**2. Literature review**

**2.1 The development of English as Lingua Franca (ELF)**

**2.1.1 English in the world**

Under the background of the world economy and the increase in globalization, English has become a universal language all over the world. Crystal (1987) points out that 400 million of 700 million English speakers come from non-English speaking countries. Crystal (2003) further stated that there are 430 million people those who use English as their second language while the rest 330 million are the native English speakers. He pointed out that these figures did not include 1 billion English learners in the world. According to the British Council statistics, in the past 10 years, there have been 2 billion people learning English and 3 billion people those who can speak and understand English around the world; the number of non-English speaking countries is three times of the English speaking countries; and 350 million people in Asia can use English, which equal to the total number of people using English in the United States, Britain, and Canada. Nearly 100 million children in China are learning English. According to the Guardian (2005), Gordon Brown, who is the former British Chancellor of the Exchequer, said during his visit to China that British education output had doubled in the past five years. In the next 20 years, the number of English-speaking people in China will be equal to the total number of native English speakers in the world. Brown mentioned that there is a huge potential in the Chinese English education market.

English is no longer a patent of the native speakers. As an international language, it is a way and means of understanding, communicating, and expressing different cultures. The most influential pioneer of world English theory, Kachru (1985) proposed the concept of world English based on his years of research on Indian English. He holds that world English refers to the patterns or variants of English used in different cultural backgrounds. His theoretical purpose is to try to reveal the typical features of various variants. Kachru distinguishes three major English users: first, native speakers of English, those who are fluent in using the language. Second, the non-native speakers of English, those who use English as their second language. Third, are the kind of English speakers those who use this language to a very limited extend. However, Graddol (2006) believes that it is necessary to distinguish between English proficiency and bilingual identity of speakers in the globalized world. Graddol (2006) suggests that an inner circle is a high-level group of English users, mostly the native speakers, regardless of their study and use of English, and that the core of this division is the level of English users. Jenkins (2009) proposed three levels of world English. She believes that if the changing population is taken into account and the advantages of English bilinguals, different grades can be drawn. In the three level English world, the bilingual English speaker with international competence is at the top， such as Chinese English, Korean English, Japanese English, or native language bilingual users such as North American or British English variants and the domestic English changes are reflected in the same level , whether they are inner or an extended circle variants.

No matter from where the English speakers come from and the language they use, describing their level of expertise is the most effective way. In other words, Kachru（1995） emphasizes the social use of the language, while Graddol （2006）emphasizes the English proficiency of the users. There are overlaps between the two, but they are not necessarily identical. Therefore, the key factor is the level of English, and not learning the language. The status of an English speaker is determined by his or her intercultural communicative competence in using English, and not by his or her native language identity. The researchers in most of the academic institutions in the UK, and the United States and the other inner circle countries comes from the outer circle or the extended circle countries. Their efficiency and the proficiency in English is sometimes higher than the native English speakers. In fact, some of them are better than native speakers in terms of vocabulary size, choice of vocabulary, the vividness of expression and clarity of information transmission.

Kachru (1985) proposed three concentric circle models to divide world English into three circles: inner circle, outer circle, and extended circle. The inner-circle refers to the native English-speaking countries (ENL), including Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia, etc. The outer circle indicates the countries (ESL) where English is the second language , including Singapore, India, and Nigeria. Expansion refers to the countries where English is a foreign language (EFL), including China, Japan, Russia, etc. When English came in contact with these countries in the outer circle, a new variety of English is formed. However, the model is based only on geography and history, not on the speaking English use. In some outer-circle countries such as India, English is used as an official language to communicate with each other. Similarly, a large number of extended circle English users also use English extensively, while communicating with the native speakers and even more with the non-native speakers (same or different native speakers). For example, English has gradually become the language of instruction in schools in Europe and Asia (Jennifer, 2009). According to JENKINS (2009), English is no longer a tool for communicating with people from the inner-circle countries, but a common language for communicating with countries within the extended circle because these countries have their own national languages, they need a common language to communicate. Therefore, the status of ELF in the cross-cultural communication which is becoming more and more prominent. The next chapter will show the prominence of ELF.

**2.1.2 English as a lingua franca**

Common language refers to a contact language used by people from various countries with different language background to communicate with everyone. According to Meierkord (2002), the common language originally refers to a variant used on the southeastern coast of the Mediterranean between the 15th and 19th centuries. This variant was originally based on the Italian dialect and also featured Spanish, French, Portuguese, Turkish, Greek and Persian. It is noteworthy that the earliest common language did not have native speakers. Samarin (1987) once defined common language as "the medium of communication between people who speak different mother tongues”. This medium is the second language for all the participants. From this definition, neither party who uses the common language in communication is the native speaker of the language. This concept was later extended to English as a lingua franca (ELF). In a narrow sense, ELF only covers the communication between speakers of different cultural backgrounds who speak English as their second language. Therefore, the communication among the native speakers and second speakers of English are not included. Firth (1996) pointed out that common language English is a communicative language used between people without a common mother tongue and a common cultural background. For these communicators, English is chosen as a medium to communicate with the foreigners across the world. House (1999) holds that communicating in general English is a communicative activity carried out in English by people from two or more different linguistic and cultural backgrounds where the native language of the communicator is not English. Seidlhofer (2001) defines ELF as English used by people with different mother tongues to communicate with each other, including the native speakers, who choose English as their medium of communication, and English is often the only choice. Jennifer Jenkins also supports this view. Jenkins (2012) argues that ELF a way of communicating with people from different mother tongue backgrounds, including the native speakers. Jenkins (2000) pointed out that ELF emphasizes the communication between people from different mother tongue backgrounds, which is also the primary purpose of learning English in international community. It implies group rather than alienation; emphasizes commonality rather than difference and bridges the language differences which indicates that mixed language is acceptable. Consequently, the preservation of some features of the native language is either inherent or erroneous, such as phonetics (Jenkins, 2000). It means that English is no longer unique to native speakers but belongs to everyone who uses English. According to VOICE, Jenkins (2011) defines universal language English as a language system acquired separately, which is used as a common tool of communication between speakers of different mother tongues. This definition shows that ELF is not traditional authentic English, which means that native speakers of English also need to learn this kind of English in order to better communicate in the context of globalization, rather than traditional thinking that they are the provider of language standards.

The theory of ELF is still in the process of development and construction. Jenkins（2015）summarizes its course into three stages: the first stage is from the 1980s to the beginning of this century, focusing on the study of pronunciation and lexical and grammatical forms of substantive English variants. The representative achievements include Jenkins own exploration of the "common core" of ELF pronunciation and Seidlhofer exploration of the "common core" of ELF pronunciation. On the basis of VOICE corpus, the "hypothesis" of ELF lexical grammar and Ana Mauranen. Academic Situational English General Corpus (ELFA) are studied. Phase 2 starts from the second half of the first ten years of the new century. The focus of the research has shifted from stable features of coding changes to dynamic, variable, and uncertain communications. It is considered that encoding entity features are impossible. This stage of ELF embodies the characteristics of its’ construction. At present, ELF is moving towards stage three, that is, from a self-contained ELF framework to an ELF in a multilingual framework. ELF at this time transcends English monolingualism and pure language communication, focusing on flexible communication using multilingual and multimodal resources.

**2.1.3 English as a foreign language (EFL)and ELF**

English teaching has always followed the EFL teaching mode under the foreign language paradigm. Under this model, native speakers are regarded as the target communicators of learners, and native speaker norms are considered to be the only sufficient criteria for learning. The goal of learners is to acquire standard English and to reach (approximate) near-nativeness in fluency. In the academic discourse of EFL as a foreign language paradigm, learners are regarded as "users of interlanguage." Any language deviating from native language norms is viewed as inadequate ability and "error," with the traces of "transfer and interference" of the first language. Code-switching, on the other hand, is labeled as "compensating for the inadequacy of English language competence. "English teachers or evaluators under EFL still use the inner circle of "Standard English" as a reference for learners’ oral measurement (Quirk 1985). This standard emphasizes precise accuracy but neglects the smoothness of information transmission and communication as well as the pragmatic strategies of cross-cultural communication and tends to put the cart before the horse. However, the essence and essential function of a language is to convey information and communicate (Jenkins 2006). As a result of this backwash effect of "strict" criteria to communicate successfully, English learners have to deal with both semantics and pragmatics of language forms, i.e., pronunciation and syntax. This will increase the burden and computational complexity of language processing in the brain, and on the contrary, it will be more prone to linguistic errors.

Jenkins (2011) pointed out that ELF and EFL are two completely different linguistic phenomena from a sociolinguistic point of view and also made an essential distinction between them, which is, ELF is an example of international English, while EFL is a pure foreign language different from native English. It is regarded everywhere as a legal variant of English, unlike foreign language English which considers these differences as linguistic errors. Moreover, common language English regards code-mixing and code-switching as bilingual pragmatic strategies, while foreign language English regards them as gaps in language use.  
ELF is the result of language contact and language evolution. Language assessment criteria are based on communicative validity, which considers comprehensibility to be more important than accuracy. Learners are regarded as "bilingual people" who have the legal right to use the language. Errors are no longer labeled as negative meanings but a result of language contact. Code-switching signifies learners; multilingual cultural identity and their ability to mobilize multiple languages to achieve communicative effectiveness. Language teaching from the perspective of ELF is no longer a "common core" linguistic feature of learning English, but the ability to integrate various linguistic and non-linguistic symbolic resources for communication, that is, communicative capability is (Widdowson, 2015). That is to say, what stands out here is the effectiveness and creativity of using communicative strategies to achieve better communication rather than the accuracy and suitability of language compared to native speakers. Code-switching or "trans-linguistic" expressions, graphics and text mixing are commonly used, accepted and encouraged in ELF communication. ELF theory emphasizes that when judging the variants of each common English language, we should take into account the corresponding mother tongue, culture, and other factors. These variants are the result of the combination of "standard English" and local cultures, and they have their own rules and standards (Seidlhofer 2011)."English in Rome Following the Romans" can no longer be based on inner circle English as EFL does. The basic criteria and goal of ELF is to communicate smoothly among different English varieties. It focuses on the comprehensibility of language output and strategies of language communication, such as repetition, confirmation, clarification, and rewriting (Jenkins 2006). ELF theory holds that native English pronunciation in the inner circle should not be taken as a required criterion to measure the progress of English learners in an extended circle. On the one hand, this standard is unrealistic, and even second language learners who have lived in British and North American countries for many years do not have a genuine accent. On the other hand, according to the Critical Period Hypothesis, after childhood, it becomes very difficult for adult human beings to acquire a native language, as the plasticity of the brain gradually disappears with age (Ellis 2013:27).

**2.1.4 ELF and Culture**

As a common language, English has its own linguistic advantages, as well as many other geographic, historical, social, and cultural reasons. The formation of English "global lingua franca" is closely related to the British colonial language expansion policy, the prosperity of the United States in the 20th century and the rise of other English-speaking countries, as well as the acceleration of the process of global integration (Saxena, 2010). Globalization has expanded the use of English. ELF has become not only the language of communication between native speakers and non-native speakers but also the language of communication between non-native speakers. The characteristics of ELF in phonetics, vocabulary, and pragmatics show that the cultural background and knowledge sharing of both sides play a vital role in the context of ELF (Baker, 2012). Socio-cultural theory holds that language embodies the development of society, culture, and history in which communicators live, and that language is also the medium of people advanced thinking, which to some extent regulates people thinking (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Baker (2015) believes that ELF is cross-cultural. According to the definition of ELF communication, it concerns speakers of different languages and cultures. Through ELF, dynamics and threshold of cross-cultural communication, we need to re-examine the relationship between language and culture and get rid of it (Baker, 2011). According to Baker (2011), in ELF, the definition of language and culture is emergent and dynamic, and the boundary between one language and the culture, and the other is not obvious. He believes that language is adjusted and shaped according to users; needs, and communication environment. Therefore, languages, such as English, need to be varied in personal, local, or global environments. According to Byram (2001), culture should be regarded as a dynamic and mobile resource in intercultural communication. How to define intercultural competence is controversial. There are many differences between how to best understand the basic issues of culture, how to describe it, and how to teach or implement it (Rathje, 2007). Baker (2011) believes that the ability to systematically conceptualize and investigate knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to intercultural communication is a reflection of intercultural competence. Seidlhofer (2009) emphasized that ELF is unique in the speaker’s use of communication strategies rather than language norms. This communication strategy is most likely to occur among multilingual and multicultural language users rather than among monolingual native speakers (kramsch, 2009).In different linguistic contexts, intercultural awareness is needed in communication. This awareness may enable English speakers to successfully negotiate the complexity of intercultural communication (Baker, 2007). ELF communication forces us to recognize the discrimination, ethnocentrism, linguism, otherness, and inequality implied in intercultural communication from the perspective of native speakers in the inner circle. (Baker, 2011)

**2.1.5 ELF in the International University**

Bjorkman (2011) holds that English as a universal language is a relatively new topic. In all the environments in which English as a common language is discussed, the context of international universities has become the most interesting situation in which English is used as a daily teaching language in many universities. At the same time, the validity of English as a general academic language deserves further exploration. Jenkins (2011) pointed out that most colleges and universities using English as their teaching language consider themselves highly internationalized. From the perspective of academic language policy and practice, the author examines the meaning of "internationalization", but at the same time finds that, despite the diversity in the origin and composition of the students and faculty members in these universities, they still prefer standard British or North American English, and their admission requirements are also based on native English-based test scores, such as TOEFL and IELTS ( Jenkins (2011).) It also points out the enlightenment of using English as a common language for academic writing, as it means that non-native speakers need not seek native speakers to "modify" their academic works. At the same time, she also pointed out that because of the gradual acceptance of linguistic English in academic circles and the emergence of "multilingualism" as a new global academic norm, native speakers who only speak English as a single language are likely to be at a disadvantage in the international communication environment.  
Hynninen (2011) believes that English as a common language, plays a mediating role in international schools. She believes that English is an effective way to promote students participation in the classroom and provide them with opportunities to express themselves, thus playing a face-saving role. Knapp (2011) proposes that teachers and students can reduce the conflicts caused by cultural and linguistic incompatibility by using common English. Ljosland (2011) analyzed the reasons for using English as a common language. School managers believe that the use of English in teaching practice can attract more international students to study, expand the influence of the school, get more financial support from the school and help to train graduates more adapted to the global labour market. Students can construct their identity through a common English language.

**2.2 Identity and attitude**

**2.2.1 Identity and language**

Gleason (1983) introduced the term identity into social sciences in the 1950s, which was recognized by the academic circles under the impetus of psychoanalyst Erik Erikson. Edwards (2009) believes that a person identity includes both personal and social aspects. Hall (1997) believes that integrity is constructed through the generation of meaning. Identity lets us understand who we are and where we belong. The definition indicates that each and everyone has a multiple identity. Phan Le Ha (2008) believes that an identity is closely related to all aspects of life, from the individual level to the social level, then to the national level, and finally to the international level. There are two different concepts about the definition of identity. First one is the one who holds that identity is intrapsychic and fixed; second one is the other who holds that identity which is acquired and is the process of consciously choosing roles which are imposed or constructed by the society. Habermas (1979) talks about ego identity, which emphasizes the socialized consciousness of individual characteristics and effectively reconciles the two concepts. Identity is also closely related to the identification, which is a group membership because people tend to act in the way that they want to integrate into the circle.

The relationship between language and identity has always been a hot topic in identity studies. Norton (2000) uses the social identity model to analyze language as a tool of identity construction, and identity influences the way people use language regarding the degree of dependence on both language and identity, Hornberger (2006) pointed out that for some people, language is mostly related to identity;and for others, language is always related to identity. Llurda (2004) argues that English as a global language has an impact on the identity of the speakers because all languages acquired or taught by the speakers can affect the way we think and use languages. Jenkins (2013) mentioned that language is the most prominent way to establish one’s identity. Language not only determines individual identity but also is an important factor affecting group identity. At the same time, identity also affects language. Joseph (2003) believes that identity is a social construction of language because people can construct identity by opposing others. (cite by Jenkins, 2013)  
Some scholars began to discuss identity in theory. Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) classified character into three categories: sociopsychological, interactional, and poststructuralist. Majanen (2008) believes that a poststructuralist approach is closely related to identity understanding. The social-psychological approach relies on second language learning and language use, and it assumes a one-to-one correlation between language and identity. Interactive methods study identity negotiation in language selection and code conversion. According to post-structuralism, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) concluded that new identity choices began to play a role and new values were assigned to identity choices, which had been legalized or reduced before by mainstream identity discourse. This method is suitable for ELF research because it combines identity with society.

In ELF, identity has become the focus of research (Baker, 2015). Kalocsai (2009) points out that it is customary, not exceptional, for an interlocutor to have multiple identities in the context of ELF. Non-native speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds have become speakers of the English language; that is, English has gradually become the language of others (Jenkins, 2015). Jenkins ‘(2000) research on non-native accents shows that non-native speakers tend to use native speakers; accents. Many non-native speakers think their accents are recognized and weak. Jenkins (2009) explored the potential impact of different attitudes on ELF speakers from the expanding circle of participating countries. Jenkins (2009) mentioned that raising awareness of communicative effectiveness helps to improve understanding of communication using ELF. Jenkins (2009) found the relationship between ELF and identity. First, speakers pursue an accent close to native English because they can be considered successful. Secondly, speakers feel that using their mother tongue can give them high confidence. For ELF speakers, they use strategies to improve their understanding of different speakers in different situations. Seidlhofer (1999) argues that ELF speakers can use their non-native nature as an advantage. (cite by Majanen, 2008)  
ELF communicators actively construct a temporary speech community in interactive communication. Every ELF communicator will build one’s English (Kohn, 2011), which is not wholly identical to the native English language and reflects the self-communicative style and social and cultural identity. The trend of English becoming the other language urges us to pay attention to the non-linguistic contextual variables such as interpersonal harmony, cross-cultural mediation and so on, as well as the pragmatic competence of dynamic adaptation according to cultural differences and communicative contexts (Baker, 2011).  
**2.2.2 Attitude**McKenzie (2010) mentioned that views have been the focus of many studies throughout the social sciences. The purpose of language attitude research is to study people attitudes towards specific languages, language elements, language variants, and language users. Backman (1964) believes that position is closely related to belief, reaction, and behavior. Edwards (1982) put forward two views on the relationship between feelings, emotions, and practices related to language attitudes. First, attitudes and actions are not necessarily related. This indicates that people may have a negative attitude towards English, but still want to use English (Jenkins, 2007). Second, attitudes and beliefs are not mutually exclusive. Edwards (1982) made it clear that this is particularly relevant to language attitudes. However, the relationship between these two concepts has become complicated because researchers hold different views in the study of language attitudes. Preston (2002) believes that beliefs determine attitudes. Garrett, Coupland, and Williams (2003) argue that attitudes and beliefs interact. Jenkins (2007) believes that attitudes and beliefs are independent of each other, but also acknowledges that attitudes and beliefs sometimes complement each other. These theories prove that pragmatic attitudes and beliefs cannot be separate. Therefore, belief, reaction, and behavior should be taken into account in the study of Chinese student’s language attitudes.  
Jenkins (2013) proposed that language attitudes and beliefs have complex connections in social judgment. Whether within or outside the social group, the speaker’s judgment of other speakers involves complex factors, and these language attitudes and beliefs are specifically related to accents  
Attitudes as a whole can be divided into three categories. First, English users have a positive attitude towards ELF. Secondly, users hold a negative attitude of rejection. Thirdly, there is a hovering conflict between acceptance and rejection. Sung (2014) studied the relationship between accent, acceptance, and ELF of Hong Kong College students. It was found that about half of the learners were willing to retain their local accent when speaking English, mainly because they realized that eliminating their native accent was a difficult and unrealistic goal. He (2012) found that 62.6% of English users supported the incorporation of some features of Chinese English into language teaching and took a positive attitude towards ELF. Some studies have found that the subjects hold a negative attitude towards ELF. Wu (2014) found that most people hold a negative and skeptical attitude towards the development of Chinese English. In teaching practice, they agree with the English teaching mode based on the thinking mode of native speakers. Gao (2015) used quantitative questionnaires and qualitative interviews to find that most teachers and students are reluctant to accept the localized education model of Chinese English, mainly because of the deep-rooted "language awareness of native language standards". Other studies have found that there is a hovering conflict between acceptance and rejection. For example, the study of He (2012) investigated the attitudes towards Chinese English at the phonological and syntactic levels. It was found that half of the users (55.4%) accepted the use of English with a native accent, but most users (71%) believed that the syntactic aspect should strictly follow the native speaker’s criteria. Users try to strike a balance between following and deviating from native language norms. On the one hand, they believe that native English is the essence of the English language. On the other hand, they also consider how to express their cultural identity and how to achieve communicative effectiveness in specific situations, which requires flexible use of their own language resources.