

“given the relevance of CSs, from repetition and clarification requests to paraphrase in ELF communication in meaning co-construction and achievement of mutual understanding, it would seem reasonable to make learners aware of such aspects in ELT materials. Providing exemplifications of how these expressions are used in context, as well as opportunities for guided and freer practice in (ELF) naturally occurring conversations, would seem equally important.”

Vettorel (2017, 90)

Most research into CSs (communication strategies) has also dealt with pedagogic aspects and language teaching, above all, in relation to English. Two main views emerge from literature: some scholars believe that CSs cannot be formally and overtly taught, mainly on the ground that strategic transfer from the L1 is possible, or that they can only be acquired in real-life contexts ...; other scholars, instead, argue in favour of the inclusion of CSs in formal instruction and class activities Supporters of a ‘teachability’ perspective for CSs generally argue that ‘teaching CSs’ can be enacted both in terms of awareness-raising (not least for their usefulness), and by providing learners with CSs models and examples, as well as with ways and opportunities to cooperatively interact in L2 contexts ...”

Vettorel (2017, 76-77)

Communication strategies were grouped into the following four macro-areas:

1. appeal for help (direct/indirect);
2. (a) meaning negotiation: requests for repetition, clarification, direct questions/minimal queries); (b) meaning negotiation: confirmation checks, direct/indirect question, repetition in rising intonation, interpretative summary (e.g. you mean...?), content /summary;
3. Responses: repetition, rephrasing, expansion, reduction/simplification, confirmation, rejection, repair; lexical anticipation / suggestion / correction (Kirkpatrick 2007); use of fillers and time-gaining devices;
4. achievement strategies: circumlocution/paraphrase, approximation/all-purpose words/word-replacement, restructuring, word-coinage, code-switching – or literal translation from L1 (mother tongue)/Ln (any language part of the interactants’ repertoire), foreignizing, code-switching into L1/L3/Ln”

Vettorel (2017, 80-81)

“Practices such as repetition and paraphrase, which create redundancy and may be regarded as superfluous in native speaker conversations, provide participants in ELF interaction with effective means of negotiating meaning and achieving shared understanding. Similarly, self-repair practices like lexical replacement and insertion, which may be considered disruptive to the smooth flow of conversation, afford the speaker the means to work at producing talk that is comprehensible and accessible. What appears obvious ... is that in ELF communication, different norms of language use apply. Practices perhaps considered undesirable in native speaker communication are the very same ones that contribute to greater clarity and communicative effectiveness in ELF talk.”

(Kaur, 2017, 251)

Kaur (2017, 243/251)

Vettorel (2017/2020)

“Professional communication in the domain of business today involves a complex and interweaving set of skills, represented in the Global Communicative Competence (GCC) model (Louhiala-Salminen and Kankaanranta 2011), comprising Multicultural competence, Competence in BELF and Business knowhow. In order to adequately prepare (future) professionals to communicate internationally in the globalized world of work, ELT business materials, syllabi and training practices should include elements from all the three layers of GCC, and above all those connected to the development of BELF and multicultural competence;”

Vettorel (2020, 146)

BELF Materials (2017 - 2022)

“Specifically, materials need to be designed that provide learners with opportunities to:

- engage in the mutual pursuit of understanding, particularly in the context of potential and/or real instances of breakdown in communication;
- enhance the explicitness and clarity of their speech, particularly in contexts where ambiguity in language use can adversely impact the comprehensibility of what they say.”

Kaur (2017, 243)

Galloway (2018,471)

“ELF corpora (e.g. the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE), the English as a lingua franca in academic settings (ELFA) corpus and the Asian Corpus of English (ACE)) clearly offer ELT materials writers, or at least those who base their course books on corpora data, a valuable insight into what ELF looks like and how detracting from the path taken by “authorized pathfinders – the educated native speakers” ... does not necessarily result in unsuccessful communication. ELF, then, as a different concept to native English, requires that we reconceptualise the very content of ELT materials; the English language. This clearly has numerous implications for materials writers and publishers.”

Galloway (2018, 471)

Kiczowskiak (2020, 1-9)

“seven practical and research-based principles that materials writers can use to create materials that promote the use of ELF:

- 1 Intelligibility rather than ‘native speaker’ proximity
- 2 Successful E(LF)nglish users rather than ‘native speakers’
- 3 Authentic E(LF)nglish use rather than ‘native speaker’ corpora

4 Intercultural communicative skills rather than fixed cultural models

5 Communicative skills rather than ‘native-like’ correctness

6 Multilingual E(LF) use rather than monolingual ‘native speaker’ language use

7 Raising students’ awareness: towards an ELF mindset”