content is only very vaguely prescribed, the topics might offer more concrete examples. However, in this context it is only suggested to use topics derived from the areas of language and communication”, “human beings and society”, “nature and technology”, “creativity and design”, and “health and sports” (BMUKK 2000b: 3f.).

Additionally, it is stated that learners should be familiarised with a wide range of topics and contexts (IIIa3-L3). Moreover, the curriculum requires that topics to reach the goals should be relevant to reality and the current situation of the world (IVc1-B7) as well as refer to recent events (IIC4-U4). The assumption is that dealing with such topics enables learners to gain insights, knowledge and competences which allow them to cope with various situations in the “real world” (IIIa5-B7).

Even if the topics are not given, there are a lot of restrictions concerning their selection. In fact, the choice of the topics should ensure that learners gain an understanding of societal relations (IIIb2-U1) and should allow insights into society, civilisation, politics, media, economy, science, culture and art of the respective speech community (IIIb3-U4). In general, a variety of different topics should ensure that students are presented with different

lexical items (IIIb4-U4). Thus, there is again a strong focus on an idealised NS community, while no specific examples are given.

In sum, there are only very vague and general formulations, and no specific indications concerning topics that might or should be used in language classrooms. Consequently no possible realisations are suggested (IIIe1-B8). This fact might allow for a lot of ELF elements to be included. In fact, despite those very general requirements and the broad topic areas, the choice is completely up to the teacher (ibid.).

Sequences are not clearly defined either. The proceeding seems to be completely up to the teacher; that is, she or he can decide when which topics, content, methods, etc. to reach the goals are introduced. Still, the goals have to be reached. The only hints concerning progress that the document offers are that if progression in teaching is faster than expected, competences should be further elaborated, that is, more domains and different text-types as well as situations should be included (IIIc1-L5 & IIIc5-U3).

Additionally it states that, with progress in teaching, there should be a focus on different registers, coherence, fluency, clarity, and appropriateness (IIIc2-U3 & IIIc3-U3). Similarly, the lexical repertoire should be enlarged according to situations and context (IIIc4-U3) as well as correctness should constantly become more important (IIIc5-U3). Again one can say that the document offers very little information on how teaching can be structured.

As we have seen, the ways in which the goals should be reached are only vaguely described. Therefore, there is a lot of space where ELF features might enter despite the NS orientation. In fact, it appears that the core area needs to be specified by the teachers to the same extent as the expansion areas (IIId1-B8). Hence, the teacher could shift the focus from ENL to ELF realisations and come up with a concrete plan at which stages certain elements may be considered.

6.5 Goals in the Austrian curriculum

As general goals were found and discussed in the section on didactic aspects, it is necessary to look at goals related to research areas in order to see to what extent ELF could play a role in teaching. In this context, the curriculum prescribes that grammar is more important in function than in form (IVa1-L2 & IVa2-U3). Moreover, grammar, as well as the lexical repertoire, has to be taught and practiced in various contextualised forms (Iva3-L2).

Regarding pragmatics, linguistic functions are mentioned as essential elements for a communicative competence (IVa4-U3).

Moving on to phonetic aspects the curriculum says that comprehension, production and intonation have to be taught to such an extent that it allows for an adequate communication in the language in question (IVa5-U3). In this context it is mentioned that an approximation to standard pronunciation should be aimed at as long as learners are not discouraged by it (ibid.). For this purpose the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) should be taught at least to such an extent that it can be read (IVa6-U2 & IVa7-L3). Furthermore, non-verbal features such as facial expressions, gesticulation, eye-contact, proxemic etc. should be introduced (IVa8-U3) as well as, social competences in multicultural settings have to be developed (IVa9-U1).

Thus, in connection to non-verbal features, intercultural competence is a big issue. More specifically, learners should be made aware of the diversity of languages in Europe and of the existence of other cultures by the use of intercultural topics (IVa17-U1). The use of such topics should raise awareness of cultural differences and similarities (IVa18-L1). Moreover, mobility within Europe should be an issue (IVc2-U1).

In this sense, learners should be made aware of the positive aspects a competence in a foreign language has for their occupational and economic situation (ibid.). With reference to globalisation, learners should critically reflect their own identities and should become open-minded (IVc3-B1). In sum, according to the curriculum, interest for cultural differences (IVa10-B5) and the culture of the native speaker community (IVa11-U4) are utterly important in language teaching classrooms in Austria.

Finally, national varieties as well as non-native realisations, if the language functions as a lingua franca, need to be included in the receptive skill of listening (IVa12-U3). However, with listening and participation in spoken interactions, for the levels B1 and B2 there is again a focus on the native speaker (IVa13-16-U5).

Regarding the specific goals we can say that there is still a very strong focus on NS norms. Therefore, the question of the binding force of these goals arises. As the curriculum is goal-driven, one could suspect that it is very strong. Indeed, the goals one finds in the section “Lehrstoff” (syllabus), stated in the form of competence descriptions according to the CEFR, are mandatory (IVb1-B9). For the teachers this entails that the concise and abstract formulations of the goals have to form the basis of their lessons (IVb2-B9).

For the individual goals and competences this means that the indications given for every stage in the learning process, in this case every year, are the basic requirements (IVb3-

L5). As there is still a native speaker focus for the levels B1 and B2, we can assume that this is equally valid for the other levels for which however, no explicit reference to a NS competence was found. Thus, a consideration of ELF features might not be easily possible according to the findings in this category.

Looking at the results so far we have encountered that generally taking account of ELF might be possible, if the overall focus was not on a native speaker competence. Therefore, we can look at the opportunity to include alternative goals. The “Erweiterungsbereich” (expansion area) in which goals can be formulated individually (Ic2-B9 & Ic4-B8) may offer such possibilities.

Still, the goals of the expansion area have to be oriented towards the overall competences (IVd1-B9) which have an ENL focus, as was seen. In spite of that, the formulation of those alternative goals has to account for regional and local conditions, as well as needs, interests and demands of the students (IVd2-B9). Interestingly, the expansion area is also flexible in assessment which has to be adapted according to the decisions the teacher makes content-wise (Ic4-B8). Therefore, the inclusion of ELF might and at the same time might not be possible. This is a dilemma that will be discussed in the next chapter.

Another opportunity for an ELF orientation can be found in teaching across different subjects, as it should confront learners with real life scenarios in various domains of the language (IVe3-B11). Interestingly, teaching across subjects is a big issue for the curriculum as it should help in achieving a good overall education (IVe1-B2) and particularly foreign languages are mentioned as important subjects for teaching across different subjects (IVe2-L3).

In practice, teaching across various subjects should focus on a complex, real-life topic/project relevant to social settings (IVe3-B11). In fact, the curriculum states that learners should experience “authentic” language use in combination with activities from various subjects (IVe2-L3). The goals of the language classroom are then seen in a different light with a focus on the topic or project in order to gain knowledge in broader contexts (IVe4-B11). Thus, findings from research into ELF could be included or may be referred to in teaching across subjects due to the real-life focus. In fact, as was found in the theoretical part, real-life use of English is more frequently ELF than ENL. However, before we can go on to discuss the impact ELF can have on teaching across different subjects, another broad aspect has to be looked at, that is, the perspective of the learner.

6.6 The learners' role in the curriculum

Beginning with the learners' L1 it can be noted that the curriculum prescribes a conscious and reflective approach with respect to the learners' first language (Va1-L3). Along this line, contrasting methods should be introduced in situations in which students may benefit from it (ibid.). It is furthermore acknowledged that students approach the foreign language via various steps in which errors have to be seen as constructive and natural occurrences (Va2-U2). However, as was found in category 2e, correctness in the L2 should still be approximated to a "reasonable extent". Therefore, while implicitly acknowledging that L2 learning cannot lead to an L1 output, the focus of the curriculum is still on ENL standards.

Reference to learners' choice was also mentioned quite a few times in the theoretical part. Legally speaking learners have the right to take part in the organisation of the lessons in Austrian classrooms (Vb1-B8). More specifically, regional conditions as well as the learners' choice should be part in the decision of topics as well as methods used in teaching (Vb2-B6). What is more, students' choice is especially important in the expansion area (Vb3-B9 & Vc4-B9). As was found that this is the area where a lot of flexibility is given, special attention should be paid to the interests and talents of the learners when deciding upon the goals in this area (Vb3-B9).

Not only the students' choice, but also the learners' interests and their reality have to be included (Vc1-B1). More precisely, methodologically and didactically the needs of the students have to be considered in lesson planning (Vc2-B6). One of the goals of language teaching has to be to equip students with competences they need in their future lives, be it in further education or in their future occupation (Vc3-B2). In more detail, the goal of language classrooms in the upper secondary is to prepare learners to be able to deal with basic communicative demands in all domains of the language in various private, occupational, and public situations not only linguistically but also culturally (Vc5-U1).

The focus on the learner is also present in the prescription that teaching has to regard prior knowledge and experiences of the students as well as their mindscape (Vd1-B5). Those aspects have to be reflected in the pedagogic and didactic decisions the teacher makes (Vd2-B5). There is even a law which requires that teaching has to be oriented towards the experiences students have had before (Vd3-B2). Therefore, the curriculum has a strong learner focus, and so would an ELF-oriented approach to teaching, as we saw (Chapter 2.1). The question then is how this learner focus is reflected in the demands.

6.7 Demands of the Austrian curriculum

First of all, despite the recognition of errors as natural aspects of language learning, a good approximation to correctness should be achieved (VIa1-L2). In general, the goals taken over from the CEFR can be seen as basic requirements and every preceding goal needs to be seen as achieved (VIa2-L5 & VIa2-U6). The goals from the CEFR are seen as standards against which all students should be measured as will be seen in Chapter 7. Hence, one may ask whether individual differences are recognised in such demands. In this respect, it can be found that individual progress and efforts need to be taken into consideration for the assessment and evaluation of the students (VIb1-L2). Therefore, the curriculum prescribes standardised goals to be achieved by all students, as well as it requires a consideration of individual progress and efforts.

The final important question is whether or not demands are appropriate for the students and in particular whether they are achievable. Here one finds that in the process of evaluation lexical and grammatical errors should be seen as a consequence of a risk taken in order to communicate successfully (VIc1-L2). This could mean that if the learner makes efforts to communicate while not acting correctly with reference to NS grammar or lexis, this error does not need to result in a bad mark.

In fact, the curriculum recognises that violations of the norm are only one aspect of language competence and cannot be decisive (VIc2-L2). Other aspects that need to be taken into consideration are comprehensibility, sociolinguistic and pragmatic adequateness and differentiation of the employed linguistic devices (*ibid.*). Thus, for the demands it seems that intelligibility is an issue even though an approximation to correctness in terms of NS norms is desired (IIe1-U2). The question remains however, how this can or should be taken into account in testing and assessment.

6.8 Testing and assessment in the Austrian curriculum

In this category the curriculum gets very abstract again. In fact, one does not find a lot of concrete requirements when it comes to testing. As already mentioned, it is only generally acknowledged that learners approximate the foreign language via steps and that errors are a natural phenomenon of this approximation (VIIa1-U2). However, there is no reference to what extent such errors should be graded in evaluations. Thus, it remains rather unclear how

to deal with so called errors, stemming from L1 transfer, when they do not hinder communication.

However, it is noted that correctness can only be one aspect of evaluation and must not be decisive (VIIb1-L2). In fact, the use of language functions (i.e. pragmatics), the appropriateness of the utterances (i.e. sociolinguistic appropriateness), and the range of vocabulary and syntactic structures employed (i.e. linguistic devices), have to be taken into account when students are assessed (VIIC1-L2). Interestingly there is no reference to other aspects of assessment such as that of pronunciation. Thus, the curriculum again provides only very vague formulations.

However, for assessment there is another document called “Leistungsbeurteilungsverordnung” (prescription for performance evaluation) which similarly to the curriculum determines the teachers’ actions. There it says that the evaluation has to take account of the age of the learner, the educational stages in which she or he is, the demands of the subject and the curriculum as well as the stage of language learning according to the class the learner attends (Bundeskanzleramt 1974: 1). Thus, a learner focus can again be identified, even if criteria for a differentiation between variation and error are missing.

Looking at the criteria for written tests on the other hand, one finds that: a) idiomatic expressions, b) grammatical correctness, c) lexicon, d) content (or, if required for the task, factual correctness), e) orthographical correctness, f) appropriateness of expressions and style, and g) correctness of formal aspects need to be taken into consideration (ibid. 11).

Hence, it seems that what the curriculum says about pragmatic and sociolinguistic adequateness as well as intelligibility does not apply to written tests. Instead, the criteria presented have a strong focus on formal aspects and can therefore be seen as a clear indication of native speaker norm benchmarks in written tests.

The final remark does not give a lot of hope considering the implication of ELF features and research findings. However, to a certain extent it was found that results might be included. Therefore, the following chapter tries to come to an answer to the research question posed in the introduction.

7. Discussion of the results

In the last section the ‘raw data’ obtained from the analysis of the curricula for Austrian grammar schools was presented. However, the data in itself only gives a very broad insight into how the curriculum works and what this means for an integration of ELF.

Therefore, the following chapter attempts to reconsider the findings of this paper by drawing parallels and marking differences between the prescriptions in the curriculum and ELF research findings. Thus, the results of the curriculum analysis will be combined with the insights from the theoretical part in order to find answers to the initial research question. The starting point is the very general focus of the Austrian curriculum. Thus, we will have a closer look at the way English is seen in the Austrian school system, the approach/(es) which inform/(s) the curriculum and which consequences this viewpoint has for a possible integration of ELF.

In a next step we will then, based on the general focus discussed first, look at parallels and differences between ELF research findings and the assumptions of the curriculum and consider which role ELF and ELF research findings could play in the Austrian school system. This will then form the basis for a closer look at which ELF research areas can inform specific aspects of English language teaching according to the requirements of the curriculum. Finally, the results will be summarised followed by an outlook on the issues that will need further investigation as well as on the changes to the Austrian curriculum that are necessary. In order to proceed from the general to the specific we will investigate the focus of the curriculum first.

7.1 The focus of the curriculum

At the end of the first chapter we found that one challenge to ELF is to argue that English, due to its role as an international language, is a unique case and should therefore not be compared to other foreign languages in school settings. However, in the first part of the analysis, dealing with general aspects, it was found that English does not have its “own” curriculum. Instead, guidelines for the subject English in Austrian grammar and secondary modern schools are the same for each and every foreign language which can be taught in Austria. This is due to the fact that there is still a predominant perception of equally important individual and

independent languages (Seidlhofer 2005b: 27). Hence, the role of English as an international means of communication is not recognised in the structure of Austrian curricula.

The fact that there is no specific curriculum for English, as also pointed out by Seidlhofer (2012a: 77), has consequences for the way English is taught. Indeed, as was found, the lingua franca function of English differentiates it clearly from other languages. Whereas, languages, as for example Italian, might still be taught for a predominant use with native speakers this is not the case with English. Hence, the focus is a completely different one and therefore would need to be reflected in the curriculum.

The fact that the exceptional role of English is not recognised is also problematic for other languages. As we found in the chapter on context, English is the predominant language in primary education even if other languages could be chosen. This is due to decisions taken by policy-makers as well as parents and students (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 182). Thus, the population recognised the importance of English. However, by being able to communicate in English other languages become less important (ibid. 188f.). Consequently, the acknowledgement of ELF might prove beneficial to the teaching of other languages as well.

Still, the fact that English does not have a separate curriculum does not necessarily mean that it is not recognised at all. There still might be references to the special status of English within a document for all foreign languages. However, this is not the case in Austria. Instead, the only reference to a lingua franca found is valid for all languages performing this function (Ib1). The question one might ask consequently is how many of them are out there at the moment. In fact, there is no other than English, at least not on the same scale, that can be thought of. Therefore, we can look at possibilities the curriculum offers for lingua franca functions in general and see what this could mean for ELF.

Here the disappointing result is that there is a restriction on the presentation of non-native varieties to listening comprehension activities (IVa12). Thus, the general assumption in the curriculum seems to be that a receptive competence in understanding non-native realisations of a language is sufficient. Unfortunately, there is no reference to features which might be important for facilitating the active use of the language for the learners. Therefore, one can say that the curriculum is clearly focused on native speaker norms and standards while it disregards the fact that the learners themselves will become lingua franca speakers.

This focus might stem from the idea that “[c]urriculum developers are concerned with working out students’ projected communication purposes and contexts [...]” (Leung 2005: 126). As a consequence, among the developers there seems to be a belief that a close

approximation to native speaker norms leads to successful communication (Seidlhofer 2012: 78). Still, as Seidlhofer (*ibid.*) states, and as was argued in the theoretical part, this is not at all true. However, this is a fact which is not recognised in the curriculum. Therefore, it might be difficult to take ELF research findings into account.

Interestingly, the curriculum talks about projected communicative needs of the students. In fact, it refers to occupational as well as personal demands which should be taken into consideration (Vc3). Thinking of English one can imagine that more lingua franca than ENL encounters will take place in the learners' future. In this way the curriculum imagines the students' future use of English as McKay suggests thinking about it, that is. that the projected needs for English with respect to the lingua-cultural background of the learners should determine the goals which are set (see Chapter 2).

In fact, in the category on learner focus it was stated that teaching should equip learners with means which they will need necessarily in their future occupational and private lives (Vc3). Furthermore, especially for the upper secondary it is prescribed to prepare students for adequate communication in various public, private and occupational contexts (Vc). What is more, learners should be able to fulfil basic communicative tasks (Ia4). This is also stated in another document co-published by the ministry of education (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 51).

Interestingly, there is no reference to a certain target group (*ibid.*). Hence, one can say that for English, as there is a need for it, learners have to be prepared for situations with non-native speakers as well. Therefore, it can be noted that, even if the function of ELF is not recognised in the structure, it is recognised in the projected use of English, in this case.

Thus, on the one hand the function of ELF is recognised, whereas on the other hand it is not granted a status "in its own right" (see Chapter 1.3). In fact, the general recognition of the function of ELF can also be traced in the prominence of English in the Austrian school system. As Widdowson (2003: 75) states, "the purpose for most learners is to engage with English as an international means of communication, and [...] this is the reason, usually made quite explicit in policy statements, why English figures so prominently in curricula all over the world".

This is also true of Austria (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 194). Indeed, English is said to be the most relevant language for employees in Austria (Archan 2005: 68). Furthermore, English is also the most common medium of communication in business relationships (*ibid.*).

Worth mentioning is that Nunan (2003: 592) calls ever earlier starting English language classes an indicator of the recognition of the international role of English. As Austria was among the first countries to introduce foreign language teaching, in practice English, in primary schools (see Chapter 5), we can say that it was among the first to recognise the lingua franca function of the language. Unfortunately, the recognition of ELF as an important aspect in international communication did not leave many traces in the way the language is approached in actual teaching.

It seems that the authorities have not yet recognised that native speaker competence does not have advantages in ELF communication (McNamara 2012: 201). Instead, the native speaker remains the benchmark even though implicitly the importance of English as the lingua franca has been recognised. What is interesting in this context is that within the curriculum no scientific argumentation for the way in which language teaching is approached can be found.

In fact, what could be found in this regard is very little. First of all, it is clear that communicative competence is in the foreground (Ia3). Thus, we can speak of a communicative approach. Moreover, regarding goals related to research areas it could be identified that grammatical functions are more important than grammatical form (IVa1 & IVa2). Finally, language teaching according to the curriculum has to be action-oriented (Ia4). In consequence, it can be assumed that the curriculum is based on a functional and action-oriented approach with a focus on communicative competence.

Nonetheless, the curriculum does not give indications what this means and we cannot make assumptions what the role of ELF can be in this approach. Thus, further investigation is needed. In order to answer the research question we will therefore briefly analyse what this approach implies for ELF.

A document co-published by the ministry of education states that the curriculum takes into consideration research findings from didactics from the last three decades (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 52). According to this text the curriculum follows a functional approach to language and a competence orientation towards teaching and learning (ibid.).

In general, one could therefore say that the curriculum is based on CLT (communicative language teaching⁵). This is also proved by the focus on sociolinguistic and discourse competence (Leung 2005: 127), as was found in the analysis (IVc2). However, CLT is clearly informed by native speaker norms (Seidlhofer 2012: 74). In fact, Leung (2005: 131)

⁵ For a comprehensive introduction to CLT see Hedge 2000

states that the idea of description based on a single native speaker code prevails in this approach.

Therefore, what seems to be needed is a sound reconsideration not only of the curriculum but also of the underlying approach. Even if there is vital research into ELF and even if the role of English internationally is acknowledged, it seems that the implications of this role have not been considered in pedagogic approaches yet.

For the Austrian situation this is not really surprising as research so far has not been influencing policy makers to a large extent (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 192). This is very problematic, as we found in the theoretical part that the inclusion of research findings is an essential element of the teaching profession (see Chapter 1.2.1 above). What is more, even the curriculum states that scientific results have to inform language teaching (Ia2). The adoption of ideas from research into ELF might be especially easy for authorities in Austria due to ELF expertise at the University of Vienna.

Instead, the Austrian curriculum takes account of the CEFR. In fact, reading through the threshold levels for the four skills one is only given very little information on how and why those descriptions were chosen. Thus, in order to get a better insight one has to look at the original document of the CEFR.

The CEFR itself is also based on an action-oriented approach to language teaching (Horak 2005: 41). Despite descriptions for threshold levels it provides insights into what should be known and which abilities are necessary to communicate successfully (ibid.). To this end, the CEFR deals with pronunciation and intonation, lexis, morphology, syntax, orthography, communications strategies and sociocultural knowledge (ibid.).

However, the document is again, as is the curriculum, valid for all languages. Additionally, due to the underlying approach, it is also focused on a native speaker norm. In fact, the interlocutors with whom language learners are imagined to communicate in the future are seen as native speakers (McNamara 2012: 200). What is more, on various levels fluency is again measured against nativeness (Seidlhofer 2012: 77). In fact, this is also what was found in the goals for Austrian learners (IIb3).

Therefore, while the CEFR in general can still be seen as an important instrument, the relevance it has for ELT in general is questionable (Seidlhofer 2012: 77). In fact, the “[...] prescriptions may be much less relevant when the focus is on communicative function and situational appropriateness rather than on standard ENL correctness” (ibid. 79). Therefore, the CEFR does not appear to be an adequate tool to take account of ELF findings in a language classroom either.

In sum, we found that the Austrian curriculum is definitely focused on a native speaker norm. This is due to the underlying approach of CLT and the reference to the CEFR which similarly refer to ENL standards. Consequently, it may seem useless to further investigate possible ways of including implications of ELF in the Austrian school system unless the focus of these documents changes.

Still, the recognition of the students' projected future demands allows for the interpretation that what the students will need is a capability in the international lingua franca. What is more, the CEFR can also be seen as a tool which has to be used individually and which can be adapted (ÖSZ 2005: 37).

Indeed, the CEFR is not a prescriptive instrument, but a document which is intended to be open, dynamic and undogmatic (Rieder 2005: 47). In addition, it was found that even though the curriculum is a prescriptive document in its nature, its prescriptions are very vague. In fact, it seems that the only specifications given are the formulations at the end of each document which describe what learners should achieve. The means, the content and the topics can be chosen by the teacher (IIa5). Thus, the document is very flexible.

Additionally, the few definite prescriptions presented are very abstract and leave room for individual modification. The suggested content areas for instance are very broad and include things such as "human beings & society" (BMUKK 2000b: 3f.). What is more, a recurring prescription is also to use a variety of contexts, situations and domains (IIIa3 & IIIb1). Therefore, in the selection of the means, the content and the topics of teaching the teacher might be able to include an ELF focus or at least to raise awareness of this phenomenon. In sum, what was found in this subchapter is that the focus of an ELF-informed pedagogy differs completely from the focus of the curriculum. However, there are also some parallels which can be identified.

7.2 Parallels and differences between ELF research findings and the Austrian curriculum

By drawing attention to the parallels and differences between the suggestions of the Austrian curriculum and the ideas ELF research offers to English language teaching the next section tries to recapitulate what has been found so far. On the basis of those findings and the findings of the following subchapter there will be a section dedicated to necessary further developments.

Moving from the general to the specific again, this section looks at the broad ideas ELF research and the Austrian curriculum share. Even though one might not expect a lot of similarities there are some parallels that can be identified.

The analysis found that the basic goal of the curriculum is communicative competence. The underlying approach CLT clearly informs the document in this way. Returning to Chapter 2, in which basic underlying assumptions of teaching in an ELF context were presented, we can say that the teaching of ELF should similarly focus on competences/capabilities. To be more precise, the focus should not be on the students' deficiencies. Instead the accomplishments of the students should be acknowledged.

One could now argue that this is not specifically stated in the curriculum. Even if this is the case, the curriculum formulates the goals for each stage in the form of "can-do statements" (IVb3), that is, it is described what the students should be able to perform in a language. Therefore, there is no reference to the deficiencies and the statements show learners what they already can do and in this way present them as competent language users to a certain degree. Thus, as was found that a capability orientation is important in ELF testing (Subchapter 3.5), it can be said that this is also true of the curriculum.

In general, the curriculum appears to be strongly focused on the learner, as the analysis revealed. In the theoretical part of the thesis this was found to be the view on learners in ELF research as well (Chapter 2.1). Thus, there is another clear similarity the curriculum shares with ELF ideas. Related to this is that learners' future needs, demands and uses of the language as well as their own preference should be respected not only according to the curriculum (Vc1 & Vc3) but also according to ELF researchers (Chapter 2.1). Therefore, the view on the learner and her or his future use of the language can be seen as a shared position.

In connection to the future demands of the learners we found that globalisation was an issue. In fact, the emergence of ELF is very closely connected to globalisation as was found in Chapter 1. The use of English among speakers from various backgrounds allows global communication. The fact that the world has become more connected and that people are moving beyond nation states is also recognised in the curriculum (IVc2). Thus, as was stated above, the idea of the use of the language as a means of international communication is very similar.

Therefore, the focus on the real world as recognised in ELF research by the use of English as a common means of communication is also recognised in the curriculum. The importance of being intelligible in this world may be one of the main motivations for ELF researchers to investigate this phenomenon. In the curriculum this attitude is present in the

focus on the functional aspect of the language (IVa1). Still native speaker norms are not abandoned. Thus, we turn to the contradictions in the document and to the main differences between the ideas of ELF research and the curriculum.

The main differentiating factor is of course the NS focus of the curriculum. This distinctive element has already been analysed to a large extent and does therefore not need further treatment. However, related to this aspect is the issue of intelligibility. As was found throughout the theoretical part, ELF is very much concerned with mutual understanding. Looking at what the curriculum says concerning this issue is that the functional aspect is more important than the formal one (IVa1).

At first sight this might seem to be a parallel. Still, as was found in the category investigating contradictions, the curriculum asks the learners to approximate the “correct” language forms (IIe1). Thus, on the one hand the document realises that communication is dependent on intelligibility and that it therefore has to be seen as one of the most important aspects of language (Alptekin 2007: 267). On the other hand, it prescribes an approximation to something which cannot be achieved by a NNS (Chapter 1.2). Thus, it seems that the curriculum stops halfway where it would make sense to follow this through, namely, in recognising that intelligibility should be more important when it comes to the use of English as an international language.

What is more, there is no recognition of the features which are used regularly and without causing problems by speakers of various lingua-cultural backgrounds, as empirically identified by ELF research. In fact, research into ELF already offers a large amount of information on language features which might facilitate the learning process. However, authorities in Austria have not made use of those findings yet.

In relation to that it has to be noted that there is no reference to variation according to the curriculum. In fact, what can be exemplified with the non-core features (Chapter 3) is that there are certain influences of the L1 which are acceptable since they are not likely to cause communication problems. Instead, such features may allow the language user to demonstrate his or her own culture or lingua-cultural background. Thus, the prescriptions of the curriculum take away this opportunity by strictly adhering to a goal which can never be achieved.

In this context one can look at the benchmark levels. Even on higher levels of proficiency the descriptions in the curriculum taken over from the CEFR focus on an idealised NS interlocutor and on NS language use, as was seen in the last section. Again this is a projected target students will never be able to reach. Thus, the curriculum states goals which, if taken over 100%, would frustrate the students. This would even be more frustrating for the

teachers. Indeed, if they totally adhered to the prescriptions of the curriculum they are supposed to teach something which they themselves as NNS speakers of English have not and are never going to achieve.

Therefore, the overall goals are far from appropriate for learners and teachers alike. Interestingly there are a lot of contradictions as was found in the last chapter. To name just one example the “Leistungsbeurteilungsverordnung” (prescription for performance evaluation) focuses extremely strongly on formal aspects. In fact, reading through this statement the feeling arose that all the other references to intelligibility were irrelevant.

Therefore, the treatment of errors needs to be mentioned again. In fact, the curriculum encourages its users to view errors as constructive signs (Ile1). However, as some of them work perfectly well for intelligibility there would be no need to look at them as violations (Seidlhofer 2011: 39). On the contrary, some so called “errors” work better than the “correct” ENL counterpart as the NS norms are in-group markers which are not adequate for L2 users of the language (Seidlhofer 2012: 80). Hence, errors could also be seen as a sign of making use of everything available to the learner and thus of using the language as a resource (Widdowson 1999: 111). However, there is no such acknowledgment of variation as demanded by research into testing and assessment in ELF (Subchapter 3.5).

Still, there is some acknowledgement of errors as constructive elements in the process of language learning. However, the curriculum implies that they will turn into correct language use someday. In fact, this recognition sees the language of the learner as an “interlanguage” (Seidlhofer 2012: 80); whereas these “errors” can also be seen as a way of functioning communicatively successfully in English (ibid.). If those errors are always corrected even though they would not cause difficulties for interlocutors the willingness to make use of the language creatively may be hindered. Such an effect would be very severe as it would inhibit the development of one of the important SLUBs ELF users employ (Chapter 3). This is similarly true of L1 transfers.

Interestingly enough, even though most of the classrooms for learners still focus on NS norms, they still produce those deviations from the norm which nonetheless enable successful communication (Seidlhofer 2012: 80). Thus, it seems unnecessary to correct those violations of the NS norms as errors when students then as ELF users still use them. One can imagine that, if learners realise that features which are in class seen as defective still work when they actually use the language outside the classroom, they are not motivated to change them. Consequently, teaching and correcting features which are not necessarily in need of correction can be seen as time-wasting. Instead, this time could be used more effectively for

other aspects. As Seidlhofer states learning and using happens simultaneously and if successful communication works teaching was effective (ibid. 81).

Hence, the way errors are treated in the curriculum completely goes against what ELF research suggests. However, this does not necessarily have to be the case. In order to have a look at alternative ways we are now turning to the discussion of which results from research into ELF might be included in actual teaching. To find an answer to this question we will first of all look at the general role ELF could play in English classrooms according to the curriculum.

7.3 The role of ELF in the Austrian curriculum

As was found in Subchapter 7.1, basically an ELF orientation is not possible according to the goals which still focus on a NS competence. In fact, the binding force of the goals is very strong, as the analysis showed. However, the vague formulations and the projected future demands may still offer some opportunities for including an ELF perspective. In broad terms we can speak about three general areas in the curriculum which open up this opportunity. In fact, teaching across different subjects and the distinction between core and expansion area, as well as an option possible due to autonomous school organisation could allow for an ELF perspective and will therefore be looked at in this section.

First of all, school organisational differences could help to account for ELF implications. This is an issue dealt with in the general part of the curriculum but which was only briefly mentioned in the chapter on context, as it does not directly affect language teaching. However, for a general integration of ELF it might be an opportunity worth considering.

In fact, for lower grammar schools it is possible to set a general focus for all four years. The curriculum mentions possible emphasis on computer sciences, economics, sports, health and alimentation etc. for instance (BMUKK 2000b: 10). The interesting aspect for this thesis is that a focus on foreign languages is also possible (ibid.). It is noteworthy that in such a case the introduction of alternative subjects is possible (BMUKK 2000b: 9). Thus, this focus could open up an opportunity to introduce a subject specifically focusing on languages and communication in general, as suggested by Seidlhofer (2005a: 27).

Making use of this opportunity could then allow for teaching international communication. In doing so research findings from investigations of ELF could form an

important part of this subject. In fact, in a subject which focuses on communication processes in the world ELF has to play an important role. The emphasis could be on transnational and transcultural encounters and on how to deal with such situations. Such a subject would consequently take into consideration that students should be prepared for projected future demands (Vc3 & Chapter 2). What is more, the traditional subject English could then focus on native speaker realisations as it would be separated from the international role of the language.

The problem concerning the introduction of such a subject is, however, that a syllabus would need to be prepared beforehand. Thus, further research will be needed in order to define which content and which issues will form part of a subject like this. Therefore, for the moment it seems that the introduction of international communication as a subject in its own right is very difficult to realise. Still, it is interesting that the opportunity exists. In this sense there will hopefully be further research and maybe even first attempts to conceptualise such a subject so that it will become possible to be introduced in the near future.

A second way to focus on the role of English as an international language could be in interdisciplinary projects (IVe2). In fact, as was found in the theoretical part, a lot of international communication happens in English (Chapter 1). Thus, the demand to focus on real-life situations and to carry out projects which should simulate realistic events (IVe3) opens up ways to bring ELF situations from the world to the classroom.

As an example, a project together with the subject geography and economy could allow the inclusion of BELF situations. In this context, it would be possible to use videos and audio recordings of business encounters. Moreover, the learners could prepare talks themselves in which the negotiation of meaning will be most important. Hence, the project could be to negotiate products, prices, etc. with imagined partners from other countries.

The subject English in this context could help to present learners with the most important strategies to reach the goal of the project. Thus, SLUBs will play an important role. Furthermore, phonetic aspects can be included in order to make learners aware of which sounds could be problematic for their interlocutors and which will probably not. Similarly, many other activities can be included if the teacher thinks carefully about what her or his students will need.

As a matter of course a lot of work resides with the teacher again as materials will need to be prepared. However, teaching across subjects is a particularly interesting part of teaching as it may allow ELF research to inform teaching. The students as future users will

profit from the inclusion of ELF findings, as was seen in the theoretical part. Thus, it is highly recommended to make use of the possibilities teaching across subjects offers.

Last but not least, the third option to include an ELF perspective might also be very promising. During the analysis the differentiation between core and expansion area in the curriculum was mentioned quite often. As was stated, an ELF perspective could be adopted most probably in the expansion area. The reasons are that the goals for the core area are binding, for the expansion area, on the other hand, they can be defined by the teacher (III d2).

Another reason is that in the expansion area the learners' interests and needs have a more important role than in the core area (V b3). With reference to the theoretical part in which it was argued that learners, as future English users, need to be prepared for ELF encounters, we can say that especially the second reason is evidence that research into ELF should inform content of this part of language classrooms.

As the goals in the curriculum prescribe an approximation to native speaker norms, the core area might not be as adequate for an ELF focus. However, as the goals of the expansion area can be specified by the teacher it might be possible to include certain research findings. The requirement that individual goals of the expansion area have to be connected to the goals of the core area (V d2) does not hinder this endeavour, as communicative competence among non-native speakers can be said as being connected to communicative capability in contact with native speakers as well.

Thus, the alternative goals formulated for the expansion area can help including the international role of the English language. Possible goals can consequently focus on intelligibility in a wide range of international contexts in which English is "the medium of choice" (see Chapter 1.3). In this context a wide range of encounters with interlocutors from different lingua-cultural backgrounds can be included. Thus, besides intelligibility there can be a focus on accommodation.

What is more, a general focus on the use of English in the world can be included. That is, learners can be made aware of the importance and impact of the English language by presenting a wide range of domains such as research, the media, diplomatic communication, business communication, student exchange programmes, international friendships, NGOs, etc. In including such topics, the use of English in connection with interlocutors from different parts of the world can be included. This would also account for the focus on variety which is required by the curriculum (III a3). Thus, goals as exemplified above are very much connected to the prescriptions of the curriculum and can therefore be seen as acceptable.

The acceptance of such situations for the curriculum is due to the abstract formulations in the document which allow for alternative interpretations of it. Consequently, content from international settings can be included. In fact, this interpretation of the curriculum ties in with Widdowson's definition of syllabi. He (2003: 127) states that "[...] a syllabus is an idealized schematic construct which serves as reference for teaching". Thus, what can be said is that the role of ELF in English classrooms in Austrian grammar or secondary modern schools depends to a large degree on the interpretation of the curriculum by the teachers. If the possibilities the document offers due to its vague formulations are recognised and exploited ELF could enter language classrooms.

The role of teachers is therefore essential in the integration of ELF. Indeed, the syllabus does not directly determine the teaching of the language, but it is the basis upon which the teachers act individually (Widdowson 1999: 129). Despite the distinction between core and expansion areas the teacher has the possibility to decide independently upon the methods and the content used in the classroom (IIa5). Regarding the fact that the syllabus, defined in terms of communicative competences according to the four skills in the Austrian curriculum (IVb1, IIa2 & IIb1), is only a course of action to be realised by the teacher (Widdowson 1999: 129), this can also provide an opportunity to include ELF aspects in the core area.

Those ELF aspects can be, at least, communicative situations in which not only native speakers take part. Thus, the goals focusing on native speakers might be approached via texts in which speakers from various lingua-cultural backgrounds take part. It might be interesting how such an implementation could work and it will definitely be necessary to document the results if it is tried out. Hence, research into actual applications is an issue that will become important.

Another aspect that it will be interesting to investigate is how such a proceeding can be planned time-wise. In fact, as planning and sequencing is dependent on the teacher (Subcategory IIIc) a clear and structured plan beforehand will be necessary to have a guideline how such an integration of ELF can be applied. Thus, taking ELF into consideration will be more demanding for the English teachers.

This might also be due to the fact that relatively few materials which include an ELF perspective are available (see Chapter 2). Furthermore, it is suspected that textbooks in Austria still focus on native speaker norms. However, further research in this area will also be needed. In sum, ELF can play a role in 3 broad areas of language classrooms, namely teaching

across different subjects, autonomous subjects and the expansion area of the subject English. What is more, it may be generally referred to if the teacher is willing to do so.

However, a problem might be that learners themselves to a large degree want to adhere to NS norms (see Chapter 1). Thus, the question arises how this can be dealt with. After the discussion of the results so far we can say that it will definitely not be possible to focus on ELF only. On the contrary, ENL due to the prescriptions of the curriculum will still be the most important point of reference, while an ELF orientation may be chosen to some extent.

In accounting for ELF, that is in including “ELF thinking”, it might be valuable to draw parallels if there are some when the respective ENL language functions or features are taught in the classroom. How and to what extent this will be done remains with the teacher. However, what and in which sections this might be possible is the issue of the next section. We are therefore turning to specific findings which could be included in ELT in Austrian grammar schools.

7.4 Taking specific research findings into consideration

The following part of the thesis tries to provide an overview which specific ELF research findings could play a role in English language classrooms of Austrian grammar schools. The reason that this should be done was argued in the theoretical part. Still, one could say that we are now walking on thin ice. Therefore, it is important to bear in mind that this is by no means a prescription of what has to be done. Rather the next section has to be seen as an attempt which tries to demonstrate which features could play a role or as Seidlhofer (2012a: 83) puts it:

To say this is not to suggest that things can or should change overnight. For some time to come it is likely that reference books and textbooks based exclusively on the standard language and NS norms of usage will continue to dominate the scene. But the question is how these materials are used and to what extent they are allowed to dictate what goes on in the classrooms. Teachers can be encouraged into a critical awareness of the issues so as to equip them with professional room for manoeuvre.

As the curriculum is still oriented towards NS norms this can be no more than a suggestion to include what is possible according to the “loopholes” in the document.

It is important to note that in the discussion of the general role ELF could play some specific findings have been mentioned already. If we return to what was said about teaching across different subjects, it was found that communication strategies could be included in projects dealing with BELF situations, for instance. Additionally, strategies may also be

taught overtly. In fact, the curriculum states that communication strategies play an important role in communicative competence and therefore need to be included (IVa4).

However, there are no specifications which strategies have to be included. Interestingly enough in the section on pragmatics it was found that NNS speakers are more consensus-oriented and that communication breakdowns have hardly ever been observed in empirical ELF studies (Chapter 3). Thus, it is almost too obvious to point out that specific ELF SLUBs should be included. Obviously, NS language use behaviour cannot be ignored, but again it might be better to deal with it reflectively.

In this sense it might be a good idea to compare recordings of NS and NNS communicative encounters and to point out differences and parallels. In fact, doing so will present NS speaker strategies as well as ELF SLUBs. In this way learners are made aware of how communications function and what is done in order to reach understanding. It might of course be beneficial if the recordings deal with similar topics.

However, comparative ways of dealing with communication strategies are only one part of the task of teaching them. The question of how to include them in the production might be more difficult. Still, there are some possibilities as found in Chapter 3. In fact, pair work was mentioned as an effective method in this context. Thus, after raising awareness of SLUBs learners could be given role cards with varying points of view and consequently can be asked to try to come to a conclusion, for instance.

For this task students are equipped with a wide range of strategies presented in the input from which they can choose behaviours to adopt. A similar thing is possible with information gap activities. Thus, awareness raising activities could help to direct learners to output-oriented communicative tasks. Therefore, it can be stated that the introduction of ELF SLUBS is possible while not violating the prescriptions of the curriculum.

The treatment of communication strategies can be seen as a relatively easy thing to be included in English language teaching. Another pragmatic aspect of the language on the other hand is more problematic. In fact, the curriculum states that idiomatic language use should be fostered (IVa20). As was found that the use of idioms can hinder mutual intelligibility (Chapter 3) the teacher is in a difficult situation. The problem seems to be that authorities still believe that native speaker idiomaticity is an essential part of communication even though this assumption has not been proved empirically (Seidlhofer 2012: 76). Still, the curriculum and its prescriptions cannot be ignored. Therefore, a way of dealing with idioms is needed.

As it has to be included idiomatic language use cannot be ignored. However, what could be done is to show students ways of dealing with it. Therefore, awareness raising will

be an important issue again. The teacher will have to ensure that learners are aware of the fact that idioms are markers of native speaker language and that they are therefore only useful if they are understood by both interlocutors. As a first step this could be seen as useful for international intelligibility. However, it might not be sufficient to only be aware of this problem.

Hence, another way of introducing idioms and idiomatic language use might be a reflective treatment of those units. In more detail, it might be valuable if students know how to paraphrase the meaning of the item(s). Thus, if the learner is familiar with idiomatic expressions to such an extent that she or he can explain what it means it may be less problematic as possible intelligibility problems can be resolved.

Such a treatment would at the same time train the negotiation of meaning as well as accommodation skills. Similarly, this may help the learner to develop the ability to co-create idiomatic language use together with their interlocutor(s). Furthermore, it trains the strategy of using self-explanatory language which was found to be more important than idiomatic language use (Subchapter 3.3).

This reflective treatment of idiomatic language can also be used for code-switching. In fact, making learners aware of the difficulties which can arise due to the use of idioms can similarly be important for the use of L1 features or transfers. Thus, it may be essential to overtly explain to which extent transfers from the first language can on the one hand create problems and on the other hand function as strategic language use behaviours or identity markers (Subchapter 3.3.1).

Another issue regarding the L1 is that according to the curriculum it can be used to explain certain features (IIa9). However, this should only be done if it proves to be more efficient. Therefore, the use of the L1 is not completely banned even though the document suggests not using it too often (IIa10). What is more, on higher levels translations may also be used as a method (IIId2). Therefore, this is an activity which definitely can and should be included as it was found to be important for the development of a sufficient language competence for ELF users (Subchapter 3.3.1).

Therefore, the pragmatic features which have been investigated in ELF research can to a certain extent inform teaching practices in Austrian classrooms already. Even if it is not completely possible to take on an ELF perspective and idiomatic language cannot be ignored, there is already something that could be done in order to prepare learners for successful international communication.

Another area of ELF research that was thoroughly reviewed in the theoretical part is phonology and phonetics. Accommodation skills and the ways those can be trained have been already mentioned above. Additionally, they can be practiced by specific activities focusing on various realisations of English due to the fact that NNS accents are even recognised in the curriculum (IVa12). Thus, when it comes to accommodation the use of recordings of NNS communication is not problematic at all. However, as was found in the analysis there is a restriction to the receptive skill of listening (ibid.). Therefore, we will still take a closer look at which aspects can be included in the productive skill of speaking.

As was found in Chapter 3 pronunciation teaching already offers a lot of material. Walker's book presents a lot of ideas on how to include an ELF orientation to pronunciation in English language classrooms. The inclusion of recordings from speakers from different lingua-cultural backgrounds can then be seen as a starting point for work on productive skills. Regarding these, the curriculum states that a NS pronunciation should be approximated if it does not discourage the students (IVa5). This aspect opens up a lot of possibilities for the teachers.

First of all, the curriculum calls for the presentation of native speaker varieties. However, it is not specified which variety; neither is it prescribed that only one of those can be presented. Therefore, for the phonemes /r/ the American realisation and for the phoneme /t/ the British one might be introduced as those were found to be more straightforward (Subchapter 3.1.3). In this sense the teacher can always try to strive for the phonemes which are less problematic for the learners.

Another opportunity the curriculum offers with the prescription given above is to exclude unteachable aspects of pronunciation. In fact, it was found that weak forms are not important as they can be seen as unteachable on the one hand, and may hinder mutual understanding on the other hand (Chapter 3). In this sense, it can be said that they are discouraging, thus it might be a good idea if they are not strongly focused on. What can be done instead is to make students aware of their existence if they come up in recordings or other texts in order to ensure a maximum of comprehension. Furthermore, there will be no extensive treatment of /ð/ and /θ/ for the same reasons (Subchapter 3.1.1).

Such a way of dealing with those features ensures that students are prepared adequately for their future use of English while it completely conforms to the requirements of the curriculum. However, the question of how the other elements of phonetics can be dealt with remains. Returning to Walker's suggestions awareness raising comes in again. In fact, he suggests making use of graphic illustrations of where sounds are produced (Subchapter 3.1.3).

Therefore, students can be presented where which sounds are produced in order to draw comparisons with the L1 realisations of certain phonemes.

In doing so, the teacher could then put more emphasis on the sounds which were found to be important according to the LFC, in Austria especially those which were found to be problematic for German learners of English (Subchapter 3.1.2), while putting less focus on those which are not problematic. This ensures that native speaker realisations are presented while the students are not “discouraged” by them. Thus, they are given a choice. Moreover, this way of including pronunciation frees up time for more important issues such as nuclear stress, length differences and individual sound differences which might be problematic such as /v/ and /w/ for German learners. Ideas how those issues can be taught and practised were presented in Chapter 3.

Thus, also the field of pronunciation does not strictly need to focus on NS norms according to the curriculum. On the contrary, there are some very important changes which can already be made in order to include an ELF perspective. The ways in which pragmatic as well as phonetic features can be treated are very similar. As found in the theoretical part, awareness raising seems to play a very important role in including ELF in a language classroom.

Indeed, this is also true of intercultural competence. The fact that this aspect of language teaching is mentioned several times makes clear that it is very important for Austrian authorities. As stated in another document co-published by the ministry, acceptance and curiosity for differences should be evoked and not only factual information presented (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 52). It is obvious then that knowledge alone cannot be sufficient for an intercultural language competence as was also mentioned in the theoretical part (Subchapter 3.4).

Furthermore, regarding the NS focus of the document, it needs to be made explicit again that for English intercultural competence cannot be restricted to Anglo-American cultures (Seidlhofer 2012: 75). The findings in the theoretical part clearly demonstrated that the conventions of native speaker communities are only marginally important for the purpose for which students will need the language. In fact, it was found that they expect to learn to be able to communicate cross-culturally (Subchapter 3.4). Therefore, especially with intercultural competence, it will be important to look for alternatives which enable to include other cultures as well.

Here the vagueness of the formulation and the few references to the target culture allow for an integration of a lot of findings. However, there are also references to behaviours

of the native speakers (IVa11). Therefore, it will be necessary to include aspects of the NS culture(s) as well. Still, it is not mentioned that no other cultural backgrounds can be included. Instead, the curriculum states that learners need to be equipped with social competences to take part in multicultural environments (IVa9). Thus, the following ideas can be used for preparing students for encounters with NNS as well as NS.

The ways in which intercultural competence can be trained are various as was found in the theoretical part of this thesis. Despite the teacher as a good role mode (Subchapter 3.4), one of the possible means to include cultural differences mentioned was accommodation. Therefore, the above presented activities for practising accommodation skills can already be seen as important elements for teaching and training intercultural competence. Moreover, the use of recordings by speakers from different L1 backgrounds has been mentioned already. While such texts can be used for different phonetic realisations they can also be employed to raise students' awareness of differences in intonation and differences in speaking behaviours. Such texts can be even more important if another dimension is added to them.

In fact, if the presentation of texts by speakers from different lingua-cultural backgrounds is not only restricted to listening but if it is made visual, learners may profit even more from them. If, instead of audio recordings, videos are used, attention could be drawn to gestures, facial expressions and differences in proxemics, for instance. Those are also issues which are mentioned in the curriculum (IVa). A discussion of the differences could then follow. Proceeding in this way would ensure that awareness of different behaviours is raised and comity can be promoted (Subchapter 3.4). Moreover, by talking about those differences students see what others make of certain manners. In comparing the behaviour of the speaker(s) on the video with the learners' behaviours in similar situations they should experience that cultural aspects are an important issue of communication.

A way of training this skill, as mentioned in Chapter 3, could be by the use of critical reflections. However, this does not have to be done orally in a discussion among the group as presented above, but can also be an individual activity. Therefore, written essays can also be used to train intercultural competence. For this purpose it can be valuable for students to try to describe how they would react in a given situation and to argue their decisions.

Hence, a critical reflection of cultural behaviour could show students ways in which differences can be handled and show them differences between the foreign culture(s) and their own way(s) of life. In fact, it is said to be a general issue nowadays that learning about foreign cultures also means to learn about one's own culture (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 198). Consequently such a reflection may help learners to show their own cultural identity

without causing problems for mutual intelligibility and how to deal with differences in behaviour. Moreover, it will give insights into how comity can be established.

Generally, it may be possible to include intercultural elements in almost all activities, especially in teaching across subjects. One can imagine including information gap activities in which the other person is a tourist, for instance. Therefore, it appears to be possible to focus on cultural differences throughout ELT and to adapt the material provided in course books for example.

Thus, again the inclusion of ELF research findings depends on the teacher and on how she or he interprets the curriculum. If the teacher is willing to do so culture can be used in almost every activity. However, including an ELF perspective might not be as straightforward when it comes to grammar teaching.

As was found in the theoretical part among students as well as teachers grammar is still very much thought of in terms of NS usage. In addition, the curriculum with its clear focus on ENL norms is also very much concerned with what is seen as 'correct' with reference to the target language (Ile1). Hence, for the task of considering lexicogrammatical lingua franca features of English in the Austrian language classrooms this does not seem to be a good starting point.

However, in the analysis a focus on the functional aspect of grammar was found to be important (IVa1). In fact, intelligibility was mentioned as a sign of successful communication and as an aspect which needs to be taken into consideration when errors occur. Thus, the form in grammar is less important than the function. Regarding the research findings presented in Chapter 3 this entails that, as the features presented do not cause intelligibility problems, they cannot be seen as incorrect.

However, for the curriculum, implicitly, they will still count as errors as they are deviations from the NS standard which is the benchmark. Therefore, it will be important to draw attention to them in language classrooms. In fact, ignoring the native speaker forms of the ELF features identified may be problematic for the learners. Especially in writing where there are yet hardly any specific ELF research results (Chapter 1) students may be disadvantaged if they use NNS lexicogrammatical features, even if they would not hinder mutual understanding. Therefore, it seems that it is not an option to include them at all.

Nonetheless, when it comes to spoken interaction in the language classroom the teacher could see those features as functionally acceptable. Consequently, NNS lexicogrammatical features which do not hinder mutual understanding such as the ones described in Chapter 3 above may not be weighed heavily in oral assessment. Thus, even if it

might yet not be possible to alter teaching practices regarding lexicogrammar, findings may still be taken into consideration when oral activities are evaluated.

This brings us to testing and assessment in general. The section on this aspect of ELT in the theoretical part demonstrated that testing is a problematic issue for ELF research. In fact, McNamara argues that it is one of the most important challenges for ELF to find ways to be included in testing practices (2012: 201). Therefore, it will be interesting what future research projects will offer to this debate. Hopefully, ELF researchers will come up with ways to account for specific features of ELF in testing. Still, for the moment it seems that hardly anything can be done.

However, this might not be completely true as there are some things that may already be taken into consideration. First of all, intelligibility was said to be an important criterion which needs to be taken into consideration in evaluation (VIIb1). What is more, the curriculum states that the approximation to a NS standard pronunciation should not discourage the learners (IVa5). Consequently, unteachable features cannot be seen as decisive elements in grading students and the 3 stage evaluation model introduced by Walker can be taken into consideration (Subchapter 3.5).

For pragmatics no specifications for the intended communication strategies were found, therefore, the use of ELF strategies can be seen as equally valid as NS strategies and therefore be acknowledged in testing situations. What is more, if there is a specific focus on international communication either in the expansion area or in an additionally introduced subject, assessment can be adapted according to the changes made and the goals formulated (Ic4). The other aspects mentioned in the theoretical part on testing are taken up in the discussion in subchapter 7.2.

Thus, it is not true that no ELF research findings at all could be accounted for in testing and assessment, but it is only little than can be taken into consideration. This is especially true if one looks at the specification of the document focusing on grading, since there, as was found in the analysis, the focus in written exams is still very strong on formal aspects. Therefore, in general the focus will need to remain on NS norms as the benchmark while some issues may be taken into consideration for oral evaluation as well as in areas where there is a different focus.

For the overall research question this section revealed very interesting findings. The discussion of the analysis shows that a lot of ELF research findings can already be taken into account to some extent. Indeed for pragmatics and phonetics it was shown that a lot of findings can be included even if the curriculum in general is concerned with NS norms.

Similarly, intercultural competence allows for reference to the international role of English to a large extent and can inform various activities.

For other aspects of ELT such as lexicogrammar as well as testing and assessment there are fewer possibilities to take account of the phenomenon of ELF. However, even there slight changes are possible. Therefore, it is utterly important to raise awareness among teachers that, even though ENL materials are still used, a different focus is possible (Seidlhofer 2012: 83). In this sense they should understand “learner performance as evidence of a developing capability that can perhaps be fostered in unconventional ways” (ibid.).

If teachers are willing to do so, this might prove beneficial for the consideration of implications of ELF. Therefore, due to its vague formulations, the curriculum for Austrian grammar schools is very flexible and can be interpreted in different ways. However, overall it is still relatively little that can be done and the findings which can already be accounted for do not have to be included. In fact, it was found that everything depends on the teacher and her or his interpretation of the document as well as use of the materials available. Therefore, some change for the future should be expected. What this change should bring about is the topic of the final subchapter of this thesis.

7.5 Outlook on further developments

In a document co-published by the Austrian ministry of education one finds that there were three events in recent history which can be seen as linguistic challenges for the Austrian school system (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 85). Those listed are: the fall of the Iron Curtain, the Austrian EU membership and the EU membership of the former Soviet neighbouring countries (ibid.).

Furthermore, the text states that “[e]ach of these events has brought an increase in inward and outward mobility, opened up new opportunities for trade, and raised new questions to which language education has still to find answers” (ibid. 87). This statement refers to the new mobility; however, it ignores globalisation and the role of English in this process. Thus, we may add that this is another issue which needs to be taken into account.

On the other hand, one may say that there are already a lot of ELF findings which can be accounted for in the Austrian curriculum and that no need for a change is given. Indeed, a conclusion of this paper could be that, at least partially, ELF could inform English language teaching in Austria. However, this is not enough. In fact, the NS focus remains and presents

students with a model they can never reach. Moreover, as was found in the discussion, there are aspects which can hardly be accounted for, such as lexicogrammar. Therefore, in order to make the lives of language learners easier, while still preparing them to become competent and successful users of English, there are some issues which will need to change.

At large, some of the challenges for ELF in general as described in Chapter 1 equally apply to the situation of English as a school subject in Austria. In fact, awareness of the role of English as an international means of communication might be one of the most pressing needs in this country.

Referring to a study carried out in 2005, 86% of the companies said that their employees need a competence in foreign languages (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 59). As one might expect, 80% of these companies named English as the language which is most important and 64% said that the demand for competences in foreign languages is growing (ibid.). Thus, English plays an important role in Austrian economics and it is hardly imaginable that those companies only work with NS.

Nonetheless, another result of the study was that more native speakers should be employed (ibid.). Consequently, the role English as an international language has not been recognised yet. Neither is that there are distinctive features of this kind of language use. As for economy, the same is true of the parents. In fact, they also call for more native speakers in Austrian schools as well as for a more important role of CLIL in the Austrian English classroom (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 89).

The voice of the parents is utterly important as they play a crucial role in language teaching in Austria. Indeed, they are described as “the most influential stakeholders when it comes to education” (ibid.). Strangely, this is something which is possible in English whereas in other subjects the parents do not have such a strong voice (Jenkins 2007: 105). Their ideas and beliefs influence learners’ viewpoints which in turn influence teachers’ attitudes towards the variety of English which is taught (ibid.).

This circle then seems to spread to society in general and to the authorities. It can be imagined that the manifestation of NS norms as demanded by parents and economy accordingly leads to respective decisions in school policies. Therefore, as parents are still concerned with English as described in terms of NS norms it might be necessary to present them with ideas from research into ELF.

However, in order to promote a change away from ENL norms authorities will need to take part in awareness raising. In fact, the ministry acknowledges that it is a difficult task make the general public aware of the necessity of reforms (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008:

77). Unfortunately, the reforms mentioned in this context are not concerned with the recognition of ELF.

Instead, the demand for CLIL is mentioned as an important issue for other languages too (ibid.). Interestingly, CLIL is implicitly seen as the best way to deal with the international role of English (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 110). Thus, despite the awareness that English is not mostly learned for communication with native speakers, the focus is still on NS English (Seidlhofer 2012: 77). Therefore, the phenomenon of ELF has not yet been recognised by the authorities. So how could it then possibly arrive in classrooms?

A way to promote such a change may be found in teacher education. Unfortunately, the role of English as an international language is not mentioned in a recent document dealing with future developments in this field (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 121). Instead, there is an implicit demand that teachers should spend some time in countries where the language in question is the first language (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 48).

Hence, there seems to be a strong resistance against the ideas of ELF even in teacher education. Still, the reasons therefore are not quite clear as the demand for an international language is clearly recognised in the curriculum (IVc2) as well as in other documents (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2009: 110). Especially in an educational context one might expect to find references to recent research findings, however, this is not the case in Austria.

Therefore, the need for recognition of the phenomenon of ELF in all areas of life seems to be the first important thing to make other changes possible. As teacher training still is concerned with NS norms the question how this change can happen arises. In fact, the problem that research in Austria does not really inform decisions of the authorities has already been mentioned. And this might be the most important starting point in taking ELF into account.

Thus, it will be necessary for authorities to make use of the knowledge which is available to them (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 203). This seems the way in which ELF could start to find its ways into the curriculum. After making authorities and all the people involved in ELT aware of the international role of English as well as of the benefits of this perception, more specific changes can follow. One of those changes consequently has to be the recognition of ELF in the curriculum.

In this context it is very interesting that the ministry recognises that plurilingualism – or multicompetence as we referred to it in Chapter 1 – is deeply rooted in the students' mind (ÖSZ, BMUKK & BMWF 2008: 12). However, despite some recognition of the learner language (Ile1 & Ila11), there is no reference to multicompetence in the curriculum. Instead,

the native speaker norm can be seen as evidence for the fact that the curriculum does not recognise the difference of multicompetent minds. Therefore, a further important change that needed is to pay respect to students' first language and to the fact that a second language can not result in a native speaker competence.

In recognising this change a shift in focus follows automatically, as such a recognition accepts the impossibility of a NS target. Consequently, intelligibility could play a more important role and students' accomplishments would be seen in a more positive light. However, such a change in focus needs to be introduced by new curricula in which a different focus introduces a completely new way of seeing English language teaching. In order to get there more research into ELF is needed (see Chapter 1) as well as a willingness to change existing ideas of the concept of language.

This project gave a brief insight into the role ELF could play in Austrian grammar schools. Of course one should also bear in mind vocational schools, which might also be an interesting field for the implementation of ELF, especially in combination with ESP. Thus, here would be a first aspect where further research on possible implications of ELF in Austria will be needed. Moreover, further investigation into teaching materials might result in interesting findings. Sticking to grammar schools however, it was found that even if more research is needed and should be carried out there are things which can be changed already.

This is not to say that this project shows how ELF can be included from the beginning to the end. Instead, it should be seen as a first attempt to present possible ways to take account of ELF in teaching. For the future it might be interesting to investigate what a curriculum for languages in general could look like. Furthermore, a syllabus for the expansion area would be very important in order to make a consideration of ELF possible for all the learners in Austria.

Thus, the development of specific goals and content would be helpful and may encourage teachers to include ELF research findings. If such a general document will not become available it seems rather unlikely that ELF informs teaching practices on a large scale.

Therefore, it will be important that further ELF research, especially into writing, lexicogrammar as well as into testing and assessment, will inform teaching practices. In a next step, those teaching practices should be further researched and contextualised for classroom use in order to make them available to as many teachers as possible. For the moment however, it is only possible to recognise and implement research which is already available to the extent possible, as presented in this paper.

If this is done, the documentation of changed teaching practices could inform ELF research. Such a constructive collaboration might one day result in a completely new way of teaching English which respects its most common use, namely as a means of international and transcultural communication. Therefore, a lot of work remains, but for the benefit of learners, teachers and competent users it needs to be done.

Conclusion

In the introduction the idea for this research project was outlined. Returning to the starting point it can be said that the dilemma of being a non-native teacher was the reason to look at possible ways to include an ELF orientation in teaching.

Throughout this thesis it was found that changing teaching practices towards the recognition of ELF could help to see learners and teachers in a more positive light. In fact, one issue, if not **the** most important one, in ELF is to shift the focus away from the exclusive fascination with the NS and their standard(s) (Seidlhofer 2004: 226).

The examination of existing literature revealed that this is not just an ideological whim of ELF researchers, but would also facilitate language learning for students. In fact, English is most commonly used among speakers for whom it is not the L1, as was found. The question then was why they should not be taught the forms which are typical of this use.

It became clear relatively quickly that in order for such a change to become possible, the perception of English, and languages in general, needs to change. In fact, it was found that among the general public, as well as among students, teachers, the economy and political stakeholders, the belief that a native speaker norm is the best choice for students of English is still very prominent.

Indeed, this was what I expected to find. Therefore, this project set out to look at possibilities to account for ELF research findings despite the fact that a lot of people might still strive for NS standards. The outcome presented in the last chapter is indeed more than was expected to be found. In fact, it shows that, at least to some extent, results from all research areas which investigate ELF can be taken into account in ELT in Austrian grammar schools.

In more detail, it was found that for pronunciation teaching as well as for the integration of SLUBs there are very few restrictions on taking account of ELF research findings. For lexicogrammar as well as testing and assessment, on the other hand, there are not so many possibilities to take ELF research findings into consideration. This may be due to the fact that these are fields which need further investigation. Nonetheless, an ELF perspective can already be part of language classrooms in Austrian grammar schools to some extent. This is due to the vague formulations of the curriculum as well as the implicit recognition that English is **the** international language.

However, a very important problem concerning those findings is that they only **can** but do not **have to be** included. Indeed, even if ELF could, to some extent, inform teaching

practices in Austria, whether this is done or not entirely depends on the teacher. The problem is, however, that teachers are only slowly accepting the idea of ELF, as we found. Indeed, the prevailing goal for themselves is still an approximation to NS norms. Therefore, it is very unlikely that ELF will become an issue for a large number of students in Austria even if it would be possible to some extent.

Thus, there is a need for a change of the curricula. In fact, the recognition of ELF was found to be present implicitly in the acceptance that English is the most prominent language for business and for communication within the European Union. However, the implications of this acceptance are still disregarded. This is obvious in the focus on an idealised NS which is the benchmark for the curriculum as well as for the CEFR and the underlying approach CLT. Therefore, it is more than high time to accept the implications the global and international use of English brings about.

It is obvious that this perception cannot change overnight and it is understandable that some time will be needed in order to implement a new approach to ELT. Moreover, it is clear that publications with a focus on NS norms will still be prevailing. Still, it is possible to include ELF complementarily and to slightly shift the focus away from the unreachable native speaker idealisation even with existing materials.

However, to be able to take on ELF findings as a complementary orientation in classrooms a different way of dealing with research in general would be necessary. Unfortunately, in Austria research is not very prominent in the curriculum for grammar schools even if it is required to base teaching on scientific research. Therefore, it will be of utmost importance to stay in contact with research in order to constantly optimise teaching. This is not only an important aspect of the teaching profession, as was found; I would say it is even an obligation of teachers and authorities.

As was found, a starting point for research to play a more important role in Austria can be seen in teacher education. In fact, it will be essential to make future teachers aware of the role of English as the international language. A change of attitude has to begin during the time in which teachers are prepared for their future profession. This is not to say that attitudes are not changing already. Indeed, a lot of my colleagues and I myself are constantly becoming more aware of the implications ELF has for ELT. However, in order to spread the word it might be necessary to refer directly to these implications and to present ways in which one can deal with them.

For them, as well as for practising teachers who are aware of the obligation of taking recent research into account this brief and first attempt to see which findings can be taken into

account may hopefully be of help in accounting for the international role of English in their classrooms. From contact with practising teachers I know that there are some colleagues who, at least, use materials in which speakers from various lingua-cultural backgrounds have a voice. This can already be seen as a big achievement, as was found in this paper. However, it will be necessary to draw attention to the independent status of these language users and this may only be ensured if it is legally prescribed by the curriculum.

In fact, when students should really be prepared for the best level of English (Ur 2010: 87), ELF will be the most important issue for the future of English teaching in Austria and in the rest of the world. As this role is acknowledged implicitly by the curriculum, the implications wait to be recognised. The investigation of this paper hopefully contributes to this recognition as well as it shows ways in which ELF may slowly start to inform teaching practices despite the missing acknowledgment of ELF in official documents. Returning to the quotation in the introduction this will hopefully make it possible that non-native learners and speakers of English will be granted a status in their own right without being seen as failed native speakers.

Bibliography

- Alptekin, Cem. 2002. "Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT". *ELT Journal*. 56/1, 57-64.
- Alptekin, Cem. 2007. "Teaching ELF as a language in its own right: communication or prescriptivism?" *ELT Journal* 61/3, 267-268.
- Archan, Sabine. 2005. „Impulsreferat „Welchen Fremdsprachenbedarf hat die Wirtschaft?““. In Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum. (ed.). *Sprachen – eine Kernkompetenz in einem Europa von morgen. Die gemeinsame Umsetzung der europäischen Ziele bis 2010 in Österreich*. ÖSZ Fokus Heft 3. Graz: ÖSZ, 66-72.
- Belcher, Diane D. 2006. "English for Specific Purposes: Teaching to Perceived Needs and Imagined Futures in Worlds of Work, Study and Everyday Life". *TESOL QUARTERLY* 40/1, 133-156.
- Berger, Armin. 2010. "German". In Walker, Robin. *Teaching the pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: OUP
- BMUKK 2000a. (Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur). *Lehrplan der AHS Unterstufe: Lebende Fremdsprache (Erste, Zweite)*. <http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/782/ahs8.pdf>, (05.02.2013).
- BMUKK. 2000b. *Verordnung der Bundesministerin für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, mit der die Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der allgemein bildenden höheren Schulen geändert wird*. (revised version 2004). <http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/11668/11668.pdf>, (05.02.2013).
- BMUKK. 2004. *Lehrplan der AHS Oberstufe: Lebende Fremdsprache (Erste, Zweite)*. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/11854/lp_ahs_os_lebende_fs.pdf, (05.02.2013).
- BMUKK. 2010. „Lehrpläne der AHS-Unterstufe“. *Unterricht und Schule*. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/lp_ahs_unterstufe.xml (20.03.2013).
- BMUKK. 2013. „Lehrpläne der AHS-Oberstufe“. *Unterricht und Schule*. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/lp_ahs_oberstufe.xml (20.03.2013).
- Bundeskanzleramt. 1974. *Verordnung des Bundesministers für Unterricht und Kunst vom 24. Juni 1974 über die Leistungsbeurteilung in Pflichtschulen sowie mittleren und höheren Schulen (Leistungsbeurteilungsverordnung)*. Fassung vom 06.03.2013. <http://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10009375> (06.03.2013).
- Carter, Ronald; McCarthy, Michael. 2003. "Correspondence". In Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 85-86.
- Cogo, Alessia. 2012. "English as a Lingua Franca: concepts, use, and implications". *ELT Journal* 66/1, 97-105.

- Cook, Vivian. 1999. "Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33/2, 185-209.
- Crandall, Elizabeth; Basturkmen, Helen. 2004. "Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials". *ELT Journal* 58/1, 38-49.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Kaltenboeck, Gunther; Smit, Ute. 1997. "Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria". *World Englishes* 16/1, 115-128.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Faistauer, Renate; Vetter, Eva. 2011. "A country in Focus. Research on language teaching and learning in Austria (2004-2009). *Language Teaching* 44.2, 181-211.
- Felberbauer, Maria. 2005. „Fremdsprachenlernen in der Grundschule: Ein Überblick“. In: Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum (ed.). *Sprachen – eine Kernkompetenz in einem Europa von morgen. Die gemeinsame Umsetzung der europäischen Ziele bis 2010 in Österreich*. ÖSZ Fokus Heft 3. Graz: ÖSZ, 57-60.
- Firth, Alan; Wagner, Johannes. 2003. "On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research". In Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 173-198.
- Haenisch, Hans. 1982. *Lehrpläne auf dem Prüfstand*. Schule und Weiterbildung Band 15. Paderborn et al.: Schöningh
- Hedge, Tricia. 2000. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: OUP
- Higgins, Christina. 2003. "Ownership" of English in the Outer Circle: An Alternative to the NS-NNS Dichotomy". *TESOL Quarterly* 37/4, 615-644.
- Horak, Angela. 2005. "Impulsreferat „Die Rollen von Sprachenportfolios und Standards im österreichischen Schulwesen“". In Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum (ed.). *Sprachen – eine Kernkompetenz in einem Europa von morgen. Die gemeinsame Umsetzung der europäischen Ziele bis 2010 in Österreich*. ÖSZ Fokus Heft 3. Graz: ÖSZ, 40-45.
- Jenkins, Jennifer; Cogo, Alessia; Dewey, Martin. 2011. "Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca". *Language Teaching* 44/03, 281-315.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: OUP
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2002. "A Sociolinguistically Based, Empirically Researched Pronunciation Syllabus for English as an International Language". *Applied Linguistics* 23/1, 83-103.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2006. "Current Perspectives on Teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca". *TESOL Quarterly* 40/1, 157-181.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitudes and Identity*. Oxford: OUP
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2009. *World Englishes*. A resource book for students. (2nd edition). Abingdon: Routledge

- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2012. "English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom". *ELT Journal* 66/4, 486-494.
- Kachru, Braj B. 2003. "Liberation Linguistics and the Quirk Concern. In Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 19-33.
- Kormos, Judit; Kiddle, Thom; Csizér Kata. 2001. "Systems of Goals, Attitudes, and Self-related Beliefs in Second-Language-Learning Motivation". *Applied Linguistics* 32/5, 495-516.
- Kuo, I-Chun (Vicky). 2006. "Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca". *ELT Journal* 60/3, 213-221.
- Leung, Constant. 2005. "Convivial communication: recontextualizing communicative competence". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15/2, 119-144.
- Lindemann, Stephanie. 2005. "Who speaks "broken English"? US undergraduates' perceptions of non-native English". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15/2, 187-212.
- McKay, Sandra Lee. 2002. *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: OUP
- McNamara, Tim. 2012. "English as a lingua franca: the challenge for language testing". *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1/1, 199-202.
- Munro, Murray J.; Derwing, Tracey M.; Morton, Susan L. 2006. "The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech". *SSLA Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 111-131.
- Norton Peirce, Bonny. 2003. "Social Identity, Investment and Language Learning." In Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 236-255.
- Nunan, David. 2003. "The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region". *TESOL Quarterly* 37/4, 589-613.
- Ollinger, Astrid. 2012. "The good ELF user: A qualitative meta-analysis of strategic language use behaviours in English as a lingua franca". Masterarbeit: Universität Wien
- Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum (ÖSZ); BMUKK; BMWF (eds.). 2008. „LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY PROFIL“. *Länderbericht. Sprach- und Sprachunterrichtspolitik in Österreich: Ist-Stand und Schwerpunkte. Eine Initiative des Europarates*. Österreich: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Austria_CountryReport_final_DE.pdf (02.12.2012).
- ÖSZ; BMUKK; BMWF (eds.). 2009. *Sprach- und Sprachunterrichtspolitik in Österreich. Länderprofil. Language and Language Education Policy in Austria. Country Report*. Graz & Wien: ÖSZ

- ÖSZ. 2005. „Resümee und Empfehlungen für die Weiterarbeit“. In Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum. (ed.). *Sprachen – eine Kernkompetenz in einem Europa von morgen. Die gemeinsame Umsetzung der europäischen Ziele bis 2010 in Österreich*. ÖSZ Fokus Heft 3. Graz: ÖSZ, 35-40.
- ÖSZ. s.t. *Der schulische Fremdsprachenunterricht in Österreich. Erste Ergebnisse einer Studie zum Schuljahr 2004/2005*. Graz: ÖSZ [page numbering according to the pdf document]
- Pölzl, Ulrike. 2003. “Signalling cultural identity: the use of L1/Ln in ELF”. *Vienna English Working Papers* 12/2, 3-23.
- Pölzl, Ulrike. 2005. *Explaining the third space*. Negotiating culture in English as a lingua franca. Dissertation: University of Vienna
- Prodromou, Luke. 2003. “Correspondence”. In Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 82-84.
- Prodromou, Luke. 2003a. “Correspondence”. In Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 86-90.
- Quirk, Randolph; Widdowson, Henry G. (eds.). 1985. *English in the World: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: CUP
- Quirk, Randolph. 2003. “Language varieties and standard language”. In Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 9-19.
- Rieder, Mario. 2005. „Impulsreferat „Zugänge zum Europäischen Sprachenportfolio. Individuelles Lernen im standardisierten Rahmen““. In: Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum. *Sprachen – eine Kernkompetenz in einem Europa von morgen. Die gemeinsame Umsetzung der europäischen Ziele bis 2010 in Österreich*. ÖSZ Fokus Heft 3. Graz: ÖSZ, 45-51.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 1999. “Double standards: teacher education in the Expanding Circle”. *World Englishes* 18/2, 233-245.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. “Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca”. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11/2, 133-158.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2003. *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2004. “Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca”. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 209-239.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005a. “English as a lingua franca”. *ELT Journal* 59/4, 339-341.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005b. “Impulsreferat “SprachlehrerInnen brauchen Bildung, nicht nur Training““. In: Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum. (ed.). *Sprachen – eine Kernkompetenz in einem Europa von morgen. Die gemeinsame Umsetzung der europäischen Ziele bis 2010 in Österreich*. ÖSZ Fokus Heft 3. Graz: ÖSZ, 23-28.

- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: OUP
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2012. "The Challenge of English as a Lingua Franca". In Eisenmann, Maria; Grimm, Nancy; Volkmann, Laurenz. (eds.). *Teaching the New English Cultures & Literatures*. Anglistische Forschungen 404. International Journal of English Studies 23/1, 73-86.
- Sewell, Andrew. 2012. "English as a lingua franca: ontology and ideology". *ELT Journal* 10, 1-8.
- Sowden, Colin. 2012. "ELF on a mushroom: the overnight growth in English as a Lingua Franca". *ELT Journal* 66/1, 89-96.
- Timmis, Ivor. 2002. "Native speaker norms and International English: a classroom view". *ELT Journal* 56/3, 240-249.
- Ur, Penny. 2010. "English as a Lingua Franca: A Teacher's Perspective". *Cadernos de Letras* 27, 85-92.
- Walker, Robin. 2010. *Teaching the Pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: OUP
- Widdowson, Henry G. 1994. "The ownership of English". *TESOL Quarterly* 28/2, 377-389.
- Widdowson, Henry G. 1999³. *Aspects of language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP
- Widdowson, Henry G. 2003. *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP

Intrinsische Curriculumevaluation (summarised from Haenisch 1982: 98 – 104)

- a) Gesetzeskonformität
 - a. Überprüfung auf Gesetzeskonformität
 - i. Bezug von Lehrplan zu Gesetzestexten

- b) Fachwissenschaftlicher Aspekt
 - a. Wissenschaftliche Angemessenheit
 - b. Werden Ziele eingeführt, die nicht wissenschaftlich gedeckt sind
 - c. Werden gewisse Aspekte außen vor gelassen (Einseitigkeit)
 - d. Werden aktuelle Tendenzen mit einbezogen (Modernität)
 - e. Werden alle fachwissenschaftlichen Aspekte mit einbezogen (Vollständigkeit)
 - f. Werden auch kontroverse Positionen aufgenommen (Pluralität)

- c) Fachdidaktische Aspekte
 - a. Auswahl und Begründung der jeweiligen fachdidaktischen Konzeption(en)
 - b. Auswahl und Begründung der Leitziele
 - c. Auswahl, Begründung und Festlegung der Lerninhalte (Stoff)
 - d. Auswahl und Begründung der Lernprozesse
 - e. Widerspruchsfreiheit und Stimmigkeit zwischen Lernzielen, Lerninhalten und Lernprozessen

- d) Aufbau-/ Konzeptionsaspekt
 - a. Gibt es ein durchgehendes Konzept
 - b. Verhältnis zwischen Inhalt und Themenstellung
 - c. Verhältnis zwischen Inhalt und Zielen
 - d. Plausible Abfolge von Inhalts- und/oder Zielelementen
 - e. Hilfestellung für Konkretisierung
 - f. Deutlichkeit und Übersichtlichkeit

- e) Ziel-/ Inhaltsaspekt
 - a. Bezug von Lernzielen und –inhalten zu Lernerfahrungen der Schüler
 - b. Beziehung zwischen allgemeinen und unterrichtsnahen (kurzzeitig erreichbaren) Zielen (Lernzielhierarchie)
 - c. Verbindlichkeit bestimmter Ziele und Inhalte
 - d. Offenheit für alternative Ziele und Inhalte
 - e. Hinweise für fächerübergreifende/s Lehre und Lernen
 - f. Kommt Zukunftsorientiertheit zum Ausdruck
 - g. Präzision der Formulierung der Lernziele
 - h. Steht ein begründetes Konzept hinter den Lernzielen

- f) Sprache:
 - a. Klarheit, Verständlichkeit, Eindeutigkeit
 - b. Gliederung – Ordnung
 - c. Kürze – Prägnanz

- g) Anforderungen:
 - a. Angemessenes Anspruchsniveau der jeweiligen Schulstufe
 - b. Inwieweit sind unterschiedliche Anspruchsniveaus repräsentiert
 - c. Erfüllbarkeit

- h) Schülerbezug
 - a. Schülerorientierung der Erfahrungsmöglichkeiten
 - b. Berücksichtigung der Interessen/ Bedürfnisse der Schüler
 - c. Schüleradäquate Zugangsmöglichkeiten
 - d. Förderung von schülergerechten Aktions- und Handlungsformen
 - e. Verteilung unterschiedlicher Verhaltensweisen (kognitiv, motorisch...)
 - f. Berücksichtigung der Lernvoraussetzung und Lerngeschichte

- i) Umsetzungsbezug
 - a. Werden Freiräume offen gelassen
 - b. Realisierbarkeit

- j) Lernerfolgskontrolle
 - a. Werden Lernerfolgskontrollen vorgeschlagen
 - b. Werden diagnostizierende Kontrollmethoden vorgeschlagen
 - c. Werden alle Bewertungsgesichtspunkte respektiert

- k) Bezug zu anderen Schulformen und – stufen
 - a. Durchlässigkeit
 - b. Referenz

- l) Generelle und fachspezifische Vorgaben
 - a. Hinterfragung der erzieherischen Aufgaben

Category I

Research

Number	a. Underlying approach of the curriculum	b. The acknowledgement of ELF	c. The extent to which ELF might be included
1	Fremdsprache ist Ausdruck von Kultur- und Lebensformen. (L1)	Handelt es sich bei der gelehrten Fremdsprache um eine internationale Verkehrssprache (Lingua franca) ist auch der Kontakt mit nicht-muttersprachlichen Aussprachevarianten zu ermöglichen. (U3)	Die zeitliche Gewichtung und die konkrete Umsetzung der Vorgaben obliegen alleine den Lehrerinnen und Lehrern und ermöglichen somit eine flexible Anwendung. (B9)
2	Der Unterricht hat sich entsprechend § 17 des Schulunterrichtsgesetzes sowohl an wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen [...]. (B2)		Der Lehrplan unterscheidet in den Pflichtgegenständen und verbindlichen Übungen zwischen einem Kern- und einem Erweiterungsbereich. Für den Kernbereich sind zwei Drittel der in der subsidiären Stundentafel (siehe Z2 im Vierten Teil - Stundentafeln) angegebenen Wochenstundenanzahlen vorzusehen. Neben dieser zeitlichen Begrenzung ist der Kernbereich auch inhaltlich definiert. (B9)
3	Für den gesamten Fremdsprachenunterricht steht Fertigungsorientierung im Vordergrund. (L5)		Die Umsetzung der knapp und abstrakt formulierten Kernanliegen ist verbindliche Aufgabe der jeweiligen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer. Die zeitliche Gewichtung sowie die konkrete Umsetzung obliegen den jeweiligen Lehrerinnen und Lehrern. (B9)
4	Dem handlungsorientierten Ansatz gemäß stellt die kommunikative Sprachkompetenz das übergeordnete Lehr- und Lernziel des Fremdsprachenunterrichts dar. Das heißt, fremdsprachliche Teilkompetenzen sind in dem Maße zu vermitteln, wie sie für erfolgreiche mündliche und schriftliche Kommunikation nötig sind. (U2)		Planungsvorgänge beziehen sich insbesondere auf: - Konkretisierung der Kernbereiche (5. bis 8. Schulstufe) durch die einzelnen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer, - Gestaltung der Erweiterungsbereiche (5. bis 8. Schulstufe) durch die einzelnen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer, - fächerverbindende und fächerübergreifende Maßnahmen, - Abstimmung der Leistungsfeststellungen auf die Unterrichtsarbeit [...]. (B8)
5	Bei fortschreitendem Lernzuwachs auf höheren Lernstufen ist – über das Lehr- und Lernziel der erfolgreichen Kommunikation hinaus – dem Prinzip der Sprachrichtigkeit zunehmende Bedeutung beizumessen. (U3)		Die Unterrichtsplanung umfasst die zeitliche Verteilung sowie die Gewichtung der Ziele und Inhalte. Sie bezieht sich auch auf die Methoden, die zur Bearbeitung der Inhalte und zur Erreichung der Ziele angewendet werden sowie auf die Lehrmittel und Medien, die eingesetzt werden. Die Planung erfolgt in mehreren Schritten, als Jahresplanung sowie als ergänzende mittel- und kurzfristige Planung während des Schuljahres. (B9)

6	<p>Im Fremdsprachenunterricht ist höchstmögliche Authentizität der zum Einsatz kommenden sprachlichen Mittel auch durch direkte persönliche Begegnungen mit Personen zu fördern, deren Muttersprache die gelehrt Fremdsprache ist (z.B. durch den Einsatz von Fremdsprachenassistentinnen und –assistenten im schulischen Alltag). (U3)</p>		
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Category II <u>Didactic aspects</u>					
Number	a. Didactic principles	b. Selection and justification of goals GOALS	c. Selection and justification of content	d. Selection and justification of learning processes	e. Contradictions
1	Der Lehrplan gibt Ziele vor. (B5)	Die kommunikativen Teilkompetenzen, die Schülerinnen und Schüler von der 5. bis zur 8. Schulstufe erwerben sollen, folgen den international standardisierten Kompetenzniveaus A1, A2 und teilweise B1 des Gemeinsamen Europäischen Referenzrahmens für Sprachen [...] (L4)	Der Abschnitt „Lehrstoff“ legt zur Gewährleistung der Vergleichbarkeit und Durchlässigkeit den verbindlichen Kernbereich fest. (B9)	Eine breite Streuung an schülerzentrierten, prozess- und produktorientierten Lehrmethoden, Arbeitsformen und Lernstrategien ist sowohl dem Fremdspracherwerb als auch der Entwicklung dynamischer Fähigkeiten (Schlüsselkompetenzen) dienlich und somit generell anzustreben. (U2)	Im Fremdsprachenunterricht ist auf allen Lernstufen zu berücksichtigen, dass sich Schülerinnen und Schüler der Zielsprache über lernersprachliche Zwischenschritte annähern und Fehler ein selbstverständliches und konstruktives Merkmal des Sprachenlernens darstellen. Zielsprachliche Richtigkeit ist dennoch in einem sinnvollen Maß anzustreben; (U2)
2	Didaktische Grundsätze: Kommunikative Kompetenz als übergeordnetes Lernziel Als übergeordnetes Lernziel in allen Fertigkeitsebenen ist stets die Fähigkeit zur erfolgreichen	Die kommunikativen Teilkompetenzen, die Schülerinnen und Schüler im Laufe der Oberstufe erwerben sollen, folgen den international standardisierten Kompetenzniveaus A1, A2, B1 und B2 des Gemeinsamen Europäischen Referenzrahmens für Sprachen [...] (U4)	Fremdsprachenkenntnisse erleichtern den Zugang zur internationalisierten Präsentation von Fachinformationen. Deshalb sind auch im Fremdsprachenunterricht gelegentlich gezielt ausgewählte und dem Lernniveau entsprechende fachsprachliche Texte zu bearbeiten. (L1)	Die Techniken mündlicher und schriftlicher Übertragung und Übersetzung in die Muttersprache sind auf niedrigeren Lernniveaus nur als punktuelle lernstrategische Zwischenschritte, z.B. zur Vertiefung von Textverständnis und Grammatikvermittlung, anzuwenden. Auf fortgeschrittenen Lernniveaus hingegen sind Übertragung und Übersetzung den Schülerinnen und Schülern als Arbeitstechniken grundsätzlich vertraut zu	Auf Praxisrelevanz sowie steigende Authentizität der Sprachmittel und Sprachsituationen ist dabei besonders zu achten. (U2)

	Kommunikation – die nicht mit fehlerfreier Kommunikation zu verwechseln ist – anzustreben. (L2)			machen. (U2)	
3	Ziel des Fremdsprachunterrichts ist die Entwicklung der kommunikativen Kompetenz in den Fertigkeitsbereichen Hören, Lesen, An Gesprächen teilnehmen, Zusammenhängend Sprechen und Schreiben. Sie soll die Schülerinnen und Schüler befähigen, Alltags- und Unterrichtssituationen in altersgemäßer und dem Lernniveau entsprechender Form situationsadäquat zu bewältigen. (L1)	Allgemeine Fachziele sind - das Verstehen von gesprochener Sprache bei Standardaussprache und durchschnittlicher Sprechgeschwindigkeit - das selbstständige Erschließen und Erfassen schriftlicher fremdsprachlicher Texte verschiedener Art mit Hilfe angemessener Lesestrategien - der produktive mündliche Einsatz der erworbenen Redemittel in adressatenadäquater Form in für die Schülerinnen und Schüler relevanten Gesprächssituationen - die produktive schriftliche Anwendung der erworbenen Sprachmittel in adressatenadäquater und mediengerechter, d.h. der jeweiligen Textsorte entsprechender, Form (L1)	Nationale Sprachvarietäten sind exemplarisch in den Fertigkeitsbereich Hörverstehen zu integrieren. Bei speziell gegebenen Interessenschwerpunkten sind auch regionale, soziale, berufsspezifische und nichtmuttersprachliche Sprachvarianten zu berücksichtigen. (U3)	Direkte persönliche Begegnungen (z.B. Einsatz von „native speakers“ und anderen Personen, mit denen die Kommunikation in der Zielsprache erfolgt, Schüleraustausch, Intensivsprachwochen) sowie die Nutzung von audiovisuellen Medien und neuen Technologien wie E-Mail und Internet sind im Sinne möglichst großer Authentizität zu empfehlen. (L3)	Als übergeordnetes Lernziel in allen Fertigkeitsbereichen ist stets die Fähigkeit zur erfolgreichen Kommunikation – die nicht mit fehlerfreier Kommunikation zu verwechseln ist – anzustreben. (L2)

4	<p>Die Fertigkeitsbereiche Hören, Lesen, An Gesprächen teilnehmen, Zusammenhängend Sprechen und Schreiben sind in annähernd gleichem Ausmaß regelmäßig und möglichst integrativ zu erarbeiten und zu üben. (L2)</p>	<p>Im Hinblick auf eine transnational orientierte Berufs- bzw. Studierfähigkeit sind mündliche und schriftliche Fremdsprachenkompetenz in ausgewogener Relation zu fördern und auf die Befähigung zur gezielten Nutzung fremdsprachlicher Informationsquellen auszurichten. (U1)</p>	<p>Spezielle thematische Schwerpunkte sind jeweils im Einklang mit individuellen Interessenslagen und Bedürfnissen der Schülerinnen und Schüler sowie mit aktuellen Ereignissen zu setzen. (U4)</p>		<p>Das Erleben der Fremdsprache als authentisches Kommunikationsmittel in fächerübergreifenden Aktivitäten ist anzustreben. (L3)</p>
5	<p>Im Sinne ihrer eigenständigen und verantwortlichen Unterrichts- und Erziehungsarbeit haben die Lehrereinen und Lehrer - die Auswahl der Unterrichtsinhalte und Unterrichtsverfahren zur Erreichung dieser Ziele vorzunehmen, - im Unterricht Lernsituationen zu gestalten und Lernprozesse einzuleiten und zu unterstützen, - vielfältige Zugänge zum Wissen zu eröffnen und auch selbst Informationen anzubieten, - Gelegenheiten zu schaffen, Können zu</p>		<p>Die Inhalte des Erweiterungsbereichs werden unter Berücksichtigung der Bildungs- und Lehraufgabe sowie der Didaktischen Grundsätze festgelegt (siehe den Abschnitt „Kern- und Erweiterungsbereich“ im dritten Teil). (L5)</p>		

	entwickeln und anzuwenden sowie Erfahrungen und Eindrücke zu gewinnen. (B5)				
6	Schaffung und Erhaltung eines positiven Lernklimas (L2)				
7	Zur Festigung des Gelernten ist beizutragen, indem Zusammenhänge zwischen neu Gelerntem und bereits Bekanntem hergestellt werden und indem - soweit möglich - Neues in bekannte Systeme und Strukturen				

	ingeordnet wird. (B7)				
8	Der Fremdsprachenunterricht hat einen Beitrag zur Entwicklung sozial angemessenen Kommunikationsverhaltens der Schülerinnen und Schüler – sei es in der Muttersprache oder in einer Fremdsprache – zu leisten. (L1)				
9	Im Unterricht ist so viel Fremdsprache wie möglich zu verwenden. Die Techniken der Übertragung und Übersetzung sind lediglich punktuell als Verständnis- und Lernhilfe einzusetzen; (L3)				
10	Als Unterrichtssprache ist so viel Zielsprache wie möglich, so wenig Deutsch wie nötig einzusetzen. (U2)				

11	Der reflektierende Umgang mit Sprache (auch im Vergleich mit der Unterrichts- bzw. Muttersprache, mit Volksgruppen- und Nachbarsprachen bzw. mit anderen Fremdsprachen) ist im Unterricht zu fördern. (U2)				
12	Dem handlungsorientierten Ansatz gemäß stellt die kommunikative Sprachkompetenz das übergeordnete Lehr- und Lernziel des Fremdsprachenunterrichts dar. Das heißt, fremdsprachliche Teilkompetenzen sind in dem Maße zu vermitteln, wie sie für erfolgreiche mündliche und schriftliche Kommunikation nötig sind. (U2)				

Category III		<u>Structure</u>			
Number	a. Content and suggested topics	b. Relationship between content and goals	c. Sequences of content and/or goal related elements	d. Stages at which ELF features can be included	e. Suggested possible Realisations
1	Der Lehrplan gibt Ziele vor. Im Sinne ihrer eigenständigen und verantwortlichen Unterrichts- und Erziehungsarbeit haben die Lehrerinnen und Lehrer - die Auswahl der Unterrichtsinhalte und Unterrichtsverfahren zur Erreichung dieser Ziele vorzunehmen [...] (B5)	Um größtmögliche fremdsprachliche Kompetenz für private, berufliche und studienbezogene Kommunikationssituationen zu erreichen, sind die fremdsprachlichen Mittel in eine möglichst breite Streuung von öffentlichen und privaten situativen Kontexten einzubetten [...] (U4)	Für den gesamten Fremdsprachenunterricht steht Fertigkeitenorientierung im Vordergrund. Verläuft der Lernfortschritt der Schülerinnen und Schüler durch förderliche Begleitumstände besonders günstig, sind die erworbenen Kompetenzen zu festigen und zu vertiefen. Auch eine Erweiterung auf mit Bedacht ausgewählte einzelne Fertigkeiten des jeweils nächst höheren Kompetenzniveaus – jedoch maximal Teile aus B1 – ist möglich. (L5)	Planungsvorgänge beziehen sich insbesondere auf: - Konkretisierung der Kernbereiche (5. bis 8. Schulstufe) durch die einzelnen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer, - Gestaltung der Erweiterungsbereiche (5. bis 8. Schulstufe) durch die einzelnen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer, - fächerverbindende und fächerübergreifende Maßnahmen, - Abstimmung der Leistungsfeststellungen auf die Unterrichtsarbeit [...]. (B8)	Die Festlegung insbesondere der konkreten Inhalte und Beispiele erfolgt durch die jeweiligen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer. (B8)
2	Die Festlegung insbesondere der konkreten Inhalte und Beispiele erfolgt durch die jeweiligen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer. (B8)	Durch die Auswahl geeigneter fremdsprachlicher Themenstellungen ist die Weltoffenheit der Schülerinnen und Schüler sowie ihr Verständnis für gesellschaftliche Zusammenhänge zu fördern. (U1)	Mit fortschreitendem Lernzuwachs sind zunehmend Registerunterschiede zwischen neutralen, formellen, informellen, freundschaftlichen bzw. vertraulichen Sprachformen zu beachten, die dazu beitragen, dass sich die Schülerinnen und Schüler sprachlich sozial angemessen verhalten; den Höflichkeitskonventionen kommt dabei besondere Bedeutung zu. (U3)	Dabei ist zu berücksichtigen, wie viel Zeit für den Kernbereich (5. bis 8. Schulstufe) zur Verfügung steht. Die Festlegung insbesondere der konkreten Inhalte und Beispiele erfolgt durch die jeweiligen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer. Diese haben außerdem festzulegen, welche Teilziele im Erweiterungsbereich (5. bis 8. Schulstufe) behandelt werden und wie die beiden Bereiche zusammenwirken. (B8)	

3	Die Schülerinnen und Schüler sind durch die Einbindung der sprachlichen Mittel in vielfältige situative Kontexte mit verschiedenen Themenbereichen vertraut zu machen [...] (L3)	Durch entsprechende Auswahl der Unterrichtsmittel ist für grundlegende Einblicke in Gesellschaft, Zivilisation, Politik, Medien, Wirtschaft, Wissenschaft, Kultur und Kunst des betreffenden Sprachraumes zu sorgen. (U4)	Bei der Anwendung fremdsprachlicher Mittel ist im Laufe des Lernzuwachses zunehmend auf Kohärenz, Logik, Flüssigkeit, Klarheit und Angemessenheit des Ausdrucks zu achten. (U3)		
4	Spezielle thematische Schwerpunkte sind jeweils im Einklang mit individuellen Interessenslagen und Bedürfnissen der Schülerinnen und Schüler sowie mit aktuellen Ereignissen zu setzen. (U4)	Zur Erlangung eines möglichst umfassenden lexikalischen Repertoires sind verschiedenste Themenbereiche zu bearbeiten (U4)	Wortschatz und Idiomatik sind situationsorientiert, im Kontext und systematisch zu erweitern. (U3)		
5	Im Sinne des exemplarischen Lernens sind möglichst zeit- und lebensnahe Themen zu wählen, durch deren Bearbeitung Einsichten, Kenntnisse, Fähigkeiten, Fertigkeiten und Methoden gewonnen werden, die eigenständig auf andere strukturverwandte Probleme und Aufgaben übertragen werden können. (B7) 3A		Bei fortschreitendem Lernzuwachs auf höheren Lernstufen ist – über das Lehr- und Lernziel der erfolgreichen Kommunikation hinaus – dem Prinzip der Sprachrichtigkeit zunehmende Bedeutung beizumessen. (U3)		

Category IV					
Goals					
Number	a. Goals related to research areas	b. Binding force of the goals	c. Reference to reality	d. Alternative goals	e. Teaching across subjects
1	Der funktionale Aspekt der Grammatik hat Vorrang gegenüber dem formalen Aspekt. (L2)	Die Vorgaben (Lehrziele, Themenbereiche usw.) im Abschnitt "Lehrstoff" sind verbindliche umzusetzen; dies gilt auf für den Fall schulautonomer Stundenreduktionen. (B9)	Im Sinne des exemplarischen Lernens sind möglichst zeit- und lebensnahe Themen zu wählen, durch deren Bearbeitung Einsichten, Kenntnisse, Fähigkeiten, Fertigkeiten und Methoden gewonnen werden, die eigenständig auf andere strukturverwandte Probleme und Aufgaben übertragen werden können. (B7)	Kern- und Erweiterungsbereich sind sowohl inhaltlich als auch organisatorisch miteinander vernetzt. [...] Die Zuordnung hat sich vielmehr an den Lernzielen zu orientieren. (B9)	Im Sinne der gemeinsamen Bildungswirkung aller Unterrichtsgegenstände hat der Unterricht die fachspezifischen Aspekte der einzelnen Unterrichtsgegenstände und damit vernetzt fächerübergreifende und fächerverbindende Aspekte zu berücksichtigen. (B2)
2	Grammatik ist im Fremdsprachenunterricht vorrangig unter funktionalem Aspekt zu erarbeiten; (U3)	Die Umsetzung der knapp und abstrakt formulierten Kernanliegen ist verbindliche Aufgabe der jeweiligen Lehrerinnen und Lehrer. (B9)	Im Fremdsprachenunterricht ist der europäischen Dimension sowie den zunehmenden Mobilitätsanforderungen an die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der europäischen Gemeinschaft Rechnung zu tragen; die positiven Auswirkungen von Fremdsprachenkenntnissen auf Beschäftigung und Wirtschaftsstandorte sind dabei deutlich zu machen. (U1)	Bei der Gestaltung des Erweiterungsbereiches sind insbesondere folgende Gesichtspunkte zu berücksichtigen: regionale und lokale Gegebenheiten; Bedürfnisse, Interessen und Begabungen der Schülerinnen und Schüler; (B9)	Das Erleben der Fremdsprache als authentisches Kommunikationsmittel in fächerübergreifenden Aktivitäten ist anzustreben. (L3)

3	<p>Der Vermittlung von Wortschatz und Grammatik in vielfältig kontextualisierter und vernetzter Form ist größtes Gewicht beizumessen, z.B. ist Vokabular, wo immer möglich, in Kollokationen, Redewendungen und Phrasen mit impliziter Grammatik einzubetten. (L2)</p>	<p>Die folgende Zuordnung von Kompetenzniveaus und Lernjahren gibt die Grundanforderungen an, die für alle Schülerinnen und Schüler einer bestimmten Lernstufe gelten; vorangehende Niveaus sind dabei stets vorauszusetzen. (L5)</p>	<p>Der Bildungs- und Erziehungsprozess erfolgt vor dem Hintergrund rascher gesellschaftlicher Veränderungen insbesondere in den Bereichen Kultur, Wissenschaft, Wirtschaft, Technik, Umwelt und Recht. Der europäische Integrationsprozess ist im Gange, die Internationalisierung der Wirtschaft schreitet voran, zunehmend stellen sich Fragen der interkulturellen Begegnung und Herausforderungen im Bereich Chancengleichheit und Gleichstellung der Geschlechter. In diesem Zusammenhang kommt der Auseinandersetzung mit der regionalen, österreichischen und europäischen Identität unter dem Aspekt der Weltoffenheit besondere Bedeutung zu. (B1)</p>	<p>Bei speziell gegebenen Interessensschwerpunkten sind auch regionale, soziale, berufsspezifische und nichtmuttersprachliche Sprachvarianten zu berücksichtigen. (U3)</p>	<p>Bei fächerübergreifender Unterrichtsgestaltung steht ein komplexes, meist lebens- oder gesellschaftsrelevantes Thema oder Vorhaben im Mittelpunkt. (B11)</p>
4	<p>Die Befähigung, fremdsprachliche Mittel zu bestimmten kommunikativen Zwecken einzusetzen, ist Kernaufgabe des Fremdsprachenunterrichts; damit ist den Sprachfunktionen eine zentrale Rolle einzuräumen [...] (U3)</p>			<p>Kern- und Erweiterungsbereich sind sowohl inhaltlich als auch organisatorisch miteinander vernetzt. Lernformen, Unterrichtsphasen, Schulveranstaltungen usw. sind nicht von vornherein dem einen oder dem anderen Bereich zugeordnet. Die Zuordnung hat sich vielmehr an den Lernzielen zu</p>	<p>Dabei erfolgt eine Bündelung von allgemeinen und fachspezifischen Zielen unter einem speziellen Blickwinkel, wodurch es den Schülerinnen und Schülern eher ermöglicht wird, sich Wissen in größeren Zusammenhängen (siehe den Ersten Teil "Allgemeines Bildungsziel") selbstständig anzueignen. (B11)</p>

				orientieren. Sowohl Leistungsfeststellung als auch Leistungsbeurteilung beziehen sich auf beide Bereiche. (B9)	
5	Lautwahrnehmung, Aussprache und Intonation sind in dem Maße zu schulen, wie sie eine in der Zielsprache angemessene Verständigung gewährleisten. Eine Annäherung der Aussprache an die Standardaussprache ist zwar wünschenswert, darf jedoch nicht zur Überforderung der Schülerinnen und Schüler führen. (U3)				
6	Zur Schulung von Aussprache und Akzentuierung ist das rezeptive Beherrschen der internationalen Lautschrift anzustreben. (U2)				
7	Das rezeptive Beherrschen der internationalen Lautschrift ist als Hilfsmittel bezüglich der Aussprache und Intonation nach Möglichkeit anzustreben (L3)				
8	Begleitend zu den sprachlichen Mitteln ist die Kenntnis grundlegender Formen der non-verbaler Kommunikation zu vermitteln (wie kulturelle Konventionen bezüglich Gestik, Mimik, Körperhaltung, Augen und Körperkontakt sowie räumlicher Abstand von Sprechern und				

	Sprecherinnen in Interaktionssituationen). (U3)				
9	Sozialen Kompetenzen in multikulturellen Umgebungen ist dabei besonderes Augenmerk zu widmen. (U1)				
10	Interkulturelles Lernen beschränkt sich nicht bloß darauf, andere Kulturen kennen zu lernen. Vielmehr geht es um das gemeinsame Leben und das Begreifen, Erleben und Mitgestalten kultureller Werte. Aber es geht auch darum, Interesse und Neugier an kulturellen Unterschieden zu wecken, um nicht nur kulturelle Einheit, sondern auch Vielfalt als wertvoll erfahrbar zu machen. (B5)				
11	Durch entsprechende Auswahl der Unterrichtsmittel ist für grundlegende Einblicke in Gesellschaft, Zivilisation, Politik, Medien, Wirtschaft, Wissenschaft, Kultur und Kunst des betreffenden Sprachraumes zu sorgen. (U4)				

12	<p>Nationale Sprachvarietäten sind exemplarisch in den Fertigkeitsbereich Hörverstehen zu integrieren. Bei speziell gegebenen Interessenschwerpunkten sind auch regionale, soziale, berufsspezifische und nichtmuttersprachliche Sprachvarianten zu berücksichtigen. Handelt es sich bei der gelehrten Fremdsprache um eine internationale Verkehrssprache (Lingua franca) ist auch der Kontakt mit nicht-muttersprachlichen Aussprachevarianten zu ermöglichen. (U3)</p>				
13	<p>B1 Hören: Die Schülerinnen und Schüler können die Hauptpunkte verstehen, wenn klare Standardsprache verwendet wird und wenn es um vertraute Dinge aus Arbeit, Schule, Freizeit usw. geht. Sie können vielen Radio- oder Fernsehsendungen über aktuelle Ereignisse und über Themen aus ihrem (Berufs- und) Interessengebiet die Hauptinformationen entnehmen, wenn relativ langsam und deutlich gesprochen wird. (U5)</p>				
14	<p>B1 An Gesprächen teilnehmen: Die Schülerinnen und Schüler können die meisten Situationen bewältigen, denen man auf Reisen im Sprachgebiet begegnet. (U5)</p>				

15	<p>B2 Hören: Die Schülerinnen und Schüler können längere Redebeiträge und Vorträge verstehen und auch komplexer Argumentation folgen, wenn ihnen das Thema einigermaßen vertraut ist. Sie können im Fernsehen die meisten Nachrichtensendungen und aktuellen Reportagen verstehen. Sie können die meisten Spielfilme verstehen, sofern Standardsprache gesprochen wird. (U5)</p>				
16	<p>B2 An Gesprächen teilnehmen: Die Schülerinnen und Schüler können sich so spontan und fließend verständigen, dass ein normales Gespräch mit Muttersprachensprechern und –sprecherinnen recht gut möglich ist. (U5)</p>				
17	<p>Durch interkulturelle Themenstellungen ist die Sensibilisierung der Schülerinnen und Schüler für die Sprachenvielfalt Europas und der Welt zu verstärken, Aufgeschlossenheit gegenüber Nachbarsprachen – bzw. gegenüber Sprachen von autochthonen Minderheiten und Arbeitsmigrantinnen und -migranten des eigenen Landes – zu fördern und insgesamt das Verständnis für andere Kulturen und Lebensweisen zu vertiefen. Die vorurteilsfreie Beleuchtung kultureller Stereotypen und Klischees, die bewusste Wahrnehmung von Gemeinsamkeiten und Verschiedenheiten sowie die kritische Auseinandersetzung mit eigenen Erfahrungen bzw. mit österreichischen Gegebenheiten sind</p>				

	dabei anzustreben. (U1)				
18	Das bewusste Aufgreifen solcher Fragestellungen soll zu einer verstärkten Sensibilisierung der Schülerinnen und Schüler für kulturelle Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede führen und ihr Verständnis für die Vielfalt von Kulturen und Lebensweisen vertiefen(L1)				
19	Der Prozess des Fremdsprachenerwerbs bietet auch zahlreiche Möglichkeiten der Auseinandersetzung mit interkulturellen Themen. [...] Dabei ist die Reflexion über eigene Erfahrungen und österreichische Gegebenheiten einzubeziehen. (L1)				
20	Wortschatz und Idiomatik sind situationsorientiert, im Kontext und systematisch zu erweitern. (U3)				

Category V		<u>The learner perspective</u>		
Num ber	a. Acknowledgement of the special case of the L2 learner	b. Reference to choice	c. Needs, projected future demands and interests of the L2 learner	d. Reference to prior learning experiences/ knowledge
1	Ein bewusster und reflektierter Umgang mit Sprache (auch im Vergleich mit der Unterrichts- bzw. Muttersprache) ist zu fördern. Komparative und kontrastive Methoden sind vor allem dort angebracht, wo sie zu einem verbesserten sprachlichen Bewusstsein der Fremdsprache gegenüber führen und den Lernerfolg wesentlich verstärken. (L3)	Auf die Rechte der Schülerinnen und Schüler auf Beteiligung bei der Gestaltung des Unterrichts ist Bedacht zu nehmen (siehe § 17 und § 57a des Schulunterrichtsgesetzes). (B8)	[...] die Berücksichtigung der individuellen Interessen und persönlichen Lebensrealität der Schülerinnen und Schüler (B 1)	Der Unterricht hat an die Vorkenntnisse, Vorerfahrungen und an die Vorstellungswelt der Schülerinnen und Schüler anzuknüpfen. (B5)
2	Im Fremdsprachenunterricht ist auf allen Lernstufen zu berücksichtigen, dass sich Schülerinnen und Schüler der Zielsprache über lernersprachliche Zwischenschritte annähern und Fehler ein selbstverständliches und konstruktives Merkmal des Sprachenlernens darstellen. (U2)	Das Festlegen von Themen, Arbeits- und Sozialformen soll unter Einbeziehung der Schülerinnen und Schüler, aber auch unter Bedachtnahme regionaler und schulautonomer Schwerpunkte erfolgen. (B6)	Die methodisch-didaktische Gestaltung soll die Berücksichtigung der jeweils aktuellen Bedürfnisse der Schülerinnen und Schüler gestatten. (B6)	Für den Unterricht ergeben sich daraus folgende mögliche Aufgabenstellungen bzw. pädagogisch-didaktische Konsequenzen [...] Vorkenntnisse, Vorerfahrung und kulturelles Umfeld [...]. (B5)
3		Bei der Gestaltung des Erweiterungsbereiches sind insbesondere folgende Gesichtspunkte zu berücksichtigen: [...] Interessen und Begabungen der Schülerinnen und Schüler; (B9)	Die Schülerinnen und Schüler sollen eigene weltanschauliche Konzepte entwerfen und ihre eigenen Lebenspläne und eigenen Vorstellungen von beruflichen Möglichkeiten entwickeln [...] [und] Fähigkeiten erwerben die später in Ausbildung und Beruf dringend gebraucht werden, etwa für die Bewältigung kommunikativer und kooperativer Aufgaben. (B2)	Der Unterricht hat sich entsprechend § 17 des Schulunterrichtsgesetzes sowohl an wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen als auch an den Erfahrungen und Möglichkeiten, die die Schülerinnen und Schüler aus ihrer Lebenswelt mitbringen zu orientieren. (B2)

4			Bei der Gestaltung des Erweiterungsbereiches sind insbesondere folgende Gesichtspunkte zu berücksichtigen: [...] Bedürfnisse [...] der Schülerinnen und Schüler; (B9)	
5			Ziel des Fremdsprachenunterrichts der Oberstufe ist es, die Schülerinnen und Schüler zu befähigen, in der jeweiligen Fremdsprache grundlegende kommunikative Anforderungen des gesellschaftlichen Lebens zu erfüllen und sich in den Fertigungsbereichen Hören, Lesen, Sprechen, Schreiben in einer breiten Palette von privaten, beruflichen und öffentlichen Situationen sprachlich und kulturell angemessen zu verhalten. (U1)	

Category VI		Demands	
Number	a. Benchmark levels	b. Differentiation	c. Appropriateness
1	Dennoch ist insgesamt und in sinnvollem Maße eine möglichst hohe Qualität und zielsprachliche Richtigkeit der fremdsprachlichen Äußerungen anzustreben; (L2)	Bei der Einschätzung und Bewertung von Schülerleistungen sind der individuelle Lernfortschritt und das Bemühen um die Optimierung von Arbeitsergebnissen mit zu beachten. (L2)	Die Bereitschaft der Schülerinnen und Schüler, neue sprachliche Strukturen in den Bereichen Lexik und Grammatik anzuwenden und dabei Verstöße gegen zielsprachliche Normen zu riskieren, ist im Sinne des übergeordneten Zieles der kommunikativen Kompetenz von zentraler Bedeutung und bei der Evaluation der Schülerleistungen dementsprechend einzubeziehen. (L2)
2	Die folgende Zuordnung von Kompetenzniveaus und Lernjahren gibt die Grundanforderungen an, die für alle Schülerinnen und Schüler einer bestimmten Lernstufe gelten; vorangehende Niveaus sind dabei stets vorauszusetzen. (L5 + U6)		Verstöße gegen die Sprachrichtigkeit sind nur eines der Bewertungskriterien und sind für die Gesamtleistung nicht alleine ausschlaggebend. Weitere Gütekriterien wie Verständlichkeit der Äußerungen, soziolinguistisch und pragmatisch angemessene Situationsbewältigung sowie Differenziertheit der verwendeten sprachlichen Mittel sind mit von Bedeutung. (L2)

Category VII		<u>Testing and Assessment</u>	
Number	a. Influence of the L1	b. Intelligibility and variation	c. Testing and assessment of different skills and competences
1	Im Fremdsprachenunterricht ist auf allen Lernstufen zu berücksichtigen, dass sich Schülerinnen und Schüler der Zielsprache über lernersprachliche Zwischenschritte annähern und Fehler ein selbstverständliches und konstruktives Merkmal des Sprachenlernens darstellen. (U2)	Verstöße gegen die Sprachrichtigkeit sind nur eines der Bewertungskriterien und sind für die Gesamtleistung nicht alleine ausschlaggebend. Weitere Gütekriterien wie Verständlichkeit der Äußerungen [...] sind mit von Bedeutung. (L2)	Verstöße gegen die Sprachrichtigkeit sind nur eines der Bewertungskriterien und sind für die Gesamtleistung nicht alleine ausschlaggebend. Weitere Gütekriterien wie [...] soziolinguistisch und pragmatisch angemessene Situationsbewältigung sowie Differenziertheit der verwendeten sprachlichen Mittel sind mit von Bedeutung. (L2)

Category I

Research

Number	a. Underlying approach of the curriculum	b. The acknowledgement of ELF	c. The extent to which ELF might be included
1	A foreign language is the expression of culture and lifestyles. (L1)	If the language in question functions as a lingua franca, contact with non-native pronunciation varieties should be made possible. (U3)	Temporal emphasis and the concrete implementation of the guideline reside with the teacher alone and consequently allow for a flexible application. (B9)
2	According to § 17 of the “Schulunterrichtsgesetz” (school education law) teaching has to be based on scientific findings as well as on [...]. (B2)		The curriculum for obligatory subjects and mandatory tutorials distinguishes between a core and an expansion area. For the core area 2/3 of the weekly hours according to the subsidiary schedule (see Z2 in the fourth part – schedule) have to be used. Besides this temporal plan there is also a definition of content for the core area. (B9)
3	Competence orientation is in the foreground of foreign language teaching. (L5)		The application of the briefly and abstractly formulated core objectives is binding for the teachers. The temporal planning as well as the specific application rests with the respective teachers. (B9)
4	According to the action-oriented approach, communicative language competence is the super-ordinate goal of teaching and learning of the foreign language classroom. This entails that various competences have to be taught to such an extent that successful written and spoken interaction is possible. (U2)		The planning process particularly concerns: - the concretisation of the core areas (5 th to 8 th year) by the teacher - design of the expansion area (5 th to 8 th year), - interdisciplinary activities – reconciliation of assessment according to actual teaching [...]. (B8)
5	In the progress of learning on higher levels – beyond the learning and teaching aim of successful communication – correctness should become more important. (U3)		The planning process entails the temporal allocation as well as the balancing of goals and content. It also regards the methods employed to deal with content and to reach the goals as well as the materials and media used. The planning process happens at various stages; there is an annual plan as well as complementing intermediate and short-term planning. (B9)

6	In the foreign language classroom utmost authenticity of the materials employed should be given as well as personal direct contact with native speakers should be enabled (e.g. employment of language assistants in the school routine). (U3)		
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Category II					
<u>Didactic aspects</u>					
Number	a. Didactic principles	b. Selection and justification of goals	c. Selection and justification of content	d. Selection and justification of learning processes	e. Contradictions
1	The curriculum prescribes goals. (B5)	The communicative partial competences which students from the 5 th to the 8 th year should acquire follow the standardised competence levels A1, A2 and partially B1 of the Common European Framework of Reference for languages [...] (L4)	The passage „Lehrstoff“ (syllabus) defines the binding core areas and guarantees comparability and transition. (B9)	A broad distribution of student-centred, process and product oriented teaching methods and learning strategies facilitate foreign language acquisition as well as the development of dynamic competences (key competences) and should therefore be aimed at. (U2)	At every stage of foreign language teaching it has to be respected that students approximate the target language via intermediate steps marked by learner language. It furthermore has to be respected that errors are a natural and constructive feature of language learning Correctness with regard to the target language should nonetheless be aimed at to a reasonable extent; (U2)

2	<p>Didactic principles: communicative competence as super-ordinate learning goal Communicative competence as the super-ordinate learning goal should be aimed at in all competence areas. This is not to be mistaken with flawless communication. (L2)</p>	<p>The communicative partial competences which students in the upper secondary should acquire follow the internationally standardised competence levels A1, A2, B1 and B2 of the Common European Framework of Reference for languages [...] (U4)</p>	<p>Competences in foreign languages facilitate the accessibility of the presentation of international expert information. Therefore, texts using professional jargon should be introduced occasionally relevant to the learner level. (L1)</p>	<p>The methods of written and spoken translation and interpretation into the L1 should be used on lower levels only selectively as strategic intermediate steps to deepen understanding and to teach grammar, for instance. On higher levels, on the other hand, students should be familiarised with interpretations and translations as basic techniques. (U2)</p>	<p>Hereby a focus should be on practice-orientation and increasing authenticity of the materials and situations. (U2)</p>
3	<p>A goal of foreign language teaching is the development of communicative competence in the skills of listening, reading, spoken interaction, oral presentation and writing. The communicative competence should enable students to cope with everyday- and teaching-situations relevant to their level and adequate to the situation. (L1)</p>	<p>General subject goals are: - understanding of spoken language when standard pronunciation is used at a normal speaking rate – independent exploitation and understanding of written texts by the use of various methods and the help of adequate reading strategies – the productive and adequate oral deployment of acquired phrases in relevant encounters – the productive written deployment of acquired linguistic devices adequate to the addressee as well as adequate to the text type (L1)</p>	<p>National varieties have to be integrated generically in the skills of listening. Given the students' interest, also regional, social, economical and non-native varieties should be included. (U3)</p>	<p>Direct personal contact (e.g. with language assistants and other persons with whom communication in the L2 happens, in exchange programmes, stays abroad) as well as the use of audio-visual media and new technologies such as e-mail and the internet are recommended due to utmost possible authenticity. (L3)</p>	<p>Communicative competence as the super-ordinate learning goal should be aimed at in all competence areas. This is not to be mistaken with flawless communication. (L2)</p>

4	<p>The skills listening, reading, spoken interaction, oral presentation and writing should be practiced to almost the same extent regularly and integratively. (L2)</p>	<p>With regard to a transnationally oriented ability to work and/ or study, spoken and written competences have to be fostered sufficiently. Furthermore, those competences should be oriented towards the ability to use information sources in the foreign language. (U1)</p>	<p>Specific topical focuses have to confirm to the individual interests and needs of the students as well as to recent events. (U4)</p>		<p>It should be made possible that students experience the foreign language as an authentic means of communication in interdisciplinary activities. (L3)</p>
5	<p>With regard to independent and autonomous teaching and education, teachers have to select the content and the methods to reach the goals: - during lessons learning situations and learning processes should be introduced and fostered, - various accesses to knowledge should be presented and information has to be offered by the teacher, - opportunities should be provided to develop and apply abilities as well as to make experiences and gain insights. (B5)</p>		<p>The content of the expansion area is defined with respect to the educational and teaching aim as well as on the basis of the didactic principles (see part on core and expansion area in the third part). (L5)</p>		

6	Creating and maintaining a positive learning environment. (L2)				
7	The maintaining of the acquired features should be promoted by the presentation of interrelations between newly taught and already acquired features. New aspects should thereby be integrated into existing structures and systems as far as possible. (B7)				
8	The foreign language classroom has to contribute to the development of socially adequate communication behaviours of the students in the L1 as well as in the L2. (L1)				

9	<p>During the lessons the L2 should be used as much as possible.</p> <p>Translations should only be used selectively for better understanding and as an assistance in the learning process;</p> <p>(L3)</p>				
10	<p>The classroom language should be as much L2 as possible and as little German as possible.</p> <p>(U2)</p>				
11	<p>A reflective use of the language (also in comparison to the first language or the language of education as well as to neighbouring languages and other foreign languages) should be fostered.</p> <p>(U2)</p>				
12	<p>According to the action-oriented approach, communicative language competence is the super-ordinate goal of teaching and learning in the foreign language classroom. This</p>				

entails that partial competences have to be presented to the extent required for successful spoken and written communication. (U2)				
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Category III		<u>Structure</u>			
Number	a. Content and suggested topics	b. Relationship between content and goals	c. Sequences of content and/or goal related elements	d. Stages at which ELF features can be included	e. Suggested possible Realisations
1	The curriculum prescribes goals. With regard to independent and autonomous teaching and education, teachers have to select the content and the methods to reach those goals [...] (B5)	To reach the highest possible competence for private, occupational and studies-related communication situations, the linguistic devices have to be embedded in a possibly wide range of public and private situational contexts [...] (U4)	For the entire process of foreign language teaching competence orientation is in the foreground. If progress advances due to beneficial circumstances, the acquired competences should be deepened and maintained. Furthermore, an expansion of carefully selected individual skills towards the next higher levels – at the maximum B1 – is possible. (L5)	Planning processes refer especially to - the concretisation of the core areas (5 th to 8 th year) by the teacher – design of the expansion areas (5 th to 8 th year) by the teacher, - interdisciplinary activities, - accordance of assessment with actual teaching practices [...]. (B8)	The decision of, especially the specific content and examples, lies with the respective teacher. (B8)
2	The decision of, especially the specific content and examples, resides with the respective teacher. (B8)	By the selection of adequate topics the open-mindedness of the students as well as their understanding for societal relations should be fostered. (U1)	With advancing progress differences in register between neutral, formal, informal, friendly or confidential linguistic devices have to be considered, which contribute to the task for the students to communicate linguistically and socially adequate; politeness plays an important role in this context. (U3)	Thereby it has to be considered how much time for the core area (5 th to 8 th year) is available. The decision of the specific content and examples resides with the teacher. He or she has to decide additionally which partial goals are dealt with in the expansion area (5 th to 8 th year) and how those areas work together.. (B8)	
3	Students have to be familiarised with various situational contexts and with various topic areas by the use of linguistic devices [...] (L3)	By the selection of teaching materials, understanding and insights into society, civilisation, politics, media, economy, science, culture and art of the respective linguistic area should be gained. (U4)	In the application of linguistic devices with advancing progress more and more focus should be on coherence, logic, fluency, clarity and adequateness of the expression. (U3)		

4	<p>Specific topical focuses have to confirm with the individual interests and needs of the students as well as with recent events. (U4)</p>	<p>To reach a possibly large lexical repertoire, various topic areas should be included. (U4)</p>	<p>Lexical knowledge and idiomatic language use should be expanded systematically situation-oriented within contexts. (U3)</p>		
5	<p>With regard to generic learning, relatively recent and realistic topics have to be chosen. The preparation of those topics should enable to acquire insights, knowledge, competences, skills and methods, which could consequently be applied to similar problems and tasks independently. (B7)</p>		<p>In the progress of learning on higher levels – beyond the teaching and learning goal of successful communication – correctness should become more and more important. (U3)</p>		

Category IV					
<u>Goals</u>					
Number	a. Goals related to research areas	b. Binding force of the goals	c. Reference to reality	d. Alternative goals	e. Teaching across subjects
1	The functional aspect of grammar is more important than the formal. (L2)	The prerequisites (goals, content areas etc.) in the section „Lehrstoff“ (syllabus) have to be included obligatorily; this is also true in case of school autonomous decreased lessons. (B9)	With regard to generic learning, relatively recent and realistic topics have to be chosen. The preparation of those topics should enable to acquire insights, knowledge, competences, skills and methods, which could consequently be applied to similar problems and tasks independently. (B7)	Core and expansion area are linked in content as well as in organisation. [...] The allocation of content has to be based on the learning goals. (B9)	With regard to the common impact of education of all subjects, teaching has to respect the single specific aspects of the single subjects related to interdisciplinary aspects. (B2)
2	Grammar in the language classroom has to be included foremost in the light of its functions.; (U3)	The application of the briefly and abstractly formulated core demands are the obligatory task of the teacher. (B9)	In the language classroom the European dimension as well as the growing demand for mobility for the inhabitants of the European community has to be respected; the positive impacts of a foreign language competence on the occupational situation and on the business locations have to be made explicit. (U1)	In the design of the expansion area the following points have to be considered particularly well: regional and local circumstances, - interests and talents of the students; (B9)	The foreign language as an authentic means of communication should be experienced in interdisciplinary activities. (L3)

3	<p>The mediation of lexis and grammar should happen mostly in various contextualised and interconnected ways, e.g. vocabulary wherever possible should be embedded in collocations, idioms and phrases with implicit grammar. (L2)</p>	<p>The following allocation of competence levels and learning level states the basic requirements which are valid for students on a certain level; preceding levels can be seen as given. (L5)</p>	<p>The teaching and education process happens against the background of quick societal changes, especially in the areas of culture, science, economy, technology, environment and law. The European integration-process is in progress, the internationalisation of the economy continues, increasingly there are questions of intercultural encounters and challenges in the area of equal opportunities and equal rights for men and women. In this context an examination of the regional Austrian identity and the European identity is utmost important with regard to open-mindedness. (B1)</p>	<p>Given specific interests, regional, social and non-native language varieties have to be included. (U3)</p>	<p>In teaching across subjects a complex, mostly realistic and societal relevant topic or task is in the foreground. (B11)</p>
4	<p>The ability to use foreign linguistic devices for specific communicative purposes is the central task of foreign language classrooms; thereby language functions have to play a central role [...] (U3)</p>			<p>Core and expansion area are linked content-wise as well as in the organisation. Methods and teaching stages, school events etc. are not assigned to one or the other area right from the beginning. The allocation is much more dependent on the learning goals. Assessment as well as evaluation has to regard both areas. (B9)</p>	<p>Thereby happens a pooling of general and specific goals through the light of a specific viewpoint which enables the students to independently acquire knowledge in rather broad connections (see part one „Allgemeines Bildungsziel“ (general teaching aim)). (B11)</p>

5	<p>The perception of phonemes, pronunciation and intonation has to be trained to such an extent that they enable an adequate understanding of the target language. An approximation to standard pronunciation is admittedly desirable; however, it must not discourage the students. (U3)</p>				
6	<p>To train pronunciation and accentuation receptive knowledge of the international phonetic alphabet should be aimed at. (U2)</p>				
7	<p>The receptive knowledge of the international phonetic alphabet as a helpful device for pronunciation and intonation should be aimed at if it is possible. (L3)</p>				
8	<p>Alongside linguistic devices, a basic knowledge of non-verbal communication devices has to be taught (cultural conventions regarding gestures, facial expressions, posture, and eye-contact, proxemic). (U3)</p>				
9	<p>Social competence in multicultural environments should play an important role in this context (U1)</p>				
10	<p>Intercultural learning is not restricted to getting to know other cultures. Much more in the focus is living together and the understanding and experience as well as the co-creation of cultural values. However, it is also important to arouse curiosity and interest for cultural differences in order to make the positive experience of variety tangible. (B5)</p>				

11	By the respective choice of teaching materials a basic insight into society, civilisation, politics, media, economy, science, culture and art of the respective linguistic area should be enabled. (U4)				
12	National language varieties should be included selectively in the skill of listening. Given specific interests, regional, social, occupational and non-native language varieties have to be respected. If the foreign language in question functions as a lingua franca non-native pronunciation should be made accessible. (U3)				
13	B1 Listening: The students are able to understand the main points when clear standard language is used and familiar topics from work, school, free-time etc. are talked about. They are able to understand the main points in many radio or TV transmissions talking about recent events and topics from their occupational environment and of interest if the interlocutors speak clearly and slowly (U5).				
14	B1 Spoken interaction: The students are able to master most of the situations which they will encounter if they travel through the respective linguistic area. (U5)				

15	<p>B2 Listening: The students are able to understand longer speeches and presentations and can follow longer argumentations if they are mostly familiar with the topic. They are able to understand most of the news transmissions on TV and recent reports. They understand most of the feature films if standard language is spoken. (U5)</p>				
16	<p>B2 Spoken interaction: The students are able to talk spontaneously and fluently to the extent that communication with native speakers is possible. (U5)</p>				
17	<p>By the use of intercultural topics the sensitisation of the students for the linguistic variety of Europe and the world should be maintained as well as open-mindedness towards neighbouring languages and the languages of autochthon minorities should be fostered. Generally, an understanding for other cultures and lifestyles has to be promoted. There should be unprejudiced treatment of stereotypes and clichés as well as a reflective approach to the recognition of similarities and differences with regard to personal experiences and the Austrian situation. (U1)</p>				

18	<p>Conscious examination of such topics should lead to a strengthened sensitisation of the students for cultural similarities and differences and deepen their understanding for variety in cultures and lifestyles. (L1)</p>				
19	<p>The process of foreign language acquisition offers a lot of possibilities for the examination of intercultural topics. [...] Thereby reflections of personal experiences and local environments have to be included. (L1)</p>				
20	<p>Lexis and idiomatic language use have to be expanded systematically situation-oriented and in context. (U3)</p>				

Category V		<u>The learner perspective</u>		
Number	a. Acknowledgement of the special case of the L2 learner	b. Reference to choice	c. Needs, projected future demands and interests of the L2 learner	d. Reference to prior learning experiences/ knowledge
1	A conscious and reflective approach to languages (also with regards to the language of teaching or the first language) has to be fostered. Comparative and contrastive methods are especially valuable where they lead to a better linguistic consciousness for the foreign language and where they strengthen the learning success. (L3)	The rights of the students to take part in the design of teaching have to be respected (see § 17 and § 57a of the „Schulunterrichtsgesetz“ (school education law). (B8)	[...] the consideration of individual interests and personal realities of the students (B 1)	Teaching has to be related to prior experiences and knowledge as well as to the mindset of the student. (B5)
2	In language teaching it has to be considered on every level that students approximate the target language via learner language related intermediate steps as well as that errors are constructive features of language learning. (U2)	The decision of topics and methods should happen together with the students, as well as there should be a consideration of regional and school autonomous focuses. (B6)	The methodological and didactic design should enable a consideration of the respective recent needs of the students. (B6)	For the lessons thereby arise the following possible tasks and/ or pedagogic and didactic consequences [...] prior knowledge, prior experiences and cultural environment [...]. (B5)
3		Particularly in the design of the expansion area the following aspects have to be considered: [...] interests and abilities of the students; (B9)	The students should develop personal concepts regarding the view of the world, their own plans for their lives and occupational possibilities [...] [and] acquire competences which are urgently needed in future occupations, as for example the ability to cope with communicative and cooperative tasks. (B2)	Teaching, with regard to § 17 of the „Schulunterrichtsgesetz“ (school education law), has to be oriented towards scientific research findings as well as towards the experiences and possibilities of the students. (B2)
4			In the design of the expansion area particularly the following aspects should be considered: [...] needs of the students; (B9)	

5			<p>The goal of language teaching in the upper secondary is to enable students to master basic communicative tasks in society and to act linguistically and culturally appropriate in the skills of listening, reading, talking and writing in a wide range of private, occupational and public situations.</p> <p>(U1)</p>	
---	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Category VI		Demands	
Number	a. Benchmark levels	b. Differentiation	c. Appropriateness
1	Nonetheless, overall and to a reasonable extent a high quality and target-like correctness of the utterances in the foreign language should be aimed at; (L2)	In assessing and evaluating the students' individual progress and effort have to be considered. (L2)	The willingness of the students to apply new linguistic structures in lexis and grammar as well as deviations of standard norms in this context have to be considered in evaluation with regards to the super-ordinate goal of communicative competence. (L2)
2	The following allocation of competence levels and learning level states the basic requirements which are valid for students on a certain level; preceding levels can be seen as given. (L5 + U6)		Deviations from the norm are only one criterion for evaluation and cannot be decisive for an overall grading. Other criteria such as intelligibility of the utterances, sociolinguistic and pragmatically adequate behaviour in situations as well as the differentiation of various linguistic devices used have to be taken into consideration. (L2)

Category VII		<u>Testing and Assessment</u>	
Number	a. Influence of the L1	b. Intelligibility and variation	c. Testing and assessment of different skills and competences
1	At every stage of foreign language teaching it has to be respected that students approximate the target language via intermediate steps marked by learner language. It furthermore has to be respected that errors are a natural and constructive feature of language learning. (U2)	Deviations from the norm are only one criterion for evaluation and cannot be decisive for an overall grading. Other criteria such as intelligibility of the utterances [...] have to be taken into consideration. (L2)	Deviations from the norm are only one criterion for evaluation and cannot be decisive for an overall grading. Other criteria such as [...] sociolinguistic and pragmatically adequate behaviour in situations as well as the differentiation of various linguistic devices used have to be taken into consideration. (L2)

Abstract

English nowadays is used by more non-native speaker (NNS) than native speakers (NS). Consequently, the traditional idea of individual languages as properties of fixed nation states does no longer hold.

The fact that English functions as **the** global lingua franca clearly challenges the way we need to think about its speakers, teachers and learners. What is more, the change in the role of English has affected the character of the language itself. In fact, research into the phenomenon of English as a lingua franca (ELF) offers a wide range of findings which clearly demonstrate that lingua franca usage differs from native speaker usage of the language. Therefore, it can be said that ELF speakers can use the language successfully even if they do not adhere to native speaker norms.

The features which distinguish ELF from English as a native language are found to enable successful communication while respecting the identity of the speakers. Nonetheless, those findings are widely ignored in language teaching practices. On the contrary, native speakers mostly remain the ultimate authority in English language teaching (ELT). However, a recognition of characteristics of ELF communication could facilitate the learning process for students while enabling them to communicate successfully in situations with NS as well as NNS. These theoretical considerations argue for a need to change teaching practices.

This thesis therefore investigates ways to include results from research into ELF in Austrian grammar schools. As content for school subjects cannot be chosen deliberately by the teacher, the curriculum as a prescriptive guideline is investigated. Based on this analysis, comparisons between findings from ELF research and the prescriptions of the curriculum are drawn in order to see which results could inform teaching practices in Austria.

At the end of this paper, it is shown to what extent an ELF orientation can be included in ELT in Austrian grammar schools, despite the fact that native speaker norms still remain the ultimate goal in the curricula. Furthermore, ideas for the ways in which this inclusion could happen are provided. Overall this thesis shows how English could be taught in Austrian grammar schools in order to respect the speakers as legitimate users of the language, independent of its native speakers.

Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Englisch wird heutzutage öfters von Sprechern unterschiedlichster Herkunft verwendet als von Muttersprachlern. Daraus ergibt sich, dass die traditionelle Vorstellung einer individuellen Nationalsprache die ihren Sprechern zu Eigen ist, nicht mehr aufrecht erhalten werden kann.

Die Tatsache, dass Englisch als weltweite Verkehrssprache (Lingua franca) fungiert, erfordert das Überdenken der Konzepte „Sprecher“, „Lehrer“ und „Lernender“. Außerdem wurde und wird der Charakter der englischen Sprache von ihrer Lingua franca Funktion beeinflusst. Tatsächlich gibt die Erforschung dieses Phänomens viele Einblicke und präsentiert verschiedenste Ergebnisse wie sich internationales Englisch von muttersprachlicher Verwendung unterscheidet. Deshalb kann festgehalten werden, dass Lingua franca Sprecher erfolgreich miteinander kommunizieren können, auch wenn sie sich nicht an muttersprachlichen Regeln und Normen orientieren.

Die Merkmale, die Lingua franca Englisch von muttersprachlichem Englisch unterscheiden, belegen, dass neben erfolgreicher Kommunikation durch die Verwendung ebendieser Merkmale auch Platz für die eigene muttersprachliche Identität bleibt. Dennoch werden diese Ergebnisse im Fremdsprachenunterricht weitgehend ignoriert und Muttersprachler nach wie vor als die letzte Instanz für den Englischunterricht angesehen.

Allerdings könnte eine Einbeziehung dieser Merkmale das Sprachenlernen für SchülerInnen erleichtern ohne erfolgreiche Kommunikation zwischen verschiedensten Sprechern zu beeinträchtigen. Diese theoretischen Betrachtungen fordern also ein Umdenken für das Lehren der englischen Sprache.

Die vorliegende Arbeit versucht daher Wege zu finden wie Ergebnisse aus der Lingua franca Forschung in österreichischen Gymnasien eingebunden werden können. Da der Inhalt von Unterrichtsgegenständen nicht allein durch die Lehrperson bestimmt werden kann, werden Lehrpläne als präskriptive Dokumente untersucht. Das Resultat dieser Analyse wird Forschungsergebnissen aus der Lingua franca Forschung gegenübergestellt.

Am Ende werden Ergebnisse, die zeigen welche Rolle Lingua franca Merkmale im gymnasialen Englischunterricht spielen können, präsentiert. Weiters werden Möglichkeiten dargestellt wie die Einbeziehung dieser Forschungsergebnisse vonstattengehen kann. Gesamt zeigt diese Arbeit also Wege auf wie Englisch in österreichischen Gymnasien unterrichtet werden kann, ohne dass ständig auf Defizite im Bezug auf eine unerreichbare Muttersprachler-Kompetenz verwiesen werden muss.

Curriculum vitae

Persönliche Daten

Name: Paul Artner

Email: paul.artner@gmx.at

Geburtsort: Leoben, Österreich

Geburtsdatum: 2. Oktober 1987

Schulische und universitäre Ausbildung

1994 – 1998 Volksschule Kraubath an der Mur

1998 – 2006 Abteigymnasium Seckau

2007 – 2013 Lehramtsstudium der Fächer Englisch und Italienisch an der Universität Wien

2010 – 2011 Auslandssemester an der Universität Triest

Sprachkenntnisse

Deutsch: Muttersprache

Englisch: C2

Italienisch: C1

Französisch: A1