UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

Chinese speakers' perceptions of their English in intercultural communication

by

Ying Wang

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

June 2012

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

Doctor of Philosophy

CHINESE SPEAKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ENGLISH IN
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

by Ying Wang

In the field of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) research, an overarching question is why native English should be exclusively followed by all users around the world regardless of their purposes of communication and identity projection. This provides the starting point of my investigation into Chinese speakers' perceptions of their English in intercultural communication, which is traditionally considered as 'learner English' due to its difference from native English. Influenced by the ELF perspective, I consider Chinese speakers' English as both fluid and subject to Chinese speakers' appropriation according to their purposes in engaging intercultural communication, and label it as Chinese speakers' English as a Lingua Franca (CHELF). Four dimensions of CHELF are considered in this research: linguistic creativity, community, identity and attitude, while the empirical data focuses on CHELF users' perceptions in order to offer an insight into their attitudes, identities, beliefs, and contextual factors related to their perceptions.

The research findings illuminate contrast, complementation, uncertainty and conservation in the participants' attitudes towards, and identities in, their use of English, and reveal an interplay between a traditional EFL perspective and the ELF perspective that underlined their attitudes and identities. The data highlights contextual factors as playing a key role in influencing, shaping and developing the participants' perceptions of ELF. Importantly, a good understanding of the concept of ELF makes a difference in the participants' confidence in their ELF use. The findings thus suggest the possibility of CHELF developing legitimacy, as well as the challenges involved in such a development. This study thus provides a fresh insight into Chinese speakers' English and contributes to ELF research at large. In particular, the establishment of contextual factors to CHELF users adds to the growing evidence of the necessity of including ELF in pedagogy.

List of contents

Declaration of authorship

I, YING WANG, declare that the thesis entitled

CHINESE SPEAKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ENGLISH IN
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

and the work presented in the thesis are both my own, and have been generated by me
as the result of my own original research. I confirm that:

- this work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree
  at this University;

- where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any
  other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been
  clearly stated;

- where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly
  attributed;

- where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With
  the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;

- I have acknowledged all main sources of help;

- where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have
  made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed
  myself;

- none of this work has been published before submission

Signed: …………………………………………………………………..

Date:………………………………………………………………………….

Acknowledgement

My supervisor Professor Jennifer Jenkins has been an integral part of the development of this PhD thesis and a constant source of very much appreciated inspiration, guidance, support and motivation. I thank her for bringing me to this research field and for her generous time on the supervision. My advisor Dr Alastair Archibald has given me lots of advice on this thesis. Professor Rosamond Mitchell deserves appreciation for her substantial and constructive feedback on this thesis. I also thank Dr Martin Dewey for his considerable comments on this thesis. The group of members in the Centre for Global Englishes deserves thanks for the development of this PhD thesis as well. In particular, Hsiu-ya Lee, Rob Baird and Mariko Kitazawa have been generous sharing their thoughts and ideas. I also thank Dr Nikki Puckey for proofreading my thesis.

I would like to thank the Overseas Research Studentship which covered part of my tuition and enabled me to undertake this research. I owe thanks to the Modern Languages department of the University of Southampton for their help with my tuition in the second year of PhD. I would like to thank Professor Hu Xiaoqiong at the Three Gorges University who offered considerable help during my fieldwork in China. I should also thank Yan Qin, Yuting Han and many other friends without whom I could not have accessed the research participants from different organizations and companies in China. I also appreciate Mary Page for her help with the access to participants in the pilot study in Southampton, UK. I owe a debt of gratitude to the research participants who made this thesis possible.

My family have been a constant source of support and inspiration throughout this PhD project. Their understanding and encouragement have been central to my work on this thesis. I owe special thanks to my parents who helped to take care of my son so that I could concentrate on my thesis, especially during difficult times. My husband Wei Shen deserves both appreciation and praise for his inspiration on my research ideas, his support for my PhD, his tolerance of my limited time on housework and family life, and the sacrifice of his own time and energy in order for me to work on this thesis. Lastly, I dedicate this thesis to my son Boheng Shen who has always motivated me to carry on and who has always been considerate when I have needed time for myself in order to complete this thesis.

Abbreviations used

CHELF	Chinese speakers' English as a Lingua Franca
EFL	English as a foreign language
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
EIL	English as an international language
ELT	English language teaching
ENL	English as a native language
ESL	English as a second language
EC	Expanding Circle
FG	Focus group
IC	Inner Circle
L1	First language
L2	Second language
NES	Native English speaker
NNES	Non-native English speaker
NSE	Native speaker English
NNSE	Non-native speaker English
OC	Outer Circle
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
Std. NSE	Standard Native Speaker English
WE	World Englishes

x

Chapter 1 Introduction

This research was motivated by the ways in which the globalization of English has shaped the sociolinguistic landscape and led to a situation in which non-native English speakers (NNESs) greatly outnumber native English speakers (NESs). This has resulted in the shift from a monocentric view to a multicentric one, largely owing to Kachruvian research on World Englishes. The monocentric view divides the English-knowing population into two groups: NESs and NNESs. While NESs are considered as default custodians of English norms, NNESs are supposed to follow NESs in their use of English. The Kachruvian view challenges the traditional NES-NNES grouping by mapping the English-knowing population onto a three-concentric-circle model (Kachru 1992): ENL (English as a native language) users in the Inner Circle (IC), ESL (English as a second language) users in the Outer Circle (OC), and EFL (English as a foreign language) users in the Expanding Circle (EC). Whereas both ENL and ESL users use English for intranational communication, EFL users use English primarily for international communication. By re-grouping the English-knowing population, Kachru (1985) sets an agenda for researching English in the OC. From OC users' linguistic rights to their linguistic 'errors' (i.e. differences from ENL), from their 'functional nativeness' to their sociocultural identities, from the functional range and depth of their English use to their attitudes towards their own way of using English, World Englishes (WE) research has been fruitful in the defence of the legitimacy of OC Englishes and the argument that OC users have their own norms for English. This leads to the establishment of a multicentric model of English use in the world, as suggested by the phrase World Englishes in plural.

The fruitful WE research, however, leaves what Kachru (1992) refers to as EC users marginalized. While OC users and IC users have different English norms of their own, EC users are still seen as subject to exonormative English models. The paradigm shift does not result in any changes in evaluating EC users' English. Following either the mainstream second language acquisition (SLA) research tradition or the recent trend in the WE research, EC users are considered as the default followers of exonormative Englishes. Despite the vigorous argument for the changing ownership of English, EC users remain stereotyped as 'permanent learners' (Medgyes 1994:83). For EC users, the difference between the two paradigms, i.e. traditional SLA research and the WE

paradigm, is what kind of exonormative English should be set as their models. While EC users are still expected to 'approximate as closely as possible to the native standard' of English (Jenkins 2000:5), WE researchers argue that OC Englishes should also be set as EC users' reference points (Kachru 2005). Further, WE researchers claim the impossibility for EC Englishes to be accepted as legitimate in their own terms, a point I will discuss in detail later. In light of this, the WE research establishes OC users as functionally native users of English, but the situation faced by EC users seems more unfavourable to them. EC users are not only left to be the mere focus of criticism for using English in their own way, but also the only subjects to exonormative Englishes.

Nonetheless, the unprecedented and on-going English globalization continues to shape the sociolinguistic outlook of English and presents us with updated data that EC users constitute the largest group of the English-using population. This presents us with 'a state of delicate balance' (Seidlhofer 2004: 209):

> While the majority of the world's English users are now to be found in countries where it is a foreign language, control over the norms of the language still rests with speakers for whom it is the first language. (ibid.)

Inspired by WE research, Jenkins (2000), Seidlhofer (2001), Mauranen (2003)[1] and their followers set out an agenda to rethink EC users' English with a changing perspective.

1.1. English as a Lingua Franca: a changing perspective

The changing perspective is today known as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). As Jenkins (2006a) stated, ELF research can be traced back to Smith's (1976) work on English as an international language (EIL). A body of literature has been devoted to the discussion of EIL in EC contexts, including a focus on pedagogical concerns (e.g. Strevens 1980, Jenkins 1998, Jenkins 2002, McKay 2002, Holliday 2005, Phan 2008). EIL was sometimes used as an alternative term for ELF in the initial stage of ELF research. As seen in Jenkins (2000), she used EIL in the title of her book but proposed 'lingua franca core' in the same book. Subsequently, the terminology issue was resolved; as Jenkins (2006a) states, ELF researchers prefer the term ELF than EIL.

---

[1] In the Fourth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca, Andy Kirkpatrick referred to Jennifer Jenkins, Barbara Seildhofer and Anna Mauranen as 'three mothers' of English as a Lingua Franca research.

The necessity for clarification is to avoid the confusion caused by the practice of using international English and EIL interchangeably (Seidlhofer 2004, Jenkins 2006a). As Seidlhofer (2004) points out, *international English* is used in some works to refer to English in the OC and in other works to relate to English for international communication. A major deficiency is that the term *international English* might make people feel that 'there is one clearly distinguishable, codified and unitary variety' labelled as *international English* (Seidlhofer 2004:210). Nonetheless, a monolithic view of English is actually criticised by ELF researchers (e.g. Jenkins 2006a, Seidlhofer 2006a, Cogo 2008), who (e.g. Jenkins 2000, Seidlhofer 2004, Seidlhofer 2005, Cogo and Dewey 2006, Jenkins 2007) argue for, and endeavour to empirically capture, the polymorphous, fluid, and diversified nature of English. Not long after, a proliferation of literature has emerged in the name of ELF, involving theoretical discussions, led by Jenkins (e.g. 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2009a) and Seidlhofer (e.g. 2001, 2003, 2006b, 2007a, 2009a), and empirical studies crossing different levels of language, different domains of language use and different groups of language users (Seidlhofer 2004). These works deal with linguistic features (e.g. Jenkins 2000, Mauranen 2003, Ranta 2009, VOICE project,), identity issues (e.g. Jenkins 2007, Li 2009, Virkkula and Nikula 2010), functional and pragmatic issues (e.g. Mauranen 2006, Cogo 2009) and others regarding ELF communication. In due course, they have established ELF as a field of research inquiry in its own right.

The ELF concept evolves from the notion lingua franca. It is widely accepted that lingua franca refers to a linguistic means used for communication between people for whom it is not a native language (e.g. Jenkins 2006a, Seidlhofer 2007b). Strictly following this, some researchers associate the term ELF with English used by non-L1 English users for the purpose of communication (e.g. Firth 1996, House 1999, James 2005). Such definition, according to Jenkins (2007:2), reveals 'the 'pure' interpretation of a lingua franca', describing ELF as the language restricted to NNESs.

Researchers adopting the narrow sense of ELF have their limitation in explaining the communication between ELF users. On the one hand, studies on ELF in its narrow sense (e.g. Firth 1996, James 2005, House 2003) seem to suggest that ELF users are unsuccessful users of English in communication. According to Firth (1996), EC users follow a 'let-it-pass' principle in ELF communication. House (2003:567) claims that the intercultural encounter between EC users is likely to take the form of 'parallel

monologues' rather than mutual engagement. According to both studies, EC users do not achieve effective communication in essence, as they do not actually negotiate meaning to resolve misunderstanding but let misunderstanding go. On the other hand, however, the researchers (i.e. Firth and House) find in their studies that ELF 'communication does not break down' (House 2003:567). This contradiction is yet to be addressed.

The narrow sense of ELF also fails to address the issues regarding exonormative English models set for EC users. What should EC users do when they encounter IC or OC speakers? Should EC users approximate NESs as mainstream English language teaching (ELT) indicates or should they conform to OC speakers as Kachruvian researchers suggest in order to achieve communicative success? Should they negotiate meaning with native speakers or OC speakers as they do among themselves? Conversely, should IC and OC users participate in negotiation when they encounter EC users and adapt their way of using English? These questions also point to the deficiency of the narrow sense of ELF in addressing the NES-NNES relationship. The exclusion of NESs from the narrow sense of ELF leaves NESs untouched, therefore fails to challenge the NES-NNES power relationship in English authority while the NES-NNES population ratio continues to exist. Furthermore, the narrow sense of ELF fails to capture the reality that all three-circle users enter the domain of international communication due to the ongoing English globalization. All of these issues point to the limitation of the exclusion of native speakers in the narrow sense of ELF, that is, the failure to address the issue posed by the situation faced by the majority of English users, i.e. EC users, in the world.

A more comprehensive treatment of ELF is to extend the ELF conception to include both native speakers and non-native speakers (see Seidlhofer 2004). According to Seidlhofer (2004), not only EC users but also IC and OC users might encounter international communication. A similar point is made in Canagarajah (2006): OC users start to expand their use of English from only intranational use to both intranational and international communication. Jenkins (2007) echoes that ELF is still in operation when IC or OC speakers join the communication that is initially held among EC users. Thus, a broad sense of ELF is English used for communication between different speakers with different L1 backgrounds (Jenkins 2007). This is the position taken by Jenkins (e.g. 2007), Seidlhofer (e.g. 2004) and their followers. Going beyond the three-circle model,

4

such treatment implies that both native and non-native speakers participate in ELF communication on an equal footing in international communicative contexts. Given the nature of lingua franca communication, interlocutors share the responsibility of realising communicative purposes and negotiate meaning. Accommodation and code switching are major pragmatic strategies used for successful lingua franca communication (Cogo 2009, Jenkins 2009a). In light of this, both native speakers and non-native speakers appropriate their language in ELF communication. The language *sui generis* in ELF communication is different from ENL as a result of accommodation and adaptation The ELF conception thus implies an independence from ENL norms and what Seidlhofer (2003) calls the perspective shift from 'real English' to 'realistic English'[2]. According to the ELF conception, English proficiency should be judged upon whether users can fulfil communication purposes rather than the degree of approximation to native speaker norms. This, consequently, opens up the possibility of reconsidering EC Englishes.

ELF as a new perspective demonstrates the development of a new conceptual framework of English in the world. An overview of the conceptual development provides us with a picture like this: the traditional view of English follows the NES-NNES dichotomy; the WE paradigm leads to a new categorization, that is, the three-circle model, within which IC and OC speakers use English for intranational communication whereas EC speakers use English for international communication; the ELF perspective provides a lens through which all users equally undertake the construction of English when international communication is in operation. While it draws upon the lesson from WE research regarding the fundamental issues as mentioned earlier in the beginning of this section, ELF has its focus on what Kachru defines as the EC, with the concern that EC users are not only still considered as followers of exonormative Englishes, but also accepted as the largest English-using group in the world. In terms of English for the EC, ELF challenges the prevailing EFL perspective. According to Jenkins (2006c, 2009a), ELF belongs to the family of World Englishes[3], whereas EFL falls into the category of modern languages. That is to say, while ELF highlights the existence of English used in different ways, which gives birth

---

[2] Seidlhofer (2004) criticises the view of NSE as 'real English' which is observed to widely exist. She argues that ELF is the English that is realistic for both NESs and NNESs. Widely echoed by ELF researchers (e.g. Kirkpatrick 2007, Li 2009), her point is that NSE is a neither realistic nor necessary goal for NNESs, given the wide use of ELF in the world nowadays.
[3] I use World Englishes in full to distinguish Jenkins's view of World Englishes from Kachruvian WE paradigm. While Jenkins argues for Englishes of users from all of the three cirlces mapped by Kachru (1992), Kachruvian WE is likely to focus on OC users.

to Englishes in plural, EFL attached the importance to the conformity to NSE norms, because English is seen as a foreign language belonging to its native speakers and learned by NNESs. Due to the different perspectives, EC users' Englishes are considered as Englishes in their own right (ELF) and 'interlanguages' (EFL) respectively. The ELF perspective has, as its advantage, the ability to capture EC users' linguistic reality in three aspects. First, EC users are using English in their own distinctive way. This is demonstrated through empirical data, for example the VOICE project (http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/), Mauranen (2003) on academic use of English by EC users, Cogo (2009) on pragmatics, and Dewey (2007) on lexical innovations, to name just a few. Second, EC users are found not necessarily to desire an integration with native speakers as assumed by mainstream ELT practitioners. Third, English globalisation has led to a situation whereby EC speakers use English to communicate with speakers from all of Kachru's three circles rather than only NESs. In particular, EC speakers are more likely to communicate with OC speakers and other EC users.

These realities problematise the necessity and the desirability of near-native competence for EC users. In a similar vein, they contradict Kachru's (2005) argument for OC Englishes to be set as EC users' reference point. In addition, the ELF perspective has an advantage in addressing EC users' linguistic rights, that is, the rights of using English in their own way and using English to reflect their L1 culture and bilingual creativity. By contrast, where ELF has its strength is precisely where EFL has its deficiency. The EFL perspective ignores EC users' linguistic reality in three ways. Firstly, the distinctive features of EC users' English are interpreted as 'common errors' due to fossilisation. Secondly, 'integrative motivation' is considered as important for successful English 'learners'. Thirdly, English is considered as the means of communication between EC users and NESs rather than other NNESs.

The overlooking of EC users' linguistic reality leads to the prescription of NSE in the EC and the obsession with 'authentic' NSE. This leads to little awareness of EC users' linguistic rights. EC users' own way of using English is criticised as errors and their L1 transfer worries mainstream ELT practitioners, who devote themselves to the undertaking of transforming EC users into near-NESs.

The comparison between the ELF perspective and the EFL one suggests the value of the ELF concept in that it provides a new lens through which we can re-examine EC users' English. The ELF lens effects the reconsideration of EC users' English in four ways.

6

First of all, English is used predominantly as a lingua franca rather than a foreign language by EC users. Secondly, the fact that EC users' English is different from native speakers does not justify the conclusion that EC users' English is erroneous. Thirdly, EC users and users from the other two circles are on an equal footing. Lastly, a descriptive rather than a prescriptive view is respected and the language used in real life can thus be accepted. Therefore, EC users' Englishes should not be criticised as learner Englishes or interlanguages in comparison with the traditional reference points. Rather, EC users' Englishes can be accepted as Englishes in their own right.

1.2.   Rationale for the study

This thesis seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How do Chinese speakers perceive their own way of using ELF?
2. How do Chinese speakers perceive their identity in ELF?
   a. How do Chinese speakers perceive their cultural identities in their use of ELF?
   b. How do Chinese speakers perceive themselves as learners or users of ELF?
   c. How do Chinese speakers position themselves individually or collectively in the global community of ELF use?
3. What factors contribute to Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their use of ELF in their own way?
   a. What beliefs are related to their attitudes and identities?
   b. What contextual factors are related to their attitudes and identities?
4. Can an ELF conception make a difference in their attitudes?

I aim to contribute to ELF research by investigating the extent to which Chinese speakers' English in intercultural communication can be accepted as legitimate in its own right rather than judged as erroneous with reference to NSE norms. Previous research (e.g. the studies reported in Mauranen and Ranta 2009) has been conducted in order to investigate the nature of ELF communication, the process of ELF communication and there is corpus-based data of ELF communication (e.g. the VOICE project[4], the ELFA project[5]). Chinese speakers of English who are from mainland China

---

[4] The Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English. Accessible at www.univie.ac.at/voice

[5] The corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (Mauranen 2003).

account for an English-knowing population of around 400 million (Crystal 2008). Their English, however, remains a rarely touched field of ELF research.

It is also the purpose of this thesis to call for a reconsideration of Chinese speakers' English as traditionally criticised as learner English. China falls into what Kachru (1992) categorises as the EC, where the default goal for English is to approximate NSE due to the traditionally perceived function of English as a foreign language. Like other EC Englishes, Chinese speakers' English has long been judged as 'learner English' or 'interlanguage'. Looking through the ELF lens, I criticise the view of Chinese speakers' English in intercultural communication as a learner variety with reference to exonomative English models and argue that their English should be considered as legitimate in its own right. Nonetheless, empirical study is needed to explore the extent to which Chinese speakers' own English can be reconsidered. Thus, the investigation of Chinese speakers' perceptions of their own English used in intercultural communication will inform us of the acceptability of their English, so defined as CHELF in this thesis (see section 2.4 below for the discussion of the relation between attitude and acceptance).

The notion of CHELF is used as a short name of Chinese speakers' English as a lingua franca, that is, Chinese speakers' own way of using English for their intercultural communication. I agree with Seidlhofer (2011) that ELF should not be considered as fixed linguistic systems to align with countries or ethnic groups within certain boundaries. But research (e.g. Cogo and Jenkins 2010) demonstrates that NNESs adapt their use of English and, consequently, their English does not conform to ENL, in order to suit their own purposes. An important dimension of ELF use is ELF users' L1 cultural identities. I consider CHELF as a notion describing Chinese speakers' own way of using ELF that reveals their Chinese cultural identity. With an ELF perspective, I claim that Chinese speakers' appropriation and adaption of English, which results in their English as different from ENL, are important reasons for the potential of CHELF to emerge as legitimate in its own right. I will discuss the CHELF conception in greater detail in chapter 2. However, it is necessary to point out here that CHELF is not viewed as a fixed variety that is restricted within the boundary of China. Rather, CHELF is used to describe the English that is used by Chinese speakers who are involved in the dynamic process of ELF communication. Jenkins's (2000) Lingua Franca Core, the VOICE project led by Seidlhofer (2004), the ELFA project (Mauranen 2003) and other

studies on features of ELF communication suggest that a good understanding of ELF users' momentary production helps to capture the fluidity of ELF communication. None of them suggests that the features emerging in ELF communication relate to the fixity of ELF communication. Likewise, the English used by Chinese speakers for ELF communication, known as CHELF in this thesis, does not relate to a fixed variety but the English that results from a fluid process.

The English is labelled as CHELF because the research focus is on Chinese speakers of ELF. It is possible that Chinese speakers have similarities with and/or differences from other ELF users in using ELF. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to investigate the features of Chinese speakers' ELF use. Nonetheless, it is the purpose of this thesis to investigate how Chinese speakers perceive their use of an English which is different from NSE. Following the WE paradigm, a body of research on Chinese English/China English has been conducted. It is necessary to point out that China/Chinese English research is likely to deal with the English that is tied with China, given the theoretical foundation of the WE paradigm. Thus I would like to make clear that CHELF research is based on the ELF perspective and is not tied to the boundary of China, although the focus is on Chinese speakers who are mainly from China. Undoubtedly, China English/Chinese English research offers invaluable reference to the research on CHELF, which I will discuss in chapter 2.

Now I should explain how attitudinal research can meet the purpose of justifying CHELF as legitimate in its own right. Specifically, three considerations motivated me to undertake this study.

Firstly, different Englishes exist but attitudes towards them are different. This is a point vigorously criticised by Jenkins (2006b) and Kirkpatrick (2006). As Jenkins (2006b) points out, whereas the histories of language change in all three circles are similar, attitudes towards language change in different circles are different. This motivates us to ask why EC users' performances of English cannot be accepted. Kirkpatrick (2006:75) uses a metaphor to criticise the negative or sceptical attitudes towards NNES Englishes: 'this is a bit like demanding that people have a birth certificate before allowing that they are alive'. That is to say, ELF users' performances exist as variations from NSE, although they have not been accepted as legitimate yet. The danger of leaving ELF users' performances unaccepted is the marginalization of ELF users, who are actually the majority of English-knowing population in the world today. Secondly, attitude is an

important index of the development of a language or language variety into its legitimacy. Although negative towards EC users' performances[6], researchers of OC Englishes have contributed arguments in terms of how attitude is important to signify the development of NNSE into its legitimacy. In Görlach's (2002) words, how people evaluate a language demonstrates how successful the language is in that society. In discussing attitudes towards Singlish, Tan and Tan (2008:467) point out that Singlish speakers' attitudes will have 'a strong bearing on whether any attempt to use Singlish would be beneficial in the long run'. Kachru (1992) uses a three-stage model to describe how attitude and variety keep pace with each other in their co-development. The three stages include craze for NSE norms in the first stage, recognition of NNSE features in the second stage, where the NNSE features make non-native users feel humiliated, and the acceptance of non-native featured use of English in the third stage, where NNSE features are established as stable norms. Drawing upon Kachru's three-stage model, Kirkpatrick and Xu (2002) point out that China English is in the second stage of this development. This implies that China English is in the transition area between the dependence on NSE norms and the independence from exonormative Englishes.

Thirdly, identity is also an important factor in the development of NNSE. Although WE researchers' works (e.g. Kachru 1986, 1992, Schneider 2003, 2007)have their limitations in the researchers' perspective on 'varieties' as fixed entities bound with particular local boundaries, their contribution in terms of the establishment between NNSEs and identities is still helpful. Specifically, Schneider and Kachru demonstrate that NNESs go through the process from desiring NES community membership to emancipating themselves from their strong and valuing their difference from NESs. In this sense, I follow their arguments and focus on how Chinese speakers position themselves in relation to NESs and how they perceive their identity in relation to their own first language and culture background. Influenced by an ELF perspective, I look at CHELF users' identity in relation to/ influenced by their first language and culture background, instead of assuming there is a kind of 'identity' fixed and bound with an assumed 'Chinese speaker group'. To sum up, my study on Chinese speakers' attitudes will help to inform us of the extent to which we can expect CHELF to move towards its legitimacy. It was my hope that I could submit this thesis written with my own English

---

[6] OC Englishes researchers generally hold that EC users are using English as a foreign language for international communication and thus unlikely to develop into legitimacy. Following Kachru's three-concentric-circle model, they argue that EC Englishes are learner varieties which should be criticized. However, I argue that EC Englishes, especially in this thesis CHELF, should also be accepted as Englishes in their own right.

10

in order to project my L1 Chinese identity. I hoped so for three reasons. Firstly, English is used as a lingua franca to achieve intercultural communication. In order to target an international readership, it is not necessary that the language should follow NSE norms. Secondly, this international university reflects an international community. I therefore believe that NSE students and NNSE students should be equally allowed to use their own English for the purpose of communication, either in written or spoken forms. Thirdly, just as WE research has benefited from the body of authorship in post-colonialized Englishes (e.g. Nigerian English writer Chinua Achebe, Indian English writers Raja Rao and Salman Rushdie), I would have liked to contribute to the research on CHELF by using CHELF to write. However, I understand that it is not realistic to do so at this moment because of the NSE norms-based language requirement for PhD theses at this university. I have therefore endeavoured to write in an English that is reasonably close to that of NESs. But I look forward to the day when Chinese speakers' own way of using English could be accepted as legitimate and contribute to a wider authorship in CHELF.

1.3.   English in China

This section provides the background of the current study, presenting the historical and socio-cultural profile of English in China and highlights the issues related to English faced by Chinese speakers and learners in current China. The purpose is to contextualize the study and to facilitate the understanding of Chinese speakers' perceptions of their own ELF that I will explore later with empirical data.

1.3.1. Historical and socio-cultural overview

Chinese speakers' contact with English language started in 1637 when the first British mercantile ships arrived in Canton and Macau - both situated in the south of China (Bolton 2003). Chinese speakers then started to learn English for the purpose of trade. As William (1836:429) observed, this was a strange phenomenon at that time:

> Everywhere else it is expected that time will be devoted to the acquisition of
> the language of the country by strangers; and no one thinks of going to
> France, Germany, or India to reside, and intending to speak a foreign dialect
> while there. But here, the case is exactly the reverse. Foreigners have for
> ages come to China from different lands for trade, and still all
> communication is carried on in a foreign tongue.

There were historical reasons behind Chinese speakers learning English rather than vice versa. The Chinese government controlled the communication between the native Chinese and the English, known as 'redhaired barbarians' at that time, and even banned teaching Chinese to the English (William 1836). Consequently, the English found it extremely difficult to learn Chinese and Chinese speakers learning English became the only and best solution. By the end of nineteenth century, English speakers, including businessmen, missionaries and colonizers - mainly from Britain and America - came to China (ibid.) and, not surprisingly, the use of English exceeded the domain of business communication. With the attempt to 'convert the Chinese' (Bolton 2003:230), missionaries built up missionary schools and colleges successively and consequently brought English education into the classroom. Around the same time, the Chinese government and Chinese people started to realize the importance of English in acquiring advanced knowledge and technology. Chinese people thus desired formal English education.

According to Bolton (2003), English went through ups and downs along with different political, economic and cultural reasons[7]. However, English has established itself as a primary 'foreign language'[8] in the country since 1970s when the language regained its popularity due to the Chinese government's awareness of its importance in national development. English was used in limited professional domains and in the English teaching and learning classroom to prepare students for future professions. The professional domains included science and technology, media, foreign trade and tourism, and translation (Pride and Liu 1988, Campbell and Zhao 1995). In professional domains, the English-speaking interlocutors that Chinese speakers encountered were mostly NESs, and the English-medium jobs were normally oriented towards communication with NESs. Students mainly used English in their encounters with their

---

[7] The establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949 symbolized the new era of China and brought about the new turn of English development with it. Due to the Russia-oriented foreign policy and the persisting conflict with the United States since the Cold War, New China encouraged the study of Russian instead of English. Then, along with the new situation of the Sino-US relationship starting in the early 1960s, English was resumed in national education. However, when the notorious Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) damaged all levels of education, English — like everything foreign — was viewed as evil and thus became a forbidden subject in China. When the ten-year turmoil eventually finished, the Chinese government began to consider economic development and felt the urge to promote English education for the purpose of learning from the outside world.

[8] The notion of foreign language needs discussion. It is necessary to distinguish foreign language as a construct or foreign language as a phenomenon. As I discussed earlier, ELF is a new perspective from which we can examine English in China. The EFL/ELF distinction is a matter of perspective. In talking about ELF/EFL perspective, I consider EFL as a construct. But here, foreign language describes the phenomenon that English was mainly used as a foreign language for the communication between Chinese and NESs years ago.

12

peers and teachers, whether Chinese or NESs, for pedagogic purposes. Chinese users of English mainly constituted a small group of elites in China; jobs involving English use were likely to have high prestige in the job market. Studies suggest that the use of English was limited to a small group of Chinese users. English instruction at tertiary level was divided into two strands: English for English majors and English for non-English majors, which, in turn, could be divided into two subgroups: college English and English for specific purposes. English majors were those who studied English with the orientation towards English literature, linguistics, translation, English teaching and who were prepared for posts where 'a good working knowledge of English' was required, such as interpreters, English teachers, foreign affairs, foreign trade, foreign cultural exchanges, tourism and other domains involving international communication or international services (Campbell and Zhao 1995, Pride and Liu 1988).

With the start of the 21st century, English in China has moved into a new era. With the increase in international communication, English has spread to a wider range and penetrated further into the Chinese society. The domains where English is needed are increasing. People from all walks of life are using English, especially those who are working in the service sector, such as taxi drivers, although their English knowledge is limited. China's entry into the World Trade Organization allows for more business exchanges between the country and other countries. This expands the use of English. The media are providing people with more exposure to English. There are more English-medium television programmes (e.g. some of the programmes provided by CCTV[9]4 and CCTV9) and more English-medium newspapers (e.g. *China Daily* and *Beijing Weekend*). The personal demand for English is increasing. While English was previously used mainly for career and education, English is used for the purpose of searching for information, entertainment, personal communication, expressing personal emotions, and advertisement. While English was considered as alien in the past (see Pride and Liu 1988), currently Chinese people freely code-switch between English and Chinese (see Shu 2006).

Whereas English was used by limited groups of language elites in China in the past, English has become a widely used language accessible to many users in China. Following the bid for the 2008 Olympic Games, an English-learnt-by-all movement took place throughout China. Access to the Internet is growing and, correspondingly,

---

[9] China Central Television

access to a wide range of English-medium cultural products is increasing. This expands the 'cline' of Chinese bilinguals[10]. English is used by Chinese speakers with increasingly different proficiency levels of English.

An increasing number of Chinese speakers are using English to communicate with people having no Chinese background, a growing number of whom are from non-IC countries. Not only international events hosted in China, for example, the 2008 Olympic Games and the 2010 World Expo, attract people from other parts of the world, but also an increasing number of Chinese people go abroad for different purposes. This two-way flow increases the use of English by Chinese speakers in intercultural communications. In this sense, British and American speakers are not necessarily the communication partners of Chinese speakers. Rather, Chinese speakers of English are more likely to use English to communicate with other NNESs as a result of expanding international communication.

Keeping pace with the growing demands of using English, English education also develops. Teaching and learning English as a compulsory subject starts in the third year of primary education all over China. However, children might start English learning much earlier than this. In both big and small cities, bilingual kindergartens are popular and holiday schools providing English classes designed for children starting from age 3 are welcomed. English continues to be a compulsory subject through secondary and tertiary education. Apart from formal English education, evening schools and holiday schools everywhere are providing English language courses. It is not surprising that ELT is now a popular industry in China. 'Crazy English' and New Oriental English are typical examples of such an industry. In addition, there is a wide range of examinations in addition to those found in the school and college systems[11]. Different types of English tests recruit candidates from both students and professionals. What Seidlhofer (2003) and Jenkins (2006b) observe in terms of ELT practice in EC countries applies to China. That is, NSE norms have been prevailing in ELT and, correspondingly, all English tests are oriented towards NSE. However, while the predominance of NSE in Chinese education system is observed (e.g. Hu 2004), few published studies have yet

---

[10] For both WE and ELF researchers, the notion of 'cline of bilingualism' describes the range of English proficiency levels among bilingual speakers.
[11] For example, Children are encouraged to sit the Cambridge Young Learners English Test. The Test for English Majors (TEM) is specifically designed for English majors, while the College English Test (CET) is oriented towards non-English majors in universities. There are also English tests addressing specific purposes, for example, the Medical English Test System (METS), the Financial English Certificate Test (FECT), and the Computer English Test, to name just a few.

14

investigated the reasons behind this phenomenon in China. A recent study, Li (2009), reports some findings retrieved from 89 university students and 18 professionals and offers some insight into the reasons behind the preference for NSE accents: NSE accents are considered as 'very good', 'real', 'professional', 'beautiful', 'widely accepted'. More research is needed in order to boost a broad understanding of English education in China. It is one of the purposes of this study to elicit attitudes towards NSE and CHELF respectively and reveal some fundamental reasons behind the attitudes.

1.3.2. Issues arising in current China

As a language with 'linguistic power' (Kachru 1986a:1, Kachru 1986b), English enjoys an undoubtedly high status in China. In many people's eyes, the connotation of English is success, career and wealth. According to a survey conducted by *People's Daily*, 'English' is considered as the synonym of 'talent' in many Chinese people's mind (Yang 2003). Motivated by social mobility and economic benefits, Chinese people have been devoted to the nationwide undertaking of learning English. As the Ministry of Education reported (2005), Cambridge Young Learners English Test had aggregately registered over 1.3 million heads among Chinese children. It is then not surprising that English is playing a gatekeeper role in education and careers in China. For many years, most universities have followed the practice that university students should pass CET 4[12] before they can graduate with first degrees (Song 2005, unknown 2007 from China's Ministry of Education website). At the same time, CET 4 certificate is considered the minimum qualification in job markets. As for particular professions, different English certificates are also needed.

A few issues emerge in the Chinese society. A major issue is the gatekeeper role of English in education and careers. A heated debate occurs regarding whether college students' achievement in CET 4 should be set as the condition on which a degree certificate can be offered (see e.g. unknown 2005a from sina.com news, Song 2005). According to Li (2006), the status of English is held high among Chinese people and leads to students' mere focus on English learning and, by contrast, the neglect of their other subjects. As he criticizes, Chinese people's craze for English is irrational. He

---

[12] CET tests Chinese undergraduates' level of proficiency. According to the National College English Teaching Syllabuses (NCETS), The test includes listening, reading, vocabulary and grammar, and writing. For CET4, students are expected to master 4000-word vocabulary. The grammar agrees to the grammar learned and taught in classroom, which is normally based on British English or American English. Although the NCETS specifies the focus on communicative competence, the evaluation is normally NSE-oriented.

further warns that the dramatically increasing enthusiasm for English learning in China reflects the ignorance of the threat of English imperialism. Some Chinese people consider the concern of English imperialism to be exaggerated. As Wang (2005) argues, it is not English that poses a threat upon Chinese culture; but the problem is that Chinese people devote all their effort on learning English but overlook other subjects.

The social concern of English learning has reached governmental level. The Ministry of Education implemented a new policy regarding CET 4 and CET 6, according to which a points-based marking system is in place of the previous pass/fail certificate system (unknown 2005b from sina.com news). According to the vice minister, Wu Qidi, the purpose of the new policy is to reduce the pressure on English examinations which resulted from the assumption of English in relation to social mobility (Yuan 2005). In response to the changing CET format and scoring system, however, employers have set their own entrance requirement regarding CET results (Pan 2007). In this sense, the tension between the enthusiasm for English learning and the criticism of the presumed link between English and talent continues to prevail. It needs mentioning that NSE norms-based English examinations play an important role in evaluating one's English. That is to say, in response to the criticism of the English craze phenomenon, changes have only happened to the English examination system at the surface level in terms of the format of examination and marking system; nothing has affected NSE norms playing the gatekeeping role.

A second concern is the impact of English upon the Chinese language and Chinese culture[13] (e.g. Li 2006, Shu 2006). According to Kachru (1994), English acculturization and local language Englishization are two Janus-like faces of language contact. The language changes in both ways are inevitable, because of the 'intrinsically changeable' nature of language and people's needs to creatively communicate (Widdowson 2003:46). Like in many other countries where languages come into contact, especially against the backdrop of the spread of English, both the Chinese and English languages are changing in China (e.g. Zhou and Feng 1987, Gao 2006). The impact of English on the Chinese language is apparent in the way that Englishization of Chinese is evident at phonological, lexical, semantic and syntactic levels (Zhou and Feng 1987, Guo 2002,

---

[13] The development of ELF research challenges the traditional view of the boundary of language, culture and identity. It also deconstructs the notions of 'language', 'culture' and 'identity'. In this sense, it is not appropriate to say 'a language', 'a culture', 'Chinese language' or 'Chinese culture' in singular form, However, here I describe the view expressed by other people (e.g.Li 2006, Shu 2006) for whom language and culture remain tied with national boundary.

Gao 2006). Apart from Englishization, code-switching and a Chinese-English hybrid have found their way into Chinese speech.

All of these worry some people, whether scholars or laypersons. According to a recent news article (Ying and Zhang 2010), Chinese scholars are worried about the English-Chinese hybrid in Chinese speech, whether formal or informal, and thus call for the defence of the purity of the Chinese language. A prevailing argument is that the purity of language is critical in demonstrating a country's 'cohesion' and 'soft power' (Shu 2006). As Shu (2006) advocates in a news article, 'we learn English for the purpose of international communication, but we should be careful not to damage the 'purity' of Chinese'. It is not surprising that the call for purifying Chinese is indistinguishable from the concern of the impact of English on Chinese culture. However, while some are concerned with the 'pollution' of Chinese, others go further to bring English imperialism to the fore in their examination of English in China. As Li (2006) claims, English imperialism is indexed by the supreme status of English in contrast to the decline of Chinese and Chinese culture in China. Further, he calls for Chinese people to endeavour to improve Chinese education and expand Chinese use.

The arguments regarding the impact of English on the Chinese language and culture point to the critical treatment of English in Chinese discourse. Language is not only a tool for communication, but also a way of showing identity. Their criticisms (e.g. Li 2006) reflect their 'either English or Chinese' attitudes. That is to say, English is competing with Chinese in such an 'either/or' perspective. This resembles the situation in Europe as described by Seidlhofer (2003). I would like to borrow Seidlhofer's (2003:10) question, asking '*why not both?'*. The answer to this question requires an ELF perspective, which defends NNESs' identities related to their first languages and cultures in using English (Seidlhofer 2003). ELF researchers argue against the NSE bias and advocate non-native speakers' needs to express their cultures and identities. For ELF researchers, code-switching and hybridity constitute a 'third space' for non-native speakers, a point first borrowed by OC Englishes researchers from Bhabha (1990) and then applied to ELF (Jenkins 2006c). If we go further to ask how we can have both Chinese and English, then we come to my argument for using the concept of CHELF. This concept focuses on Chinese users' right to appropriate English in their own way and project their L1-related identities.

A third concern emerging from the Chinese context relates to English education. The struggle that Chinese learners of English are experiencing has attracted widespread attention and severe criticism in Chinese society. Most university students are found to spend half of their study time and even more in some cases on English learning whereas the rest of their study time is spent on all of their other subjects, including their major subjects (Yang 2003). Still, many candidates fail CET 4 and CET 6 every year. Due to the gatekeeper role of English, as discussed earlier, this means that they are disqualified in educational and social mobility. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that CET is a 'criterion-related norm-referenced[14] test', as described in the *Syllabus for College English Test* (http://edu.sina.com.cn/exam/2005-12-14/160314239.html). While no question has been asked as to what/which norm(s), there seems to be a dilemma. The pre-set norms are NSE norms. It is therefore not surprising that the expected goal for NSE constitutes a big obstacle for Chinese speakers/learners in their education and careers. The policy makers argue that the purpose of CET is to promote English proficiency among Chinese learners of English. The unrealistic goal, however, lets Chinese learners down in English because of the presumption that 'English' means the 'English of native speakers'. In the meantime, because Chinese learners focus on learning English and spend less time on other disciplines, their development in other disciplines is hindered.

These three concerns relate to a fundamental issue. That is, the appropriateness of approximating NSE by Chinese speakers for their own purposes. Despite that an increasing number of Chinese speakers are using English to communicate with a growing number of speakers of English from all three circles, examinations of different kinds are still based on NSE norms. This is a mismatch. In addition, many Chinese learners endeavour to get close to the benchmark set by different English tests but fail. ELF research motivates us to reconsider the taken-for-granted NSE-oriented benchmark. Why should NNESs exclusively follow NESs' ways of using English? Why should NNESs be judged exclusively upon their approximation of NES competence? Is the only goal for NSE or near-NSE realistic and appropriate for NNESs? Such questions open up a wide research area in Chinese context.

While ELF research calls into question the default reference points of NSE norms, an ELF perspective justifies NNESs' own way of using English (e.g. Cogo and

---

[14] 'Norm' is here a statistical term rather than a linguistic term.

Dewey2006, Cogo and Jenkins 2010). This is the starting point of my inquiry. While I argue for the legitimacy of CHELF as an alternative to NSE for Chinese speakers and learners, it is important to understand how the agents in China think about their own English in relation to NSE, which is prevailing in Chinese context, before we can understand any possible change in the future. I therefore look from Chinese speakers' perspective and investigate whether CHELF can be accepted as alternative goal for this group of ELF speakers. I am particularly interested in the factors behind their perceptions of the acceptability of CHELF. The focus of this study is therefore on Chinese speakers' attitudes towards CHELF rather than a linguistic inquiry of CHELF itself. It is the purpose of this study to provide an insight into the acceptability of CHELF and facilitate reflections on current English models at the policy-making level.

1.4. Structure of the thesis

This thesis has seven chapters. In chapter 2, I will review literature in order to conceptualize Chinese speakers' English as a Lingua Franca (CHELF). Four dimensions of CHELF will be discussed: creativity, community, identity and attitude. Chapter 3 deals with the methodology of the study, followed by chapters 4, 5 and 6, in each of which I will present and discuss the research findings retrieved from questionnaires, interviews and focus groups separately. Chapter 7 is a concluding chapter and provides the thoughts on future directions in the research on Chinese speakers' own way of using ELF.

Chapter 2 Chinese speakers' English as a Lingua Franca: creativity, community, identity and attitude (literature review)

Previous research on the English used by Chinese speakers is likely to follow two trends. The traditional SLA oriented research has its focus on Chinese learner English. As discussed earlier, the ELF perspective as a changing perspective poses a challenge for the criticism of EC Englishes as learner Englishes. This thesis adopts an alternative perspective and argues against the bias over Chinese speakers' English in international communication.

Following the WE paradigm, China/Chinese English research (e.g. Zhou and Feng 1987, Campbell and Zhao 1995, Kirkpatrick and Xu 2002, Bolton 2003, Hu 2004, Hu 2005, Chen and Hu 2006, Fang 2008, He and Li 2009, Eaves 2011) has been done with the focus on English used by Chinese speakers for intranational communication among themselves. Given the changing situation in which Chinese speakers are using English, China/Chinese English research has two limitations.

The first limitation resides in its focus on Chinese speakers' English within a geographically defined speech community. China/Chinese English does not address the issue of the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English in intercultural communication. The second limitation is that China/Chinese English is likely to follow the approach that is defined by You (2008:233) as 'the inference model'. Within such a model, scholars turned to 'Chinese discourse features and cultural traditions for reference' and predicted some to-be-empirically-identified features of Chinese speakers' English (ibid). To put it differently, the China English conceptualization was supported with a constructed collection of data (e.g. Kirkpatrick and Xu 2002, Hu 2004, Poon 2006, He and Li 2009). Examples illustrating China English features were constructed on the basis of the comparison between Chinese and English in different dimensions; for example, phonological, lexical, semantic, syntactic, discourse and pragmatic dimensions. Central to their approach was what bearings the Chinese language has on Chinese speakers' English. Such an approach is problematic. Firstly, transference is just one of the three reasons, the other two being preference and innovation, which Xu (2008) lists to explain the differences between Chinese speakers' English and Standard native speaker English (Std. NSE), a point which will be discussed later. Secondly, as You (2008) criticizes,

such an approach treats Chinese discourse strategies as 'static', in that it overlooks the context in which a language is used. Third, as You (2008) further criticizes, it highlights the influences of the Chinese language and culture as the main variables of Chinese speakers' English and, on the other hand, neglects the context and the users as agents negotiating with their contexts and their interlocutors. Thus, Chinese speakers' English as used in a naturally realistic context is still to be addressed.

In this thesis, I argue that Chinese speakers' English used in intercultural communication is legitimate in its own right rather than as erroneous as a stigmatized learner variety. Borrowing Seidlhofer's (2007, 2011) reconceptualization of 'variety' and 'community', I argue that CHELF represents Chinese speakers' adaptation and appropriation of English to suit their purposes for communication in lingua franca encounters. CHELF is not defined on the basis of a geographically confined boundary, but is related to the speakers who are from mainland China and who indicate their sense of belonging to the group in which they have their shared Chinese language and culture for them to drawn on.. Instances that give evidence of Chinese speakers' innovative use of English are considered to reflect Chinese speakers' performance at particular moments in the whole process of fluid communication and represent how they project their identities as different from those of speakers who do not have L1 Chinese and culture background. Importantly, CHELF allows for the identity projection of Chinese users of ELF rather than other L1 users' ELF in different global communities of practice through ELF.

Research on New Englishes has become a well-established field. Much discussion has been devoted to the inquiry of what makes a variety a variety. A review of the discussion of New Englishes (e.g. Llamzon 1983, Platt, Weber and Ho 1984, Kachru 1986, Bamgboṣe 1998, Butler 1997, Bolton 2003, Schneider 2007) reveals that the discussion of the legitimacy of non-native Englishes is likely to focus on four factors: linguistic creativity, community, identity, and attitudes. Bearing in mind Jenkins's (2006c, 2009a) distinction between the ELF and EFL perspectives and Seidlhofer's (2007) reconceptualization, I consider the CHELF conceptualization in terms of these four factors, and I will discuss them respectively in the rest of this chapter.

2.1. Linguistic creativity

ELF research on NNES creativity has laid the foundation for my research on CHELF in at least two aspects. Firstly, the difference between NNESs and NESs in terms of English use involves attitude. Research (e.g. VOICE project[15], ELFA project[16], Jenkins 2000) suggests that NNESs use English, which does not conform to NSE norms, to perform ELF functions. ELF researchers consider the non-conformity as 'an entirely natural linguistic phenomenon' in Seidlhofer's words (2011:124). The endorsement for NNESs' non-conformity reflects the ELF perspective. As Jenkins (2006c, 2009a) points out, the same linguistic phenomenon might be interlanguage in the EFL perspective but 'innovation' in the ELF perspective. In this sense, Chinese speakers' use of English that is different from NES needs to be considered as to whether it is legitimate or not. This is the question that I endeavour to answer in this thesis.

Secondly, corpus study on ELF does not suggest that ELF is a fixed variety to be codified. Rather, the fluidity of ELF use can be understood with the representation of ELF use at particular moments in specific contexts, which can be captured with corpus study. In this sense, the conceptualization of CHELF relates to the view of Chinese speakers' English as the result of Chinese speakers' adaptation of English in order to suit their ELF purposes and more importantly, relates to the acceptance of 'fluid' English used by Chinese speakers as opposed to the perspective of 'fixed' variety used by Chinese speakers. To put differently, CHELF conception deals with the English in a fluid process rather than the English that is to be codified. In light of this, a small body of corpus study on Chinese speakers' English suggests Chinese speakers' difference from NESs in terms of English use and, accordingly, supports my argument that Chinese speakers have their shared repertoire which helps to project Chinese speakers' identity in ELF communication. However, it is an empirical question whether Chinese speakers perceive the difference between their English and NSE as Chinese speakers' shared repertoire that helps to project CHELF identity[17]. This is the question that I need to answer in this thesis with my data. Before that, I shall now turn to the literature that informs me of Chinese speakers' creativity in English.

---

[15] www.univie.ac.uk/voice
[16] www.eng.helsinki.fi/elfa
[17] CHELF identity is shorthand for the identity related to CHELF. It involves what I am going to discuss ELF user/learner identity, L1 Chinese identity and multilevel identity of ELF users in the glocal context. See pp.40-8; pp.167-179.

Despite its different perspective, WE paradigm-based China/Chinese English research offers a lot to the conceptualization of CHELF, in that the small corpus study suggests that Chinese speakers use English in a way that is different from NESs' way, although I bear in mind that the features of English used by Chinese speakers are subject to change or adaptation when CHELF users encounter ELF communication.

Bolton (2003) uses Chinese Englishes in plural to suggest that, as a result of language contact (c.f. Widdowson 1994, Mufwene 2001, Jones and Singh 2005)[18], English is used in different ways from context to context in China, a huge country where there exists different dialects and diversified realities regarding English education (see also Kirpatrick and Xu 2002, Ho and Wong 2003). On the other hand, as Deterding (2006:176) points out, some features can still be found to 'mark the English of [all] speakers from China as distinct from other varieties of English' (cf. Pride and Liu 1988).With an ELF perspective, the notion of 'variety' is problematic. However, the findings retrieved from previous research provide an insight into Chinese speakers' creativity (e.g. Yang 2005, Deterding 2006, Xu 2008, Liao 2009, Tang and Zhang 2009), A long list of the features is presented in Appendix 1 (see pp.255 below). To indicate my position on the issue of Chinese speakers' English that is different from NSE, I use the terms 'creativity' and 'variation' to express my view of CHELF as fluid and acceptable but avoid the use of 'features' which seem to suggest a stable set of data.

Pronunciation is an inescapable feature of speech and likely to be associated with identity (Jenkins 2007).. Chinese speakers' pronunciation shares some common ground with speakers from other L1 background and overlaps with some findings of Jenkins's (2000) study of lingua franca core. Deterding's[19] (2006) small-scale corpus study reveals, to some extent, Chinese speakers' creativity in pronunciation of English (see pp.255 below).According to him, identifiable variations have their roots in Chinese language and English education contexts in China. Recent ELF research is likely to focus on spoken English, given that the nature of ELF associates with real-time meaning negotiation. My argument is based on the ELF framework and therefore focused on spoken English. However, innovations in written English undoubtedly mirror Chinese speakers' own way of using English. Given that the purpose of this

---

[18] Mufwene (2001) and Jones and Singh (2005) hold that language changes as the result of internal and external motivations. Language contact is therefore considered by them as only one of many factors contributing to language change.
[19] Deterding (2006) is the only study on Chinese speaker's pronunciation of English.

thesis is partially to investigate how Chinese speakers consider their innovation, I also take into account innovations in written English here. Lexical borrowing is a contributing factor to Chinese speakers' creative use of English. Research has been conducted to investigate lexical creativity in Chinese speakers' written English. Through data collected from 84 articles in two leading English newspapers in China, Yang (2005) has found 59 borrowed lexical items, either loan words or loan translations. Loanwords are those Chinese terms which enter English through 'transliterating Chinese ideograms into the Latin alphabet', i.e. via Chinese Pinyin system (Yang 2005:428). Loan translations form another part of the lexical creativity of English. They are those items formed through word-for-word or literal translation from Chinese into English (He and Li 2009).

Although the analysis of the data shows that the lexical items presented above are neither widely nor frequently used, Yang (2005:425) argues that the loanwords are likely to be 'culture-specific lexical items, nonce borrowings and necessary borrowing'. That is to say, those words constitute, or at least potentially constitute, an essential part of Chinese speakers' use of English when they come across the need for cultural expression, and add to their English repertoire (Hu 2004). On the other hand, the contribution of lexical borrowings to English is self-evident given the great number of word entries of Chinese origin included in Std. NSE (Cui 2006), for example, the loanwords *fengshui*, *yin* and *yang*, and loan translations *Beijing opera, paper tiger* and *one China policy*.

As Gao (2001) suggests, the understanding of such lexical words requires the understanding of Chinese culture. This reinforces the link between lexical borrowings and Chinese-specific culture, although this simultaneously adds to the difficulty of non-Chinese speakers in accessing this part of English used by Chinese speakers. However, as every community of speakers of English, for example, British speakers or American speakers, have their idiomatic use of English, it is fair to say that 'the lack of congruence' (Li 2001:15) between Chinese culture and NESs' cultures on which Std. NSE is based represents a part of Chinese speakers' own way of using English. To apply this to CHELF use, I understand that Chinese speakers, like either NESs or other NNESs, need to adapt their idiomatic English when they enter ELF communication.

Through three sets of data, Xu (2008) explores syntactic variations of Chinese speakers' spoken English, written English and English in literature in particular, although the

study shows that spoken English is where Chinese speakers highlight their own way of using English. According to Xu (2008), Chinese users' syntactic creativity emerges in written discourse are found to include norminalization, coordination of clause constituents, and modifying-modified sequencing (Xu 2008). The English in literature reveals two features, that is, the use of imperatives and tag variation strategy (Xu 2008). More variations are found in Chinese speakers' spoken English (see pp.257 below for a list of the variations) than their written discourse and their literature writing.

Studies on Chinese speakers' English in terms of discourse and pragmatics particularly shed lights on my CHELF research. The emergent discourse features identified in a few small-scale studies, although elusive, allow us to say that Chinese speakers are using English in their own way which is different from both native speakers and in a flexible way. One of the studies is You (2008). This study demonstrates that research participants were flexible in accommodating to different contexts of using English and code-switching in order to suit their communicative purposes. His study reveals some discourse features and pragmatic strategies in Chinese speakers' use of English, through his investigation into how his research participants communicated in cyberspace with each other in order to achieve four pragmatic motives, i.e. requesting opinions, seeking advice, sharing experience and expressing feelings.

In terms of the motive to request opinion, opinion elicitors were likely to start the conversation by describing background before they moved on to their topics (You 2008). Follow-up participants, on the other hand, built up the rapport and enhanced their credibility by sharing their personal experience while they commented on the topics. The discourse features emerged as being both deductive and inductive. While 17 out 40 tokens appeared to be deductive, only 4 out of 40 tokens were inductive. That is to say, his participants were more likely to use deductive discourse than inductive discourse.

As for the motive to seek advice, the discourse followed, in You's (2008:240) term, the 'reasoning-suggested actions' pattern, which was in contrast with the 'therefore-because' principle adopted in British or American English. Advice seekers tended to initiate the conversation with their personal experiences, which served to 'arouse various emotional response', before they formulated their messages for advice (You 2008:240). Advice givers were likely to provide background information, which included 'pure rhetorical syllogisms, definitions, or personal anecdotes', before they gave suggestions (ibid.:241).

26

With regards to the motive to share experience, narratives were often used among conversation participants in You's research. Conversation followers drew the topics from the initiators' narratives and then either commented on what the initiators talked about or elaborated on their own experiences. That interlocutors tended to maintain the similar themes they identified from the initiators' narratives helped to build up the rapport which could be extended to all members of the temporarily constructed communities. The sense of community was highlighted when interlocutors could identify 'some urgent issue' for any members and tried to provide solutions to the issue. Importantly, code-switching was used to enhance the sense of community and served to project its users' bilingual cultural identities.

The motive to express feelings was achieved through a diversity of discourse forms including creative discourse, narrative and code-switching. Although the focus was on personal feelings, participants contributed to the conversation and projected their identities as both members of the temporarily constructed community, that is, 'the forum' in You's term, and Chinese speakers via the sharing of their feelings and the use of expressions having roots in Chinese culture background.

Obviously, You's study is small and has limitations in generalizing Chinese speakers' use of English in terms of discourse and pragmatics. It is suggested that much work would have to be done to yield findings of Chinese speakers' own way of using English. However, his study provides preliminary findings that Chinese speakers use bilingual resources (i.e. code-switching) and accommodate in order to build up rapport to achieve their communicative motives and maintain the communities of practice. Another study, Liao (2009), dealt with Chinese speakers' use of discourse markers in an academic setting in the US, proceeding from the observation that 'the use of discourse markers is common in everyday native speech'. The study demonstrates that Chinese speakers use discourse markers to fulfil different functions from NESs' use and in a marked manner. Liao (2009:1326) also pointed out that the participants 'perform different identities by deploying different linguistic resources in different contexts'. Liao's findings add evidence to the argument that Chinese speakers use English in their own way and adapt to communicative contexts.

There are other studies showing how Chinese speakers use English in the pragmatic aspect. Tang and Zhang (2009), as one of such studies, investigate how Chinese speakers respond to compliments, motivated by the understanding that compliment

responses are a major subject in pragmatics studies. They compared mandarin Chinese speakers' reactions to compliments with Australian English speakers and concluded that the former expresses appreciation for a compliment less and denigrate themselves more than their counterparts do. In their view, Chinese speakers' linguistic behaviour owes to their bond with Chinese culture background.

To recap, Chinese speakers' variations have been found in phonology, lexis, syntax, discourse and pragmatics. The said variations share common ground with ELF users' English (see Cogo and Dewey 2006, Cogo 2009, Jenkins 2000, 2009b). For instance, the use of /s/in place of /θ/, the drop of third person –s, the transfer of L1 culture in international communication and code-switching. The similarity can be interpreted as the share repertoire between CHELF users and ELF users from other L1 backgrounds. On the other hand, the studies on Chinese speakers' variations in English suggest the influence of Chinese language and culture background. Although the development of ELF research challenges the conventional notions of language, culture and identity in relation to fixed boundaries, this does not suggest the meaninglessness of considering the influence of ELF users' first language and culture backgrounds. The discussion of Chinese speakers' variation, which bears Chinese cultural influences, thus points to the reflection on the legitimacy of CHELF. and the possibility of CHELF to emerge as the English that shares some common ground with other ELF users' English but is simultaneously identifiable as Chinese speakers' ELF rather than other ELF users' English due to the influence of the sociolinguistic background and educational contexts on Chinese speakers' use of English. . Research on OC and IC Englishes demonstrates that OC and IC Englishes went through a similar process of being justified (Jenkins 2006b). The issue as to whether NNESs' non-conformity to NSE is legitimate relates to the attitudes towards it (Kachru 1986, Jenkins 2006b, 2007, 2009b). It is for this consideration that the current PhD project set out to investigate Chinese speakers' attitudes to their own way of using English in intercultural communication.

2.2. Community

Seidlhofer (2007, 2011) reconceptualises 'community' as the construct that goes beyond the physical contact between members within speech community. She considers 'community' as the construct that captures 'groupings sharing their particular modes of communication, with English being the most widely used code' (Seidlhofer 2011:88). Inspired by her idea, I consider CHELF users' communities of practice.

Conventional conceptualization of 'a variety' is likely to concern with a geographical boundary-based speech community and face-to-face contact. CHELF users' communities of practice relate to CHELF users' engagement in different communities of practice which are formed between CHELF users and those who are not from L1 Chinese background through their joint enterprises, for example, business transactions academic discussions. That is to say, I am not considering CHELF users as belonging to a group which exclude ELF users from other L1 backgrounds. Rather, I am considering CHELF users as members of global communities of practice co-constructed between CHELF users and other L1 ELF users. I shall discuss why CHELF users are CHELF users as opposed to other L1 ELF users in section 2.3.

Adopting Wenger's (1998) theory of 'communities of practice', I consider that Chinese speakers 'mutually engage' with non-Chinese speakers in the 'joint enterprise', that is, international communication, where they 'share' the 'repertoire' with non-Chinese speakers of English as the result of co-construction of meaning in ELF encounters. As discussed earlier (see pp.23-28), Chinese speakers have some variations in English which mirror the findings in ELF research. Although further research (e.g. ELFiA project[20]) will be helpful to identify the extent to which CHELF users have shared repertoire with ELF users from other L1 backgrounds, Chinese speakers' variations in English drawn from previous research might suggest the potential of CHELF users' common ground with ELF users from other L1 backgrounds.   On the other hand, Chinese speakers' variations in English are influenced by their sociolinguistic background and their educational contexts, as suggested in a few studies (see pp.23-28) (e.g. Deterding 2006, Xu 2008, You 2008). CHELF users' linguistic creativity thus helps to project their identities as members of global communities of practice via the use of ELF and simultaneously relates to the identities of CHELF users who are from Chinese sociocultural background and educational contexts in China. It is necessary to point out that there is not 'a' CHELF community. Rather, the notion of 'community of practice' is used to capture the dynamics that CHELF users are involved in different and temporary communities of practice at the global level via ELF as the means of communication. For the ease of discussion, I use the term 'CHELF community' in this thesis to indicate my research focus on CHELF speakers who are involved in different communities of practice.

---

[20] English as a Lingua Franca in Asia (ELFiA) project in Hong Kong Institute of Education

The CHELF community thus relates to Chinese speakers' use of ELF which helps to project their identity both as ELF users and Chinese speakers. The CHELF community is closely connected with CHELF users' identity rather than defined according to the traditional geographical boundary of the country. Given the conceptualization of CHELF in relation to both international communities and the 'local' influence, an imperative task emerges as the discussion of how Chinese speakers use their English to establish the link between the global and the 'local'. I put scare quotes on 'local' in order to suggest that the 'locality' does not mean a fixed speech community with 'a' fixed culture and language in conventional sense. Rather, the 'locality' is defined in this thesis as the fluid 'community of practice' constructed by Chinese speakers who have shared linguistic, socio-cultural and socio-historical background, which influence their use of ELF to communicate with other non-Chinese L1 speakers in intercultural practices. This thus suggests a change in the perspective. While speech community is defined according to the physical contact between speakers, communities of practice group people together via joint practice, despite their physical distances between each other.

An ELF perspective problematizes the conventional notion of 'variety' as it is attached to a fixed homogeneous culture or language (Seidlhofer 2011). A body of ELF research (e.g. Pitzl 2009b, Mauranen 2007, Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2007) demonstrated the decreased relevance of territoriality to ELF performances. For example, Mauranen's (2007: 245) study demonstrates that 'even though the similar language backgrounds of, say, Dutch speakers influence their English, the similarities have not arisen in mutual communication. What we have here is more like a group of developed idiolects with a number of similarities'. However, this does not suggest that it is unnecessary to think about the possibility of ELF users' first language and culture backgrounds that come into play in their attitudes and identities. According to Widdowson, L2 English speakers' beliefs of their first languages might feed into their perceptions of L2 English. While identity is a relevant factor in relation to attitude, I consider CHELF community by viewing Chinese speakers of ELF as members engaging with the wider ELF community but projecting their identity as different from non-L1Chinese speakers.

In order to discuss this, I will first consider how the relationship between the global and the local is represented in different paradigms concerning English globalization. Then I will discuss Wenger's (1998) orientation towards the global-local relationship, which

has inspired me in my inquiry into the CHELF community. Finally I will move to the focus on how the global-local relationship is configured through Chinese speakers' English.

2.2.1. Old paradigms revisited

There have been four perspectives regarding the interpretation of the spread of English, each of which will be discussed in this section, with the focus on how each paradigm represents the global-local relationship for the purpose of this thesis.

2.2.1.1.   Focus on the global: linguistic imperialism and Std. NSE bias

There are two perspectives on English globalization, which represent the global-local relationship with the focus on 'the global'. One is oriented towards 'us' (i.e. NESs), whereas the other is oriented towards 'them' (i.e. NNESs). In sociolinguistics, 'us' and 'them' are two major concepts dealing with social identities, which are likely to be defined by language (see Duszak 2002), which, in turn, is considered as English in this thesis. The 'us-them' dichotomy is severely problematic in that it marginalizes 'them', who are essentially the majority of English users in the world and that it fails to address the linguistic diversity (Kachru 1992, Widdowson 1994, Brutt-Griffler 2002, Seidlhofer 2003, Jenkins 2009a). The dichotomy is used here to refer to two ends of the push-pull in English globalization as to who are driving the spread of English, a question of relevance with issues regarding whose norm(s) should be followed, what kind(s) of identity is/are constructed, and ultimately who own(s) English. The focus here is not on the discussion of the identities of two groups but just for the ease of discussion, I ironically use 'us' to refer to 'NES' and 'them' 'NNES'[21].

The 'them'-oriented perspective is associated with Phillipson's (1992) linguistic imperialism theory. With his controversial book *Linguistic Imperialism*, Phillipson (1992) considers the spread of English as resulting from and being maintained by linguistic imperialism (op.cit: Brutt-Griffler 2002). According to him, English has been used by 'the centre' and 'the centre'-oriented elites in 'the periphery' as a tool to seek political and economic profits. The preceding point is the criticism of the centre-periphery, i.e. 'us-them', relationship realised through the imposing of English onto

---

[21] It is interesting to see in my data that my participants used 'us' to refer to 'Chinese speakers' and 'them' to refer to NESs.

colonized countries. The notion of English hegemony originated in Phillipson (1992) is accepted by a group of researchers (e.g. Skuttnab-Kangas 1999, Nettle and Romaine 2000) who express their concerns about the perceived threat of English and English culture on minority languages, minority cultures and identities of people from minority groups (cf. Bisong 1995, cf. House 2003). In short, linguistic imperialism theory implies that the spread of English is driven by 'us' and beneficial for 'us' on the one hand, and results in the disadvantages of 'them' as the passive receivers of English as a global language sent by 'us' on the other hand (Phillipson 1992). In this sense, linguistic imperialism theory criticises the effects of 'us' on the global-local relationship. This point is convincingly challenged by Brutt-Griffler (2002), with her major criticism that linguistic imperialism theory is biased in that it neglects the role of local English users as agencies in the process of English globalization. Further, Brutt-Griffler (2002) actually makes a case that the driving forces behind English globalization reside with 'them'. This is a point that I will return to in terms of the WE perspective on English globalization.

The 'us'-oriented perspective on English globalization shares common ground with Std. NSE bias. Whereas linguistic imperialism theory criticizes the English enterprise led by profit-driven 'us', Std. NSE bias suggests that the motivation of 'them' to grasp English is either the integration with 'us' or instrumental use of English (Gardner and Lambert 1972). Both perspectives, however, depart from the impact of NSE norms upon NNESs and neglect the realistic needs and the roles of NNESs as agents. Having settled the distinction, I will discuss Std. NSE bias in what follows as to how the global-local relationship is represented from this perspective.

A consensus has been established that mainstream ELT is dominated by Std. NSE bias (e.g. Jenkins 2007, Widdowson 1994), given the observation that 'English continues to be taught according to native-speaker norms and no need for significant change is perceived' (Dewey 2007:334). The pursuit of 'authenticity' and 'accuracy' in (native) English use and the emphasis on the idiomatic use of NSE relate to the attachment to NSE as well as NSE cultures. Such a bias reflects a monolithic view of English, along with the top-down approach to promoting the spread of uniform English. Correspondingly, there are notions such as English as a global language, global English, world English and international English (Jenkins2006a). Non-native speakers' different use of English contradicts Quirk-led (1990) English purists' concerns about language

pollution (Widdowson 1994). The Std. NSE bias-based relationship is strongly criticised by researchers holding different perspectives. Critical applied linguists view such a monolithic approach as the representation of 'linguistic imperialism' (e.g. Phillipson 1992, Canagarajah 2006). WE (e.g. Kachru 1985) and ELF researchers (e.g. Jenkins 2000, Seidlhofer 2003, Cogo and Dewey 2006) take issue with the necessity and legitimacy of the sole reference to native speakers, who constitute the smallest population in the English-using world. From the sociolinguistic perspective, a ground-breaking question was raised regarding 'the ownership of English' (Widdowson 1994, Brumfit 2001), against the backdrop of the increasingly vigorous appeal that English belongs to all who use it (Seidlhofer 2009a).

Both positions presented above deal with the global-local relationship, with the focus on 'the global'. While linguistic imperialism advocates (e.g. Phillipson 1992, Pennycook 1994, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1999) make overt arguments against the politics of Englishes belonging to 'us', i.e. NSE, in the global-local relationship, Std. NSE supporters (e.g. Quirk 1990, Trudgill 2002) assert the importance of NSE for NNES ('them') in 'the global' context. Both groups pay attention to 'the global' end of the global-local relationship. By contrast, 'the local' end of the relationship associates with local contexts of English where English is used for intranational purpose, as discussed below.

2.2.1.2.   Focus on the local: WE paradigm

'The local'-focused perspective on the global-local relationship overlaps with the WE paradigm. The WE paradigm takes issue with the relevance of Std. NSE (at the global end of the global-local relationship) for non-native speakers (at the local end of the global-local relationship). The tension between the global and the local is apparent in English users who are 'torn between the norms' (Bamgboṣe 1998:1), that is, the set of NSE norms on the one hand and the set of norms taking the form of local needs and local realities on the other hand. As Meyerhoff and Niedzielski (2003) argue, the study of the tension between the global imposing authentic NSE and the local adapting English to suit their needs and realities is significant for the study of language variation and change. This paradigm represents the global-local relationship with a focus on 'the local'. It criticises the monolithic view of English and challenges the Std. NSE bias. With the focus on 'the local', it deals with English localization as the opposite direction of the globalization of Std. NSE as the uniform English. As the term World Englishes in

plural suggests, the paradigm represents a pluralistic view of English (Kachru 1992), with a wealth of research on local varieties of English, localized varieties, nativization and acculturation of English (e.g. Kachru 1986a, 2005). An important study is Canagarajah's (1993) critical ethnography, which demonstrates how Sri Lankan students claim their local identities in the local L2 classroom and, in turn, contributes to the argument that learners and users from NNES contexts are not receivers of NNSEs but agents in developing their endonormative Englishes. So far, three paradigms have been revisited, including linguistic imperialism, the Std. NSE bias and the WE paradigm. Interestingly, these paradigms, although representing the tension between the global and the local in the field of English globalization, resemble the development of sociological paradigms in late modernity (see Giddens 1990). At the initial stage of (English) globalization, the focus was on the global. That NESs were uncritically accepted as default norm providers (op.cit: Jenkins 2006b) corresponded with the transition from the 'organism' to the 'mechanism' in modernity (Durkheim 1964). Along with the progress in (English) globalization, the tension becomes increasingly high, with the centre of the global-local relationship shifting to the local. While sociological research has suggested that the local negotiates their independence in the process of globalization (e.g. Cvetkovich and Keller 1997, Harvey 1989), sociolinguistics has decentred the authority of English from Anglo-speaking countries to a diversity of NNES contexts against the background of English globalization. Importantly, 'the global' represented by the three paradigms on English globalization appears to be associated with NES communities. That is to say, 'the global' is represented as the equivalent to NS communities rather than the combination of NS and NNS communities. The debate between Std. NSE promoters and WE supporters, following the famous one between 'Quirk concern' and 'linguistic liberalism' (Kachru 1990)[22], provides an insight into how they interpret 'the global' as NES communities. The focus of their debate is on whether NNESs should speak English in the same way as NESs do. While mainstream ELT has attempted to develop near-native competence in NNSs, Kachruvian researchers have devoted their attention to the argument that authentic NSE are neither desirable nor necessary for NNSs. A major argument, which challenges the concept of 'integrative motivation' (Gardner and Lambert 1972), is that NNSs are not targeting NES communities. On the other hand, Quirk (1990) claims that

---

[22] A debate was held between Randolph Quirk and Braj Kachru on *English Today* in 1990, with regards to the 'purity' of (native) English and the legitimacy of non-native English. Whereas Randolph Quirk defended the authenticity of NSE, Braj Kachru argued for the legitimacy of NNSE in OC.

not conforming to NSE will lead to things falling apart and cause unintelligibility in NNSE. Their arguments equate the global/local dichotomy to the NES/NNES one. Thus, all the three paradigms have the tendency to interpret 'the global' as NES communities. Bearing this in mind will help to comprehend their gap from a recent perspective, which will be presented, in what follows, as the fourth paradigm, i.e. the ELF framework (Jenkins 2006c, 2009a, Seidlhofer 2003). Within the ELF framework, 'the global' is co-constructed by both NNESs and NESs (See Seidlhofer 2003 and Berns 2009 for the debate on exclusion/inclusion of NESs in ELF communication).

2.2.1.3.   Converging the global and the local: ELF perspective

While the global and the local diverge in the above discussed perspectives, the global and the local converge in the ELF perspective. As Coupland (2003) suggests in his introduction to a special issue of *Journal of Sociolinguistics* with the title 'sociolinguistics and globalisation', there are shared methodological principles underlying both English globalization in the sociolinguistic field and globalization as a well-explored subject in sociology. Following this, a few researchers (among them, Heller 2003, Machin and Leeuwen 2003, Coulmas 2005, and Dewey 2007), adopt an interdisciplinary approach and seek the implications of globalization research for English globalization-related issues. Dewey (2007) has dealt with the global-local relationship in ELF research by using the analogy between the ELF concept (Jenkins 2007, Seidlhofer 2007) in relation to English globalization and the transformationalists' view[23] of globalization (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton 1999) in sociological research. Dewey (2007) has discussed the interrelationship between the ELF perspective and the transformationalists' view at the conceptual level, with his focus on transformationalism regarding its bearings on ELF research. I will attempt to revisit the interrelationship between the two perspectives, by focusing on the ELF perspective, so as to make sense of the global-local relationship in ELF research. At least three similarities can be drawn between the two perspectives.

---

[23] According to Held et al. (1999), three perspectives have evolved regarding the conceptualization of globalization. The three perspectives are hyperglobalist, sceptical and transformationalist. The hyperglobalist view of globalization highlights the uniform global market; the sceptical view of globalization focuses on on the role of local governments; transformationalists accept the importance of globalization and simultaneously seek the maintenance of local authority in their pursuit of the global market.

The first similarity is that both transformationalists (Giddens 1990) and ELF researchers (Jenkins 2007, Seidlhofer 2001) accept that (English) globalization has come to an era when the process of (English) globalization is historically unprecedented.

The second similarity is that the unprecedented process brings up a reconsideration of boundaries. For transformationalists, contemporary globalization brings geographically defined nations and regions together, which form a global market, and re-stratifies the global according to the 'division of labour' (Held et al. 1999:8). Correspondingly, ELF researchers (e.g. Seidlhofer 2007) hold that the old concept of 'speech community' should be substituted with the newer concept of 'communities of practice' (Wenger 1998). While globalization brings up 'a new international division of labor' (Held et al. 1999:8), international communication via English leads to 'communities of practice' (Seidlhofer 2007, 2009a, Dewey 2009). While new world order is defined by 'labour', ELF communities are defined by 'practice'. Whereas the physical contact-based speech communities coincide with the geographically defined territories, for instance, countries and regions, 'communities of practice', which are defined according to 'practice' (see Wenger 1998), can be interpreted as the counterpart of new societies divided according to 'labour' in globalization.

The third similarity is the acknowledgement of the importance of being international. According to Giddens (1990), the historically unprecedented globalization has the effect that governments and societies across the globe have to adjust to a world in which there is no longer a clear distinction between the international and the national, the external and the internal. Understanding this point requires a comparison with the global-based and the local-based perspectives on the global-local relationship. In particular, supporters of the linguistic imperialism theory criticize the role of global English; Std. NSE promoters claim the importance of the globally uniform English for the interest of the global. By contrast, WE paradigm followers emphasize the importance of local variability for local needs and local identities. Despite diverging focuses, they commonly represent the contradiction between the global and the local. However, in the transformationalist view, the local acknowledges the importance of being involved in the global, which consists of different localities. In the case of the ELF perspective, OC speakers who are traditionally considered to use English for intranational communication leak out of their boundaries to communicate with IC and EC speakers, due to the unprecedented English globalization. Using English successfully in

international communication calls for ELF rather than ENL or ESL and accommodation as well as other communication strategies, for example, clarification and repair strategies (see Mauranen 2006).

Based on these similarities, the transformationalist framework has inspired me as to how to comprehend the global-local relationship in ELF research. One of the useful transformationalist concepts for ELF research is community interdependence (see Giddens 1991). To understand this notion in ELF, ELF serves as a networking mechanism, through which the relationship between interlocutors from different 'speech communities' in a traditional sense is constructed and maintained. OC users and IC users are now using English not only for their intranational communication but also joining EC users of English to use English for international communication. Seidlhofer (2003) and Canagarajah (2006) have separately discussed the issues as to why IC users or OC users should use ELF for international communication. Jenkins (2000), from a different angle, provides empirical evidence as to how IC speakers cause communication breakdown by using their native varieties of English without the awareness of accommodating to their interlocutors and adapting their way of using English in international communicative contexts.

The ELF perspective problematizes the Kachruvian three-circle model in its categorizing of English users into three groups: norm-providing, norm-developing and norm-dependent communities. The VOICE project provides hard evidence that EC users have their emerging variations in English and that EC users' non-conformity to NSE norms serves their purposes and fulfil functions. In this sense, why should EC users be considered as norm-dependent? From the ELF perspective, the relationship featuring the hierarchy in relation to norms and one-way dependence is obsolete. Instead, a new relationship featuring two-way interdependence is taking shape in communication via English against the backdrop of the unprecedented process of English globalization. Two-way interdependence is particularly indexed by accommodation strategies in ELF communication. Basically, accommodation strategies refer to different ways of adjusting one's speech in order to make communications between interlocutors successful (Cogo 2009). Two-way interdependence thus describes the relationship between interlocutors who both make efforts to adapt to each other's expectations for intelligible speech. ELF researchers (e.g. Mauranen 2007, Cogo 2009, Kaur 2009) have endeavoured to discover some accommodation strategies used by ELF

users. For example, self-rephrasing- the speaker paraphrase him/herself in order to clarify the meaning of the original utterance (Mauranen 2007); adapting to the interlocutors' linguistic and cultural expectations in order to pre-empt possible difficulties in getting meaning across (Kaur 2009); repetition and code-switching (Cogo 2009). The studies suggest that it is not a fixed, pre-agreed set of norms that makes the communication successful (Pölzl and Seidlhofer 2006). Rather, it is the interlocutors who accommodate each other and negotiate meaning to realise communicative purposes (Cogo and Dewey 2006). The sense of community interdependence contributes to equality among communities, by encouraging ELF speakers to accommodate to each other's expectations in communication (e.g. Kaur 2009) and problematizing the exclusive authority of NESs in English (Widdowson 1994). Correspondingly, the interconnectedness among communities combine to index a 'wider' community formed of individual communities related to each other. This allows us to perceive ELF in what Dewey (2007) describes as an 'interconnected' way.

A second useful transformationalist concept that can be extended to understand the ELF perspective is the compression of time and space, that is, the 'intersection of presence and absence' and 'the interlacing of social events and social relations "at distance" with local contextualities' (Giddens 1991:21). With less reliance on physical presence in social events, traditional concepts of time and space are redefined via what can be borrowed from Wenger (1998), that is, the 'engagement' with the 'practice' in a given historical moment. Seidlhofer (2009:238) considers the notion of community based on physically frequent contact among people as obsolete and Wenger's (1998) concept of 'communities of practice' as appropriate in the era featuring 'pervasive and widespread global communication'. From the ELF perspective, time and space boundaries are blurred due to international communication realised through new technology (Seidlhofer 2007, Dewey 2007). This thus allows us to go beyond time and geographical boundaries and perceive ELF communication from a macro-level.

Third, the concept of disembedding (see Giddens 1991) helps to explain the link between the local with the global in the ELF perspective. The notion of disembedding deals with 'the "lifting out" of social relations from local contexts and their rearticulation across indefinite tracts of time-space' (op.cit:18). This concept resembles the recontextualization of 'practice' in Wenger's (1998) work. That is, the locally occurred 'practice' can be reconsidered in the global context. Conversely, it is possible

38

to trace the globally defined 'practice' back to its local context. Theoretically, it is therefore inferable that 'practice' has both the global dimension and the local dimension. This point echoes Pennycook (2006), as he notes that 'global' Englishes are 'locally' embedded. Such inference finds its way into the treatment of the global-local relationship from the ELF perspective. Jenkins (2006b) repudiates the assumption that international intelligibility and local variability cannot be achieved at the same time (see also Anchimbe 2009, op.cit.Quirk 1985). For ELF researchers (e.g. Jenkins 2009b, Cogo and Jenkins 2010, Seidlhofer 2011), international intelligibility can be achieved through accommodation rather than stopping ELF users from bring their local variability into different communicative practices.Seidlhofer (2004:215) holds that the 'linguacultural background of interlocutors', which is likely to be locally defined, is a measure to categorize ELF use in descriptive data. Dewey (2007:339) compares transformationalists' view with ELF research and makes it explicit that 'global phenomena are locally variable'. Descriptive research on ELF use is likely to focus on, as Seidlhofer (2004) states, either 'interlocutors from particular linguacultural backgrounds' or 'domains'. Two studies have been conducted with a focus on specific locations: Deterding and Kirkpatrick (2006) on East Asian ELF, and Seidlhofer, Breiteneder and Pitzl (2006) on European ELF. As for country-specific research, a small body of research has investigated Chinese speakers' use of English (e.g. Deterding 2006 on pronunciation, Xu 2008 on syntax, see appendix 1 for the findings and You 2008 on pragmatics). The domain-focused research involves ELF communication in business (e.g. Haegeman 2002), academic communication (Mauranen 2003), international air (Intemann 2005) and sea travel (Sampson and Zhao 2003). Those studies reveals how local communities negotiate their international communication (Dewey 2007). Thus, theoretical interpretation, conceptual treatment and empirical evidence combine to lead us to the conclusion that ELF 'practice' is the site where the global and the local converge in a linguacultural view.

Based on the understanding of the ELF concept in relation to globalization theory, the ELF concept also strengthens the link between the global and the local by acknowledging the importance of the orientation towards the global against the backdrop of the unprecedented scale of English globalization and simultaneously the significance of local needs and realities. Echoing the transformationalists' challenge of the binary dichotomy between the global and the local, between external and the internal (Held et al. 1999), ELF research combines the global and the local by

identifying the locally defined territories as interconnected to each other and blurring the boundaries in-between them. It also accepts that ELF communication brings the global and the local together to the extent of 'the global in the local' and 'the local in the global'.

2.2.2. CHELF community: linking the global and the 'local'

Perceptions of CHELF are closely related to the question of how to position it in the global-local relationship, which is, in turn, largely dependent upon which perspective is adopted (see pp.40-43 for the four perspectives). With the Std. NSE perspective, CHELF is positioned in 'the global' focused relationship and evaluated with reference to NSE norms. As Jenkins (2007) observes, EC Englishes are judged according to their approximation to or distance from NSE in mainstream ELT. It is therefore not surprising that there is a stereotype of Chinese speakers' English that is considered as 'learner English' due to its difference from NSE. What deserves mentioning is that the WE paradigm, which is focused on the local as discussed earlier, distinguishes EC Englishes from OC Englishes in terms of whether NSE should be followed (Kachru 1992, 2005). While OC Englishes are justified as localized varieties in their own right, EC Englishes are still considered as norm-dependent on NSE within the WE paradigm (see Kachru 1992). In other words, EC Englishes are still perceived in 'the global' focused network of English users within the WE framework. English used by Chinese speakers therefore continues to be considered as a 'learner variety' (Campbell and Zhao 1990, Hu 2004, Hu 2005).

A body of research, known as China/Chinese English, has been done to justify Chinese speakers' own English with the focus on a localized variety (e.g. Campbell and Zhao 1990, Kirkpatrick and Xu 2002, He and Li 2009). By doing so, previous research has represented the global-local relationship with the focus on the local. One argument for China English as a nativized variety is that English is used among Chinese speakers within China (see Campbell and Zhao 1990, Kirkpatrick and Xu 2002).The investigation into China English as a localized variety, aligning with similar studies on other EC users, for example, Erling (2007) on the local use of English in Germany, contributes to the argument for the legitimacy of English used by EC users at large and Chinese speakers in particular. However, the legitimacy of English used as a lingua franca by Chinese speakers for international communication is still to be addressed. Specifically, the stereotype of Chinese speakers' English as used for international

40

communication is still associated with 'learner English' or 'interlanguage', in the field of either SLA or WE research. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, the unprecedented scale of English globalization calls for the examination of English in the global context where English is used as a lingua franca. Therefore, the examination of Chinese speakers' English needs to take into account the global context and the ELF function.

I view Chinese speakers' English from an ELF perspective. The ELF perspective of the global-local relationship (see pp.40-43 above) supports the view CHELF as the site where ELF communication is variable on the basis of different groups of speakers who are from different sociocultural and socio-historical backgrounds. This perspective thus points to two changing focuses. Firstly, English is not viewed as a foreign language based on the Std. NSE paradigm. Jenkins (2006c, 2009a) distinguishes ELF from EFL. While EFL is conceptualized with reference to NSE, ELF is conceptualized as English used by its speakers in their own right. That is to say, while the EFL framework accepts NSE norms while judging EC users' Englishes, the ELF framework acknowledges Englishes developed among users themselves (no matter which circle they are from). Secondly, the focus is not on English used by Chinese speakers for intranational purposes. By contrast, such a perspective deals with the function of English in international communication for Chinese speakers. CHELF is thus perceived as Chinese speakers' 'practice' of ELF (see Wenger 1998). Their 'practice' is viewed as not only belonging to the global context towards which it is oriented but also reflecting Chinese speakers' shared history of acquiring the language (see Wenger 1998, Brutt-Griffler 2002) and the shared sociocultural and historical contexts in which they develop their proficiency of English..

Another useful concept to understand CHELF 'practice' is Wenger's (1998) orientation towards the global-local relationship. According to Wenger (1998:131), 'the local and the global are not different historical moments in an expanding world' but involve 'related levels of participation (of people) that always coexist and shape each other'. This describes a new perspective, which accepts that the local and the global coexist in the same historical time and share an extending space where they belong to different social contexts respectively. The reconsideration of time-space restriction agrees with Held et al's (1999:7) concept of globalization that acknowledges both the 'distinctive spatial attributes' of the local-national-regional continuum and 'the way these (spatial attributes) unfold over time'. People's simultaneous participation in the local

community and in the global community corresponds with the notion of multiple identities (Erling 2007), which implies, a person can be both global and local at the same time. Erling's (2007) research shows how German speakers of English redefine their identities as the ones integrating 'the global' identity with their 'local' identity and assert their multilayered identities via their English. Based on this perspective, CHELF community can be further conceptualized as the group of Chinese speakers who join other ELF users in global communities of community and simultaneously project their identities as Chinese speakers other than other ELF speakers from other L1 badkground.

It is interesting to compare this perspective with Bhabha's (1990) notion of 'third space' (see also Jenkins 2006c, Bhatt 2008, Baker 2009). According to Bhatt (2008:181), code-switching in Indian users' English is no longer viewed as a form of 'linguistic acts of resistance' against linguistic imperialism. Rather, it is interpreted as a 'third space' where Indian users' bilingual creativity is employed to represent the users' global identity and simultaneously differentiate them from 'other' non-native users of English. His view corresponds with the sociologist Pieterse's (2010:332) perspective on globalization, which, as his term 'hybridization', describes 'the fluid end of relations between cultures: it's the mixing of cultures and not their separateness that is emphasized'. The recontextualization of Indian English from a local context to a global context provides an alternative interpretation of English use by speakers of mixed L1 cultural backgrounds. To link with CHELF conceptualization, 'the mixing of cultures' is particularly meaningful. China is a country where people speak different dialects and have different local cultures. The focus on the 'mixing' is constructive in considering cultures and socio-historical contexts within China in order to discuss CHELF speakers' identity in relation to their socio-cultural background, which I give a short name L1 Chinese identity or Chinese cultural identity for the ease of discussion. That is to say, I accept the diversity in Chinese speakers' cultural and linguistic backgrounds. However, I focus on the 'mixing' as opposed to the 'separateness' in order to investigate the extent to which CHELF speakers draw on Chinese culture rather than other L1 speakers' culture in their use of ELF and in their perceptions of ELF. I intend to do so because research suggests that ELF users' L1s feed into their performances and attitudes (e.g. Mauranen 2007, Kaur 2009). Thus, a new perspective on Chinese speakers' English involves the reconsideration of their English by addressing both the language that reveals L1 Chinese identity and CHELF speakers' global orientations.

42

To conclude, in this section I reviewed literature in order to present how I positioned CHELF in relation to the global ELF network and how I conceptualized the CHELF community. While Std. NSE followers view Chinese speakers' English as an interlanguage variety with the reference to NSE norms, the WE paradigm continues to position Chinese speakers as dependent upon exonormative Englishes. There is a body of literature which proposes the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English in its own right by positioning Chinese speakers' English as a localized variety, with a focus on the English used for intranational communication. By contrast, I acknowledge the importance of English for international communication and readdress Chinese speakers' English used in international encounters in a corresponding framework, i.e. the ELF framework. I argue that CHELF is Chinese speakers' ELF residing with Chinese speakers' L1 identity. In the following section, I will specifically address the identity aspect of the CHELF conception.

2.3. Identity

Identity is a major factor in the development of languages and varieties (Jones and Singh 2005, Mufwene 2001, Schneider 2007). As Edwards (2009:1) notes, 'any investigation of language that considers only language will be deficient'. Proceeding from this concern, scholarly interest (e.g. Jenkins 2007) in the relationship between language and identity has contributed to our knowledge of how to understand identity, particularly, whether to follow an essential tradition or a non-essential trend[24] (see Woodward 1997), how language serves as a marker of identity (e.g. Giles and Johnson 1981, Giles Johnson 1987) and, more importantly, how identity is constructed through language (e.g. Gumperz 1982, Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982, Heller 1987, Heller 1988, Norton 1997, Norton 2000, Peirce 1995, Pennycook 2003).

Given the well-recognized link between identity and language (as mentioned in previous paragraph), the consideration of identity factors in relation to CHELF points to the necessity of explaining how I understand this link. The burgeoning research on ELF has increasingly problematized House's (2003) argument that ELF is neutral and serves as a mere tool for communication rather than for cultural and social identification. ELF,

---

[24] Woodward (1997) makes a distinction between essentialism and non-essentialism. According to Woodward (1997), essentialism follows a static view that identity associates with the 'self', whereas non-essentialism adopts a dynamic view that identity relates to the role of the 'self'. I adopt a non-essential view and consider identity as the relationship that the self attempts to establish with the context. This will be discussed later.

by its very definition, is a contact language for communication (Jenkins 2007, Seidlhofer 2004). However, the acknowledgement of the function of ELF in communication should not downplay the mutually constitutive effect between language and identity (see Norton 1997, Pavlenko 2001, Weedon 1997). Canagarajah's (2006) demonstration as to how local values and identities are negotiated through ELF use has provided empirical evidence that ELF is the site where its users project their identities and negotiate their values. Jenkins (2007) has addressed ELF users' identities through her book-length discussion, arguing that ELF allows its users to present their national and cultural identities. Virkkula and Nikula (2010) have reported how Finnish users of ELF project different identities at different times and how they change their identities after their period of stay in Germany. Seidlhofer's (2007, 2011) redefinition of 'variety' and 'community' has resolved the misconception (e.g. House 2003:560) that 'there is no definable group of ELF speakers'. Seidlhofer (2007, 2011) adopts a dynamic perspective, which is called for in understanding the nature of ELF and ELF communication. According to her (Seidlhofer 2007), an ELF community is temporarily co-constructed among ELF users through ELF 'practice' (Wenger 1998). In short, ELF is not only a language for communication but also a language for identity projection from a dynamic perspective.

Following this, it is necessary to consider identity factors in the CHELF conceptualization. This section is thus divided into three parts. While the first part deals with how the concept of identity can be best understood for the purpose of this thesis, the second part covers a tentative discussion of CHELF identity, followed by the third part providing the concluding remarks.

2.3.1. Understanding identity

According to Edwards (2009) and Riley (2006), one's identity involves both the personal and the social dimensions. While personal identity is likely to depict the 'self' as to how the 'self' is different from others, social identity describes how the 'self' is positioned in relation to the social (Edwards 2009, Riley 2006, Davies and Harré 1990). The concept of pure 'self' owes to the essentialist-oriented research tradition, where identity is considered as biologically defined, innate and fixed (Fuss 1989, Jagose 1996). The social turn on identity conception (e.g. Tajfel 1974, Giles and Johnson 1981, Gumperz 1982, Heller 1982, Peirce 1995) has led to a consensus that identity should be understood in the social context, given the indispensability of the social nature in the

44

individual. Among different approaches to social identity conception (see Pavlenko and Blackedge 2004, and Jenkins 2007), the poststructuralist approach has established itself as a state-of-art one, which perceives identity as socially constructed and negotiated, with the acknowledgement of dynamics, diversity and conflicts as key to identity conception (Norton 1997, Norton 2000, Peirce 1995, Weedon 1997).

The poststructuralist approach has much to offer an understanding of identity factors vis-à-vis CHELF for the purpose of this thesis. In what follows, I will discuss my understanding of identity based on my reading of poststructuralist approach-informed works. These provide groundings for my inquiry of CHELF in terms of identity issues, owing to their implications on identity conception regarding ELF research and, more relevantly, the CHELF conceptualization.

2.3.1.1.   Identity and social relationships

As mentioned earlier, social identity deals with the issue of how the 'self' is positioned in relation to the social (Davies and Harré 1990). 'Positioning', in Davies and Harré's (1990) work, implies assuming 'social roles', for instance, teacher, mother, wife and student (Fairclough 2003, Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). Such an interpretation focuses on the 'self' in the self-social relationship established through a social identity conception. Another approach is the focus on the in-between relationship, also exemplified in Norton (1997, 2000) and Norton and Toohey (2001) dealing with L2 learner identity in relation to the L2 learning context. Norton (1997, 2000) sets out a theoretical framework of social identity as encapsulating how the individual understands his/her relationship to the social, how that relationship is constructed across historical time and social space, and how the individual perceives future possibilities in that relationship. Inspired by Norton (1997, 2000), this thesis focuses on the in-between relationship and thus accepts that social identity deals with social relationships.

According to Weedon's (1997) theory of subjectivity, how the 'self' is positioned in relation to the social depends on how we understand our positions and, further, our understanding is socially constructed. In this sense, social identity reflects our understanding of social relationships. Feminist poststructuralism theorist Weedon (1997:21) considers language as the site 'where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested' on the one hand, and 'where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is

constructed' on the other hand. What is inferable is that language is not only an indicator of existing social relationships and of possible changes in such social relationships, but also a means via which we construct our understanding of ourselves in relation to the social.

The link between social identity and social relationships is established via language. It is important to accept that social identity and language are mutually constitutive (Weedon 1997). According to Norton (1997), the mutual constitution between social identity and language is realized through the mutual constitution between subjectivity and language. Based on the connections among language, identity and social relationships, we are able to understand how social identity reflects our understandings of social relationships via language. For the purpose of this thesis, I attempt to discuss this point with regards to three issues and with the reference to ELF research.

Firstly, language is an indicator of existing social relationships, as echoed in Agha (2007). In terms of ELF research, whose English is followed or accepted by whom is an indicator of social relationships, which depict who have the authority of English and who are subject to the authority. Among different social relationships, the relationships that are relevant to my study are those between NESs and NNESs, NESs and English, and NNESs and English, all of which are represented through the ownership of English, which has motivated ELF research, given an overarching question asked by ELF researchers is why NNSs should exclusively follow NES norms (Jenkins 2006a, Seidlhofer 2003), following the ground-breaking challenge to the sole ownership of English claimed by NESs (Widdowson 1994).

Secondly, language reflects possible changes in social relationships, a point corresponding with Fairclough (1993). As to ELF research, the discussion of the legitimacy of NNSEs, which are currently associated with 'interlanguages', reflects the exploration of possible change in the ownership of English and, thus, the possibility for English users to take 'new identity options' (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004:12) different from the current ones they hold, for example, the shift from 'permanent learners' (Medgyes 1994) of NSE to legitimate users of their own Englishes. Although strongly criticised, the reality remains that, as Jenkins (2009b) observes, mainstream ELT exclusively follows IC Englishes and therefore different use of English from IC Englishes is denounced by mainstream ELT as erroneous. The inquiry into the

legitimacy of ELF users' own Englishes provides an insight into the possibility for ELF users to be accepted as users of English in their own right.

Thirdly, language is a means via which we construct our understanding of ourselves in relation to the social. On the one hand, our understanding of ourselves and of our identities is subject to our understanding of social categories, for example, communities, and social relations. In terms of ELF research, our understanding of ourselves as 'native' speakers of our own English or 'non-native' speakers of ENL[25], as users or learners or bilinguals, as members of specific communities, reflect our understanding of social categories and social relations. On the other hand, language is a means through which we react to the social. The way we react to the social involves both identity construction and identity negotiation (Norton 1997, Swann 1999, Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). The choice of some English forms rather than others can be viewed as responses to social categories and social relationships based on the understandings of them (Heller 1987). Constructing a certain kind of identity by violating given linguistic norms is common in the research on L1 schoolchildren's behaviour (e.g. Sadker and Sadker 1997, Heller 2001, Wortham 2002, Davies 2003, Fuller 2009). Similarly, Rampton's (1995) notion of crossing also suggests how English users challenge the way English is normally used by their social group in order to claim to be members of the non-mainstream social group. All of these studies share the common ground that people choose to use the linguistic forms whose legitimacy is still open to criticism. Nevertheless, how people use innovative forms to show their rebellion against a priori, socially accepted categorization and assert their affiliation with 'the other' is self-evident. As to ELF research, using English in a way which is different from the NESs' way, according to Jenkins (2007), is an index that NNESs are asserting their unwillingness (where conscious or subconscious) to assimilate to NESs.

By examining the individual's relationship with the social in different historical moments, Norton's (1997, 2000) identity conception framework depicts the actual situation of social identity, the process of social identity construction and the possible future change in social identity. In her inquiry into how L2 learners construct their social identities in their interaction with their learning contexts, the fundamental

---

[25] Kachru (1986) distinguishes biological nativeness and functional nativeness and argues that OC users have developed functional nativeness in using English. Seidlhofer (2011) problematizes 'nativeness' and 'foreignness' in her argument for the ELF perspective. Their works provide the theoretical support for the rethinking of the dichotomy between nativeness and non-nativeness.

concern is the extent to which L2 learners can develop their awareness that they are eligible to claim ownership of English. As the ownership of English involves the power of changing and adapting English (Brumfit 2001), whether ELF users claim their ownership of English is of relevance to their acceptance or rejection of their own use of English that does not conform to NSE. If extending Norton's (1997, 2000) theory of social identity into the ELF field, the investigation into how ELF users construct their social identity in ELF contexts allows us to understand how they perceive their innovative use of English (see Jenkins 2007), and vice versa.

The conception of social identity in relation to social relationships (Norton 1997, Norton 2000, Weedon 1997) is productive for my inquiry into CHELF. First, regarding the question of what social relationships CHELF identity depicts, I focus on two kinds of relationships. The first kind of relationship is centred on the ownership of English, whereas the second kind of relationship is related to community membership. Second, in light of social identity in relation to possible change in social relationships, I focus on the possibility of change in the ownership of English and community membership. Third, that social identity is socially constructed directs my attention to how Chinese speakers make sense of the ownership of English and community membership in relation to their understanding of the social. Given the mutually constitutive effects between social identity and language (Pavlenko 2001, Peirce 1995), the investigation into CHELF identity will provide an insight into the development of CHELF.

2.3.1.2. Diversity of identity

The diverse nature of identity has become an indisputable notion in an increasing bulk of research (e.g. Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004, Gu 2010). This diverse nature suggests the existence of multiple, conflicting and overlapping identities (Omoniyi 2006). This point is constructive for the CHELF identity conceptualization. I am interested in Chinese speakers' identity in terms of the global/local community, mainstream/minority community and NS/NNS community, and their identity in relation to the ownership of English. In order to investigate the extent to which CHELF is acceptable in its users' perspectives, , I am also interested in how Chinese speakers perceive themselves in relation to the social at the present and how they perceive the possible change in their identities in the future via their use of ELF.

The notion of conflicting identities is relevant to the current situation of Chinese speakers' identity. The conflicts are shown in different aspects. In one aspect, NNESs constitute the majority of English users, but they are associated with norm followers (see Jenkins 2006a, Seidlhofer 2003). Another aspect is that NNESs belong to international communities of practice, yet NNESs refer to NES norms (ibid.). Given Bamgboṣe's (1998) observation of local users of English torn between the conformity to NSE norms and their needs to be creative, I am interested in how Chinese speakers perceive global intelligibility in relation to their needs in their engagement in different ELF communicative contexts. The paramount conflict is considered to exist between CHELF identity and an identity with a stigmatized learner variety, that is to say, the conflict between Chinese speakers' desire for their own English and their uncertainty of their variation from NSE. As Erling (2007) discovered, German students redefined their local identity with global connectedness. This kind of overlapping identity is also expected in the inquiry into CHELF identity. I am thus interested in whether CHELF speakers consider their memberships in different global communities on the one hand, and their sense of belonging to the group whose members have shared L1 Chinese and culture background.. In order to consider the possible trend of CHELF identity, I will explore not only how Chinese speakers perceive their identities in real life practice-based communication, but also how Chinese speakers perceive their identities in the future situations that they imagine to happen.

2.3.1.3.   Identity construction

The dynamic nature of identity has been widely recognized in a wealth of poststructuralist-oriented literature, where identity is accepted as 'highly fluid' (Luk and Lin 2007), even fleeting (Fuller 2009), context-specific (Heller 1987, Norton 2000, Jenkins 2007) and changing over time (Norton 2000, Schneider 2003, Schneider 2007, Jenkins 2007). This is of great relevance to ELF communication. Accommodation and code-switching are necessary strategies for successful ELF communication (Cogo 2009, Jenkins 2009a, Cogo and Jenkins 2010). Identity construction and reconstruction in ELF communication can be viewed as being presented through accommodation and code-switching (Jenkins 2007). The dynamic nature suggests that identity is in on-going construction and reconstruction.

Schneider (2003, 2007) emphasizes the synchronous development of NNES varieties along with NNESs' reconstruction of identity, which, according to him, goes through

five consecutive stages: foundation, exonormative stabilisation, nativisation, endonormative stabilisation, and differentiation. I found Schneider's model to have a few limitations to apply to the discussion of CHELF in relation to identity. Firstly, his model reflects his conventional perspective on 'variety' and 'identity', which are bound with national boundaries. While his model seems suitable for the postcolonial Englishes in their socio-cultural context, it is not appropriate to apply to CHELF, such a construct that describes Chinese speakers' engagement in different communities of practice which, within the ELF conceptual work, go beyond the geopolitical boundary of China. Secondly, Schneider (2003, 2007) views 'stabilisation' of 'norms' as an important index of 'variety' and associates it with 'identity'. ELF research demonstrates that ELF has its 'fluid' nature (Seidlhofer 2007, 2011) and adaptation of forms is important for successful ELF practices. Thus, Schneider's model of 'variety' in relation to 'identity' appears problematic when I consider CHELF in relation to its users' identity. However, his discussion of how the construct of 'variety' relates to the construct of 'identity' is still helpful for my research. According to him, NNESs go through the process from aligning with NESs to distancing from NES community membership along with the process of their own emancipation from NSE norms. Such a view highly corresponds with Kachru's (1992) model of NNESs' attitude change in relation to their variety development. I therefore examine how CHELF users align with or distance from NSE community in order to understand the extent to which CHELF users position themselves as users of ELF who are justified in their own right.

Identity is constructed to show who one is and who one wishes to be. As Pennycook (2003:528) argues, 'it is not that people use language varieties because of who they are, but rather that we perform who we are by (amongst other things) using varieties of language'. This implies that language users are agents in constructing their identities. The role of agency is further explained in Schneider (2003). As he notes, it is the desire for a specific identity that is more likely to be the driving force behind identity construction and reconstruction. As echoed in Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004:17), 'imagination plays a crucial role in the process of creation of new identity options'. This is relevant to the CHELF identity inquiry. Through a look at how Chinese speakers as agents construct their identities or desired identities, it is possible to identify the conflict between the reality and their imagined community. The identification of the conflict will provide an insight into the possibility of change in their English use.

As mentioned earlier, language is a means via which identity is constructed. Regarding the multiple identities mentioned in relation to CHELF, a concern is what role English plays in constructing diverging or converging identities. A body of research has shown that English is used as a means to link the global with the local in identity construction. O'Hara-Davies (2010:115) observes that it is 'common with many young people all over the world' that English can be used to 'seek to merge the global with the local in a way that suits their own context(s)'. This resonates with Erling's (2007) point in her study of German students' identity construction. English allows German students to show that they have local identities in their own way of using English, which is influenced by their local culture and language. Simultaneously, through the use of English, German students project their identities which are connected to the global community. In this sense, English has become part of their local identity and also part of their global identity. This is of great relevance to the CHELF identity conceptualization. ELF allows Chinese speakers to assert their identity as global community members and acknowledge the influence of Chinese language and culture on their identity construction in different global communities. It is possible to say that the convergence of the global and the local is common in ELF users.

A factor which influences identity construction is that of power relationship. Research has demonstrated how shifting power relationships can lead to 'new identity options' and how people take the new options in response to the new power relationships (see Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004:17). An important power relationship is created by, in Bourdieu's term (1991), *symbolic power*, which, is so ingrained that those who are subject to it just follow the 'habitus' without consciousness. The notion of 'habitus' is relevant to the ELF research (Pölzl and Seidlhofer 2006) and therefore CHELF research. As ELF researchers observe, NSE norms are used as default reference for NNESs. The notion of 'default' points to the 'habitus' in NNESs. That is to say, NNESs refer to NES norms, without thinking whether the norms are appropriate to their contexts and their needs. According to Bourdieu (1991), identity is used as a means by which symbolic power is exerted:

> The power of suggestion which is exerted through things and persons and which, instead of telling the child what he must do, tells him what he is, and thus leads him to become durably what he has to be, is the condition for the effectiveness of all kinds of symbolic power that will subsequently be able to operate on a habitus predisposed to respond to them'. (Bourdieu 1991:52)

Bourdieu (1991) focuses on one-sided power and overlooks users' agency (Gal 1989, Heller 1992). However, his symbolic power concept can be applied to the current situation of English use. The 'unstable equilibrium' in English use is hand-in-hand with the NES/NNES power relationship in the English-using world (Seidlhofer 2004:209). It is indisputable that the symbolic power is dominated by NESs. The NNES identity is closely associated with (ENL) learner identity and learner English. NES norms are considered to be the default norms for EC users and NES authenticity is considered as the standard for good English. The relevance to the CHELF inquiry is the necessity to find out the identities associated with the taken-for-granted goal of native-like competence and to identify the reasons behind this assumption. While the change in the sociolinguistic profile caused by English globalization (Kachru 1985, Widdowson 1994, Seidlhofer 2003, Jenkins 2006a, Dewey 2007) has resulted in the increasing voice that English belongs to all who use it, the investigation into how Chinese speakers perceive the ownership of English will help to understand their identity and possible changes in their identity in the future. Drawing upon Norton's (1997, 2000) theory, the investigation into CHELF identity aims to answer the underlying question: to what extent do CHELF users consider themselves as legitimate owners of English?

2.3.2. Identity issues in Chinese speakers' English

Although the previous section deals with the implications that a conception of identity has for Chinese speakers' own English, this section aims to provide a more focused discussion of CHELF identity issues. As discussed earlier (see pp.40-43 above), Chinese speakers co-construct with speakers from other L1 backgrounds different global communities and, simultaneously, they belong to the group whose members have shared socio-cultural and socio-historical background but distance from people who have not L1 Chinese background. I am interested in whether Chinese speakers perceive themselves as members of global communities where ELF is used and whether Chinese speakers recognize their L1 Chinese culture identity as a way showing they are different from ELF speakers of other L1 backgrounds. Importantly, it is necessary to find out, if they recognize their L1 Chinese identity, whether they value it or desire a distance from it. It is possible that Chinese speakers use English to project more identities than these two senses of 'belonging'. In particular, I seek to find out how Chinese speakers perceive their identities through their non-native-like English. Following the previous section dealing with identity conceptualization, I will apply the three aspects of identity

in relation to social relationships in order to explore the CHELF identity. That is, 1) the existing situation, 2) the possible change in the future, and 3) the role of how people make sense of identities.

Firstly, the current practice of following NES norms does not appropriately reflect the current relationship between Chinese speakers and NESs, in that the interlocutors whom Chinese speakers encounter include not only NESs but also NNESs. Although ELF researchers (e.g. Jenkins 2007, Seidlhofer 2003) have reiterated that English, against the backdrop of ongoing English globalization, is more likely to be used among NNESs without the presence of NESs than between NESs and NNESs, it is generally held that NES norms are crucial for EC users to maintain intelligibility in international communication.

Secondly, a trend in Chinese speakers' English use is that an increasing number of NNESs are becoming Chinese speakers' interlocutors. Olympic Games in 2008 provide a good example of this trend. The mismatch between the norms set for Chinese speakers and the reality of their English (as described in the first point) and changing trend (as described in the second point) thus suggests possible changes in the social relationships in English regarding who has the power to change and adapt English. That is to say, Chinese speakers might or might not accept NSE ownership of English and follow NSE. This opens up the possibility for CHELF to be accepted as legitimate.

Thirdly, whether a possible change, as described earlier, occurs, or whether the different kind of English Chinese speakers use is accepted by Chinese speakers as legitimate, depends on how Chinese speakers perceive the social relationships. According to the theory of subjectivity (Weedon1997), I argue that CHELF speakers' perceptions of their relationships with NESs, with English, with other NNESs, and their perceptions of possible change in such relations are socially constructed and thus affected by their perceptions of social and contextual factors. As mentioned earlier, the relationship between NSs and NNSs is presented through the ownership of English. According to Brumfit (2001), the ownership involves the power of changing and shaping English. Chinese speakers' perception of the ownership of English and thus regarding who has the power to change and shape English will have a role to play in their acceptance of CHELF. Due to the mutual constitution between language and social identity, whether CHELF can be accepted as legitimate is dependent upon how Chinese speakers perceive their relations to the social and, particularly, the ownership of English. In the same vein,

whether CHELF will develop into its legitimacy is dependent upon how Chinese speakers perceive the ownership of English in the future.

2.3.3. Summary

This section has discussed identity as a major factor in language development and its implication for the investigation of the legitimacy of CHELF. It has criticised the ignoring of identity issues for ELF. It adopts a poststructuralist view of identity and accepts the importance of subjectivity in identity conception. Following Norton's (1997, 2000) framework of identity, I have argued that identity captures social relationships and discusses how social relationships are relevant to the CHELF identity. Focus has been given to two relationships represented through the ownership of English and community membership respectively. Given the diverse nature of identity, the CHELF identity conceptualization is considered to involve a wide range of identities, which are conflicting and overlapping with each other. Those identities relate to the ownership of English and community membership.

The dynamics of identity are essential to a CHELF identity inquiry in that the project seeks to find out the potential for change in Chinese speakers' identity conceptualization from the current situation to the imagined future. Agency is treated as an important concept for a CHELF identity in that it is considered as the condition for the change in their identity construction. Following poststructuralists, power relationships are accepted as a factor in identity construction and reconstruction. The implication for a CHELF identity conceptualization is that attention will be given to the possible change in power relationships taking the form of the ownership of English, and in how Chinese speakers perceive the relationships.

2.4. Attitude

Previous research has investigated Chinese learners' attitudes towards English in China (e.g. Campbell and Zhao 1990), Chinese students' perception of native English-speaking teachers (e.g. Evans 2010, Rao 2010), Chinese speakers' attitudes to IC varieties of English (e.g. Evans 2010), and Chinese speakers' attitudes to a hypothesized China English model (e.g. Hu 2004, Hu 2005, He and Li 2009). To fill the research gap, the current project investigates Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their own way of using English per se. In chapter 1, I justified my investigation of Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their own English by explaining three of my considerations, that is, the

54

difference in attitudes towards different kinds of English, the role of attitudes in the development of language or language variety, and the implications of attitudes on linguistic legitimacy. In this section, I will discuss the constructs of attitudes, of language attitudes, of non-native English attitudes and in particular of CHELF attitudes in relation to this project. The purpose is to present what constitutes the attitudes which I aim to explore through this project.

As early as in Allport's (1935) observation, more than one hundred definitions were given to the notion of attitude. Today, researchers continue to regard the conceptualization of attitude as a difficult task (e.g. Garrett 2010). It is also common that researchers avoid giving a definition in their attitudinal studies (as pointed out by Shuy and Fasold 1973). Despite the complexity of an attitude construct, Garrett (2010:20) suggests that we could look to 'a general and simple 'core' definition' and look at 'various aspects of attitudes' in order to make sense of this construct. Such a 'core' definition can be understood as a 'predisposition to respond to any object' in 'a favourable or unfavourable way', given the shared sense of attitudes in the literature (e.g. Allport 1935, Fishbein 1967:483, Sarnoff 1970:279, Garrett 2001, Garrett 2010). Interestingly, this simplified definition leads to more issues that must be considered before I turn to what Garrett suggests as the second step, whereby, I look at 'various aspects of attitudes' (Garrett 2010:20). For the purpose of this project, my focus will be on two issues that are most relevant to this project: identity and articulation.

 Firstly, while some researchers consider the 'predisposition' in the conception of attitude as stable, others hold that the 'predisposition' is 'learned'. The two groups represent different research orientations. Following a psychological research tradition, those who view the 'predisposition' to be stable have their exclusive focus on people's inner world (Allport 1935, Sarnoff 1970, Edwards 1982, Baker 1992, Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998). The limitation of this approach is obvious in that, as Edwards (1982) notes, it ignores the social factors, which are proved to contribute to attitudes (see Alford, Funk and Hibbing 2005). As for social psychological researchers, the 'predisposition' is not 'innate' but socially constructed. Garrett (2010:22) points out that 'our personal experiences and our social environment' are two major sources of the learning of attitudes. I have been influenced by the social psychological approach and accept that attitude is a social construct. Following this, I argue that Chinese speakers' perceptions of CHELF should be understood in relation to their experience and the

social environment in which they position themselves, that is, the identity factor of CHELF.

Secondly, although the simplified definition has its focus on the response, attitude also involves a process of expressing attitude and talking about the issue to be evaluated . Billig (1987:205, 1989) emphasizes the relation between thinking and arguing and claims that attitudes have a 'rhetorical nature': the way that people express their views in natural discourse reflects their attitudes towards the objects that researchers investigate. Billig's argument shares some common ground with folk linguistics; as Niedzielski and Preston (2003) point out, to understand language attitudes involves the attention paid to how people's attitudes are articulated. To illustrate this with the current project, CHELF attitude research does not only relate to how Chinese speakers perceive Chinese speakers' English in intercultural communication but also how they talk about Chinese speakers' English.

Turning to the various aspects of attitudes, I mainly look at some components of attitudes. The notion of attitude is used by some researchers, for example, Secord and Backman (1964), as the umbrella label covering beliefs, reactions and behaviours. Other researchers, for example, Fishbein (1967:483), choose to use attitude 'simply referring to a learned predisposition to respond to any object in a consistently favourable or unfavourable way' and accept that belief, attitudes and behaviours as existing in a matrix. Fishbein's notion of 'attitude' seems to correspond with Secord and Backman's notion of 'feeling', as both notions relate to affective factors. In this thesis, I am interested in not only the three individual elements, i.e. beliefs, attitudes/reactions, and behaviours, but also the relationship among the three elements. In the meantime, I anticipate that 'a learned predisposition to respond to any object' (Fishbein 1967:483) might be consistent or inconsistent.

Edwards (1982) has made two points regarding the relationship between beliefs, feelings and behaviours, which are relevant to language attitudes. First, attitudes and behaviours do not necessarily refer to each other. This is supported by the social psychological explanation with regard to the predictability of behaviour in relation to the understanding of attitude (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980, Fishbein 1967). To apply this point to language attitudes, people might hold negative attitudes towards English but still desire to use it (Campbell and Zhao 1990, Bamgbose 1998, Jenkins 2007). Second, attitude and belief do not exclude each other. While Edwards (1982) makes explicit that

this point is particularly relevant to language attitudes, the relationship between the two notions is complicated by researchers holding different views of the relationship in the language attitude research agenda. Preston (2002) argues that beliefs determine attitudes. Garrett, Coupland and Williams (2003) hold that attitudes and beliefs mutually influence each other. Jenkins (2007) treats attitudes and beliefs as distinct from each other but accepts that attitudes and beliefs go hand-in-hand at times. While the theoretical consideration of the relationship seems to go beyond the focus of this study, my approach is that the attempt to separate attitude from belief seems fruitless. The implication for CHELF attitude research is therefore the necessity of taking beliefs, reactions and behaviours into account when dealing with Chinese speakers' attitudes towards CHELF.

2.4.1. Language attitude research

Language attitude research[26] has been conducted to deal with attitudes towards particular languages[27], language elements[28], language varieties [29]and language users in relation to their counterparts [30]. The research agenda stems from the field of social psychology (Garrett 2001). The earliest study of language attitudes arguably is Pear (1931) in the 1930s (see Giles and Billings 2004), in whose study BBC radio listeners were asked to judge personalities according to different British accents they heard on the programmes. Subsequently, the development of language attitude research has found its way into communication-based research and sociolinguistics (Giles and Billings 2004, Jenkins 2007, Garrett 2010), where, according to Garrett (2001, 2010), language attitude research is still searching for a coherent theoretical shape, although being accepted as an essential constitutive part. Since the 1960s, the explosion of language attitude studies (Garrett 2001, Giles and Billings 2004, Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998) has contributed rich data, especially that which has accumulated since the 1970s (Garrett 2001), which suggests the growing importance of language attitude research.

Researchers (e.g. Giles and Billings 2004, Garrett 2010) have argued for the implication of language attitude research for different research domains. Giles and Billings's (2004)

---

[26]A comprehensive overview of language attitude research is found in Giles and Billings (2004) as well as Jenkins (2007).

[27] For example, Huguet and Janés (2008) on Latin American students' attitudes towards Catalan and Spanish.

[28] For example, Jenkins (2007) on English accents.

[29] For example, Murray (2003) on Swiss English teachers' attitudes towards Euro-English as a non-native variety of English, Evans (2010) on Chinese university students' attitudes towards IC varieties of English.

[30] For example, Woolard and Gahnug (1990) on attitudes to Catalan and Castilian speakers.

introduction to language attitude research implies that the primary purpose of social scientists who set out to investigate language attitudes is to understand 'the effects of language on social judgement' (2004:187) and, in turn, their impacts on 'applied social decision-making' (2004:188). Such a concern echoes earlier arguments made by many sociolinguists (e.g. Labov 1966, Gumperz 1971) that people are subject to social stratification according to their languages and, in turn, accessible to social resources at different degrees.

While some social psychology-oriented works (e.g. Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum 1960) follow the descriptive approach to provide 'base-line data about intergroup attitudes in particular sociolinguistic communities' (Giles and Billings 2004:191, Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998), the integration of language attitude research into sociolinguistics has opened up possibilities of informing non-linguists of linguistic 'knowledge' and seeking to 'change the public's attitudes (where there is resistance)' (Garrett 2001:626). That is to say, sociolinguistic research on language attitudes goes beyond description and moves towards a more critical direction.

2.4.2. Language attitude and NNSE varieties

As an essential factor in the development of NNSE varieties, attitude includes two aspects. Firstly, an attitudinal factor affects linguistic behaviour (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980, Giles and Billings 2004) and thus provides the empirical basis for the development of varieties. It is not surprising that a variety would not emerge and, needless to say, further develop if there is no user of this variety. Secondly, attitude is the gatekeeper to the legitimacy of NNSE varieties (Bamgboṣe 1998, Jenkins 2006b). This thesis therefore accepts the strong relevance of attitude to a CHELF conceptualization in these two aspects and examines both the extent to which attitudes contribute to the development of CHELF among Chinese speakers of English and the extent to which attitudes influence the acceptance of CHELF as legitimate in its own right.

Attitude towards the English that does not conform to NSE is a complex issue. On the one hand, the Std. NSE bias prevails, as widely criticized by both WE and ELF researchers (e.g. Widdowson 1994, Seidlhofer 2003, Jenkins 2006a) and therefore causes negative attitudes towards NNSE (e.g. Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenboeck and Smit 1997). On the other hand, empirical research shows that NNSE is associated with

NNESs' inner group identity and solidarity (e.g. Tan and Tan 2008). Folk attitudes towards NNSE varieties lead to unplanned language change as opposed to planned language change (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997), and determine the development of a NNSE variety. Regarding the 'persistence of non-standard variety', Chambers (1995:221) raises such questions as: 'If regional and social accents cause their bearers discomfort or grief, why do they continue to exist?'. This question has implications for our understanding of language choice. A considerable amount of research (e.g. Heller 1987, Rampton 1995, Sadker and Sadker 1997, Heller 2001, Wortham 2002, Davies 2003, Fuller 2009) has shown that people actively choose certain language forms for the purpose of identity expression. The relevance to CHELF lies in Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their own way of using English as different from native speakers. Their positive or negative attitudes will have an impact on the development of CHELF in reality.

Having discussed the complexity of the attitude issue, a closer look at the empirical data on attitudes towards non-standard variety reveals an interesting contrast. While EC users, for example, the Austrian speakers in Dalton-Puffer et al. (1997), are likely to be more positive towards a NSE variety and more negative towards their own way of using English, OC users, for example, the Singaporean speakers in Tan and Tan (2008), are likely to be the opposite. Whereas OC speakers are likely to link their own variety with their intergroup identity, EC speakers have the tendency to admire Std. NSE and negate their own way of using English. This is not surprising if we draw upon Kachru's (1992) model of attitudinal development along with the development of NNES varieties (see pp.10 above).

Given the distinctiveness of Chinese speakers' use of English, Kirkpatrick and Xu (2002) consider China English as an emergent variety by comparing attitudes towards China English model with Kachru's three-stage model. In addition, Schneider (2003, 2007) has worked out a five-stage model of identity reconstruction during the process of NNSE development and viewed synchronically different NNSE varieties as being positioned on different points along the cycle of development (see pp.10 above). Inspired by these studies, I view OC speakers' attitudes and EC speakers' attitudes as being positioned at different stages of Kachru's model in this thesis. That is to say, I consider the attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English to exist in the whole process of attitudinal development. Likewise, I consider the identities related to CHELF to be

positioned in the whole process of identity development along with the development of CHELF. Because of these, I need to investigate possible influences on attitudes in order to understand the direction of CHELF development.

2.4.3. Attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English

As discussed earlier, attitudes are socially constructed and 'learned' (Garrett 2010). In particular, Garrett (2010) points out two ways that attitudes are learned: observational learning and instrumental learning. That is to say, people's attitudes are not only socially constructed but also influenced by others' attitudes. For this reason, I examine perceptions of Chinese speakers' English reflected in literature and documents in this section.

Attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English have been changing since English first came to China. In the initial stage of English in China, Chinese speakers' English, although considered as 'wretched and inappropriate', was accepted for the purpose of business exchange (see Eames 1974:23). William (1836) also recorded how missionaries from what Kachru (1985) refer to as IC countries used the reduced forms of English to communicate with local Chinese in the early days. As William (1836) observed, this was a strange phenomenon at that time:

> Every-where else it is expected that time will be devoted to the acquisition of the language of the country by strangers; and no one thinks of going to France, Germany, or India to reside, and intending to speak a foreign dialect while there. But here, the case is exactly the reverse. Foreigners have for ages come to China from different lands for trade, and still all communication is carried on in a foreign tongue. Hundreds of Chinese now acquire enough of the jargon spoken to do business, while hardly a foreigner ever devotes an hour to learn the language of the Chinese. (William 1836: 429)

There were historical reasons behind the de facto that Chinese speakers learned English rather than vice visa. Chinese government controlled the communication between the native Chinese and the English, known as 'redhaired barbarians' at that time, and even banned teaching Chinese to the English (William 1836). Consequently, the English found extremely difficult to learn Chinese and Chinese speakers learning English became the only and best solution. What can be inferred from the historical account is

60

that Chinese speakers' English was accepted by both Chinese and English speakers because of its pragmatic functions in the early days of English in China.

Later, when missionary schools and colleges were established in the country and English was taught in classrooms, the desire for 'correct' English was growing. At that time, native speakers were major sources of English teaching for Chinese speakers (Bolton 2002). It is therefore not surprising that 'correct' English referred to native speaker Englishes. Meanwhile there was an increasing 'distaste for pidgin English'(Reinecke 1964, Bolton 2002:5), that is, English in reduced forms previously accepted for pragmatic purposes. Pidgin English was then limited to the contexts where it was necessary to communicate with people who were supposed to receive little, if any, formal education of English (Hall 1944, Reinecke 1964). The situation allows for a tentative conclusion that Chinese speakers referred to native speaker Englishes when evaluating their own English.

However, it is worth noting how Chinese speakers negotiated between their demands for English education and their concern over the possible impacts of English on Chinese ideology (c.f. Canagarajah 1993) (see also pp.15-18 above). The Chinese philosopher Zhang proposed 'Chinese learning for fundamental principles, Western learning for practical application' and such a proposal was strongly supported by the government (cited in Bolton 2003:241). At the grass-roots level, the May Fourth Movement initiated by Beijing students (who formed a major part of Chinese speakers and received English education) broke out in 1919, as the result of the increasing concern of the potential impacts of English as the carrier of Western culture upon Chinese ideology. The planned policy and unplanned implementation both suggest the complexity of Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their own English. That is to say, although NSE enjoyed high prestige in China, Chinese speakers were cautious about the balance between the English language and Chinese ideology. As Essen (1997) notes, the past can tell us the present and further the future (Essen 1997). If so, the history of English in China helps us to understand Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their own English, which I seek to explore through this PhD project.

On the other hand, we can see conflicting attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English in current China through different publications related to English and Chinese speakers/learners. Among the publications, while some works are dedicated to helping Chinese speakers to learn NSE, there is a body of literature contributing to the 'China

English' debate. Both groups reveal attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English. The former group criticizes Chinese speakers' English as erroneous English and engages in the undertaking of correcting Chinese speakers' 'errors' in English use and making Chinese speakers' English more native-like. Typical publications that fall into this group include Forsythe's (2004) *Oral correction*, Wang's (2005) *A dictionary of common errors in English*, Blamires's (2006) *Guide to common errors in English*, Barrutia's (2008) *Say it ain't so*, to name just a few. These error-correction books designed for Chinese speakers in the Chinese market reveal mainstream ELT practitioners' attitudes and, to some extent, reflect the education policy and examination system in China. However, in Hu's (2005) study, a majority of the teachers in the survey expressed their view that Chinese speakers will eventually have their own variety of English as opposed to NSE. The relevance of this to my attitudinal investigation lies in the conflict between what we have observed from mainstream ELT practice and what English practitioners say about their beliefs regarding Chinese speakers' own English. The gap between the observed practice and the expressed attitudes suggest the complexity of the attitudinal issue regarding Chinese speakers' English.

The China English debate engaged among an increasing number of Chinese scholars provides another site within which to examine attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English. According to Han's (2007) survey, domestic academia saw 337 published articles on the topic of China English, demonstrating over 300 researchers' findings by the end of 2006. An overview of the development of the China English debate suggests diverging attitudes towards the thorny issue of an endonormative variety for Chinese speakers. For those who argue for China English, the overarching argument is that Chinese sociocultural value should be respected. In addition, among them there is a growing criticism of the mere ownership of English by NESs and an appeal for Chinese speakers' own variety. On the other hand, those who criticize the China English notion express the uncertainty and conflicts regarding an endonormative variety. To understand the complex issue, a review of China English research is necessary. I will therefore do so in what follows and discuss attitudes reflected in particular works.

The term China English was first proposed by Ge (1980). From a translator's perspective, Ge claims that the unique expressions bonded to Chinese socio-cultural context are neither Chinese English nor Chinglish but China English. Although he does

not explain the difference between China English and Chinese English or Chinglish, it is not difficult to infer that he attempts to argue that China English was not learner English. He argues for the legitimacy of a group of lexical expressions which were new to native speakers when he first proposed the label. As Li (1993) criticises, China English expressions in Ge's term are essentially loan words in NSE. However, Ge's suggestion for distinguishing China English from Chinglish is influential. This label implies that Chinese speakers' English theoretically has a third possible space, apart from NES-like English and learner English, which is likely to be labelled as Chinese English or Chinglish in the context of China (Du and Jiang 2001). What is relevant to my investigation into China English attitudes is the challenge of the argument for 'authentic' native speaker Englishes as the references for Chinese speakers and the emphasis on the value of Chinese socio-cultural identity. Nonetheless, Ge's (1980) proposal did not receive much attention until the late 1980s when Huang (1988) echoed Ge's idea in discussing translation issues. According to Ge (1980) and Huang (1988), NSE cannot fulfil Chinese speakers' needs to express some Chinese notions. In this sense, Chinese speakers' non-conformity to NSE was initiated by the needs for expressing ideas creatively. This point is obviously relevant to my CHELF attitude investigation.

Since then, many scholars have engaged in the China English debate. We can divide the scholars into two groups. While the first group adopts a deductive approach, the second group adopts an inductive approach. That is to say, the first group shares a research interest in theorizing China English, whereas the second group focuses on what implication empirical data has for China English. My focus is on the attitudes towards the issue of whether Chinese speakers' own way of using English can be accepted as legitimate in its own right. To put it differently, the issue is whether Chinese speakers' differences from NSE should be considered errors. For this reason, my examination of attitudes emerging from the China English debate focuses on how the scholars look at Chinese speakers' different use of English. Attitudes emerging from both groups are relevant to my research, as discussed below.

The first group includes Ge (1980), Huang (1988), Wang (1991), Li (1993) and Jiang (1995), to name just a few. The attitudes emerging from this group of scholars show a type of conflict. While they believe that Chinese speakers need to use English in a different way from NSE, they cannot break through the NSE bias. That is to say, they

continue to use NSE norms as the reference, yet they claim, China English exists in reality and should be respected (e.g. Wang 1991, Li 1993, Jiang 1995). This argument demonstrates the challenge of the traditional view that Chinese speakers should only refer to NSE. However, earlier China English scholars fail to understand the legitimacy of the difference from NSE. Wang (1991) defines China English as the English in accordance with Std. NSE but used by Mainland Chinese speakers to express Chinese socio-cultural identity. The limitation of this conception lies in the reliance on Std. NSE. The Std. NSE bias is shown in operation.

Li (1993) makes improvements on the basis of Wang's (1991) definition and conceptualizes China English as the English with Normative English as its reference, expressing Chinese socio-cultural identity but showing no L1 transfer. According to him, China English covers: firstly, those loan expressions which have been included in native speaker English dictionaries and secondly, those which have not been included in native speaker English dictionaries yet but used (by a certain group of Chinese speakers) for introducing Chinese culture to foreigners. His argument shows the view that native speakers are gatekeepers of English. The limitation of Li's (1993) conceptualization of China English is further shown in his distinction between China English and Chinglish. His discussion of Chinglish seeks to warn Chinese speakers of common 'errors'. According to him, Chinese speakers' pronunciations of /i/, /u/, and /ʌ/ are errors (c.f. Deterding 2006). Li (1993) uses another example to illustrate what Chinglish is. A (Chinese) student compliments a teacher from Britain, 'you're very clever'. The result is that the teacher feels unhappy, because 'clever' has negative connotation in (British) English (Li 1993:23). Li's attachment to authentic NSE is obviously shown. The attitude emerging from Li's argumentation reveals the difficulty of breaking through NSE bias, although he actually argues for China English.

Following Li (1993), a group of academics attempt to argue for the legitimacy of China English by making a distinction between China English and Chinglish (e.g. Jiang 1995). What is common is that they continue to use NSE norms to evaluate Chinese speakers' English and yet they say that Chinese speakers should have some creativity in order to suit their needs to communicate Chinese socio-cultural identity. NSE bias is apparent in their argumentation. However, there is an increasing voice that English no longer only belongs to NES countries. This conflict emerging from their attitudes is relevant to my

attitude research. By coincidence, a similar conflict has been found in my empirical data, as I will address in my data analysis.

Another group of scholars involved in the China English continue to consider Chinese speakers' own English as a 'learner variety' (e.g. Sun 1989, Xie 1995, Zhang 1995). By criticizing the pro-China English voice for the lack of empirical support, this group of scholars are likely to be negative or sceptical towards Chinese speakers' own way of using English. Xie's criticism (1995:10) is that 'it is neither objective nor realistic to theoretically let China English stand alongside American English and British English'. He argues that such a treatment would cause chaos for both theoretical and practical purposes. Both Sun (1989) and Xie (1995) claim that it is premature to talk about the concept of China English, that is, Chinese speakers' own English variety, although they argue that some features of Chinese expert speakers' creative use of English should be accepted. According to Sun (1989:21), Chinese speakers' English should be considered as an interlanguage variety in 'linguistic terms'.

In essence, the attitudes emerging from the China English debate are dominated by NSE bias. The first group of scholars show not only their awareness of the need for using an English which is different from NSE but also their uncertainty of the degree of difference. Conflict is the key word for describing their attitudes. While they argue that English belongs to all who use it, they fail to realize that Chinese speakers' English exists on its own and should not be evaluated with reference to NSE. Their focus is on the exceptional expressions demonstrating Chinese socio-cultural identity. The common 'errors' emerging from Chinese speakers' use of English, in their eyes, remain 'errors'. This shows their different attitudes from other China English researchers such as Deterding (2006) and You (2008), and ELF researchers, for example, Bjørge (2009), Björkman (2009), Breiteneder (2009) and Pitzl (2009a). The second group of scholars, for example, Sun (1989), Xie (1995), Zhang (1995), explicitly express their negative or sceptical views of Chinese speakers' own English. For them, Chinese speakers' English is a learner variety.

Nonetheless, there are some researchers who are positive towards Chinese speakers' English, including Chang (1987), Pride and Liu (1988), Cheng (1992), Campbell and Zhao (1995), Jiang (1995), Kirkpatrick and Xu (2002), Bolton (2003), Hu (2004, 2005), Chen and Hu (2006), You (2008), He and Li (2009), and Jenkins (2009a), to name just a few. These works reveal complex attitudes among academics towards Chinese speakers'

English. In what follows, I will discuss the three most salient types of attitudes emerging from the works and then present my own position in the evaluation of Chinese speakers' English.

Some researchers are positive towards Chinese speakers' English. Among those supporting the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English, Hu (2004: 26) argues that 'China English should stand alongside British, American, and the other 'world Englishes''. Her idea shared common ground with Ammon (2000), who argues for NNESs' linguistic rights, that is, the rights of using English in their own way rather than merely imitating NESs. In addition, Deterding (2006), Yang (2005) and You (2008) contribute empirical data to demonstrate that Chinese speakers' English has its own pattern as distinct from NSE. This kind of attitude, as reflected in their studies on features of Chinese speakers' English, which are presented in appendix 1, agrees with my position, which I will discuss later.

There are researchers who are sceptical of the possibility for Chinese speakers to have their own English independent from NSE. For example, Bruthiaux (2010:368) claims that the notion that Chinese speakers' English emerges as legitimate on its own is 'fanciful'. The sceptical view shares common ground with the assumption that it is impossible for EC users to develop their endonormative norms (e.g. Kachru 1992, Yano 2001, Bruthiaux 2010). A major argument is made on the basis of the WE paradigm by comparing EC Englishes with their OC counterparts. Within the WE paradigm, English is used by EC users as a foreign language for international communication, whereas it is used by OC users as a second language for intranational communication (Kachru 1985). By reiterating arguably[31] different statuses and functions of English in different circles, Kachruvian scholars argue against the application of what has been argued for OC Englishes to EC Englishes.

Three points have been drawn upon to illustrate the argument as to why OC Englishes can develop their own norms whereas EC Englishes cannot. The first point is that wide range and depth of English use in a community is a precondition for endonormative model development (e.g. Kachru 1992, Bruthiaux 2009). Holding the view that 'there is no English-speaking community' in China, Pride and Liu (1988:56) argue that Chinese

---

[31] As Canagarajah (2006) points out, the use of English by OC users has started to leak out of their own communities and enter the domain of international communication. On the other hand, research demonstrates that the use of English for EC users is emerging in intranational domains (e.g. Erling 2007).

speakers are learners of English as a foreign language rather than users of their own English. Bruthiaux (2009) points out that only wide range of English use can give rise to indigenous varieties. The second point is that the intensity of English use by its users is an important factor for endonormative model development. As Yano (2001:123) argues, while the intranational use of English on a daily basis allows the development of 'functional' native speaker intuition, international use of English appears limited and, even if possible, develops EC speakers' 'semi-functional' nativeness. The third point is that informal rather than formal use of English is a further factor for endonormative English development. According to Yano (2001:123), international communication reveals an 'acrolectal' use of English featuring the 'absence of local and indigenous linguistic and sociocultural aspects'. To put it differently, the use of English does not reflect a socio-cultural reality in the EC as it does in the OC.

However, the three points are not convincing for at least three reasons. Firstly, the perspective downplays the dynamics of English spread in the EC. This neglect of the dynamics of English spread lends itself to the negation of not only the widening range and increasing depth of English use in the EC but also EC speakers' functional nativeness development. Secondly, it is taken for granted that EC Englishes cannot develop their own norms because EC Englishes are in different contexts from OC Englishes. As Erling (2007) demonstrates, German speakers of English, as members of EC users, also use English for intranational communication. Following her research results, Erling (2007) suggests that German speakers' own English is emerging. Further, empirical research, for example, the VOICE project (Seidlhofer 2004), shows that EC users have their variable forms of English and perform functions well with their variations in English. That is to say, accept it or not, EC Englishes are there (Kirkpatrick 2006). Thirdly, the link exists between EC Englishes and socio-cultural identities. As strongly argued by Jenkins (2006b), the use of English in EC contexts represents socio-cultural aspects. In the case of CHELF, it is just socio-cultural aspects that make CHELF stand out of ELF users' Englishes. This is exactly how CHELF is defined

2.5. Summary

In this chapter, I reviewed literature and discussed four factors relevant to the conception of CHELF, covering the linguistic creativity and the community conception of CHELF, the identity and the attitude related to CHELF. The linguistic features of

China English were researched in previous studies, involving phonological, lexical, syntactic, discoursal and pragmatic levels of language. The linguistic features suggest that Chinese speakers have their own way of using English and that Chinese speakers are flexible with their English in order to suit pragmatic purposes in communication. Because of this, I argue that Chinese speakers' English should be considered as different from NSE rather than 'deficient'. However, I understand that China English research focuses on the geographically defined variety and I consider that CHELF users might or might not adapt their English in intercultural communication. With empirical data, I am going to find out how CHELF users perceive their non-conformity to NSE and what beliefs and factors are related to their perceptions.

CHELF is conceptualized in this chapter as belonging to both the ELF community at the global level and the Chinese speakers' community at the 'local' level. I need to use scare quotes in that I am not suggesting a fixed local community in traditional sense of speech community. Rather, I consider the 'local' community constructed by Chinese speakers as result from Chinese speakers' use of ELF and as closely related toL1 Chinese identity in the global community of ELF at large.

My conceptualization of a CHELF identity is influenced by a non-essentialism view of identity and aimed at describing what social relationships Chinese speakers establish through their use of English. In the end, I have discussed my understanding of attitude conception and attitudes related to Chinese speakers' English that have emerged from existing discourse.

Chapter 3 Methodology

This thesis seeks to answer four research questions:

1. How do Chinese speakers perceive their own way of using ELF?

2. How do Chinese speakers perceive their identity in ELF?

   a. How do Chinese speakers perceive their cultural identities in their use of ELF?

   b. How do Chinese speakers perceive themselves as learners or users of ELF?

   c. How do Chinese speakers position themselves individually or collectively in the global community of ELF use?

3. What factors contribute to Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their use of ELF in their own way?

   a. What beliefs are related to their attitudes and identities?

   b. What contextual factors are related to their attitudes and identities?

4. Can an ELF conception make a difference in their attitudes?

As mentioned earlier, this project proceeds from an ELF perspective and seeks to examine participants' perceptions of CHELF in order to find out how far away or close CHELF is from its legitimacy in the perspective of Chinese speakers as the agents in Chinese contexts against the background of English globalization. Given that mainstream ELT in China continues to take the position that Chinese speakers should follow NSE norms[32], it is very unlikely for a PhD project to transform the status quo. It is still, however, my hope that the study will facilitate the rethinking of English norms for Chinese speakers at the level of language planning in China. In the rest of this chapter, I will discuss what and how I do in order to find answers to the research questions and for the sake of purposes as stated.

3.1.   Initial considerations

As Creswell (2009) points out, researchers inevitably bring their philosophical orientations into their research, whether explicitly or implicitly. It is thus helpful to

---

[32] See pp.17-8 above for the discussion of the issues related to norms in China; see pp. 62-64 above for the discussion of China English debate.

identify philosophical ideas that go with the research purposes (as specified in the beginning of this chapter), in order to explain the ensuing research practice, because researchers' philosophical orientations have bearings on their decisions of particular research designs. In light of this, a primary task before I explain my research design is the clarification of my philosophical orientation. I have struggled a lot in doing this task. According to Creswell (2009), there are four salient types of orientation: postpositivism, constructivism, advocacy/participatory, and pragmatism. According to Creswell (2009), constructivism relates to the understanding of how people make sense of the world in their context and constructivists highlight the situational and structural facets of the context. Importantly, constructivists hold that knowledge is constructed rather than discovered (Creswell 2009). While I follow constructivism (Creswell 2009) with the attempt to understand how participants make sense of CHELF-related issues in their contexts, I feel the need for change in the status quo whereby NSE norms are set as the default norms for Chinese speakers. To some extent, a change-oriented position conflicts with constructivism in that a change-oriented position implies being political, whereas constructivists endeavour to keep neutral. In addition, while my focus is on participants' social and historical construction of how they look at CHELF-related issues, I accept the merit of a participatory action research method. Specifically, I see the research process as being full of opportunities to empower participants, when applicable, in raising their awareness of language-related knowledge. I was cautious not to let my attitude affect participants in eliciting their genuine and in-depth attitudes, but I was interested to know how participants responded to some awareness-raising questions throughout the research process. The starting point of this project is the observation that NSE models are taken for granted as norms for Chinese speakers to follow, despite Chinese speakers' needs in terms of Chinese culture, their communicative purposes and their difficulty in achieving NSE competence. This has motivated my intention of being transformative. Further, I understand the value of positivism (Creswell 2009) in eliciting descriptive data concerning participants' attitudes. The conflicting orientations, the complicated issues to be addressed and the multiple purposes associated with this research project point to a considerable challenge of how to choose.

3.1.1. Towards pragmatism

My turn to pragmatism, however, has resolved the dilemma explored above. Pragmatism, a term, which is derived from the Greek word *pragma*, has gone through an evolution from old works of Peirce (1878), James (1907), Wiener (1949) and others to recent literature including Rorty (1982), Murphy and Rorty (1990), and Mounce (1997), to name just a few[33]. Like many other concepts, pragmatism relates to different paradigms. For example, Mounce's (1990) close examination of Peirce's and Rorty's representations of pragmatic philosophy reveals opposing paradigms embedded in the two representations. While one paradigm can be termed as realism, the other should be considered as anti-realism. I do not want to be carried away with discussing the philosophical thinking. Instead, my concern is how pragmatism opens up the possibility of bringing different orientations together and, based on this, how I could conduct my research in order to seek answers to my research questions. In light of this, my focus turns to how pragmatism is represented in empirical research.

Given the connections among ontological, epistemological and methodological issues of research, philosophical frameworks can be categorized according to the methodological approaches associated with them. Such categorization is based on the perceptions of the relationship between quantitative and qualitative methods in research (e.g. Rossman and Wilson 1985, Onwuegbuzie and Leech 2005). A pragmatist position is distinct from the other two positions in empirical research: a purist position and a situationalist one (ibid.). Purists hold that quantitative research and qualitative research are 'mutually exclusive' to each other and that researchers should choose only one of the two methods (ibid.). For situationalists, quantitative and qualitative research has different values and different research questions require different methods, although they agree with the purists in terms of the incompatibility between quantitative and qualitative methods. Challenging the research tradition of viewing quantitative and qualitative research as incompatible, Rossman and Wilson (1985) advocate the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods in the same research project. According to them, the crucial part of a study is the result, in order to achieve which, researchers should be open to any approaches available. Their pragmatic approach is endorsed by a group of researchers, for example, Patton (1990), Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998), Onwuegbuzie and Leech

---

[33] According to Mounce (1997:2), pragmatism has gone through ups and downs since Peirce (1878) introduced the concept into the 'philosophical sphere' and it was James (1907) who made pragmatism famous'. After James's death, the influence of pragmatism started to fall among philosophers. However, in the 1950s, pragmatism revived. Based on this history, I treated some works as old and others as recent.

(2005), Morgan (2007), and Leech (2010). For Rossman and Wilson (1985), the notion of 'pragmatic researchers' has been established as referring to those who accept plural approaches and different methods with the focus on practice and problem solving rather than with the obsession of methods under different labels and theories establishing themselves as distinctive.The relevance of the notion 'pragmatism' to my project is thus obvious. Wrestling to identify a traditionally defined philosophical framework, for example, constructivist or transformative, to fit my research in is neither constructive nor necessary. On the contrary, being open to multiple approaches and methods will help me to achieve a best possible understanding of research participants' attitudes to CHELF. At the same time, I will be able to understand whatever change there might be in the status quo, for example, rethinking English norms for pedagogy to a modest degree, and, in turn, how to promote the possible change in a positive direction.

However, those who emphasize traditional research methods take issue with pragmatic orientation and criticize it as 'whatever works' (e.g. Buchanan 1992, Pawson and Tilly 1997). On the other side of the debate, Seale, Gobo, Gubrium and Silverman (2004:5) claim that 'the pragmatist position is anything but an 'anything goes' perspective' (Silverman 2001, 2005). In my view, being liberal does not mean anarchism. In a similar vein, accepting different approaches and methods does not necessarily point to chaos. Bryman (2006) warns us that we should make sure that mixed methods research is necessary or better than a mono-method approach vis-à-vis our own research. That is to say, a practice or 'action'-oriented approach is still based on the assumption that a certain approach is necessary for the purpose of practice or problem solving. Bearing this in my mind, I was cautious when designing the research project as to which methods I should choose and for what purposes. I will discuss how I selected appropriate methods for the different parts of the project later. Here, nonetheless, I consider it necessary to refer to Fielding (2008). As Fielding (2008) argues, research projects are more like 'research programmes' if we use multiple methods in our inquiry. What he means is that data collected and analyzed with different methods constitutes 'coordinated investigations of a substantial research problem' (Fielding 2010:128). In other words, being open to opposing orientations and diverging methods allow us to find data at different points of the research and, further, bring about comprehensive answers to research questions.

72

3.1.2. Mixed Methods Research (MMR)

Informed by the pragmatic perspective, therefore, this project employed mixed methods research (hereafter MMR), combining quantitative and qualitative methods. The advantages of MMR have been discussed and demonstrated in a range of research-based literature (e.g. Greene, Caracelli, Graham 1989, Niglas 2004, Onwuegbuzie and Leech 2005, Bryman 2006, Moran-Ellis, Alexander, Cronn, Dickinson, Fielding, Sleney and Thomas 2006, Klassen, Chong, Huan, Wong, Kates and Hannok. 2008, Modell 2010). Greene et al. (1989) categorize the advantages of MMR into five groups: triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion. Such categorization is supported by Bryman (2006) and Niglas (2004) in their overviews of mixed methods-based research respectively. According to Bryman (2006), although researchers can list a wide range of detailed advantages of MMR to justify their employment of mixed methods in research, the advantages subordinate to the said five groups. A comprehensive understanding of the advantages of MMR has motivated me to make the most of MMR and to follow the principles of MMR in my practice. Following this, a brief review of what other researchers have proposed as being the advantages of MMR is necessary. It should be pointed out that my focus is on the relevance of MMR to my research rather than a full account of the debate on MMR implications.

Triangulation is a concept which was introduced by Campbell and Fiske in their investigation of the validity of psychological traits (1959 in Mathison 1988, Creswell 2009, Fielding 2009). It is a method whereby different methods are used in order to remove bias in a single method-oriented research and to achieve validity in the research findings. Some supporters of triangulation (e.g. Campbell and Fiske 1959 in Mathison 1988) hold the assumption that different methods lead to the same findings and, if this is not the case, then certain measurements must be 'flawed' (Mathison 1988, Moran-Ellis et al. 2006). The limitation of the 'convergence' view is that, as Fielding and Fielding (1986) criticize, different methods that lead to unchanged research results might have similar flaws. In this sense, a 'convergence'-oriented argument ignores erroneous 'convergence'. This is certainly challenging for researchers in that the validity check becomes a complex issue. Other advocates of triangulation go further and argue that both convergence and divergence in research findings obtained through different methods are constructive (e.g. Moran-Ellis et al. 2006). For them, divergence reveals conflicts and contradictions, both of which are interesting data for a comprehensive picture of certain research issue. This point has implications for my practice.

Importantly, it provides an insight into the validity issue. I anticipated that different methods might lead to consistent or inconsistent data in different research contexts and via different instruments which I would encounter in the project. Further, while I anticipated conflicts or consistency between participants' attitudes, identities and beliefs, I understood that consistency or inconsistency in different data sets would add to the complexity of CHELF-related perceptions.

Compared with triangulation, other MMR advantages - including complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion - are less intricate. Greene et al. (1989) provide an elaboration of the features that MMR presents. For the purpose of complementarity, researchers focus on the potential that diversified datasets derived from different methods complement, enhance and explain each other. Development relates to the feature that one set of data derived from a certain method helps the researcher to decide on another method. Initiation refers to a strategy through which researchers seek new horizons and insights for another method through their application of one method. In this sense, different methods are used one after another. Expansion describes the situation where researchers use 'different methods for different inquiry components' so as to broaden their inquiries (Greene et al. 1989:259). The knowledge of these advantages undoubtedly has bearings on research inquiries in that it allows us to understand what we can achieve with MMR.

Scrutiny of research practice shows, however, that a mismatch is likely to exist between researchers' claims of using MMR for certain advantages and their actual practices (Bryman 2006). As Bryman (2006) found, some researchers justify their use of MMR at the beginning of their research by looking into particular advantages of MMR, but they end up with a practice whereby they do not actually use MMR for the purposes they stated. On the other hand, other researchers who do not intend to use MMR at the beginning of their empirical inquiry actually have their studies which turn to the MMR features, for example, triangulation, when they feel it is necessary in practice (ibid.). The implication is two-fold.

Firstly, it is necessary to think carefully before we choose MMR regarding what it is for and how. As Bryman (2006:111) warns, 'unless there is some rationale' for MMR use, 'there is the possibility of data redundancy' along with 'a waste of research resources' and 'a waste of participants' time'. It is therefore important that I undertake the examination of my research needs to ensure that MMR is used because of my research

74

needs rather than for the sake of being pragmatic or for the temptation of the advantages of MMR. Secondly, it is important to view research inquiry as a learning process through which new insights are beneficial and 'changes of direction' are possible (Bryman 2006:111).

In terms of this project, I selected MMR with two considerations in mind. One was discussed earlier, relating to the pragmatic paradigm. The other is to be discussed later, relating to research issues. However, I was open to the possibility that my research datasets might drive me to triangulate my research findings where applicable, and to use datasets to complement each other to bring the study to a more comprehensive conclusion. I also realized that a motivation to consider other benefits of MMR, for example, development, initiation and expansion, might emerge during the research inquiry. Importantly, I always remembered to consult my research needs when making decisions. Undoubtedly, limitations of MMR should be taken into account. The obvious limitations include the difficulty in its implementation, low efficiency in cost and time, and ethical concerns (Jick 1979, Brewer and Hunter 1989, Datta 1994, Newman and Benz 1998, Leahey 2007).

3.1.2.1. Linking MMR to the project

Bearing the principles discussed above in my mind, I started the project by examining the necessity and suitability of mixed methods with regards to my research needs. Generally speaking, my research questions relate to participants' interpretations, attitudes, perceptions and ideologies. The investigation undoubtedly falls into the field of qualitative inquiry, given that qualitative methods allow researchers to gain in-depth understandings of how people make sense of meaning, how people react to certain objects or phenomena, how people articulate their attitudes, how people position themselves in the social context, what beliefs people hold, and what social factors fed into people's perceptions. In addition, the fact that I consider attitude not only as outcomes but also as processes suggests that I must look for qualitative data. I attempted to find out not only what kinds of attitudes participants had towards CHELF-related issues and phenomenon, but also how participants had developed their attitudes and what factors participants thought had influences on their attitudes. Further, the project enabled me not only to listen to participants but also to observe participants, for the purpose of finding out how their experiences and contexts affected their attitudes. All of these purposes pointed to the necessity for qualitative data and qualitative analysis.

On the other hand, quantitative data and quantitative analysis were also needed, given the research purposes. My research proceeded from the argument that Chinese speakers' English should be accepted as legitimate in its own right rather than as a learner variety with reference to NSE norms. It was my interest to find out numerically whether participants were likely or unlikely to accept their own way of using English, whether participants were likely or unlikely to desire an endonormative model. That is, one of my purposes was to get an idea of CHELF-related attitudes in numerical terms. The numerical findings would provide a general picture of Chinese speakers' attitudes. Further, a quantitative method was needed in order to address certain factors in relation to CHELF-related attitudes, for example, age, education background, English-using experience, knowledge of CHELF. It was also my purpose to find out the consistency or inconsistency between what they talked about CHELF and how they evaluated instances of difference from NSE in numerical terms. This was especially evident in the questionnaire survey where open-ended questions were asked and quantitative evaluation tasks were designed (see Appendix 2, pp.259-269 below). In short, by combining quantitative and qualitative methods, this project sought to present CHELF-related attitudes at both macro and micro levels and, subsequently, provided an insight into the development of CHELF into its legitimacy. Having justified why I needed to use MMR for the project, I shall turn to how I used MMR. One issue which needs addressing is the distinction between combination and integration. As Moran-Ellis et al. (2006:51) point out, 'methods may be combined rather than integrated'. According to them, integration is a concept describing 'a particular type of relationship among methods, data, analytic methods, or theoretical perspectives, which carries significant implications for how that part of the research process functions' (Moran-Ellis et al. 2006:50). That means, different methods rely on each other in implementation and lead to new methods going beyond the original individual methods. This is also true for cross datasets, analytic methods and theoretical perspectives. In Moran-Ellis et al.'s words (ibid.), 'there is a clear mechanism which creates an appropriate and effective interface between them (that is, different methods, datasets, analytic methods, and theoretical perspectives)'. The interrelationship between integrated elements suggests that the elements contribute equal weight to the same research issues. By contrast, combination does not address the interdependence between the different elements being combined. Rather, methods being combined together in a single study contribute, separately, to the same study in different ways. A typical example is a follow-up qualitative method after a quantitative survey to explore participants' responses in a deeper manner. The

76

distinction had bearings on my practice in that it facilitated my consideration of how I positioned different approaches which motivated me to do the research, how I put different methods together, how I collected different datasets, and how I dealt with data. I will address these concerns now.

Given that these concerns are interrelated to each other, discussion of each will lead to repetition to some extent. In light of this, I will discuss MMR in relation to approaches and data respectively. Before my discussion, general information of this project is helpful. This project had three phases. The first phase involved a large-scale questionnaire survey, and the second phase engaged in-depth interviews, followed by the third phase where I studied focus groups. Questionnaires were designed to address RQs 1and 2, with the purpose to obtain a general picture of attitudes and identities. Interviews were designed to investigate RQs 1, 2, and 3, whereas focus groups were designed to investigate RQs 3 and 4.

3.1.2.2.   MMR and approaches

As discussed earlier, I adopted a pragmatic approach and followed diverse perspectives at different points of this project. Firstly, I have been influenced by social constructivism. I focused on understanding how participants made sense of meaning. Secondly, this project was informed by an ELF perspective in place of a NSE norms-based EFL perspective. I explored Chinese speakers' perspectives on English in the hope that my research would raise awareness of the changed global English landscape and of the nature of CHELF within this landscape. This motivation thus corresponded with a transformation-oriented and empowerment-oriented approach. Thirdly, I am interested in measuring Chinese speakers' acceptance of innovative or 'deviant' use of English. This practice fell into neither social constructivism nor transformative approach. Rather, this was merely for the purpose of finding out a descriptive reality. However, this was to lay the foundation upon which I would then explore the beliefs leading to such reality. In this sense, only pluralism-oriented, problem-centred and action-motivated pragmatism was appropriate for the project. Correspondingly, both qualitative and quantitative methods were needed in order to achieve the research purposes. Both quantitative and qualitative methods are used in order to explore the complexity of participants' attitudes regarding how they are developed, what beliefs and ideologies exist behind them, and what contextual factors are in operation.

The interpretive and transformative positions had effects on my practice in terms of how to engage participants. Some questions included in the questionnaire (see Appendix 2, pp.259-269 below) were designed to facilitate participants' reflection on their experience (e.g. Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9, Q10)[34], on their own English (e.g. Q18, Q19, Q20), and on English norms (e.g. Q11, Q12, Q22). I considered those questions as chain questions related to each other rather than separately as individual questions. By linking those questions together, the purpose was not only to get an idea of how participants thought but also to provide the opportunity for participants to link the ideas together by themselves. Based on such a link, I intended to motivate participants to rethink their English use and English norms. In the interviews (see Appendix 3, pp.270-271 below), I asked some questions, where appropriate, to facilitate interviewees to rethink the necessity of NSE norms for communication and the question why Chinese speakers should follow NSE norms. In the focus groups (see Appendix 4 and Appendix 5, pp.272-276), I introduced the situation of English spread in the world and the ELF concept[35] before beginning the discussion among group members. Main ideas of my introduction are presented in the handout. The purpose of the introduction was to motivate their reflection on the reasons why Chinese speakers should follow NSE norms and, further, why Chinese speakers' English could or could not be accepted as legitimate alongside NSEs.

3.1.2.3. MMR and data

When justifying MMR for my research needs, I discussed MMR in relation to data in an overall manner. Here, I would like to add some details as to the way that MMR was used in the three-phase data collection and analysis.

MMR was evident in the questionnaire data collection and analysis. In quantitative terms, I aimed to collect data contributed by a large number of participants. To be specific, I aimed for around 1000 questionnaire returns. In qualitative terms, open questions were included in order to find out what ideas participants had regarding CHELF-related attitudes. In addition, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were needed to find out possible factors that had bearings on participants' attitudes. In quantitative terms, I aimed to find out the numerical relationship between a likely factor and a particular type of attitude. I will illustrate this point with an example here.

---

[34] For the ease of illustration, 'Q' refers to 'question' hereafter.
[35] The ELF concept is drawn from Jenkins (2006b, 2006c, 2009a), Seidlhofer (2001, 2003, 2004, 2007, 2009, 2011) and Mauranen (2003, 2006).

Considering ELF experience as a possible factor contributing to CHELF attitude, I compared the number of the participants who were more tolerant of Chinese speakers' innovative or 'deviant' use of English and those who were less tolerant. The comparison of statistics retrieved from the two groups enabled me to understand whether having ELF experience promoted positive attitudes or not. However, this was just the initial information. I anticipated that interview participants talked about the views of CHELF and justified their views with their life experience. I hoped to see data from the discussions in focus groups which presented the link between group members' attitudes and their experiences. I also anticipated that there might be other factors than ELF experience. Conversely, ELF experience might affect the participants' attitudes in different ways. Therefore, qualitative analysis of the qualitative data yielded in the questionnaire was needed. To illustrate, analysis of what the participants wrote on the questionnaire regarding their evaluations of the innovative use of English (see Q25 in appendix 2, pp.262 below) allowed me to understand the factors and the beliefs that fed into their attitudes to CHELF.

Interviews and focus groups were mainly qualitative research tools, in terms of both data collection and analysis. However, the insights that I obtained from pilot interviews and focus groups fed back to a revision of my questionnaire for my main study. That is to say, a qualitative method of interviews and focus groups was related to the quantitative method used in the questionnaires. On the other hand, the numerical results of questionnaires gave me a general idea of what I would anticipate in the interviews and focus groups and further helped me to understand the meaning of participants' accounts. In this sense, quantitative and qualitative data and analysis complemented and corroborated each other.

3.1.3. Other considerations

Research ethics constitutes a prerequisite before researchers can set out to do research. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Southampton research ethics office. Both in the pilot study and fieldwork, ethical issues were cleared before research activities were conducted. Appendix 6 and Appendix 7 present complete documents that were used to deal with the ethical issues in the research project (see pp. 277-281).

Software used for data analysis includes PASW 18 and Nvivo 8.0. Appropriate research training was received in the first year of my PhD study. PASW 18 is for quantification

purposes, helping investigators in analyzing numerical responses. Nvivo 8.0 is for qualitative analysis, allowing researchers to examine – in terms of my own research - answers to open questions in the questionnaire, interviews and focus group discussions.

3.2. Research design

This project was designed on the basis of my interest in the extent to which Chinese speakers accept their own way of using English and whether they are critical of exonormative norms, that is, NSE norms in the Chinese context. It included three phases: a questionnaire survey, semi-structured interviews and focus groups. I will discuss each of them in turn.

3.2.2. Questionnaire

In this section, I will discuss the theoretical guidelines for my questionnaire design and my practice in designing the questionnaires. Before my discussion, the first thing I need to clarify is the recruitment of respondents. One of my criteria is educated respondents. I administered questionnaires to those who were undergraduates or above. In questionnaire, I had a question to check the respondents' education background (Q4). The reason for this criterion is my assumption that people had higher education would offer some ideas of their reflections on higher education language policy, which is my interest in this study.

Respondents were recruited from both college students and professionals. For EC users of English, the exposures to English are normally in ELT classrooms or in ELF communication. These two groups were recruited to elicit views from these two domains. It is necessary to point out that Chinese ELT teachers were not included, for the consideration that their exposures to English are different to the above said two groups, given the observation that they have some amount of English contact for the purpose of teaching. With my purpose to research the perceptions of agents as learners or users of English in the process of English globalization, Chinese ELT teachers were not appropriate for my data and would affect the validity of my data.

I identified the destinations for the main study before I went into the field. Three Gorges University in Yichang city was the sole destination where I intended to recruit student participants. I had three reasons for this decision. Firstly, I could find support in this university, as I grew up in Yichang and had advantages for networking. Secondly, Hu

80

Xiaoqiong who was a professor in this university had published three papers on the topic of China English. I anticipated I could get support from her due to a similar research interest. Thirdly, it was also my intention to compare students who had an awareness of China English with those who had not. I assumed Hu Xiaoqiong's students might have the awareness of China English, although I was open to the possibility that students might or might not be influenced by Hu Xiaoqiong. Student respondents were selected from both English majors and non-English majors. I assumed that the two groups might have different experiences of using English, different interpretations of the function and the role of English and different orientations towards the norms of English. I went to the university in person and used hard copies of the questionnaire.

While I recruited student participants in the same university, I also recruited participants with professional backgrounds in different cities, for example, Yichang, Beijing, Shanghai, Zhengzhou and others. I went to Yichang and Beijing for the survey, using hard copies of the questionnaire again. As for the other cities, I sent electronic copies of the questionnaire to respondents. I did not limit my recruitment of professionals to the same city because I targeted any professionals who had the experience of ELF communication. I contacted some companies, organizations, and departments of governmental agencies where I assumed I would be most likely to find people who are more frequently use English than other people. With my research questions, I was focused on CHELF users' attitudes. While it is estimated that there is a Chinese-knowing population of 400 million in China (Crystal 2008), it is necessary to point out the population is 1.3 billion in China. In order to identify appropriate participants among professionals, an efficient way was to identify companies and organizations which did business or worked with overseas customers and organizations. This did not influence the validity of my research, which was focused on the emerging evidence of the possibility that CHELF is accepted as legitimate by CHELF users. ELF communication is in essence used in international encounters. Thus I was not interested in regional differences between professionals. I understood that professionals in different regions in China might have different exposure to English speakers. However, I regarded that this kind of difference could be interpreted as their different experiences. It was precisely these different experiences that I took into account when I investigated Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their own way of using English.

3.2.2.1.   Preliminary considerations

As mentioned earlier, this project involved a large-scale survey for quantitative purposes. Questionnaires, as a typical instrument for quantitative research, were therefore employed in this project. Gillham (2000) provides a long list of advantages and disadvantages of questionnaires. Advantages include, for example, low cost in time and money, and reducing pressure on participants and respondents' anonymity (Gillham 2000). These advantages certainly helped me to confirm the employment of questionnaires. When I was planning the survey, however, more attention was paid to the disadvantages in order to find ways to overcome or compensate them.

One problem with questionnaires is that participants might interpret the 'uniform' questionnaire in different ways (Gillham 2000). This issue was addressed with four considerations. Firstly, I tried my best to offer exclusively different categories for multiple choice questions and leave spaces for respondents to provide their answers when given choices were not applicable or when they have extra things to express. Secondly, it is my intention that presumed answers to some questions, in particular, open questions, should be avoided and space should be left for respondents to decide how they perceive the questions. Such intention follows folk linguistics (Niedzielski and Preston 2003). How respondents interpret given questions, how they think about their experience of using English, how they think about the reasons behind what they see as the phenomenon of Chinese speakers' variations in ELF use, and how they explicitly express their answers are all interesting and contribute to their attitudes towards the CHELF-related issues under investigation. For example, in Q25, where respondents were asked to evaluate the acceptability of certain instances of difference from NSE, no instruction was given to limit the evaluation at different levels, for example, lexis, syntax, or pragmatics. Thirdly, questions included in the questionnaire were designed to correspond to each other and thus allow me to cross check their answers. Whether one respondent's answers conflict with each other or converge was interesting for me, as I considered that either situation reflected the participant's attitude. Take Q25 as the example again. Q25, together with Q23, allowed me to understand the extent to which a particular participant was more grammar-concerned or more culture-focused. Fourthly, interviews followed questionnaire and provided me with the opportunity to uncover the differences in interpretations. Another example is Q22, where respondents were asked whether they anticipated Chinese speakers had their own English. Different participants had different reasons for the answer 'no'. The

different reasons for the answer 'no' were then further explored through the follow-up interviews.

A second problem with questionnaires relates to the 'response rate' (Gillham 2000:9). A question for researchers is how to motivate respondents to complete questionnaires and return them (ibid.). Bearing this issue in mind, I was careful when dealing with the wording of questions, deciding the language used for the questionnaire, and administrating the questionnaires. An endeavour was made to make questions easily accessible to participants. After a few changes and improvements, questions were posed by using the simplest possible words. Prior piloting was helpful in achieving this. Chinese as the shared first language between me and the participants was used to make sure respondents felt easy and relaxed in answering the questions rather than treating the survey as an English language test. Before the administration of the questionnaires, I spent time networking to get support from the university where I conducted the survey and get help from some institutions and companies whose employees were potential respondents. This was rewarding. Not only were class time and work time generously given to me for the survey, but also access to potential participants in class time and work time was allowed. When I administrated the questionnaires, I went to the sites in person and introduced myself as well as the project in order to build up a rapport with respondents and stimulate interest in this study. After all of this had been done, the questionnaire return rate and the frequency of complete responses were high. 922 questionnaires were distributed and 769 respondents were included in the data for analysis (see pp. 283below).

While Gillham (2000) considers the 'standardization' of questions an advantage of questionnaires, I needed to use open questions in the survey for the purpose of eliciting the attitudes which I was unable to predict. This posed a third challenge for me. As Foddy (1993) observes, for some survey researchers, 'open questions tend to produce material that is extremely variable, of low reliability and difficult to code'. This criticism deserves reconsideration. Firstly, I welcomed 'extremely variable' answers, as they were manifestations of the respondents' attitudes. Secondly, the criticism of reliability seems flawed. It is widely held that open questions have the advantage of allowing respondents to provide answers that really suit them rather than make a choice from a restricted set of answers provided by the investigators (Schuman and Presser 1981, Foddy 1993). In light of this, data retrieved from open questions should be

accepted as more valid than data elicited from closed questions. However, as Foddy (1993) warns, the validity of open questions in a survey largely depends upon proper interpretation and coding. That means, where open questions are not inappropriate for use in a questionnaire survey, the challenge is how to interpret and code the data properly. In light of this, I argue that the complexity of using open question does not devalue open questions in a questionnaire survey. Consequently, how to interpret and code data elicited from open questions needs to be addressed. Given that interpreting and coding qualitative data persisted throughout the project, I will turn to this question specifically in the discussion of the qualitative part of research, that is, the interviews and focus groups.

3.2.2.2. Questionnaire construction

Before, and while, I was constructing the questionnaire, I consulted a wealth of literature (e.g. Schuman and Presser 1981, Kachru 1986, 1992, Oppenheim 1992, Foddy 1993, Gillham 2000, Jenkins 2007). Apart from my research purposes, issues taken into account included: the effects of question order and response order, the number of alternative answers, the limitation of closed questions in terms of restricting respondents' choices, and research ethics. To avoid repetition, I will illustrate these points in my justification of specific questions in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire (see Appendix 2, pp.259-269 below) includes three elements: closed questions, open questions and attitudinal scales. Questions were designed to understand the interrelationship among their experience (Q4 - Q10, Q15 - Q16), their beliefs about English (Q12 - Q14, Q17, Q23, Q26), their attitudes towards their own way of using English, and towards their peer Chinese speakers' English (Q11, Q18 - Q22, Q24 - Q26). Specifically, acceptance scales were constructed to measure participants' attitudes towards some potential CHELF instances[36]. They were designed to investigate RQs 1 and 3a. As Oppenheim (1992:187) notes, attitudinal scales are 'overt' measures dividing attitudes and 'placing people on a continuum in relation to each other'. Attitudinal scales (Q25) in this project therefore served the purpose of identifying acceptance patterns by grouping participants according to the measurement result. While this led to 'overt' quantitatively oriented results, other covert findings relating to CHELF attitudes

---

[36] They are defined as potential because they have not yet been legitimized. They are still criticized as erroneous expressions, with reference to NSE. However, with an ELF perspective, some instances of CHELF users' 'errors' in English should be accepted as manifestations of the English agreeing with Chinese speakers' own needs and suiting their own purposes of communication.

emerging from the qualitative data (i.e. open questions, interviews and focus groups) combined to provide an insight into CHELF attitudes. I anticipate an attitudinal pattern at the superficial level, underlined by certain beliefs and attitudes, which, in turn, are determined by particular factors. To put it differently, acceptance patterns, underlying beliefs and attitudes, and factors contributing to the beliefs and attitudes, are all subject to this investigation.

To be specific, there are 26 questions in the questionnaire. Following the first four questions (Q1- Q4) asking for biographic data, another five questions (Q5 – Q9) were designed to facilitate respondents' reflections on their experience of using English. Q5, Q6, Q8 and Q9 relate to reading, listening, writing and speaking respectively. Q7 and Q10 are ranking tasks. Following Q5 and Q6, Q7 asked respondents to rank the groups of English speakers according to their experience of using English. Likewise, Q10 asked respondents about their target interlocutors. Three groups were specified, including Chinese speakers, native speakers and other speakers. In order to avoid confusion, I made clear that native speakers include those from Britain, America, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. The sequence of the three groups follows Jenkins's (2009, personal communication) question concerning why the 'native speakers' choice should be the first choice. Positioning the 'native speakers' choice as the first one might, to some extent, prevent responders from careful thinking, given the popularity of the term native speakers.

The purpose of the ranking tasks was to prepare respondents to rethink English norms by asking them to think about which groups of users they are most likely to encounter. This was informed by ELF research. ELF researchers (e.g. Seidlhofer 2003, Jenkins 2006b, 2009a) take issue with the obsession of native speaker norms of English, with the consideration that most non-native speakers are using English in the absence of native speakers. However, I understood that respondents might or might not be stimulated, depending on other factors, for example, the need to pass a NSE norms-oriented examination, that came into play in their considerations.

Q11 was designed to force respondents to make a decision between NSE and Chinese speakers' own English. Only two choices were given. Following Q11, three questions were designed to obtain an idea of what respondents expected for the use of English. Whereas Q12 applies to respondents as individuals, Q13 and Q14 relate to the Chinese speakers' community of English. Further, Q13 was designed to understand how

respondents think about English in the current context, while Q14 asked respondents to predict English in relation to Chinese speakers in the future. These questions were designed to suit a two-fold purpose. Firstly, I sought to explore the respondents' attitudes towards CHELF and towards native speaker norms of English (RQs1 and 2). Secondly, I anticipated to elicit the respondents' explanation of their reasons behind their attitudes and I could further make sense of possible factors contributing to their attitudes (RQ3).

Q15-Q17 were constructed as a set in order to understand how respondents associate with different labels given to Chinese speakers' English. Two points were considered when putting the three questions into the questionnaire. Firstly, I aimed to investigate their interpretations of the two notions. For academics, especially those who research China English (see pp. 62-66 above), Chinglish is associated with a negative denotation whereas China English is associated with positive attitudes. My interest was in whether respondents have awareness that Chinese speakers **can** use English in a different way from the way that native speakers do. Secondly, the three questions link to the following questions (Q18-Q20). The responses to these three questions allowed me to position their attitudes along Kachru's (1986) attitudinal development continuum (see pp.10 above).

According to Kachru (1986), how NNESs label their own English is an indicator of their language attitudes. He used a 'self-labelling task' to investigate Indian users' attitudes towards Indian English. Following him, I included labelling tasks into the questionnaire and asked the respondents to label their own English in individual terms and Chinese speakers' English in general. By doing so, I aimed for an understanding of their attitudes from a dynamic perspective. With such a perspective, I view their attitudes at that moment as a point of the development, as I argue for the legitimacy of CHELF and therefore look at the development in this direction...

A subsequent question, Q21, gave respondents the space to comment on Chinese speakers' English. This open question was designed to explore respondents' attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English by looking at how they articulate their attitudes (see pp.56 above for the discussion of attitudes in relation to articulations). Furthermore, the open question was placed immediately after the task of labelling Chinese speakers' English. This would allow me to build up the link between their labelling and their description.

Following the flow of the previous questions with the purpose of facilitating respondents to reflect on their English, Q22 is related to RQ 1 regarding attitudes towards CHELF.. Responses to Q22 will enable me to understand, firstly, how Chinese speakers predict the future of Chinese speakers' use of English and, secondly, what Chinese speakers think about CHELF in relation to NSE. Six alternative answers were provided along an adapted Likert scale, ranging from the strongest (= 1) to the weakest (= 6) desire for an endonormative English.

Another three questions (Q23, Q24, Q25) turned to attitudinal scales. Q23 was designed to investigate what criteria respondents refer to when they evaluate a person's English. Through this question, I sought to find out the extent to which they relied on native speaker norms of English. Four items (statements 2, 4, 5, and 6 in Q23, see pp.267-268) described the focus on NSE-likeness of spoken English use. Other items were designed as distractors, although they could support the understanding of questionnaire respondents' attitudes towards English. Respondents were asked to indicate their emphasis on seven given criteria, from what they thought as of the most important (=5) to the least important (=0). Q24 was a sequel to Q23. By asking respondents to evaluate the English of their Chinese ELT instructors at the tertiary education level, I sought to find out whether respondents had bias over Chinese instructors. Specifically, I looked at whether they had preference for NNSE teachers over Chinese instructors of English, and to what extent. Respondents were asked to show their agreement or disagreement to given statements on the continua with 'strongly agree' and 'strongly disagree' on both ends.

The reason for asking respondents to evaluate Chinese college teachers of English rather than other Chinese users of English needs to be specified. In the 'cline of bilingualism' (Kachru 1992) in the Chinese context, college English instructors are normally proficient users of English, given their English education and their experience of using English, at least for teaching purposes. Respondents' evaluation of their English will largely contribute to the investigation of whether Chinese speakers are critical of NSE norms, whether Chinese speakers are influenced by NSE bias, and to what extent

Q25 asked participants to rate ten sentences in terms of acceptability along six-point continua running from the most acceptable (=5) to the least acceptable (=0). The ten sentences were selected on the basis of consulting literature and linking my experience of being a Chinese speaker. The first three sentences were selected from Chinese

websites, with the reference to my own experience of being a Chinese speaker of English. They are sentences existing in the real life use of English by Chinese speakers. They are typical sentences with Chinese culture and L1 Chinese 'transfer' embedded. The second three sentences were selected from an ELF corpus (Seidlhofer 2004, Jenkins 2009a). They share the ELF patterns. The rest of sentences were selected from Xu's (2008) corpus study of Chinese speakers' syntax in English use. They can be categorized as Chinese speakers' English-specific expressions.

Six points were decided for the attitudinal scales (Q23-Q25). The decision on even numbered positions rather than odd numbered positions was influenced by Jenkins's (2007) practice in evaluating attitudes towards ELF accents. As Jenkins (2007:152) argues, an even number of alternative answers can be helpful in urging respondents to demonstrate their attitudes, whether positive or negative, whereas respondents still retain the option of not answering the question if they are 'genuinely unable' to decide their stances. Although I did not design a 'no idea' category, space was given to respondents to make free comments following this task. I need to add one point here, regarding the weight given to different positions. I chose the highest score to be 5 and the lowest score to be 0. The rationale was that this agreed with the normal marking practice in the Chinese context, according to which, score '3' often means 'pass', whereas score '0' often indicates 'nothing' or 'none'. Coincidently, score '3' indicates mildly positive attitudes towards the given expressions. This would make respondents feel easy and ensure that they would not forget what different numbers indicate during their undertaking.

Free comments were invited in the form of Q26. Yet, suggestions were given regarding what kind of information can be helpful. This was motivated by two considerations. Firstly, many respondents might leave the space blank. Without instruction, respondents might think extra information is unnecessary. In addition to suggestions, I extended my appreciation of their ideas and opinions and emphasized their contribution to this study. Secondly, giving respondents a frame for possible information can help in avoiding data redundancy and also in coding the data. The questionnaire concluded with my invitation to respondents for the next stage of the research. Spaces were given so that interested respondents could leave their contact details. Ethical issues were dealt with by stating that any information they provided would be kept confidential and anonymity would be guaranteed.

3.2.3. Interviews

Interviews took place in the second stage of this project, following the questionnaire survey. In order to further probe the interesting cases, a qualitative research interview (hereafter QRI) was needed. Again, it is necessary to give a general idea of my recruitment of interviewees before I discuss my interview methods, given that I will relate to my practice at some points in the discussion.

Interviewees were recruited from the questionnaire respondents. My interest was in both typical and deviant cases of attitudes emerging from the quantification of the survey data. For this reason, while the profile of the interviewees was similar to the profile of the questionnaire respondents, the selection was based on the questionnaire findings. Interviewees included English and non-English majored university students from Three Gorges University and professionals. Given that the major part of the project was conducted in Yichang, I spent most of my time in Yichang and therefore selected interviewees with professional backgrounds in this city rather than others. I had planned to go to other cities if necessary. However, when I was able to find typical and deviant cases of attitudes in Yichang, I did not need to go to other cities.

A body of literature, whether methodological or empirical, has justified the benefits of interviews (e.g. Kvale 1996, Jenkins 2007). It is likely, however, that researchers are given advice that the decision on their interviews method should be made with reference to their research purposes and questions. As Oppenheim (1992:81) ponders,

> 'why use interviews at all?'. There are a number of answers to this question. But let us remember the overriding condition of relevance or appropriateness: one cannot say that interviews are always good or always bad, but rather that interviews are preferable for some problems, or under some conditions, and not others.

In light of this, I shall make explicit that QRI is necessary and appropriate for this project. The decision was made on the basis of the knowledge of QRI and a reflection on my research needs. As specified in the beginning of this chapter, this project set out to explore how Chinese speakers think about CHELF-related issues, which include the function and role of English for Chinese speakers, innovations by Chinese speakers of English, the notion of an endonormative English, the current situation and the future possibility of CHELF, in order to understand attitudes, identities, beliefs and contextual factors related to perceptions of CHELF. This is exactly what QRI can offer. According

to Kvale (1996), QRI is a useful method for 'understanding' the themes from the subjects' perspectives – in terms of this project, CHELF-related issues in Chinese speakers' perspective. While this justification might be brief, my discussion in what follows of how I was informed about QRI method will add to the justification.

3.2.3.1.　　Understanding QRI

A good understanding of the nature of QRI is helpful in preparing for the research. In this respect, Kvale (1996) proved to be a useful source, given my pilot study. According to Kvale (1996), 'the mode of understanding' involves 12 aspects. I will discuss each of them in relation to my research, presenting the benefits of QRI for the project. The headings are kept the same as Kvale's headings. At the same time, I will also discuss how I prepared for the interviews in order to achieve the benefits. For the ease of discussion, I will combine some aspects according to their interrelationships where appropriate.

Life world. This aspect emphasizes the relevance of research topics or themes to the interviewee's life and experience. As discussed earlier (see pp.13-18 above), English enjoys a high status in China and penetrates the life of Chinese speakers and learners, having an effect on their education and career. Chinese speakers and learners struggle to approximate to native speaker competence but they are likely to end up with the marks of unsuccessful learners in their identities, within the evaluation system oriented towards NSE. This project deals with Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their own way of using English and thus provides interviewees with the opportunity of reflecting on their own practice as well as their pedagogic goal. The link between the research project and the interviewees' interests helps to confirm not only the appropriateness of the QRI method but also the implication of this project. Turning back to the notion of 'understanding', data elicited from interviews can therefore be understood with reference to the interviewees' life story, life background and living context (Kvale 1996). In terms of this project, 'understanding' Chinese speakers' attitudes towards CHELF can be informed by what they say about English, English norms and Chinese speakers' way of using English in their life and international communication as well as their real life context, which is featured with Chinese culture and socio-political conditions.

In addition, the relevance of this aspect to understanding has implications for my selection of participants. I am interested in whether people having different experiences of English encounters might have different attitudes towards, or beliefs of, English norms in relation to Chinese speakers. I therefore recruited participants from both students and professional groups. Further, I targeted both English majors and non-English majors among students when I administered the questionnaires and subsequently selected interviewees.

Meaning. This aspect deals with the purpose of an interview. Researchers seek to understand the meaning of the research topic or themes in relation to their interviewees. It is important that such an undertaking is achieved through the interpretation of 'what is said ' and 'how it is said' (Kvale 1996:30). This point corresponds with Billig's (1987) emphasis on 'articulation' in addition to 'thinking' (see pp.56 above). This implies that researchers should not only use the interviewees' perspectives to understand 'what is said', but also take the researcher's perspective to reflect on 'how it is said'. Regarding my research, attention was paid to what the interviewees said about CHELF-related issues at the conscious level. Simultaneously, I sought to understand Chinese speakers' beliefs with regard to the same issues at their unconscious level by examining the way they expressed their opinions. In particular, prosodic features of participants' articulations were examined.

Understanding this aspect had an effect on my research practice. That is, I sought to encourage interviewees to verbalize what they mean. This was something I learnt from my pilot interviews. As a Chinese speaker of English who grew up and received English education in Mainland China, I had something in common with my research participants. We had a common understanding of the educational background in China, a shared sense of Chinese culture, and a collective identity of being Chinese speakers of English. These advantages helped me to build up a rapport with participants and to understand what they said and how they said it. Interestingly, however, I found in my pilot interviews that interviewees sometimes assumed that I could understand their meaning and therefore avoided developing their arguments. This caused difficulty in my follow-up data analysis. I therefore decided that certain strategies were needed to 'push' interviewees to verbalize what they meant. For examples, I would pretend to have difficulty in understanding their unclear expressions and require their clarification; I would indicate that I understand what they mean but I need them to clarify so as to

make sure I have correct understanding; I would directly check with my research participants whether I get any unsaid message correctly.

Qualification, *description* and *specification*. These three aspects involve data collection and analysis, distinguishing QRI from quantitative interviews, with which researchers ask standardized questions with mostly fixed choices of answers (Kvale 1994). As Kvale (1994) points out, qualitative research interviewers seek to capture the description provided by interviewees about a specific situation for qualitative analysis. For this purpose, I prepared a digital recorder to collect interview data and received training in the use of Nvivo 8.0 software for the sake of the qualitative study. Solo interviews, as opposed to group interviews, were chosen to obtain an understanding of the attitudes held by individuals about specific situations. Turning to the current study, I anticipated different interviewees' descriptions of their English encounters and feelings, explanations of situations in which they position themselves, and their opinions of issues regarding English in general and CHELF in particular. While the questionnaire survey allowed me to categorize types of CHELF attitudes, I aimed at probing their underlying beliefs and ideologies through in-depth qualitative interviews.

Deliberate Naïveté and *Sensitivity*. In Kvale's (1996) words, these two aspects interestingly 'contrast' each other. The former emphasizes the 'absence of presuppositions' and encourages researchers to be open to 'new and unexpected phenomena' (Kvale 1996:33). On the other hand, the latter suggests that a 'foreknowledge' about the research topic increases the sophistication of interview data (Kvale 1996:35). However, I claim that efforts should be made to strike a balance between being open and being sensitive, rather than regarding the two points as conflicting with each other. While being open allows researchers to obtain new insights and to broaden horizons, being sensitive helps researchers to notice new and interesting ideas emerging from interviewees' accounts and then explore them in in-depth levels. The relevance to this project was that I read literature with the focus on ELF, WE, China English research, ELF attitudes, NNSE attitudes, and China English attitudes before I set out to do the empirical investigation into the English that is used by Chinese speakers in intercultural communication. The purpose of doing so was to develop a sensitivity to the research topic. At the same time, I was interested in finding new insights. In essence, it is new insights that this project seeks to discover for the purpose of contributing to the field of ELF research and CHELF research.

92

Focus, ambiguity and *change*. These three aspects relate to the flow of an interview. *Focus* dictates that an interview, although taking the form of a conversation, cannot be a 'nondirective' conversation (Kvale 1996:34). As echoed in Berg (2007:130), researchers should 'try to keep the subject on track'. While the direction is driven by certain research purposes, the interview is focused on certain themes (Kvale 1996, Berg 2007). Following this, my interview planning started with a clear idea of my research purposes and themes (see pp.7-11), and I consulted my research purposes and topic from time to time during the process of the interviews. Importantly, however, the emphasis on *focus* does not remove the necessity of making the process like a 'natural' conversation, given that a natural-like conversation helps to make interviewees open up to the researcher and allows the researcher to discover new insights. Researchers are therefore encouraged to consider the situation in which interviews should be conducted and the interpersonal relationship between the interviewer and the interviewees (Kvale 1996, Berg 2007). As to how to strike a balance between the desire for new insights arising from interviewees' descriptions and the reduced possibility of data redundancy, Rubin and Rubin's (1997) suggestion is significant. That is, researchers should listen intensely in order to pick up key words, phrases, and ideas related to their research focus for interviewees to elaborate on.

Ambiguity describes a feature of qualitative research interview, that is, interviewees might sometimes be ambiguous and even inconsistent in their expressions (Kvale 1996). As Kvale (1996) warns, this should not be simply considered as a faulty communication or manifestation of personality. Rather, this might manifest how interviewees make sense of the genuinely existing contradictions in the real world. NNESs' attitudes towards NSE can be illustrative. Research (e.g. Canagarajah 1993, Jenkins 2007) found that NNESs were negative towards NSE varieties but still tried hard to learn them. A genuine contradiction exists between the needs for social mobility associated with NSE and the concern of NSE threatening local language and cultures (see Canagarajah 1993). This finding seems applicable to Chinese speakers (see pp.15-18 for the issues related to English in China). Although China does not have similar history as postcolonial countries, for example Sri Lanka, Chinese people also have divided opinions of English spread in China. While Chinese people are making efforts to learn English, there is resent voice against English linguistic imperialism. In light of this, the ambiguity and inconsistency in interviewees' expression deserves researchers' attention. This is associated with researchers' sensitivity, with which researchers can make appropriate

decisions on what emerging ideas are relevant to the research topic and how to drive the flow of conversation on and keep it on 'track'.

Change is another aspect of the flow of an interview. According to Kvale (1996), *change* can happen when interviewees 'have discovered new aspects of the themes' or 'seen the relations that they had not been conscious of earlier'. That is to say, interview is an on-going process during which interviewees reflect on certain issues and develop new insights. The relevance to the current project is evident on two levels. At the first level, I anticipated ambiguity and conflicts emerging from my interviewees' description and elaboration. At the second level, self-reflection is important in a transformative perspective. It was one of the research purposes to boost reflection on the appropriateness of NSE norms for Chinese speakers, on Chinese speakers' linguistic needs and rights and, consequently, more positive attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own way of using English. I therefore looked at whether and how the interviewees changed their views throughout the conversations.

Interpersonal situation and *positive experience*. These two points relate to the interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee. The focus is on the interpersonal relationship involved in the interview. In this respect, emotion is a factor that raises researchers' attention, given the effects of emotion on the interaction (e.g. Sullivan 1954, Rogers 1965, Berg 2007). Following this, I was careful in building up a rapport with the participants and developing their positive feelings about the project and the researcher. Throughout the whole research process, I showed my respect for the participants, sincerity for the research project, appreciation of the participants' involvement and ethical concerns. These proved rewarding in both my pilot study and fieldwork. After all, an interview can be a positive experience for the interviewee (Kvale 1996). This can be applied to the whole process of the research. Again, it was my purpose that participation in the research would develop positive attitudes towards their own way of using English and, in turn, boost their confidence in using English. It was therefore my hope that involvement in the research would be an invaluable experience not only for me to seek answers to my research questions, but also for participants (including interviewees) to find new insights and new perspectives to reflect on their experience of using English.

94

3.2.3.2.   Interview planning

The considerations arising from the discussion of 'understanding' in QRI had effects on my planning the interviews. Firstly, efforts were made in order to keep the interview process both natural-like and on track. I chose to use a semi-structured interview method but with probes prepared before I went to the interview sites (see Appendix 3 for interview probes). The interviews were planned to find answers to RQs 1, 2, and 3. According to Kvale (1996), while it is the interviewer who introduces a theme, it is the interviewees who decide what data are relevant to the theme. My strategy was to follow the interviewees' flow after I had initiated the interview by bringing up a theme with an open question. By listening intensely, I aimed to identify interesting ideas emerge from the interviewees' descriptions. The identification resulted from my reflection on my research purposes and research questions while I was listening. Notes were taken so that I could remember what to ask when the interviewees finished their turn in the conversation. The probes were designed with the primary concern of my research issues.

Secondly, the situation of the interviews was considered. As methodologists (e.g. Berg 2007) suggest, interviews should take place somewhere the interviewees feel comfortable. The selected sites for the interviews were convenient and relaxing for the interviewees and rather quiet for recording purposes. Where appropriate, the selection of the interview sites was a joint decision made by my interviewees and me. This was especially true when I interviewed the professional participants. They informed me of when they were available and then we selected a place they felt was convenient for an interview. For the university interviewees, however, the locations of the interviews were suggested by me and agreed by the interviewees. The site for the interviews was selected as a tea house on the university campus. It was quiet, cosy and easily accessible for the student interviewees.

Thirdly, work was done to build up my interpersonal relationship with the participants. The questionnaire survey provided the first encounter with the participants (see pp. 83 above). With the help of university teachers and company administrators, I went to the site of the survey in person, introducing myself and this project, extending my appreciation of their involvement, and showing my respect for their opinions and comments. This helped to familiarize myself with the interviewees. When I invited the potential interviewees to take part, 35 respondents were happy to accept and turned up,

4 respondents rejected my invitation, and 2 respondent accepted the invitation but failed to turn up. It is necessary to say that some respondents did not provide their contact numbers on the questionnaires. Therefore, I cannot access them for interviews.

Fourthly, the number of interviewees was considered. As Kvale (1996) observes, the number of interviewees involved in current interview studies ranges from 5 to 25. Where appropriate and necessary, participants numbering more or less than 30 might be interviewed. These numbers provided reference for me. Given the research purposes and realistic practices, for example, time limit and cost, around 30 participants were considered as appropriate. This was also decided upon according to my questionnaire survey results and the situation in the field. Further, advice was sought from Professor Jenkins (personal communication).

Lastly, the ethical issue was addressed. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Southampton Ethics Office before I went to the field. For the fieldwork, an interview information sheet and a consent form were prepared (see Appendix 6 and Appendix 7, pp.277-281). The information sheet was provided in Chinese while the consent form remained in English. The reason was that the content in consent form was considered to be accessible for the interviewees who had more than ten years of formal English education. Confidentiality, anonymity, and the right to withdraw participation were addressed in both the information sheet and the consent form.

3.2.4. Focus groups

At the end of the project, I used focus groups (hereafter FGs) to further explore CHELF attitudes (RQs 1, 2, 3 and 4). Participants were selected from those who were involved in the earlier stages. Only university students were recruited at this stage. For practical reasons, it was less difficult to work out a suitable timetable for the student participants to take part in a group discussion than the professional participants. For the research purposes, the student participants were sufficient. While the professional participants might be desirable for the FG study, the purpose of examining how the participants engaged with each other in the context of a group discussion can be achieved through the student groups. Further, while some FG participants had gone through both stage one and stage two of the project, others had only been involved in stage one of this study. The reason for this is discussed in the section dealing with pilot study (see pp. 103-107 below).

Before I can relate the FG method to the current project, it is necessary to generate an overall idea of what this method is. In essence, a FG is a kind of interview for qualitative purpose (Bryman 2001, Berg 2007). Following this, my earlier discussion of the nature of 'understanding' in QRI can generally be applicable to FGs except for the aspect of interpersonal relationships. That is, in a FG, interpersonal relationships exist between the group members. This suggests that group members take care of each other's emotions and engage each other in the discussion. Bearing this in my mind, I encouraged group members to engage discussion and respect each other's ideas before I initiated the group discussions. I also demonstrated ethical concerns and asked group members to respect each other by not disclosing information about the FGs to people other than inner group members.

Nevertheless, that FG has established itself as a typical tool for qualitative research (Hennink 2007) suggests that using a FG involves knowledge and techniques going beyond those of a traditional interview. A comprehensive understanding of FG methodology, as found in book-length discussions (e.g. Morgan 1997, Fern 2001, Hennink 2007), certainly promotes the quality of FG research. To be realistic and for the sake of feasibility, however, I shall discuss those points that are most relevant to my practice. This section is thus divided into two parts. While the first part deals with the rationale of using FGs in the current project, the second part involves issues that have implications for my practice. In both parts, I will explain how I designed the FG part of the research for the purpose of this project.

3.2.4.1.   Justifying the focus group method

Generally speaking, FGs can be understood as a method that allows researchers to investigate dynamic interactions among group members regarding 'focused' issues, taking the form of group discussion with the presence of a moderator (Bryman 2001, Berg 2007, Hennink 2007). To be specific, the notion of 'focused' issues dismisses the appropriateness of a wide range of issues; this method deals with group members as opposed to individuals; the attention is paid to dynamic interactions among group members rather than merely articulation of a particular participant. A moderator rather than a researcher is involved in FGs and s/he stays outside group interactions. That is, the moderator does not interact with group members but facilitates the interaction among group members to keep going. A key feature of FGs is that participants are put into a context of being social. With the purpose of understanding group dynamics, the

data of how a particular participant says contributes to the context and the dynamic process of group discussions. This can be understood in contrast with interviews. While interview researchers seek to probe into the inner world of interviewees, FG researchers examine subjects in the context of talking with each other. In other words, interviewers seek to look inside, but FG researchers are interested in what they find from the outside.

My decision to use FGs was based on such a comprehension with reference to my research purposes. I used FGs to examine how the participants made sense of CHELF in relation to NSE while they were interacting with each other. The focus was on how group members interacted with each other to develop or shape their perceptions related to CHELF in a context that was socially co-constructed by themselves with their peer members in a group.

The FGs followed up with the interviews in this research project. With solo interviews, I sought to understand the link between the interviewees' perceptions related to CHELF on the one hand, and possible contributing factors on the other, according to the interviewees' accounts and demonstrations of their personal attitudes, identities, beliefs and their concerns about social factors. FGs enabled me to observe and understand how group members challenged, supported and affected each other in terms of their perceptions related to CHELF, in dynamic interactions among group members. While I listened intensely to identify the interesting points for the interviewees to further elaborate on in the second stage, it was group members who raised and/or captured interesting ideas from each other's account. The examination of what attracted the participants' attention and how the participants influenced each other would further inform us of Chinese speakers' attitudes towards CHELF (RQ1 and RQ3).

The FG data is of great significance for my inquiry into the influences, either conceptual beliefs or contextual factors, on acceptance of CHELF (RQ3), because the data collected in a context socially co-constructed by FG participants resembles, to some extent, the real situation in which Chinese speakers' perceptions are developed with influences from each other. Further, the FG findings can be compared with the findings retrieved in the earlier stages, i.e. the questionnaire survey and the interviews, so as to triangulate, complement and extend the earlier research findings.

3.2.4.2.   Planning the focus groups

When I planned the FGs, I particularly considered five aspects of FG research: within-group composition, group size, the number of groups, discussion design and the researcher's role.

Within-group composition is a major issue in FG research, given its 'intended' and 'unintended' effects on the dynamics of group interaction (see Bryman 2001, Fern 2001:23, Berg 2007, Hennink 2007). Researchers suggest that some issues need to be considered before the decision is made on the mix of FG members.

Importantly, it is the research needs that decide the appropriateness of the specific group composition. In the questionnaire survey and the interviews, I obtained not only the general information about their attitudes and factors affecting their attitudes and identities but also the in-depth knowledge of their beliefs and their concerns about contextual factors. With the FGs, which followed the earlier two methods, the purpose was not on in-depth or detailed information of participants' attitudes but on the process through which the participants engaged in group discussions and influenced each other. Although the topic of the discussion in the FG study continued to relate to how the participants thought of Chinese speakers' own way of using English, my focus was on what issues or perspectives came to play in influencing the development of the participants' perceptions related to CHELF (RQ3). This suggested that the set of data that I sought to collect from the FGs should be different from the set of data retrieved from the interviews, although inevitably some findings emerging from the FGs corroborated the interview findings.

In addition, as Fern (2001) notes, individual characteristics are important factors affecting the dynamics of the discussion. According to Fern (2001:156), the higher 'level of homogeneity in participant characteristics' leads to the more productive and 'cohesive' discussion among group members (see also Hennink 2007:115). In addition, Hennink (2007:115) suggests that the decision should be made with regard to 'the level of acquaintance between participants'. This point is also found in Bloor, Frankland, Thomas and Robson (2001). According to them (Hennink 2007, Bloor et al. 2001), both stranger groups and acquaintance groups prove to be effective in different studies, although having different advantages and disadvantages. Methodologists' discussion (e.g. Morgan 1997, Fern 2001, Hennink 2007) demonstrates that any factors relating to

individuals and interpersonal relationships between individuals have effects on the dynamics of group discussion. This poses the challenge faced by FG researchers.

Further, practical issues might make the situation more difficult for FG researchers. A noticeable issue is the recruiting of group members. There is the possibility that researchers will not be able to recruit enough participants following the analysis of the research needs (Fern 2001). While it is impossible to follow a rigid format of organizing FGs, a more realistic approach is to bear the considerations in mind when holding FGs and when analyzing and reporting on data.

Bearing the above three points in mind, I considered the composition of different groups which involved the participants of different characteristics (see Appendix 10, pp.303), when I organized the groups, analysed the data and reported the findings. Firstly, both shy participants and the participants who were confident speakers were recruited to take part. In the questionnaire survey, I introduced the project and made explicit that the survey was followed by interviews and group discussions. Respondents voluntarily left their contact details if they would like to be involved in the later stages. Consequently, I could only access the respondents who were willing to participate in the interviews and the group discussions. However, I understood that there was the possibility that some participants were shy but still interested and motivated. I therefore was careful when moderating the focus groups and analysing the data, taking into consideration whether a participant really agreed to others because s/he was too shy to speak for himself/herself, whether a participant really expressed what s/he thought, and issues like these.

Secondly, among the FG participants, English and non-English majors constituted two sub-groups, given their different requirement for English in terms of the function and proficiency levels. I was interested to know whether English and non-English majors would have different expectations for English and attitudes towards CHELF. I was also interested in the questions as to whether they had different knowledge of English-related issues and whether the difference, if applicable, made a difference in their perceptions related to CHELF. I anticipated that English majors might or might not have specific knowledge of China English debate and a certain awareness of English globalization and variation/varieties. I was interested in whether these kinds of awareness would come into play in their interactions with other participants who had no such awareness and, if so, how other participants would react.

100

Thirdly, the FG participants divided into those who had been interviewed and those who had not (see appendix 10, pp.303 below). The reason for including the interviewed participants resided in my interest in comparing what they said in the interviews with how they interacted with other members in the FGs. The reason for recruiting non-interviewed participants resulted from a consideration of research interest and research resources. I intended to expand the pool of more diversified participants for the FG study. At the same time, it was unnecessary to interview every FG member before the FG discussions. Thus, non-interviewed participants were also recruited for the FGs.

Group size was another issue that was considered in the stage of FG planning. It is advisable that researchers decide on an optimum number of participants before fieldwork commences (e.g. Bloor et al 2001, Hennink 2007). Morgan (1998) suggests that groups including 6-10 participants are appropriate for FG studies. As Wilson (1997) observes, FGs are likely to include 4 to 12 participants. Still some FG studies have been conducted with the number of participants going down to 3 or beyond 14 (Bloor et al. 2001, Bryman 2001). It is widely accepted that large groups are difficult to moderate and likely to reduce the depth of discussion and discourage shy participants to get involved in the presence of more outgoing participants (e.g. Bloor et al. 2001, Bryman 2001, Hennink 2007). By contrast, small groups have the advantage of eliciting a greater level of detail from each participant and reducing the effects of practical constraints, for example, participant recruitment and data treatment. More importantly, the decision should be made with reference to 'the purpose of the research', 'topic of discussion', and 'characteristics of participants' (Bloor et al. 2001:26, Henninks 2007:136).

I decided that large FGs needed to be used and I aimed at recruiting 8-10 participants for each FG. There are two reasons for such a decision. Firstly, my purpose of conducting FGs was to investigate dynamic interaction rather than individual participants' views. I anticipated that large FGs would have more diversified views to bring into FG discussion than small FGs. Secondly, I was worried about shy participants. I assumed that small FGs are more probable to be influenced by the number of shy participants than large FGs. Thus, I planned to recruited more participants than actually I needed in order to avoid quiet groups.

In order to achieve this optimum number, attendance rate were considered. That is, some participants who agreed to take part in the discussion might not turn up at the site.

As methodologists (e.g. Bloor et al. 2001, Hennink 2007) suggest, over-recruiting is a necessary strategy to address this difficulty. This provided guidance for my own practice and I contacted more than 10 participants for each group in order to ensure enough members for the FG study (see pp.201-236 below).

The number of groups was considered. According to Bloor et al. (2001), the decision is made with a consideration regarding segmentation of the study population, as well as practical issues, for example, time, money and skills (see also Hennink 2007). Given the labour involved in recruitment, transcription and analysis, Bloor et al. (2007:28) suggest that 'numbers should be kept down to the bare minimum'. Based on these considerations, four FGs were decided on for the current study.

Discussion design is critical for a productive FG discussion in that a good discussion design helps to 'generate a broad yet focused, in-depth discussion on the context and various components of the topic' (Litosseliti 2003:56, Hennink 2007). Further, Litosseliti (2003:56) suggests that a FG discussion could include 'presentations or demonstrations and stimulus materials' in order to provoke discussion. However, Morgan (1997) emphasizes that the discussion guide should serve both the researchers' focus and the group's discussion. That is to say, researchers should take care of the research focus and simultaneously let group members discuss freely.

Based on these concerns, I designed a brief introduction of the spread of English in the world and the ELF concept to initiate FG discussions (see Appendix 4, pp.273). This decision was made with reference to my research purpose, literature on ELF research, and my pilot study findings. As Jenkins (2006c) points out, mainstream ELT continues to encourage NES-like competence in NNESs, due to their failure in distinguishing ELF from EFL. By including the introduction of the ELF concept, I sought to provide a new insight for the participants and examine how they reacted to the new concept. While I was doing my pilot research, a lecture on ELF was given by Professor Jennifer Jenkins to pre-sessional Master students among whom I recruited participants for a pilot FG study. The group discussion was arranged shortly after the lecture. Some participants were found to have gained new insights in their FG discussion, whereas others were not. That is, the pilot study participants reacted to the new insight in different ways. I therefore decided to include the short introduction of ELF concept in the FG design. Hand outs for this introduction were also prepared (see Appendix 5, pp. 275).

The researcher's role as a moderator in FGs suggests that researchers should strike a balance between effective data and free discussion. The key to FG research is to let group members interact with each other, researchers are not advised to step into the discussion. However, this does not mean that researchers are free. As methodologists (e.g. Bryman 2001, Litosseliti 2003, Hennink 2007) suggest, group discussion needs to be managed in order to avoid data redundancy and the waste of research resources. That is, moderators need to facilitate the discussion, encourage shy participants, identify ideas emerging from the discussion and bring about interesting and especially controversial ideas, make decisions as to whether the discussion is being carried away from the focus of the discussion and intervene to draw the flow of discussion back on track. I therefore chose to be a moderator myself rather than have other people undertake this job. In doing so, I could judge what ideas were insightful in relation to my research topic and make appropriate choices as to whether I let group members carry on with what they were discussing or whether I drew them back to the focus by paraphrasing an old idea or bringing a new idea. Another advantage of my doing this job by myself was that I had familiarized myself with the participants through our contact in the earlier stages of the project. The interpersonal relationship was therefore established to some extent.

Other issues taken into account included the site for the FG discussions, the length of the discussions, how to make participants feel at ease, audio and video recording, and ethical concerns. I will explain what I did to address these issues in my account of fieldwork.

3.2.5. The pilot study

The pilot study was conducted at the University of Southampton with its pre-Master course students from different parts of Mainland China. 100 questionnaires were administrated and 96 questionnaires were returned. 10 semi-structured interviews were conducted and a 6-participant FG was held. The purpose of the pilot study was to test the feasibility of a questionnaire, the interview probes and the FG discussion design, as well as to practice skills and techniques involved in the project. The findings from the pilot study helped to improve different components of the research design and brought new insights into my examination of the research questions. Four major changes were made from the pilot study to the main study.

The first change was with Q25 in the questionnaire which asked the respondents to evaluate some instances of English that was different from NSE. In my piloting questionnaires, nineteen China English instances were selected. Most of them were chosen from Xu's (2008) corpus study. A few of them were chosen from NSE norms-oriented ELT practitioners' work (e.g. Forsythe 2004, Wang 2005) on 'errors commonly made by Chinese learners'. They were likely to be constructed according to ELT practitioners' deductions[37] rather than collected from real life use of English by Chinese speakers or learners. Two sentences were selected from websites[38] (e.g. book.sina.com.cn/cul/2009-05-12/1420255899.shtml; rocketshipx41.blogspot.com/2008/06/good-good-study-day-day-up-up.html). After piloting my questionnaire survey, I made a major change to the selection of instances to be evaluated. According to my pre-piloting questionnaire among four people, the selection seemed to work well. The reason might be that the four people were highly cooperative. In my piloting questionnaire, however, one respondent made comments in the space given to them in the questionnaires and complained that there were too many sentences to be evaluated. I thus considered cutting down the number of sentences. Decision was made to use only ten sentences.

With the constructed examples evaluated by respondents, I found that there was some data redundancy in my analysis of the pilot questionnaires, as many respondents made comments as to what kind of English should be considered as China English. I anticipated some comments which related to the respondents' life experience of using English but I did not see such comments. I therefore decided to delete the constructed examples, as they might make the participants think they were not 'real'.

In addition, in my pilot interview, one interviewee made comments on Chinese speakers' own way of using English and on a potential China English model. As he said, some features were not just belonging to Chinese speakers but shared by both Chinese speakers and other speakers, for example, Indian speakers and Japanese speakers. Therefore, I decided to include some examples identified in WE and ELF studies and to investigate how participants thought about NNESs' creativity in general.

---

[37] It is common for ELT practitioners in China to compare the difference between Chinese and English and conclude that Chinese speakers and learners are likely to make some mistakes in using English (as a native language). For them, L1 transfer is a major reason behind Chinese speakers' difference in using English (as a native language).

[38] On some websites, examples of Chinese speakers' use of English are often given as the material for the purpose of entertaining people. People who collect the examples are likely to laugh at and criticise Chinese speakers because they use English that does not conform to NSE.

This thus constituted data complementary to their evaluation of Chinese-like creativity in particular. They were the drop of third person *–s*, the tag question *isn't it?*, and the countable form for uncountable noun. The reason of choosing these three examples was that they were obvious differences from NSE and they did not affect intelligibility (Seidlhofer 2004).

In addition, in my pilot interviews, I found that many interviewees had a strong sense of categorizing the examples they were asked to evaluate. They categorized those examples into a Chinese culture-oriented group and a non- culture-oriented group. While they were discussing their views of *good good study, day day up*, they also mentioned other similar examples. The decision of adding one example, *I will give you some colour to see see*, was made on the basis of interviewees' accounts of their attitudes towards Chinese-like expressions of English. I intended to increase the number of examples loaded with Chinese culture and achieve the balanced number of different categories in order to leave respondents with the space to decide which types of creative use of English are acceptable. With the above considerations in mind, Q 25 *(see Appendix 2, pp.268)* was re-designed to include three examples (the first three sentences in Q25) loaded with Chinese culture and found in websites, three examples (the second three items in Q25) identified by WE and ELF research, and four examples (last four items in Q25) drawn from Xu's (2008) corpus study.

The second major change was the expansion of the participant groups. Whereas the pilot study only involved student participants, I recruited fieldwork participants from both student and professional groups. The pilot study suggested that student participants commonly commented on their limited exposure to NNESs from non-Chinese backgrounds in China. That is, those participants shared the experience of using English in their encounters with NES teachers in the classroom or with other Chinese students for pedagogic purposes, when they were in China. Outside the classroom, however, student participants were not likely to have much experience of using English with English-speaking people.

This motivated me to address whether Chinese speakers in general only use English for the purpose of communicating with NESs. In the context of English globalization, however, an increasing number of NNESs from non-Chinese L1 backgrounds are in contact with Chinese speakers (see pp.14 above). This caused my concern that the project might end up with an unbalanced picture of Chinese speakers' use of English. I

therefore turned to Chinese professionals who were more likely to use ELF for communicative purposes. In addition, whereas students in the context of China might have to follow NES norms because of the NSE-oriented examination system (see pp.17-8 above), professionals who use English in their work might or might not have different orientations towards NSE, as ELF research (e.g. Mauranen 2006) has demonstrated that meaning negotiation is key to ELF communication. As Ehrenreich (2009:129) observes, professional background as part of speakers' sociological background 'may influence to a considerable degree the way ELF is perceived', and similarly, 'his or her personal target model'. In this sense, professionals could contribute another type of data. Whether this type of data was different from or similar to the data collected from students could lead us to a more in-depth insight into Chinese speakers' attitudes. Following these considerations, I recruited participants from both students and professionals in my main study.

The third major change related to the recruitment of FG participants. In the pilot study, FG members were recruited from the interviewees only. However, I recruited FG participants from those who were or were not interviewed in the main study. The main reason for this change was time efficiency and data efficiency. In the pilot study, I interviewed 10 people and held a FG discussion with 6 out of the 10 interviewees. In the main study, I planned to hold four FGs with around 10 participants for each group. It was not practical to interview each participant before the FG discussions because I could not know how many interviewees would turn up for the FG discussions. For this reason, I included the participants who only took part in the research for the first and the third stages.

The fourth change resided with the stimuli for FG discussions. The pilot FG discussion was held right after Professor Jennifer Jenkins's lecture on the ELF concept. The FG discussions in the main study were not stimulated by Professor Jenkins's talk. Rather, I gave the presentations on the ELF concept and I combined some corpus study findings of Chinese speakers' use of English that was different from NSE. One reason resided with the practical concern as it was impossible to have Professor Jenkins give talk to the participants in person. Another reason was that I would like to make the stimuli closer to the participants' life experience by drawing some findings on Chinese speakers' English.

3.3.   Main study

The participants were recruited from both students from Three Gorges University in Yichang and professionals from different trades in a few cities in China (see pp.283, pp.297-303 for the participants' information).

Questionnaire survey was conducted via hard copies and electronic copies. Hard copies were used in order to get the best return rate. Electronic copies were used because of a realistic consideration: some participants were scattered in different locations and had tight schedules. I went to different venues to distribute the questionnaires by myself and made myself familiar with the participants in order to receive questionnaire responses as many as possible and to encourage respondents' future involvement in the follow-up interviews and FGs. The survey among the university students was conducted in class time in Three Gorges University. The survey among the professionals was conducted at different sites including different companies, organizations and online. Consequently, 365 questionnaires were returned from the professional respondents, 238 questionnaires from English majored university students, and 319 from non-English majored university students respectively.

Following the analysis of the questionnaire survey, I conducted semi-structured interviews. Before each interview session, an information sheet was presented to the interviewee and permission for the recording and the use of data was elicited. This was the second stage of the study. I therefore started the interviews with an invitation of their comments on the survey. The purpose was to prepare my interviewees for the topic and to make the interviews a consecutive part continuing on from the questionnaires. 11 professionals were interviewed and 24 university students were interviewed. The longest interview lasted 1 hour and 40 minutes, whereas the shortest interview lasted 35 minutes, with the average interview at 1 hour.

For the student participants, most interviewees were interviewed in a teahouse located on the campus of the Three Gorges University. Interviews were conducted over cups of tea. The decision was made by myself but I consulted the interviewees regarding whether they were happy with the site. Two students were interviewed in the library of Three Gorges University, because the two students could only spare time in the early morning when they had no class sessions and when the teahouse was still closed. Another two students were interviewed in a drinking bar on the campus of the university because they also chose a time when the teahouse was not open. The two

sites (library and the drinking bar) were suggested by the interviewees and I agreed as these places were quiet enough for recording. For the professionals, the interviews took place in different places. Some interviews took place in company conference rooms, while others took place in coffee shops. One interview took place in a fast food outlet and another was conducted in an interviewee's office. The decisions about the sites were jointly made by the interviewees and the interviewer. While I considered their convenience as important, I expressed my requirement that the setting should be quiet and my concern for not disturbing other people.

Based on a preliminary analysis of the interviews, the candidates for the FGs were then decided. Four FGs were planned: Group A consisted of participants who were English majors and who had been interviewed; Group B included participants who were non-English majors and who had been interviewed; group C mixed participants from English majors and non-English majors, both of whom had been interviewed; group D mixed participants from English majors and non-English majors both of whom had not been interviewed.

It is important to consider the 'recruitment' and the possibility of 'refusals and non-arrivals' when planning and preparing FGs (Bloor, Frankland, Thomas and Robson 2001:91). To address the problems, Bloor et al (2001:92) suggest that 'particular attention needs to be devoted to means of ensuring maximum attendance' and that 'it is prudent to compensate for non-arrivals by a degree of deliberate over-recruitment'. My input in the questionnaire survey helped to encourage maximum attendance. This was confirmed by their positive reaction to my invitation to join the FG discussions. In order to have enough participants for each group, I invited 52 candidates via telephone, informing them of different time arrangements. 38 confirmed their participation and 9 showed an interest but needed further confirmation. Finally, 37 turned up. Four FGs included 8, 9, 9 and 11 participants respectively.

The venue for the FGs was a small classroom in a holiday school in the city centre. A few desks were moved together to form a large table, with juice, glasses, snacks and fruit set on it and seats around it. An audio recorder was placed in the centre of the table. The researcher was seated in the circle and a helper moved around outside the circle to conduct video-recording. FGs were both audio- and video-recorded. Before the start of each group, an information sheet was presented and ethical issues were explained. The permission for the audio- and video- recording was elicited.

108

The language used throughout the whole process was Chinese as the first language of both me and my participants with the purpose that my participants could express themselves freely and that I could establish a rapport with my participants. For the same reasons, I specifically used Mandarin Chinese most of time, as Mandarin Chinese is a lingua franca widely used between Chinese who are from different local areas.But sometimes I used my local dialect to boost the rapport and better relax my participants if some individual participantss were from the same area that I am from. It is necessary to point out that the notions of 'Chinese', 'Mandarion Chinese' and 'dialect' are used according to the socio-political context in China, rather than reflecting my understanding in linguistic terms. That is to say, local variations in China, whose speakers are even mutually unintelligible to each other, are considered as 'dialects' rather than 'languages', given the Chinese government's political position that 'a' language represents 'a' country and local variations are dialects. Including 'Mandarin Chinese', which is promoted by Chinese government as the official lingua franca used among Chinese in China, all dialects are considered as 'the' Chinese.

Chapter 4 Attitudes and beliefs elicited in the questionnaires

4.1.   Introduction

This chapter presents the research findings retrieved from the questionnaires and indicates the themes related to attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English. The chapter begins with a description of the research procedure at the stage of the questionnaire survey, which was the first instrument in the three-stage project. Next, the chapter presents research results in thematic terms, with the focus on closed questions and open-ended questions separately. Then, the chapter discusses the results and suggests possible directions that the questionnaire analysis leads to in the whole research project. Finally, the chapter makes concluding remarks and relates to the data retrieved through the interviews and the FGs.

4.2.   Procedure

The purpose of section 4.2 is to provide details of the procedure through which the research results were achieved. By doing so, this section reports research transparency and helps to create trustworthiness.

4.2.1. Preparing the data for analysis

4.2.1.1.   Screening cases

922 respondents (including 238 English majors, 319 non-English majors and 365 professionals) returned the questionnaires. Each questionnaire was then numbered when the data was transferred into Excel 2010 and Nvivo 8.0 software respectively. English majors were numbered as 1, 2, 3, 4 … n ; non-English majors were numbered as n1, n2, n3, n4, … nn; professionals were numbered as p1, p2, p3, p4, … pn. However, not all returned questionnaires were used, given three criteria taken into consideration below:

1) Completeness and non-response

As Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) point out, research should be conducted with a sampling group, each member of which answered the same questions. That is to say, a different number of responses to different questions on the questionnaires would affect the research reliability. For this reason, the first step to preparing effective data was to screen out incomplete questionnaires. The questionnaires include 21 closed questions

and 5 open-ended questions. Closed questions were designed to obtain an idea of Chinese speakers' attitudes in numerical terms. For this reason, only the questionnaires with responses to all 21 closed questions were analysed, while those questionnaires were omitted which provided answers to less than 21 closed questions. Some respondents only answered the closed questions and left open questions blank. Their questionnaires were still analysed, as open-ended questions elicited qualitative data, with which my focus was on themes rather than numbers. For this reason, the questionnaires returned by those respondents who answered less than five open-ended questions were still analysed. That is to say, those respondents who had answered all of the closed questions were analysed, no matter whether they provided answers to all of the open-ended questions.

However, there was one exception. Non-response to Q11 was considered to be an alternative response if the respondents answered all of the other questions on the questionnaire. This decision was made when the first examination of questionnaires was conducted. Some respondents made notes in the blank area of the question and indicated their rejection to respond to the said question (see pp.124 below).

2) *Accuracy*

In order to seek valid data, another important task is to check whether respondents provided accurate or inaccurate answers (Moser and Kalton 1977 in Cohen et. al 2000). The reason is that only accurate answers can help researchers to investigate what is to be investigated. In light of this, a check was made and some responses were found to be vague. In particular, some respondents chose two values for the same items on the Likert scales, other respondents indicated 'it depends' or 'hard to say' rather than ticking any given values. Both types of responses were omitted. It is possible that the respondents could not decide where to position their attitudes on the Likert scales. However, as the quantitative analysis has its focus on the general situation rather than individual particularities, their ambiguous responses would undermine the validity and reliability of the quantitative inquiry. Likewise, the questionnaires including any vague answers to particular questions were omitted.

3) *Appropriate respondents*

The research purpose was to investigate educated Chinese speakers' perceptions of Chinese speakers' English (see section 3.2.2 above). The questionnaire was administered in a university and many other professions in which Chinese users of

112

English were potentially to be found. However, only the respondents who reported to use English in 'real life' could be accepted as target respondents. For this reason, the examination of the responses to Q5, Q6, Q8 and Q9 was conducted in order to identity appropriate participants. Those who reported to have never used English were omitted in order to ensure research validity. That is, those who selected 'never' to each of the four questions (i.e. Q5, Q6, Q8 and Q9) were omitted. Two respondents who made no response to the question of education background (Q4) were excluded, according to the criterion that all of the closed questions should be answered by the respondents in analysis (see pp.111-112 above). This suggested that all participants were well educated.

In the end, the data were reduced to 769 questionnaires (see table 4.1[39] in Appendix 8, pp.283). After the reduction of the questionnaires, the responses to closed questions were transferred from EXCEL 2010 to PASW 18 for quantitative analysis. The responses to the open questions were analysed with the assistance of Nvivo 8.0.

4.2.1.2.   Reducing variables

As Dörnyei (2007:206) points out, 'reducing the number of variables to a manageable size' helps to conduct efficient analysis. That is to say, whereas multiple items are designed to address the same construct in the questionnaire design procedure, 'the parallel items need to be summed up' (Dörnyei 2007: 206) in order to keep the focus on the construct instead of detailed information expressed by original variables. PAWS 18 can help to reduce the number of original variables to 'a small set of underlying dimensions' (ibid.), if a few variables are tested to highly correlate each other. That is, the multiple items designed to address the same construct should be tested via internal consistency reliability check as to whether those items point to the same target.   Thus, I merged three groups of items after checking internal consistency reliability. The three groups individually described the use of English, the importance of approximating NSE, and the acceptability of difference from NSE.

Firstly, internal consistency reliability check was carried out to see whether the items (i.e. listening, reading, writing and speaking) represented by Q5, Q6, Q8 and Q9 individually could be summarized as one construct, that is, the use of English. The four

---

[39] In this chapter, I present some tables in the text and put some tables in Appendix 8, according to the extent to which I elaborate on the tables. I number the tables in sequence of their occurrences. Some tables are not included in the text but are still numbered in the same system as the tables in the text are.

items were found to have quite high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha= 0.76). According to George and Mallery (2003), it is commonly accepted that internal consistency is described using Cronbach's Alpha on a range as excellent ($\alpha \geq 0.9$), good ($0.9 > \alpha \geq 0.8$), acceptable ($0.8 > \alpha \geq 0.7$), questionable ($0.7 > \alpha \geq 0.6$), poor ($0.6 > \alpha \geq 0.5$), and unacceptable ($0.5 > \alpha$). Given Cronbach's Alpha, the four items were reduced to one construct, that is, the use of English. Subsequently, the means for the responses to the four questions were computed using the 'compute' tool in PAWS 18.

Secondly, internal consistency reliability check was conducted to see whether some multiple items designed in Q23 correlated with each other and stood away from others. Q23 was designed to elicit responses as to whether an approximation to NSE was important in the perspective of Chinese users of English. Four items were found to have acceptable internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.761). By contrast, none of the other items correlated with the said four items. In light of these, four items were grouped together. In turn, the means for the four items were computed in order to reduce variables for efficient analysis. This group described the importance attached to an approximation to NSE. After that, the means for the responses to the four items were computed using the 'compute' tool in PAWS 18.

Thirdly, multiple items designed in Q25 were categorized into a group after checking the internal consistency reliability among the items. The variables were thus reduced to only one. In Q25, ten scales of 0 to 5, each of which consisted of one instance of a 'deviant' use of NSE, were designed to elicit attitudes towards the English that was different from NSE (with 0 representing 'completely unacceptable' at one end and 5 representing 'completely acceptable' at the other end). The ten items were found to have strong internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.855). The means for the ten items were then computed using the 'compute' tool in PAWS 18.

4.2.1.3. Categorizing items in multiple-choice questions

The questionnaire included four multiple-choice questions (Q12, Q18, Q19 and Q20). In order to make the analysis more meaningful, multiple choices given in the questionnaire were categorized according to the constructs that the multiple items represented. The categorization of responses for each question is summarized in tables 4.2-4.4.

Table 4.2 Categorizing responses to Q12.

Items		Constructs	Categorizing responses
1) to exchange information		Communicative tool	1. Communicative purpose
2) to show that you are fashionable			2. Identity purpose
3) to show that you are well educated		Identity marker	3. Social mobility purpose
4) to show that you are distinguishable from other Chinese			4. Other purpose
5) to deal with the interlocutors who speak English		Communicative tool	
6) Other purposes (freely specified by respondents)	E.g. job, tourism, business, easy communication, English corner, migration, English materials, publishing, learning advanced technology	Communicative tool	
	E.g. Examination, looking for a job, requirement by the society, school requirement, teaching, learning, research subject,	Career development requirement (Social mobility)	
	E.g. hobby, interest, practice, promoting Chinese culture, fun, entertainment, knowing NES cultures,	Other purposes (The purposes that I felt difficult to categorize without knowing what the respondents actually mean by the terms they gave)	

In Q12, five items were offered to the respondents to describe their purposes for speaking English. .Items 1and 5 were focused on the communicative function of English, but other three items were focused on English as an identity marker. According to my research focus, to understand whether the respondents were focused on communicative purpose, identity projection or both seemed to be more meaningful than to know whether they speak English for different reasons, for example, tourism and examination. Therefore, the five items were categorized into two groups: communicative purpose and identity purpose.

In addition, Q12 elicited qualitative responses, given 'other purposes' specified by the respondents, for example, 'business', 'job', 'classroom practice', 'knowing native English speakers' culture' and 'hobby'. According to my research focus, that is, the extent to which the respondents use English to suit their own purposes of communication and identity, the qualitative responses were first examined as to whether

115

they fitted into the two categories. An emerging theme was the purpose to meet social expectations, educational requirements and employers' requirements. I categorized this as social mobility. This group of responses distinguished themselves from communicative purposes in that the use of English is not for the purpose of meaning communication but for social and economic benefits. With other responses, I felt very difficult to judge what the respondents really meant with only the terms they noted down on the answer sheets. For example, quite a few respondents noted 'knowing native English speakers' culture' or 'promoting Chinese culture'. It is possible that the respondents were indicating their awareness of identity in relation to English. However, it is also possible that the respondents viewed English as a tool for them to exchange the ideas about culture. For instance, 'promoting Chinese culture' does not necessarily mean the use of English that helps to project Chinese culture-influenced identity. This is clearly revealed in some China English researchers' arguments (see pp.62 above), for example, Li (1993) visualizes a kind of English that follows NSE forms and shows no L1 Chinese transfer but explains Chinese cultural items, for example, those lexical borrowings. .. To ensure the validity and reliability of data analysis, I therefore made a decision not to consider 'other' purposes in numerical data. That is to say, I did not consider the frequencies of 'other purposes' in my numerical analysis. Nonetheless, the answers provided me with an informal insight into the respondents' purposes of their English use.

Q18, Q19 and Q20 all dealt with English varieties. The given choices were categorized into two categories including Chinese speakers' English and NSE. In addition to the two categories, another category was 'any kind of English' (for Q18) or 'hard to say' (for Q19 and 20), which was used to describe the neutral position on the choice between Chinese speakers' English and NSE varieties.

Each of the three questions provided the space for the respondents to specify 'other' alternatives to given choices. The qualitative responses were then mapped into the three categories if applicable. For example, a few respondents noted 'Std. NSE', 'normal English', 'formal English promoted by the examination system' and the like. Such responses were categorized into the group of NSE varieties. For Q18, some respondents specified 'any kind of English that is intelligible', 'any kind of English that is communicative', and 'any kind of English that sound comfortable'. Such responses were categorized as 'any kind of English'. For Q19 and Q20, some respondents noted

'no idea', 'hard to say' and the like. Such responses were added into the 'hard to say' category.

For other cases, the three categories (i.e. Chinese speakers' English, NSEsand 'any kind of English'/'hard to say') were not applicable. Emerging themes were then used to categorize responses. One theme was non-native-like English. With this theme, a few responses were likely to be negative, specifying 'unauthentic English', and 'non-Std. NSE'. Another theme was other NNSE (that is, non-L1 Chinese speakers' NNSE), contributed by a few respondents who specified 'French English', 'Italian English', 'Sweden English' and so on. Therefore, five categories were created to describe the responses to Q18, Q19 and Q20.

Table 4.3 Categorizing responses for Q18

Items		Constructs	Categorizing responses
1) China English		Chinese speakers' English	1. Chinese speakers' English
2) British English		NSE	
3) Chinese English		Chinese speakers' English	2. NSE
4) American English		NSE	3. Other NNSE varieties
5) Australian English		NSE	
6) Any kind of English.		Any kind of English	4. Any kind of English (including the cases which chose above both)
7) Other (freely specified by respondents)	E.g. 'Std. NSE', 'authentic English', 'normal English', 'formal English promoted by the examination system'	NSEs	5. Other
	E.g. 'Italian English', 'French English'	Other NNSEs	
	E.g. 'any kind of English that is intelligible', 'any kind of English that is communicative', 'any kind of English that sound comfortable'.	Any kind of English	
	'English that suits Chinese speakers'	Chinese speakers' English	
	'my English', 'Chinese'	Other	

Table 4.4 Categorizing responses for Q19/Q20

Items		Constructs	Categorizing responses
1) China English		Chinese speakers' English	1. Chinese speakers' English
2) British English		NSE	2. NSE
3) Chinese English		Chinese speakers' English	3. Non-native-like English
4) American English		NSE	4. Other NNSE
5) Australian/Canadian English		NSE	5. Hard to say (including the cases which chose both Chinese speakers' English and NSE, and the cases which chose above all)
6) Other (freely specified by respondents)	E.g. 'no idea', 'hard to say', 'English', 'language', 'mixture of different kinds of English', 'non-style English', 'my own English'.	'hard to say'	
	E.g. 'English with Chinese characteristics'	Chinese speakers' English	
	E.g. 'unauthentic English', 'non-Std. NSE'. 'interlanguage'	Non-native-like English	
	E.g. 'French English', 'Italian English', 'Sweden English'	Other NNSE	

4.2.2. Analysis

4.2.2.1.   Quantitative data (responses to closed questions)

According to the statistics (see table 4.1, pp.283), the sampled population was dominated by people who were under 30 (accounting for 85.8 %). Female participants (59.7 %) outnumbered their male counterparts (40.3 %). More students (65.3 %) than professionals (34.7%) were involved in the research. Among the respondents with student backgrounds, non-English major students (36.6 %) had a higher percentage than English major students (28.7 %) in the entire sample. The respondents with undergraduate backgrounds (52.5 %) were slightly more than those with postgraduate backgrounds (47.5 %). Given the uneven distribution of respondents in terms of different biographic data, independent-samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA, and Chi-square tests were conducted to find out possible influences of these differences on the respondents' perceptions in the investigation.

In addition to age, gender, education background, profession and major, another two independent variables are the use of English and the experience of dealing with

118

interlocutors in English. The use of English was most likely to be reading English-medium materials (mean=1.99) and the least likely to be writing (mean=2.44) (see table 4.5, pp.283) The ranking task (Q7) provided an idea of the respondents' experience of dealing with the interlocutors in English (see table 4.6 below). . It is easy to see that Chinese speakers' English was the English that the participants were most likely to encounter (62.9%). By contrast, the majority of the participants (65.1%) indicated that they had less exposure to Englishes used by non-native speakers who were from non-Chinese backgrounds than either Chinese speakers' English or NSE. Some participants (15.3%) even had never been exposed to Englishes of non-native speakers except Chinese speakers at all.

Table 4.6: Ranking of the kinds of English contacted before

	No.1 N (%)	No.2 N (%)	No.3 N (%)	Never N (%)	Total N (%)
Chinese speakers' English	484 (62.9%)	192 (25.0%)	71 (9.2%)	22 (2.9%)	769 (100%)
NSE	246 (32.0%)	411 (53.4%)	66 (8.6%)	46 (6.0%)	769 (100%)
Other speakers' English	40 (5.2%)	110 (14.3%)	501 (65.1%)	118 (15.3%)	769 (100%)
Total	770 (100.1%)	713 (92.7%)	638 (82.9%)	186 (24.3%)	2307 (300%)

Following the identification of independent variables, analysis was conducted to investigate the respondents' attitudes and beliefs elicited through the questionnaires. The research interest was in the perceptions related to Chinese speakers' English and possible influences of the use of English (Q5, Q6, Q8 and Q9) and/or the encounters with speakers of English (Q7) on these perceptions. For this purpose, research tools included descriptive frequencies, chi-square tests, t-tests, one-way ANOVA, and correlation tests in analysing the closed questions.

Using an independent-samples t-test, I compared the scores of the acceptability of difference from NSE (responses elicited with Q25) between the respondents from student and professional backgrounds (see table 4.7, pp.284). There was no significant difference in the scores between the students (M=2.47, D=.99) and the professionals (M=2.6, SD=1.06), $p > 0.05$. The means were at medium levels and thus demonstrated that both the students and the professionals were neutral on the issue of deciding the acceptability of variations in English. I compared the scores of the acceptability of

difference from NSE between English majors and non-English majors. No significant difference was found in the scores between the English majors (M=2.51, SD=0.89) and the non-English majors (M=2.43, SD=1.07), $p > 0.05$ (see table 4.8, pp.284).

With an independent-samples t-test, the scores of the acceptability of difference from NSE were compared between the male and female respondents (see table 4.9, pp.285). The Levene's test shows significant difference ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that equal variance cannot be assumed. In such a situation, the probability figure 0.777 ($p > 0.05$) should be considered. The null hypothesis 'equal variances not assumed' is thus retained. Therefore, it seemed that the male and female respondents had different responses to the acceptability of difference from NSE. Pallant (2005 in Dörnyei 2007) suggests a formula to calculate the effect size indicator for independent-samples t-tests:

$$eta\ squared = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N1 + N2 - 2)}$$

Following this formula, the effect size (eta squared) was 0.0001. According to Dörnyei (2007), a commonly accepted interpretation of eta squared is that 0.01=small effect, 0.06=moderate effect, and 0.14=large effect. The value 0.0001 means the effect size is very small, indicating that the male and female respondents were nearly the same in their attitudes towards difference from NSE.

To compare groups from different education backgrounds, a t-test was carried out and no significant difference was found ($p > 0.05$) (see table 4.10, pp.285-286). A one-way ANOVA indicated that there was no significant difference in attitudes towards difference in NSE on the dimension of acceptability among different age groups ($F= 0.925$, $p > 0.05$) (see table 4.11, pp.286).

In short, gender was found to be a very small influencing factor behind attitudes towards difference in NSE, whereas age, education background, profession and major were found to make no significant difference in the attitudes towards difference from NSE.

Similarly, I tested possible factors influencing the attitudes towards the importance of the approximation to NSE (responses elicited with Q25). Gender, education background, profession and major were found to have no significant effect on the

importance attached to an approximation to NSE. Significant difference was found among different age groups (see table 4.12, pp.287) regarding the importance attached to an approximation to NSE, F= 5.12, p<0.05. The effect is rather small, given eta squared=0.03, which was calculated by following the formula[40] provided by Pallant (2005 in Dörnyei 2007):

$$eta\ squared = \frac{sum\ of\ squares\ between - groups}{total\ sum\ of\ squares}$$

Chi-square tests were used to check whether age, gender, education background, profession and major had any impacts on their choices between Chinese speakers' English and NSE (Q11), and their ranking of their expected interlocutors in using English (Q10). A significant relationship was revealed between gender and the choice of the kinds of English, x^2 (2, 769) =12.631, p=0.002 (see table 4.13, pp.287-288), though the correlation was rather small, phi=0.13. Male respondents were more willing to sound like Chinese speakers of English, whereas female respondents were more keen in sound like native speakers of English. A significant relationship was revealed between major and the ranking of Chinese speakers as expected interlocutors x^2 (2, 502) =9.365, p=0.025 (see table 4.14, pp.288-289). However, this correlation was small, phi = 0.14.

In short, different quantitative tests were carried out in order to test possible influences of age, gender, education background, profession and major on different dependent variables. Some of the independent variables specified were found to have significant influence on some dependent variables. However, the correlation strength was consistently found to be very small. In this sense, the uneven distribution of respondents in the sample seemed not to affect the research results seriously. Despite this, the data drawn from Chinese speakers of English cannot claim to be representative of them. This is the limitation of this study and further research is needed to test the results drawn from this study in a larger group of Chinese speakers of English.

4.2.2.2. Qualitative data (open-ended questions)

Qualitative data retrieved in the questionnaires included responses to five open-ended questions (Q13, Q14, Q17,Q21 and Q26) and responses to four multiple-choice

---

[40] This formula is used to calculate the effect size indicator for one-way ANOVA tests.

questions (Q12, Q18, Q19 and Q20) whereby not exclusive choices were provided for the respondents to choose from. Qualitative responses were manually analysed, given the small number of responses. Turning to the five open-ended questions, I used Nvivo 8.0 to assist my analysis. I coded the responses, using both construct-driven and data driven approaches. The coding frame I used is presented as follows:

Table 4.15: Coding frame for open-ended questions

Q13/Q14	The function of English for Chinese speakers
	   1) Communication
	      Target interlocutors
	   2) Identity projection
	      Community membership
	      Other identities (e.g. fashionable or educated person)
	   3) Social mobility purposes
	   4) Other responses

Q17	Ideas triggered by the terms 'Chinglish' and 'China English'
	   1) Criticism of L1 Chinese transfer
	   2) Positive attitudes towards L1 Chinese transfer
	   3) complex view of L1 Chinese transfer
	   4) Other
	      Irrelevant responses
	      Literal translation

Q21	Ideas of Chinese speakers' English
	   1) Form vs. function
	   2) NSE norms as the reference or not
	   3) Other
	      Responses beyond the research focus
	      Literal translation

Q26	Justifying the evaluations of difference in English (Free comments on Q25)
	   1) NES norms
	   2) Communicative function
	   3) L1 Chinese identity

Nvivo 8.0 makes it possible to examine correlations among different variables. However, the data elicited with open-ended questions was likely to be independent from contexts, unlike the interview data and the FG data that were elicited to provide contexts of certain ideas. In particular, interview and FG analysis suggested that participants involved in this study had inconsistent and conflicting attitudes and opinions. In light of this, while the responses written on the questionnaires provided certain insights into the respondents' attitudes, questionnaire findings were tentative concerning the perceptions related to CHELF.

4.3. Results

Questions clustered together and contributed to four themes: perceptions of English, perceptions of Chinese speakers' English, perceptions of the importance of approximating NSE, and perceptions of difference from NSE.

4.3.1. Perceptions of English

4.3.1.1. Expected interlocutors (Q10)

Table 4.16 shows how the participants ranked the interlocutors that they expected to encounter in the future. NESs appeared to be the most popular interlocutors that the participants expected to meet in the future, with 58.1% of the participants voted them as No.1 group of interlocutors.

Table 4.16: Ranking of the kinds of English speakers to be expected in the future

	No.1 N (%)	No.2 N (%)	No.3 N (%)	Never N (%)	Total N (%)
Chinese speakers of English	253 (32.9%)	144 (18.7%)	274 (35.6%)	98 (12.7%)	769 (100%)
Native speakers of English	447 (58.1%)	241 (31.3%)	24 (3.1%)	57 (7.4%)	769 (100%)
Other speakers of English	76 (9.9%)	296 (38.5%)	256 (33.3%)	141 (18.3%)	769 (100%)
Total	776 (100.9%)	681 (88.5%)	554 (72.1%)	296 (38.5%)	2307 (300%)

Comparing how the respondents voted for the No.1 group of interlocutors being contacted (Q7) and No.1 group of interlocutors to be expected (Q10), we can see the change in numbers:

Table 4.17: Experience of English use vs. expectation of English use

Group of interlocutors	Perceived No.1 group of interlocutors being contacted (%)	Perceived No.1 group of interlocutors to be expected (%)
Chinese speakers	62.9	32.9
NESs	32.0	58.1
Other L1 speakers	5.2	9.9

Two points can be made. Firstly, there was an increase in the number of respondents who targeted non-L1 Chinese speakers as their interlocutors to speak English with. This might suggest the perceived increase of English use for intercultural communication.

Secondly, expected interlocutors were dominated by NESs, whereas other L1 speakers of English were ranked as the least expected group with whom Chinese speakers used English to communicate. This is in contrast with the context of English globalization, which gives rise to the sociolinguistic profile that NNESs greatly outnumber NESs.

Three interpretations seemed to be possible for the dominance of NESs as target interlocutors. As seen in table 4.6, the English speakers who are from neither native speaking countries nor China accounted for a very small group of speakers of English that the respondents are very likely to encounter (5.2%). First possible interpretation is that the respondents predicted their use of English according to their experience and thus viewed the low probability of using English to communicate with people who are from other L1 backgrounds, despite their expectation of the expanding use of English for intercultural communication. Second, it might be difficult for the respondents to evaluate the reality of English globalization and thus the respondents could not see the trend of change in the long run.   That is to say,the respondents generally had little knowledge of English globalization. .This reminded me of Hu's (2006) suggestion that the knowledge of English globalization should be popularized in China. A third interpretation is that the respondents saw the change brought by English globalization as slow and they would like to play safe by not putting themselves in the pioneering position. As seen in table 4.17, most respondents (58.1%) thought they were more likely to encounter NESs than the speakers of English who were from NNES backgrounds.

4.3.1.2.   Chinese speakers' English vs. NSE (Q11 and Q18)

Q11 was originally designed to force respondents to make a decision between NSE and Chinese speakers' English, by giving respondents binary choices. However, 11 respondents left neither option ticked. Some of them voluntarily made notes on the questionnaire sheets, explaining why they rejected to tick either. The notes contributed to one theme, that is, 'I don't mind' which type of English I speak, as the focus should be on the communicative function of English instead of the form of English. For example, a note was found in one questionnaire as follows:

> The English is all right as long as we can communicate by using it. There
> should be no concern for accents. English is a tool rather than a site
> where we have accent beauty competition.

In the eleven cases, the respondents completed all other questions except this one. It is therefore interpretable that either choice was considered as applicable for them. According to the notes they made, I added one category to given options, that is, 'I don't mind'.

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (88.2 %) indicated their desire for their English to be NSE-like, whereas a small number of respondents opted for the English letting people know they were from the L1 Chinese background (see table 4.18 next page). Likewise, the responses to Q18 revealed the widespread preference for NSE over Chinese speakers' English (see table 4.19 next page). The majority of the respondents (75.7%) voted for NSE, but only 4.8% of the respondents indicated their aspiration for Chinese speakers' own English.

Table 4.18: Chinese speakers' English or NSE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A	80	10.4	10.4	10.4
	B	678	88.2	88.2	98.6
	C	11	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	769	100.0	100.0	
A. I hope I could be easily recognized as a Chinese speaker when speaking English. B. I hope my English would sound like native English speakers' English. C. I don't mind.					

Table 4.19: Desired model of English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Chinese speakers' English	37	4.8	4.8	4.8
	NSE	582	75.7	75.7	80.5
	I don't mind	146	19.0	19.0	99.5
	Other	4	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	769	100.0	100.0	

It deserves noting that a group of respondents indicated that they had no preference, fitting into the 'I don't mind' group. Some of them filled in the 'other' option on the space provided on the questionnaires and provided certain conditions to support their neutral position. For example, some respondents made notes that they were happy with any kind of English that enabled communication. It is therefore necessary to understand what kind of English was considered as communicative or intelligible in the respondents' view. Further investigation through interview data would be helpful.

The comparison between the results of Q11 and Q18 revealed the gaps in numbers regarding the attitudes towards NSE and Chinese speakers' own English. This was even more evident in the correlation test (see table 4.20 next page). One of the interesting points was that 31 out of the 769 respondents indicated their hope to be recognized as Chinese speakers and simultaneously their aspiration for NSE. This corroborates Jenkins's (2007) finding that her research participants might desire NSE but not NSE-like identity. This suggests a further investigation into the respondents' perception of English in relation to identity, which I will discuss with the interview data.

Table 4.20: Crosstab the choice for Englishes and the desired model

Desired model of English		Tick the situation that suits you better.			Total
		A	B	C	
	Chinese speakers' English	22	15	0	37
	NSE	31	545	6	582
	I don't mind	26	115	5	146
	Other	1	3	0	4
Total		80	678	11	769
A. I hope I could be easily recognized as a Chinese speaker when speaking English. B. I hope my English would sound like native English speakers' English. C. I don't mind.					

It is interesting to see how the respondents' option for NSE related to their expectation for target interlocutors:

Table 4.21: crosstab for the option of English and the expectation of interlocutors

Are native English speakers your most or lest expected interlocutors with whom you use English to communicate?		Tick the situation that suits you better.			
		A	B	C	Total
	I would never expect to use English to communicate with them.	8	48	1	57
	No.1	42	399	6	447
	No.2	30	208	3	241
	No.3	0	23	1	24
Total		80	678	11	769
A. I hope I could be easily recognized as a Chinese speaker when speaking English. B. I hope my English would sound like native English speakers' English. C. I don't mind.					

Among the 678 respondents who indicated their preference for NSE, 399 ranked NESs as their No. 1 group of expected interlocutors. In another word, other respondents did

126

not consider NESs as their No. 1 group of expected interlocutors but preferred NS-like English over Chinese speakers' own English. In particular, 48 out of 678 NSE admirers even had no idea of communicating with NESs at all. It is inferable that NSE was considered by the respondents as one-for-all regardless of target interlocutors. This reminded me of some researchers' (e.g. Jenkins 2009a) observation that NSE is sought even though there are no NESs present in many intercultural encounters.

4.3.1.3.   Purpose of using English (Q12)

The purposes for using English were categorized into four groups: communicative purposes, identity purposes, social mobility purposes and other purposes (see pp.115 above). Table 4.22 shows responses to each category. The figures (N=1094, 142.3%) indicate that some respondents ticked more than one category of purposes. In total, 769 respondents contributed to 1094 votes for all the categories together. My focus was on how many respondents ticked each category, but it was necessary to show the total number of responses, which was bigger than the total number of respondents, for the purpose of reliability check by the reader.

Table 4.22: Frequency of purposes of using English

		No. of Responses	Percent of Respondents
Purpose of using English[a]	communicative purposes	753	97.9%
	identity purposes	205	26.7%
	social mobility purposes	83	10.8%
	other purposes	53	6.9%
Total		1094	142.3%*
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.			
*This figure indicates that some respondents ticked more than one category.			

Three points need discussing here. Firstly, English as a communicative tool was well accepted. The table reveals that communicative purposes were the dominant purpose for using English for the respondents (97.9%). The respondents who ticked communicative purposes were clearly more than those who ticked identity purposes and social mobility purposes. In addition, many respondents noted down communicative purposes in given space for 'other purposes'. That is to say, communicative function of English is the top priority in the respondents' concern with the use of English.

Secondly, in comparison with communicative purposes, identity purposes were found to emerge among a smaller number of respondents (26.7%). However, this figure (26.7%) still deserves attention: the awareness of identity in relation to English was explicitly found among over a quarter of respondents. It was therefore interpretable that identity was a factor being considered in a number of respondents' perceptions of English.

Thirdly, 10.8% of the respondents considered the purpose for social mobility. For them, English was needed in order to meet certain requirements set by the gatekeepers of different sectors of society, for example, examination and job interviews. This seemed to suggest the possibility that their attitudes might be affected by how the gatekeepers perceived English. While such an assumption seemed to emerge in the questionnaires, the interview data and FG data did suggest that the participants were affected by what the gatekeepers expected for English (see chapters 5 and 6). This suggests a new direction for the future research, that is, the perceptions of gatekeepers in China regarding English in general and Chinese speakers' English in particular.

Identity purposes indicated by the respondents seemingly related to a kind of 'advantage', for example, fashion, education and distinction. That is to say, English as an identity marker was likely to deal with a sense of superiority. In an EFL perspective, NSE is the goal for non-NESs including Chinese speakers/learners. In this sense, Chinese speakers' English as inauthentic English seemed to mean learner English that was inferior to NSE. I was therefore interested in whether English as an advantageous identity marker was associated with NSE. I used crosstab to investigate possible links:

Table 4.23: crosstab purpose and preference

			Tick the situation that suits you better.			
			A	B	C	Total
purpose of using English[a]	communicative purposes	N	74	668	11	753
	identity purposes	N	20	182	3	205
	social mobility	N	7	73	3	83
	other purposes	N	2	51	0	53
Total		N	80	678	11	769

A. I hope I could be easily recognized as a Chinese speaker when speaking English.
B. I hope my English would sound like native English speakers' English.
C. I don't mind.

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Out of the 205 respondents who had identity purposes for their use of English, 182 respondents indicated their preference for NSE. Nonetheless, it is noticeable that 20 out 205 respondents indicated their preference for Chinese speakers' own English than NSE in using English to realize their identity purposes. This part of the data was striking, given the traditional view of Chinese speakers' English as learner English, which seemed to suggest a sense of inferiority with Chinese speakers who produced different forms from NSE. It is thus interesting that the English that revealed L1 Chinese background was considered by 20 out of the 205 participants as the marker of an advantageous identity.

4.3.1.4. Perceptions of function of English for Chinese speakers (Q13 and Q14)

Target interlocutors

Some responses contributed to the codes of target interlocutors, which included Chinese speakers, NESs, other NNESs, and non-L1 Chinese speakers (i.e. both NESs and other NNESs). This part of data overlapped with the responses to Q10 (see pp.123). The codes of the responses to Q13 and 14 overlapped a lot with the categories of the responses to Q12 (see pp.127), including communication, identity and social mobility purposes that English was thought to serve.

Community membership

Some respondents contributed the data that related to the issue of community membership with their responses to Q13 and Q14. English use was regarded as an identity marker of international group membership. English was considered as helpful for Chinese speakers to move on in the process of 'globalization'(全球化，国际化，走向世界), the 'integration' (融合，融入，接轨) into or becoming members of the 'global family' (国际大家庭) or 'global village' (地球村). For example,

> 1) Chinese economy will be integrated into the world economy. It won't close itself off. To some extent, the ability of speaking English will show that you are an international person, well-educated, etc. …
>
> 2) If hoping to become an international citizen, you should master this lingua franca.
>
> 3) (English is) a tool for information exchange in globalization and for

> integration (into the global community).

4) As <u>a member of the international family</u>, (we) need the competence to <u>get integrated with the most part of the globe</u>. Popularizing communicative competence in English will greatly promote the mutual understanding <u>between us and the outside world</u>.

In examples 1) and 2), 'international person' and 'international citizen' well revealed the respondents' awareness of global community membership. In examples 3) and 4), awareness of a global community was revealed, with the view of the use of English as a way of obtaining global membership or, in other words, projecting the group member identity in the global community. The phrase 'a member of the international family' in the second example implies the projection of group identity shared by L1 Chinese speakers and non-L1 Chinese speakers from outside China. On the other hand, the phrase 'between us and the outside world' indicated the projection of a group identity shared by L1 Chinese speakers but distinguished L1 Chinese speakers from non-L1 Chinese speakers. It is interpretable from the two examples that the Chinese speakers formed a sub-community in the bigger community. This contributed to the construct of multi-level identity in the respondents' view of English use.

While English was considered by some respondents as an identity marker of global community membership, no evidence was found in the responses to reveal the association between English use and NES community membership. This finding was echoed in the interview data which provided an in-depth insight into the participants' perceptions of English.

Comparing the responses to Q13 and to Q14, I found more cases relating to the awareness of community in responses to Q14. The analysis was conducted with Nvivo 8.0. 35 out of 769 cases were found to relate to the awareness of community in terms of Q13, whereas 53 out of 769 cases were found to relate to the awareness of community in terms of Q14. That is to say, more respondents showed the awareness of community when they predicted the future of English for Chinese speakers. In this sense, the respondents predicted a stronger sense of community membership in Chinese speakers' use of English.

130

4.3.2. Perceptions of Chinese speakers' English

4.3.2.1. Understanding the construct of 'Chinglish' and 'China English' (Q15, Q16 and Q17)

In WE studies, the terms 'Chinglish' and 'China English' are often used to distinguish less proficient users of English and proficient users of English, based on the argument that Chinese speakers have their English which deserves legitimation (e.g. Hu 2004). Both constructs deal with the English that reveals L1 Chinese transfer. Table 4.24 gives an idea of whether the respondents had heard of the two terms before (Q15 and 16). Nonetheless, the respondents might or might not have an idea of the difference between the two terms used by WE researchers. The purpose of asking Q17 was to get an idea of how the respondents thought of the English related to L1 Chinese transfer. For this purpose, I paid more attention to the responses dealing with L1 Chinese transfer than other responses.

Table 4.24: Familiarity with the terms 'Chinglish' and 'China English'.

		Have you ever heard of the term *China English*?		Total
		yes	no	
Have you ever heard of the term *Chinglish*?	yes	362	184	546
	no	181	42	223
Total		543	226	769

Three codes were developed during the process of analysing the responses. Firstly, some responses related to the criticism of L1 Chinese transfer. In response to Q17, the respondents paralleled L1 Chinese transfer with negatively-loaded descriptions. They perceived Chinese speakers' English as localized, Chinese styled, and representing a Chinese way of thinking. However, it seemed that the respondents regarded Chinese speakers' English as 'Chinese' featured and simultaneously considered this as bad. It is interpretable that they viewed the English used by Chinese speakers as the marker of their membership in the group of people who had L1 Chinese background, but they were negative towards the English used by Chinese speakers.

Here are some examples in which L1 Chinese transfer and negative description were collocated. I have underlined the sections where relevant:

> The terms describe <u>English localization</u> (in China), which resulted from the <u>lack</u> of emphasis on pronunciation and the 'let-it-be' practice during the learning process […].

Chinese learners' model of English education <u>should be improved</u>. Many people only know how to cope with examinations but fail to speak English. Even if they speak, they <u>can only speak the English that is so easily to be recognized as Chinese styled English</u>.

(The two terms conceptualize) <u>Sinocized</u> English, (which is) <u>disqualified</u> English.

(The two terms conceptualize) a kind of English <u>representing Chinese way of thinking and featuring Chinese accent</u>, (that is,) <u>unintelligible</u> English.

Secondly, some respondents expressed positive attitudes towards L1 Chinese influenced English and argued for the legitimation of such English. Many of the respondents in this group justified their endorsements for the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English. It is possible to see from their responses the concern for Chinese speakers' linguistic right, the belief of language change and development, the reflection on the adherence to authentic English, the focus on the communicative function of English, the belief of language appropriation and flexibility, and the awareness of culture and identity in English use. Here are some examples. In each example, I have underlined words or strings that helped to interpret the reasons for their arguments:

Linguistic right

I think <u>Chinese people should have our own English and our own norms</u>.

Belief of language change

People from any nations would have some difficulties in learning an additional language and inevitably be influenced by their first language. I think <u>language involves development.</u> As long as the language is intelligible, the language is acceptable. It is unnecessary to emphasize the authenticity and the standardization.

Belief of language as flexible and focus on communication

The terms describe a kind of English with Chinese characteristics, which I think can be developed. Language itself involves integration and <u>flexibility</u>. <u>Communication comes first</u>.

Chinese cultural identity in English

Chinese language has its history for over two thousand years. What is associated with this language is its culture. <u>For English to be developed into a real "world language", I find it helpful to incorporate sort of Chinese way of using language.</u>

Thirdly, some respondents acknowledged the value of L1 Chinese transfer but simultaneously they expressed their conservative views of accepting the L1 Chinese-influenced English. For instance:

> Chinglish represents Chinese speakers' sense of humour. For this reason, I often collect such use of English for the purpose of fun. However, I will avoid such use of English in the encounter with foreigners. I have never heard of China English. The possible reason is that Chinese speakers' English is not systematic in that English is not popularized in China. China English describes the use of English in Chinese style. This kind of English seems not to have been accepted by foreigners and remains to be alien.

This respondent indicated his acknowledgement of L1 Chinese identity in L1 Chinese-influenced English, as seen in the sections that have been underlined. At the same time, he was conservative in using the English that revealed L1 Chinese transfer. The reason he gave was that L1 Chinese influenced English was not legitimized. His attitude appeared to be complex by comparing with those who simply criticized or argued for L1 Chinese-influenced English.

This group of respondents like the above respondent appeared to be hesitant. They seemed not to object to the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English. Nonetheless, they would not like to be the pioneers of using Chinese speakers' own English if they could choose.

4.3.2.2. Labelling Chinese speakers' English (Q19 and Q20)

Kachru (1986) considers 'self-labelling' tasks as a useful measure of NNESs' attitudes towards their own English. In his investigation of Indian users' attitudes towards Indian English, he found 55.64% of his research participants labelled their own English as 'Indian English'. As Kachru (1986: 23) notes:

> It is generally believed that only a generation ago the gap between linguistic behaviour and perceived norm, was much wider. At that time, one would have hesitated to label one's own English "Indian," but by 1976 the picture was different, and it is still changing.

He therefore concludes that such a high percentage (55.64%) suggests the change in Indian users' attitudes towards their own English and a move forward to Indian English as an endonormative model. Following Kachru (1986), I used similar measures to test my research participants' attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English, with Q19

asking respondents to self-label their (i.e. the respondents') own English and Q20 asking them to label the English used by Chinese speakers in general. The results are shown in tables 4.25 and 4.26.

Table 4.25: 'self-labelling' of the English used by the respondents themselves

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Chinese speakers' English	501	65.1	65.1	65.1
	NSE	114	14.8	14.8	80.0
	non-native-like English	12	1.6	1.6	81.5
	Other NNSE	2	.3	.3	81.8
	hard to say	140	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	769	100.0	100.0	

Table 4. 26: 'self-labelling' of the English used by Chinese speakers in general

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Chinese speakers' English	522	67.9	67.9	67.9
	NSE	126	16.4	16.4	84.3
	non-native-like English	3	.4	.4	84.7
	hard to say	118	15.3	15.3	100.0
	Total	769	100.0	100.0	

The figures show that the respondents had a stronger sense of their own English (65.1% individually and 67.9% collectively) than Indian users of English (55.64%) at the time of Kachru's (1986) investigation. In addition, over 30% of Kachru's research participants labelled their own English as NSE. By contrast, only around 15% of my research participants self-labelled their own English and the English used by Chinese speakers in general as NSE. That is to say, fewer participants were considering their English as NES-like. Recognition of own English is considered by Kachru (1986) as a process through which L2 users of English move towards the acceptance of their own English as legitimate (see pp.10 above). In light of these, the respondents seemed to be more advanced in recognizing their own English as legitimate.

4.3.2.3.   Ideas of Chinese speakers' English (Q21)

With the respondents' comments on Chinese speakers' English, two themes attracted my attention. One was whether the respondents gave priority to the form or the function of English. The other was whether the respondents looked for NSE norms for their reference.

1) Form vs. function

Many respondents made comments on different dimensions of the form of English, for example, pronunciation, lexis, syntax and style. The comments on the form of Chinese speakers' English were likely to be negative. Interestingly, pronunciation appeared to be a dimension that attracted the most comments among different dimensions of the form of English. This echoes Jenkins's (2007) finding that pronunciation is the most salient aspect attracting language attitudes. Here are some examples of the comments on the form of Chinese speakers' English.

Pronunciation

> In pronunciation in particular, (Chinese speakers' English) is different from both British English and American English, with different local accents to different extent.

> Those who had experience of studying abroad or living abroad speak quite authentic English. Except them, other Chinese speakers speak English with Chinese tone and intonation, and some even with local accents. Their English doesn't sound pleasant. But in comparison with Japanese and Korean speakers, Chinese speakers' English sounds more pleasant.

> (Chinese speakers' English) doesn't sound comfortable, with rigid intonations and tones.

> Pronunciation is not very correct.

Syntax

> (Chinese speakers) don't have many opportunities of communicating in English in real life. (Their English) is Chinese English. (Chinese speakers are) rigid with grammar. (Their English is) not very authentic.

> (Chinese speakers' English) is comprehensible, with correct grammar. But it might not agree with native speakers' way of speaking.

> Many people have been influenced by English movies and American soap operas (in their use of English). Secondly, Chinese speakers' English is not grammatically authentic. These must be the problems with any uses of English who have no experience of living abroad.

Lexis

> (Chinese speakers') pronunciation is with village accents, while their use of lexis is too bookish.

> Lexical use is not very appropriate, in messy order when forming sentences.

> (Chinese speakers') pronunciation is not standard. (Their English) doesn't flow. (Their) vocabulary is very small.

Style

> (Chinese speakers' spoken) English is very much like written language.

> Chinese speak English by following Chinese way of thinking. They have little understanding of native English speakers' cultures and ways of thinking. Chinese speakers speak English in the way that they do translations. They speak little English and their English is not fluent.

> Chinese speakers' so-called English doesn't sound as natural as foreigners. Their intonations easily tell others they are Chinese.

By contrast, a few respondents made comments with the focus on the function of Chinese speakers' English. They showed awareness that Chinese speakers' English was not native-like and used a few negatively loaded words to describe Chinese speakers' English in terms of forms. However, they indicated their focus on the communicative function of Chinese speakers' English. For example:

> (Chinese speakers) have their purpose of communicating ideas and (their English) is very practical.

> (Chinese speakers) use simplest words to express different ideas. Their English can be considered as practical.

> (Chinese speakers') pronunciation is not very pure. But their English is practical and communicative.

Interestingly, the respondents who made positive comments on the communicative function of Chinese speakers' English were generally from the group of respondents with professional backgrounds. By contrast, students were unlikely to make positive comments on the communicative function of Chinese speakers' English. In terms of form, however, the respondents from either the student or professional backgrounds made some comments. Further investigation is needed, in order to find out why the professionals and the students had different and similar points of focus.

2) NSE norms as the reference or not

It is necessary to find out whether the respondents used NES norms as the reference points in order to make sense of their comments. That is to say, difference should be made between the positive attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English based on NES norms and the positive attitudes towards the English in terms of Chinese speakers' own needs of using English. For example:

136

Chinese speakers' English can be rated with different grades. Some Chinese speakers are like foreign children who have just learned to speak, while others are like native speakers (of English). Chinese speakers' English is quite acceptable in general terms. As I am a Chinese after all, I prefer foreigners' English.

Chinese hosts of English programs generally speak quite authentic English, with standard pronunciation and fluency.

In these two examples, the respondents took Chinese speakers' English as acceptable. However, the context suggests that their points of reference were exonormative English. Thus, their attitudes cannot be simply interpreted as positive towards Chinese speakers' English as the English independent from exonormative norms. Many a participant held a similar stance. By contrast, a few participants were found to view Chinese speakers' English as autonomous and indicated their positive attitudes. For example:

(Chinese speakers) follow Chinese way of thinking. Although the English does not sound like authentic English, it is acceptable.

In this example, Chinese speakers' English is accepted as different from 'authentic English'. The respondent not only explicitly indicated his acceptance of Chinese speakers' English being not like NSE, but also saw the influence of Chinese culture background on Chinese speakers' English.

4.3.2.4. Attitudes towards Chinese ELT practitioners' English (Q23)

The respondents had favourable attitudes towards Chinese ELT practitioners' English. As table 4.26 shows, Chinese ELT practitioners scored high by the respondents generally in terms of their intelligibility (mean = 4.14, Std. deviation= 0.89) and their pleasantness (mean=3.70, Std. deviation=1.10).

Table 4.26: Means for the evaluation of Chinese ELT practitioners

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1) Sounding comfortable.	769	0	5	3.70	1.101
2) Intelligible.	769	0	5	4.14	.888
3) Similar to the accent of British or American speakers of English.	769	0	5	2.68	1.186

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
4) I prefer the said Chinese teacher than teachers from native English speaking countries, if I were to choose my teacher of English.	769	0	5	2.64	1.626
Valid N (listwise)	769				

An interesting gap was found between their favourable evaluation of Chinese ELT practitioners' English and their judgement of their English as NES-like accented (mean=2.68, Std. deviation=1.19). This suggests that at least some respondents did not equate 'comfortable' English with NES-accented English.

In order to check the possible correlation between 'sounding comfortable' and being NES-accented, a bivariate test was conducted (see table 4.27, pp.289). Significant correlation was found to exist between the English 'sounding comfortable' and NES-accented English, Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.534, $p < 0.05$. In light of this, the respondents generally had a bias for NES-accented English to a moderate extent.

Subsequently, a bivariate test was conducted to test the possible effect of the said bias on the preference for Chinese ELT practitioners (see table 4.28, pp.290). Significantly, whether a Chinese ELT practitioner had near-NES accent had a small effect on a vote for him/her as a preferred ELT practitioner, Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.326, $p < 0.05$. It is therefore interpretable that near-NES accent was considered as a minor factor in the preference for teachers.

4.3.2.5. Anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English (Q22)

The mean score for the statement about the anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English as alternative to NSE was 2.90 (see table 4.29). In this sense, the respondents were generally in favour of the idea that Chinese speakers had their own English as an alternative to NSE, although in a very conservative manner.

Table 4.29: Means for anticipations for Chinese speakers' own English

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English	769	1	7	2.90	1.717
Valid N (listwise)	769				

With an independent-samples t-test, the anticipations for Chinese speakers' own English were compared between student respondents and professional counterparts (see table 4.33, pp.140). The two groups were different in terms of their anticipations for Chinese speakers' own English ($p < 0.05$). The effect size (eta squared[41]) is calculated to be 0.017 (see the formula for calculation on pp.120 above). The value suggested a very small effect size, indicating that even though the difference is significant between the two groups, the magnitude is nearly negligible. In this sense, the value suggests that student and professional respondents did not have differences in their anticipations for Chinese speakers' own English.

Following a similar procedure (t-test and ANOVA), no other independent variables (i.e. age, gender, major, and education background) were found to have an effect on the anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English.

The anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English can be viewed as the tendency to undermine the mainstream EFL perspective that NSE was undoubtedly the goal for NNESs including Chinese speakers and learners of English. This motivated my inquiry into whether the anticipation had any correlations with the importance attached to approximating NSE and with the attitude towards difference from NSE.

A very weak correlation was found to exist between the respondents' anticipations for Chinese speakers' own English (Q22) and their attitudes towards difference from NSE (Q25) (Pearson correlation=0.198, p<0.05) (see table 4.31, pp.291). That means, the respondents' anticipations for Chinese speakers' own English had nearly no relation to their attitudes towards the English that was different from NSE. To put it differently, the anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English and the acceptability of difference from NSE were two nearly irrelevant things in the respondents' views.

No significant correlation was found between the anticipations and the importance attached to the approximation to NSE (Q23) (p>0.05) (see table 4. 32, pp.291). This suggested that the anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English and the importance attached to the approximation to NSE were irrelevant to each other from the respondents' perspective.

---

[41] According to Dörnyei (2007), a commonly accepted interpretation of eta squared is that 0.01=small effect, 0.06=moderate effect, and 0.14=large effect.

Given this, the anticipation for Chinese speakers' own English seemed not to feed into the respondents' judgements of the importance of NSE and their evaluations of difference from NSE. A possible interpretation is that the respondents anticipated Chinese speakers' own English to coexist with NSE rather than take place of NSE for Chinese speakers. Another possible interpretation is that the respondents anticipated an English labelled as Chinese speakers' own English but did not challenge NSE norms. Interviews were needed in order to find out how the respondents treated Chinese speakers' own English in relation to NSE.

4.3.3. Perceptions of the importance of approximating NSE

Q23 was designed to investigate how much importance respondents attached to the approximation to NSE[42]. The mean score for the importance of the approximation to NSE was 3.13 (see table 4.33) and thus suggests that the respondents generally considered the approximation to NSE as rather important.

Table 4.33: Mean for the attitudes towards the approximation to NSE.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Approximation to NSE	769	.00	5.00	3.1278	1.00301
Valid N (listwise)	769				

I tested the possible correlation between the aspiration for NSE and the importance attached to the approximation to NSE, using one-way ANOVA (see table 4.34, pp.292). Significant difference was found among different groups based on the choice between Chinese speakers' English and NSE, F= 19.95, p<0.05, though the effect was moderate, given eta squared = 0.05. That is, the respondents who desired NSE attached more importance to the approximation to NSE than those who desired Chinese speakers' own English. The moderate importance attached to the approximation to NSE interestingly contrasts with the widespread aspiration for NSE (see pp.125-126 above). That is, while the respondents generally desired NSE, the approximation to NSE was not considered as important in a considerable manner. This motivated the exploration of possible reasons behind the gap and led to the question: what did the respondents expect for

---

42 With the Likert scales used for Q23, score 5 meant 'very important' and score 0 meant 'not important at all'.

NSE? These deserved further investigation, which was realised via the in-depth interviews.

4.3.4. Perceptions of difference from NSE

4.3.4.1. Evaluating the acceptability of difference from NSE (Q25)

The mean for the evaluation of difference from NSE in terms of their acceptability was 2.52 (see table 4.35). While score 5 meant 'completely acceptable', score 0 meant 'completely unacceptable'. This mean thus indicates that the respondents were generally neutral towards the English that was different from NSE.

Table 4.35: Means for the evaluation of the acceptability of difference from NSE

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The acceptability of difference from NSE	769	.00	5.00	2.5185	1.01915
Valid N (listwise)	769				

Significantly, the evaluation of the English that was different from NSE had a very weak correlation (Pearson correlation coefficient=0.202, $p<0.05$) with the importance attached to the approximation to NSE. In light of this, the importance attached to the approximation to NSE did not necessarily point to the bias over difference from NSE. This seemed to suggest that NSE norms were not necessarily a factor that was taken into account when the respondents evaluated differences from NSE.

4.3.4.2. Justifying the evaluations (Q26)

The respondents' explanations of how they evaluated the examples of differences from NSE in Q25 contributed to three factors that seemed to influence their attitudes towards differences from NSE: NSE norms, communicative function, and L1 Chinese identity. Here are some examples.

NSE norms

1) What we can do is to try our best to learn it well and to change our way of thinking (in order to acquire it). In terms of English itself, however, we cannot change anything. We have to learn (English as) other's first language. This is just like what happens to learners of Chinese from other L1 countries […]

2) The expressions with erroneous use of tense are not acceptable. The expressions literally translated from Chinese and conveying ideas well are acceptable. The misuse of countable and uncountable nouns is not acceptable as this will affect the use of the words following up.

In example (1), the focus on NSE norms was revealed in the respondent's emphasis on the conformity to NSE. In example (2), NSE norms were explicitly referred to.

Communicative function

3) It is fair enough that we use English to communicate our ideas well. It is unnecessary to conform to given norms or follow foreigners' way.

4) When the above expressions have become the expressions known to everybody, we don't need to judge them according to the established norms. As long as most people know their meaning, they can be accepted and popularized.

In example (3), the concern for the communicative function was obvious. In example (4), intelligibility was viewed as a priority criterion for the acceptability of certain uses of English.

L1 Chinese identity

I used the term L1 Chinese identity to describe the identity that was projected to show the membership of the L1 Chinese community that was shared by Chinese speakers of English. According to Wenger's (1998) conception of 'community of practice', three dimensions of community include shared repertoire, joint practice, and mutual engagement. Bearing this in mind, I coded some data for L1 Chinese identity. For instance:

5) The expressions commonly used by Chinese speakers but not found in Western culture are completely acceptable for me. For example, good good study, day day up; people mountain people sea.

6) Some expressions of Chinese idioms and slangs (in English) don't conform to English grammar, but they do make you feel familiar, comfortable and pleased.

In example (5), the respondent showed her awareness that some expressions were distinctive from NSE, given their Chinese background. She vigorously indicated her acceptance for the English originated in Chinese culture. In example (6), the respondent viewed the NNES-like way of using English by Chinese speakers as a trigger of

142

solidarity in the L1 Chinese group of ELF users.

The above examples (1-6) illustrate the three factors individually. Unlike these respondents, many other respondents seemed to have more than one concern. That is, their responses seemed to suggest that they were weighing up different factors in their minds.

A group of respondents considered the acceptability of the instances of difference from NSE as context dependent. The respondents were likely to provide a set of binary opposites, for example, spoken English and written English, informal and formal situations, and private and public occasions. That is to say, while variability in English was seen as acceptable in certain contexts, for example, spoken English, informal situation or private occasion, variations were seen as unacceptable in other contexts, for example, written English, formal situation and public occasions.

> I can accept grammatical errors in spoken English as long as the intelligibility is achieved. Sticking to grammar is unnecessary, as long as meaning can be conveyed. In written English, however, we should still conform to grammatical rules, which are fundamental (to the use of English)

Apparently, the respondent had a set of double standards. While intelligibility was considered as sufficient in spoken English, the conformity to 'grammatical rules' was claimed as 'fundamental' without being given any further explanation. That is to say, the conformity to NES norms appeared to be a golden rule in written English, whereas variations in spoken English is acceptable. The double standard can be interpreted as the respondent's sophisticated treatment of English regarding appropriate forms in different contexts. It might deserve further inquiry into the influences on the judgement of the appropriateness.

Another group of respondents viewed NSE norms as necessary for the communicative function. That is, the function of English could only be realized when the form is 'correct'. For example,

> The use of English is for the purpose of communicating with people. This requires unambiguous expression of our ideas. If grammar is not followed, firstly, it is impossible to clearly convey meaning, and secondly, the result will be the speaker projecting himself as a careless person. Therefore, only (the use of English) strictly conforming to grammar rules can be accepted.

In this example, the communicative function of English is highlighted and the strict

adherence to NES norms is emphasized. A considerable number of participants held such a view. The data thus highlighted the issue of the intelligibility of NNSE in the debate between SLA researchers and ELF researchers (Jenkins 2000). While ELF research has strongly established that the association between 'correct' form and intelligibility is a misconception (Jenkins 2006b), the view emerging in this study possibly suggested some respondents' lack of awareness that ELF communication was fluid and involved accommodation strategies (Jenkins 2009a).

4.4. Discussion

The questionnaire study helped to answer some of my research questions at a preliminary level. In what follows, I shall make an effort to examine how far the questionnaire study helped me with my research questions.

The target English model continued to be NSE among many respondents. NSE was voted as the most desirable kind of English, whereas Chinese speakers' own English was associated with negative viewsby most respondents. The approximation to NSE was viewed as a reference point of English proficiency by most respondents and the conformity to NSE was highlighted. Chinese ELT practitioners attracted positive comments. Some respondents showed their preference for NES teachers, whereas a few respondents voted for Chinese ELT professionals (M=2.64, SD= 1.626) (see table 4.36). Teachers' ability to speak near-NSE was found to have a moderate effect on the respondents' choice of ELT practitioners. Given the mainstream ELT practice based on SLA research, the said findings are not surprising.

However, some findings conflicted with each other and therefore were interesting. In one way, the aspiration for NSE was widespread. In another way, the approximation to NSE was not generally considered as necessary. Such a conflict motivated me to think what the respondents expected for NSE. It was possible that the respondents were 'accustomed' to the target variety of English being set as NSE, in that NSE as an advantageous language has well been accepted (Kachru 1986), while other speakers' Englishes are still under research. In the current questionnaire study, some respondents did view NSE as an advantageous variety of English. Some respondents also expressed the idea that they would accept Chinese speakers' English once it had become well-established. On the other hand, the challenge to the conformity to NSE was echoed in the responses to open-ended questions. While the conformity to NSE was highlighted

144

by some respondents, other respondents argued for the preference for the communicative purpose over the form correctness. Still other respondents argued that 'incorrect' use of English by Chinese speakers gave a sense of solidarity among Chinese speakers of English. In light of this, while NSE was undoubtedly accepted as the target variety of English, the respondents seemed to have critical thinking about the conformity to NSE norms. This was thus relevant to ELF research, as possibly a knowledge of the ELF concept might change the view of NSE as target language for any L2 users/learners. In another way, if the status of NSE as advantageous varieties is changed, the aspiration for NSE might change accordingly.

The majority of the respondents labelled their own English as L1 Chinese identity-marking English. It might be more meaningful that the majority labelled the English used by Chinese speakers in general as L1 Chinese identity-marking English. That is to say, the group of Chinese speakers had shared L1 Chinese identity in their use of English from their viewpoints. This is particularly evident if we compare their answers to those who labelled the English used by Chinese speakers as British English or American English. However, it is necessary to understand what the respondents thought about L1 Chinese identity, in particular, whether the respondents felt happy or unhappy about such an identity. Responses to open-ended questions suggested that some respondents were positive towards L1 Chinese identity, while others were negative. With interview data, it is possible to understand what beliefs were behind the attitudes towards L1 Chinese identity and thus have an idea of possible change for Chinese speakers' English in the future.

Schneider (2003, 2007) has a model of the development of NNSE varieties. In his model, NNESs firstly aligned themselves with NSs and then aligned themselves with each other before the emergence of NNES varieties. He maps different cases into different stages of the model. That is, while some cases are more advanced towards the emergence of NNSE varieties, other cases are less advanced. Following his approach, I could map the respondents' reactions to their own English, both in labelling tasks and freely made comments, into his model. The respondents who viewed their own English or Chinese speakers' English as near-NSE can be considered as reluctant to align with other Chinese speakers. On the other hand, the respondents who labelled Chinese speakers' English with L1 Chinese identity marker can be considered as aware of the group of L1 Chinese speakers of English, either happy or unhappy. In this sense, the

respondents' reactions reflected the dynamics of an attitudinal profile. With further investigation into the beliefs behind different views of L1 Chinese identity, it is possible to have a better idea of the dynamic and predict the development of Chinese speakers' own English.

In researching Nigerian users' attitudes towards their own English, Bamgboṣe (1998) points out that non-native speakers struggle between two sets of norms. On the one hand, NES norms are accepted by NNESs as the default point of reference and thus NNSs have their concern for the conformity to NES norms. On the other hand, NNESs have their own needs of using English to express their culture, project their identities, and communicate. Given NNESs' own use of English for their own purposes in tension with the conformity to NES norms, the push-pull between the two sets of norms is revealed in NNSs' perceptions of English and their own English. The questionnaire study echoed Bamgboṣe's discussion. In particular, in the responses to three open-ended questions of attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English and 'incorrect' English in a broad sense, the respondents were found to have three factors to consider when they evaluated the acceptability of Chinese speakers' English both in terms of the conception and specific instances of 'incorrect' English.

4.5. Conclusion

The questionnaire survey presented a broad picture of the attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English at the preliminary level. Along with the widespread negative attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English, opinions were evidently undermining the traditional bias on Chinese speakers' English as inferior to near-NSE or NSE. The emerging awareness of global community, recognition of Chinese speakers' English identity, emphasis on communicative purposes, and the questioning of NES norms as the traditional benchmark suggest that a few participant, although not many, are starting to reconsider their English as legitimate in its own right. The overwhelming wish for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English and the widespread negative attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English urge us to ponder on possible reasons behind the gap.

Three factors were found to come into play in the respondents' attitudes. In particular, the concerns for communicative function, identity and the conformity to NSE forms. With different weight given to different factors, the respondents were found to take a

146

different stance in evaluating Chinese speakers' English. An ensuing question is what reasons might exist to influence the respondents' decisions among their concerns for pragmatics, identity and the conformity to NSE forms? This is directly related to RQ 3. Answers will be found in the following chapter, with the analysis of the in-depth interviews which were done in order to find out the underlying beliefs that research participants had and that contributed to their articulated attitudes.

Chapter 5 Attitudes and beliefs revealed in the interviews

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents and discusses results from the interviews. Beginning with a description of the interview participants, this chapter provides details of the procedure of the interview study. Thematic framework development is explicated. Results are presented in terms of coding categories and the patterns established among different codes. Further, discussion is conducted with the aim of interpreting the results retrieved from the interview data and seeking answers to RQs 1, 2, and 3.

5.2. Procedure

5.2.1. Participants

The interview participants numbered 35. They were purposively selected from among the questionnaire respondents to show different profiles and their willingness to take part was consulted. Their biographical data and the information of their experience of contacting English are presented in detail in Appendix 9 (see pp.299-302). For the sake of research ethics, codes are used to keep the participants anonymous.

The interview participants used ELF with a range of frequency and exposure, dealing with interlocutors from a range of L1 linguistic backgrounds. This contributed to the quality of the interview data in that the participants were not limited to a specific group of Chinese users of English, for example, those who mainly used English for the purpose of examination, or those who used ELF every day to communicate with their business partners from different L1 linguistic backgrounds. The participants can be considered as representative of most Chinese users of English who use ELF with a range of proficiency and a range of frequency.

5.2.2. Transcription and translation

As Ritchie and Spencer (2003) point out, becoming familiar with data is important before drawing themes. To meet this purpose, I decided to transcribe interviews by myself. Due to time constraints, fifteen interviews were transcribed in full, while twenty interviews were partially transcribed. Before transcription, all audio files were listened to a few times and notes were taken. I obtained a general sense that some interviews

included larger amount of relevant information than others. I therefore selected the fifteen interviews among others for full transcription. The coding and analysis of the fifteen interviews were conducted before I turned to the remaining twenty interviews. I listened to the twenty interviews again and paid particular attention to identify the information related to the themes that were drawn in the first fifteen interviews. Attention was also paid to check whether new themes could be identified in the remaining twenty interviews. No new theme was exclusively found in these twenty interviews. However, three themes became salient when I had checked the twenty interviews, including the view of Chinese speakers' English as practically communicative, the belief in the need for standard and the concern for social expectation. Subsequently, I listened to the first fifteen interviews again and found data to match the three themes, which had not been highlighted before I checked the rest twenty interviews.

I chose to transcribe the parts that were shown to be closely linked with my research questions. However, this was not a linear process. When I went through the twenty interviews, I constantly made reflections on the themes and revised my thematic development with the added data. Therefore, the transcription itself was a part of data analysis and took the shape of a spiral process.

I referred to the transcription conventions adopted in the VOICE project and Jenkins (2007). I made a small adaption according to my own research focus and the context of my study. Jenkins (2007) is devoted to the prosodic features of speech made by her research participants, holding that prosodic features entail contextual information to boost the understanding of speakers' utterance. Following her, I paid attention to prosodic features of my research participants' speech. I shall use laughter to illustrate. At times, the participants laughed while they were talking and gave the feeling that they were shy indicating some seemingly unexpected ideas. For example, the idea that Chinese will be the top language if China is powerful enough. The laughter thus can be interpreted as the speaker's reflection on his/her own articulation. In the given example, the participant realized that the idea he expressed was not socially acceptable. I interpreted the laughter as the participant's awareness instead of his attempt to distance himself from the articulation, in light of my observation that the participants were quite supportive to the study and friendly to me. More importantly, the participant talked about his awareness of NSE-oriented social expectation in the same interview. Thus, my

interpretation was confirmed. Undoubtedly, prosodic features helped me to think twice about the articulations made by the participants and searched for possible consistency or conflicts in the wider textual context of the whole interviews.

Mostly, however, the unsaid messages revealed via prosodic features were confirmed by the participants themselves as the conversations progressed. I therefore drew on the participants' articulations rather than prosodic features in order to present the participants' ideas with their own voices. To avoid redundancy, I decided to focus on the articulations and leave prosodic features as complementary where necessary. For this reason, laughter, overlapping, interruption and pauses among other prosodic features were considered but not given as much weight as the articulations in discussion.

In the VOICE project and Jenkins (2007), emphasis on words and intonation are considered in order to understand how their research participants communicate meaning and what attitude can be inferred. In the current study, interview participants clearly expressed their ideas. Where necessary, the researcher asked for their clarifications. The participants were friendly, cooperative and willing to talk about their opinions. Their attitudes were articulated directly and they were likely to further explain their reasons behind their attitudes. On the other hand, the interview participants mostly listened quietly and talked in calm and soft voices, although laughter was heard all the time. This increased the challenge of capturing many participants' intonation and stress. To put it differently, while I found easy to capture a few participants' intonation and stress in their articulation, I felt very difficult to judge many other participants' intonation and stress. For the sake of consistency and reliability of analysis, I did not transcribe intonation and stress in my data. While intonation and stress were not examined as to how they revealed the participants' attitudes, the participants' explanations offered interesting insight into their attitudes and allowed the understanding of their articulation of their attitudes. One important part of transcription was the assumption of words that were unsaid. Chinese is different from English in a particular way that a subject was not needed in Chinese.

Given the reasons I discussed above, I transcribed the interview data following the listed conventions, as seen in table 5.1.

Table 5. 1:Transcription conventions for interviews (adapted from Jenkins 2007 and VOICE website)

R	Researcher
SAB, SHC, SXY, etc.	Participants who were selected from students
PAB, PHC, PXY, etc	Participants who were selected from professionals
[	Overlapping speech starts
@	Laughter
Full stop.	To indicate termination
[…]	Author's gaps
(.)	Pause of less than a second
(3)	Approximate length of pause in seconds
<SOFT> text</SOFT>	Other modes of speaking
CAPITAL	In a louder voice
(Chinese speakers' English)	Guess the words in contexts
[author's commentary]	Author's commentary
Hyphen-	Interruption, the beginning of interrupter's turn
Utter-	Abrupt cut-off, unfinished utterance

Apart from the above transcription conventions, I numbered each line in each extract with the number 1, 2, 3, … n. In order for the reader to find the lines that need particular attention, I will note the line number and the extract number within the brackets in my discussion. For instance, (1.7) refers to line 7 in extract 1, (3.1-2) means lines 1-2 in extract 3, and so on. In addition, I will highlight the words or phrases with underlining so that the reader can find the particular quotation/s in each extract that I will discuss.

The analysis was conducted with the data in its original Chinese version. The reason was to keep the data as original as possible in order for the data to be consistent for examination. Translation itself involves the translator's analysis (Widdowson 2011). A translated version would involve my analysis, which might be momentary throughout the whole research process. For this reason, translation was conducted in the process of writing up. Fortunately, Nvivo 8.0 was compatible with the Chinese version so that analysis in Chinese was applicable.

5.2.3. Thematic framework development

Thematic framework development was carried out via both concept-driven and data-driven approaches. The concept-driven approach guided me in looking for empirical evidence to fit in theoretically and conceptually based anticipations, with the aim to seek answers to the research questions. A number of preconceived codes, for instance,

L1 group identity, *near-NS identity*, *perceptions of ownership of English*, were decided before I began to study the patterns of my data, on the basis of my review of the literature (see chapter 2) and my purpose to find answers to the RQs 1, 2, and 3. As Gibbs (2007:52) suggests, the data-driven approach is important in that it draws attention to what research participants actually articulate and helps researchers to make sense of the meaning that reflects research participants' 'experience of the world'. That is to say, the data-driven approach enables researchers to avoid being limited by their 'theoretical presupposition' and see the real world (Gibbs 2007:52). In light of this, the data-driven approach was adopted in parallel with the concept-driven approach.

Thematic framework development was a spiral process as opposed to a linear one. I started with a concept-driven approach. In Nvivo 8.0, I built up a tree of nodes, mapping different constructs in relation to each other. In particular, I had five branches of nodes, i.e. 1) attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF, 2) identities in Chinese speakers' ELF, 3) underlying beliefs, 4) other possible factors contributing to attitudes and, 5) the development of attitudes and beliefs. With the framework in mind, I looked into the data. Where applicable, I mapped the data onto the categories I had in advance. Simultaneously, I paid attention to the data that did not fit in these pre-set categories, making sense of them as to how they informed me of the issues that I looked at. Some themes emerged and urged me to reconstruct the thematic framework. Then I used the updated framework to guide my data analysis. At times, I went back to the beginning of each interview and went through each interview again in order to see how some information was suitable for the updated framework.

I made six major changes to the initial coding framework. Firstly, a major change was made for the theme 'attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF'. In my preliminary analysis, I sought to understand whether Chinese speakers' English was viewed as acceptable or unacceptable and the reasons behind the opinions. The inquiry was similar to what I did with Q25 and Q26 in the questionnaire, although the purpose was to penetrate deeper into their perceptions in order to understand how the participants weighed up different factors (i.e. the conformity to NES norms, L1 Chinese identity and focus on communication) discussed in chapter 4. However, the interviews suggested that many participants used '接受' (literally translated as 'accept') to mean '容忍' (literally translated as 'tolerate'). It therefore reminded me that the acceptability of NNS Englishes in the discourse of my research participants was different from the

acceptability of NNS Englishes in the discourse of ELF research. I therefore changed the theme into whether Chinese speakers' English was viewed as intolerable, tolerable or legitimate. Accordingly, the attitudes were referred to as bias, tolerance or acceptance. With further look at the data, I revised the three codes to *bias*, *limited tolerance* and *'acceptance'* (with scare quote marks). I will discuss the meanings of the codes when I present the research results.

Apart from the said three categories, some participants hedged a lot and showed uncertainty in their attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English. I therefore added one category as *hesitation*. Unlike the participants who found it difficult to decide on their position in the discussion of Chinese speakers' ELF, a small number of participants were assertive in their own decisions but showed their willingness to change their attitudes in certain situations. Despite the small number, I added the code *change* to distinguish their attitudes.

Secondly, the participants' comments on Chinese speakers' ELF overlapped a lot with their comments on 'deviant' use of NSE. It was common that the participants referred to difference from NSE sometimes and referred to Chinese speakers' ELF sometimes. That is to say, Chinese speakers' ELF and 'deviations' of NSE seemed to be interchangeable in the participants' reactions in the interviews at times. To ensure the consistency of coding categories, I merged the data coded for 'attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF' and for 'attitudes towards difference from NSE'.

To justify my treatment, I would like to refer back to the questionnaire study. In the questionnaire, Q25 included ten examples of English that was different from NSE. Some of the examples were drawn from Xu's (2008) corpus study on Chinese speakers' use of English. Internal consistency reliability check suggests that the ten examples had high correlation. Because of this, it is interpretable that CHELF and variation from NSE were highly overlapping in the respondents' view.

Thirdly, with the investigation into the attitudes towards CHELF , an interesting theme drew my attention. Many participants voluntarily came up with the idea that CHELF was interlanguage, although they did not use the technical term interlanguage. More interestingly, some participants used seemingly negative words to describe CHELF but also expressed their acknowledgements of the function of CHELF in terms of communication and identity projection, which I interpreted as positive views of CHELF

154

as successful performance. I shall discuss this with data later. This part of the data complemented their intolerance/acceptance of Chinese speakers' ELF. In light of this, I added the code *interlanguage vs. successful performance*.

Fourthly, I had two pre-set codes for the theme identities in Chinese speakers' English, i.e. *ENL learner* and *ELF user*. During the examination of the interview data, I found that a few participants expressed their happiness in their own English because they thought their English was near-NSE. Necessarily, if the participants viewed themselves as learners of the English that belonged to them, this would differentiate from the situation in which the participants viewed themselves as learners of NSE. This would suggest whether the participants were looking forward to endonormative or exonormative English. I therefore added a code *ELF learner*.

Fifthly, regarding the theme *underlying beliefs* in my initial plan of analysis, I had my focus on the beliefs either related to the EFL perspective or the ELF perspective, with my interest in a few dichotomies that distinguished the EFL perspective from the ELF perspective. For instance, form vs. function, English vs. Englishes. For the ease of discussion, I reframed the two beliefs, i.e. the EFL and ELF perspectives, into five codes describing the beliefs *of target language*, *ownership of English*, *NNES conformity vs. NNES creativity*, *English vs. Englishes*, and *fixity and fluidity*. Apart from these, I had a code for *beliefs about first language*. As Widdowson (2003) points out, L2 English users' ideology related to their L1s might feed into their attitudes and beliefs of their use of English.

Sixthly, I refined the theme *other possible factors*. In my preliminary analysis, I was anticipating other possible factors apart from underlying beliefs. The examination of the data confirmed my initial expectation. The interview data revealed that the participants had great concern for some issues which seemed not very relevant to their beliefs. For example, some participants expressed their belief in language change but indicated their concerns for examinations of employers' expectations. This part of the data suggested that, in addition to beliefs of English and of L1, the participants were constrained by other factors which could be traced to the wider social context. I therefore revised specified that the theme dealt with *contextual factors*.

Apart from the above revisions, changes and modifications were made in all different levels of the codes. The reconstruction and revision of thematic framework were

constant throughout the data analysis, with both the context-driven approach and the data-driven approach. The finalized framework of analysis is presented in table 5.2 (with the codes numbered according to the numbers used for section 5.3).

Table 5.2: Coding frame for interviews

5.3.1   Attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF
5.3.1.1   Attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF
     1) Bias
     2) Limited tolerance
     3) 'Acceptance'
     4) Hesitation
     5) change
5.3.1.2   Perceptions of Chinese speakers' English
     1) Interlanguage
     2) successful language

5.3.2   Identities in Chinese speakers' ELF
5.3.2.1   Learner vs. user
     1) Learner of NSE
     2) ELF user
     3) ELF learner
5.3.2.2   L1 Chinese identity vs. near-NES identity
5.3.2.3   CHELF community membership

5.3.3   Beliefs 5.3.3.1   Target language: ENL or ELF 5.3.3.2   NES ownership vs. global ownership 5.3.3.3   NNES Conformity vs. NNES creativity 5.3.3.4   English vs. Englishes 5.3.3.5   Fixity vs. fluidity 5.3.3.6   Beliefs related to first language
5.3.4   Contextual factors 5.3.4.1   Gatekeeping practice 5.3.4.2   Education 5.3.4.3   ELF experience 5.3.4.4   Socio-economic changes

5.2.4. Analysis

The data analysis started with the transcription through the development of the thematic framework. The paramount part of analysis was data interpretation. I looked at not only what the participants said, but also how they said it. Contexts were important to take into account. The gap between the lay persons' understanding and the researchers' understanding, for example, of China English and Chinese speakers' English, was considered. With the coded data, I used the 'coding stripe' command in Nvivo 8.0 to examine the codes that each participant had. It was therefore possible to capture each

156

participant's interview in codes. In turn, it is possible to explore interesting co-existences between different codes in the same participant. For example, almost all of the participants considered Chinese speakers English as tolerable at times and intolerable at others. On the other hand, attitudes, identities and beliefs almost overlapped with each other. This is not surprising, given the nature of the research topic. As discussed earlier, attitudes, identities and beliefs were interrelated with each other.

5.3. Results

The investigation unfolded a complex picture of the network with different codes correlated to each other. It was common to find that an extract drawn from an interview informed me of a participant's attitude and belief simultaneously. At times, attitudes and identities revealed in an extract reinforced each other. The overlaps of data and of themes caused the difficulty in presenting the results in order. Undoubtedly, the discussion of attitudes and identities cannot ignore the beliefs and social concerns that worked as contributing factors. Conversely, beliefs and social concerns were identified with the examination of attitudes that were revealed. To avoid repetition due to the overlaps, I will only focus on the point that a specific code categorizes. For example, I will not explain beliefs that were able to be identified when I present the results related to attitudes.

5.3.1. Attitudes

5.3.1.1. Attitudes towards CHELF (RQ1)

Five codes were developed to categorize the participants' attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF, including bias, limited tolerance, 'acceptance', hesitation and inconsistency.

> *1) Bias*

A few participants expressed their bias over Chinese speakers' ELF. For example, PCZ criticized the English used by his colleagues for intercultural communication, which he explicitly referred to as typical Chinese speakers' English:

Extract 1
1 PCZ […] in our daily work, I found that those working in our export 2   department, they often contact foreigners and use English, English is 3   their working language, I found their English typical China English. I

4		just cannot TOLERATE at all. I cannot tolerate this kind of Chinglish.
5		They <u>missed</u> third person '-es' and tense. Their use of English is <u>full of</u>
6		<u>Problems</u> […] The use of English must be very accurate.

The interview with PCZ started with my invitation of open comments on the questionnaire. Without prompt, PCZ expressed his view that NSE should be followed and soon moved to the criticism of the English that was different from NSE. This extract was drawn at the point when he was expressing his negative view of difference from NSE. Clearly, in PCZ's view, Chinese speakers' ELF was an example of the English that was different from NSE and should be criticized. He used negative words, *missed* and *full of problems* (1.5-1.6), repeated his intolerance and gave emphasis on the accuracy of English (1.6).

Strong bias over Chinese speakers' ELF was particularly evident in some participants' emotional reaction to the discussion of Chinese speakers' own English. For instance, SLW expressed her idea that she would rather be labelled as a failed learner of NSE than to anticipate Chinese speakers' own English that she actually used to be accepted as alternative to NSE:

Extract 2

1	R	[…] Do you hope the usages of English frequently found among Chinese
2		learners and users to be accepted and then to be established as our own
3		norms?
4	SLW	Hard to say. In my personal view, I still hope I can, I mean, hope not
5		to be accepted. <u>Even though I can't achieve I don't want to be accepted.</u>
6	R	Why?
7	SLW	If they are accepted, I wouldn't feel the language I am learning is English.
8		<u>I don't know how to describe that kind of feeling.</u>

SLW appeared to be stubborn to the idea of Chinese speakers' own English being developed into its independence from NSE norms (2.5). She felt difficult to explain why she was not happy with Chinese speakers' independence from NSE. Instead of giving reasons, she simply talked about her feeling. The string *I don't know how to describe that kind of feeling* (2.8) particularly revealed her strong emotion and thus, inferably, her strong belief of what made English English. It is not difficult to see her belief that variation from NSE should not be considered as acceptable.

2) Limited tolerance

Many participants showed their limited tolerance for Chinese speakers' ELF. They seemed to have double standards in their discussion related to Chinese speakers' ELF. While they shared the viewpoint that difference from NSE could not be considered as legitimate at all, they saw difference from NSE as tolerable for limited occasions. No participants had said that Chinese speakers' ELF was tolerable for any occasions. This validates the questionnaire result.

PHH, for example, created a term *tolerable error* (3.6) while he was talking about his attitude to differences from NSE with the example *she go to school*. For him, differences from NSE could be considered as alternative to the 'correct' use of NSE, provided that intelligibility could be achieved (3.1-2).

Extract 3

1 PHH Err (.) you can say *she go to school*, you can also say *she goes to school*,
2   for any listener, as long as he understands you, there should be no problem.
3   R   But will you still consider this kind of use as erroneous?
4 PHH It is erroneous, <u>but</u> tolerable.
5   R   Tolerable.
6 PHH Hmm, <u>a tolerable error</u>.
7   R   You regard this kind of use as a tolerable error.
8 PHH Hmm. <u>But</u> it is tolerable in <u>informal occasions</u>. The restriction is needed.

The researcher's question seemed to force PHH to make a decision on the legitimacy of difference from NSE (3.3). PHH's response revealed his attempt to deconstruct traditional EFL orientation to NNESs' difference from NSE (3.4), suggesting that tolerance and legitimacy were two different things. While he accepted the EFL perspective on what made an error, he seemed to challenge the EFL perspective on what a NNES should do with so-called errors. Importantly, the use of *but* showed his focus on the disagreement with the traditional bias over NNES-like use of English. Interestingly, with the researcher's attempt to make PHH confirm his attitude, PHH limited the tolerability of 'deviations' to 'informal occasions' (3.7-9). With another *but*, PHH emphasized that caution was needed in considering the tolerability of differences from NSE. In this short extract, PHH went back and forth before he settled on his decision that difference from NSE could be considered as tolerable for marginal use.

Another participant, PXZ, clearly expressed her idea that double standards (see pp.143 above) should be applied when considering the acceptability of CHELF:

Extract 4

1   R   […] do you think Chinese speakers' English is good in itself?
2   PXZ   No. I should say (.) there are differences between spoken and written
3   languages.
4   R   Hmm
5   PXZ   (You) can't assume, you write in a very casual language. […]You can
6   speak Chinese very well, but when you use Chinese in formal occasions,
7   you actually have a second standard.
8   R   Oh, I see, two standards, what are the two then?
9   PXZ   That is, one applies to everyday communication-
10   R   -what is it like?
11   PXZ   That is, every user can understand. I mean, (one standard) accepted by
12   average users, agreeing with average users' habit and way (of using
13   English), then every user can understand, it is ok then.
14   R   Oh
15   PXZ   Then, (a second standard applies) when you come across relatively formal
16   occasions, and you need to use relatively <u>normative English</u>, I think, even a
17   British speaker (would use English) in this way <u>ba</u> [Chinese particle].
18   R   Hmm
19   PXZ   The language he uses in everyday life and the language he uses in formal
20   occasions must be different to some extent. <u>I'm not sure</u>. I just feel, it <u>might</u>
21   be like this.
22   R   Oh, hmm, so what do you mean by this kind of <u>normative language</u>
23   PXZ   That must be the purest <u>la</u> [Chinese particle].

Noticeably, PXZ was very uncertain. She tried to work out a seemingly reasonable criterion to evaluate Chinese speakers' English. She made an analogy to Chinese and explicated how informal use of English should be treated as different from formal use of English. Although she echoed PHH's idea that Chinese speakers' English was tolerable for informal use, she hesitated, using a few hedges, for instance, *I'm not sure*, *might* (4.20) and the Chinese particle *ba* (4.17),which indicated uncertainty in Chinese. Her uncertainty suggested that she was seeking some kind of explanation for the tolerability for Chinese speakers' English. Nonetheless, in contrast with her hesitation about Chinese speakers' English, she associated NSE with 'normative' English with great confidence. The Chinese particle *la* indicated her surprise that I did not understand what she meant by 'normative language' (4.16-23). To put it differently, she took for granted the link between NSE and normative English. We can thus see that she was struggling to justify the tolerability of Chinese speakers' English, although she looked to NSE for the reference (4.23).

160

3) 'Acceptance'

No data pointed to the view of Chinese speakers' ELF as acceptable. However, many participants claimed to endorse the legitimation of Chinese speakers' English. Those participants were divided into two groups, according to their understanding of the conception of Chinese speakers' own English. One group of participants simply welcomed the idea that Chinese speakers had their own English but had little idea of what it should be like. Another group of participants conceptualized Chinese speakers' own English as the English that simply referred to as certain lexical items. Both groups insisted that Chinese speakers' own English should not violate NSE norms. In this sense, neither group was viewing Chinese speakers' ELF, which was different from NSE, as acceptable. I therefore use 'acceptance' with scare quote mark to describe their self-contradictory attitudes.

PCZ, for example, indicated that he welcomed the idea of Chinese speakers' own English:

Extract 5

1	R	Hmm, according to your questionnaire response, you seemed to quite
2		anticipate Chinese speakers' own English to be developed among Chinese
3		speakers of English. Do you still think so?
4	PCZ	[…] we actually can't tell which is British English and which is American
5		English. [But] in my mind, they are classical English, the English I am
6		happy to accept. As for Indian English, I am not very sure. I just feel
7		English is also an official language in India. And they were colonized by
8		British for so many years. I think their English must be British English as
9		well.
10	R	Do you hope Chinese speakers have their own-
11	PCZ	-own English, but not the English like *she go to school every day*. I don't
12		mean English like this, the English mixing up singular form and plural
13		form, missing third person –s, ignoring tenses, I don't think Indian English
14		would be the English like this, although I don't know what differences
15		are exactly between Indian English and British English.

In response to the researchers' invitation to confirm his position on the legitimation issue related to Chinese speakers' own English (5.1-3 and 5.10), PCZ was hedging instead of making straightforward responses. He expressed his uncertainty about the difference between British English and Indian English. This can be interpreted as his effort to make sense of the acceptability of Indian English as a NNSE variety. After thinking carefully, he came to the conclusion that Indian English was similar to NSE (5.6-8). He described what he considered as acceptable English by describing what he

thought were unacceptable. His hesitation suggested that he did not embrace the idea of Chinese speakers' English as independent from NSE norms. Possibly, he simply liked the idea that there was a kind of English called Chinese speakers' English. If so, his endorsement might result from a kind of nationalism. As he admitted later in the interview:

Extract 6

```
1  PCZ   I hope there is a model of Chinese speakers' English. I don't know
2         when I would be able to accept Chinese speakers' English. When I can
3         accept it, I would regard it as acceptable model of Chinese speakers'
4         English. But as for what it is exactly like, I really (have no idea).
```

PCZ's claim for his endorsement of Chinese speakers' English appeared to be emotional. He appeared to feel difficult to justify his claim (6.4-5) and he only repeated the claim, as seen in the string *when I can accept it, I would regard it as acceptable*. When he realised that he needed to give me an idea of what he meant by acceptable Chinese speakers' English, he stopped with his sentence unfinished. (6.4). It is thus interpretable that PCZ had emotional support for Chinese speakers' own English in spite of his lack of understanding of what Chinese speakers' own English is in relation to NSE.

PHH represented the second group of participants who claimed to have favourable attitudes towards the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English. However, what they meant by Chinese speakers' own English was limited to some borrowings from China. Strong attachment to NSE remained unchallenged:

Extract 7

```
 1  PHH  Speaking of Chinese English, I think, you shouldn't move away from
 2        British and American English norms, because, you can have your own
 3        characteristics, but, but you cannot have it independent from existing
 4        norms.
 5    R  Err, characteristics, you mean-
 6  PHH  Err, you can have your own phrases,  for example, baozi, youtiao, this kind
 7        of things, which are not found in other countries. Then, you can, err, create
 8        some lexis. And (.) I mean (.) only lexis, but (.) the use of English itself,
 9        involving its grammar, its proposition, and the order how nouns are put
10        together, all of these can't be changed.
```

---

4) Hesitation

A few participants appeared to hesitate in the discussion related to the acceptability of Chinese speakers' own ELF. PYM, for example, admitted that she was uncertain about the tolerability of Chinese speakers' creative use of English. Extract 8 presented her thinking aloud process:

Extract 8

1 PYM I'm always holding the view that intelligibility is everything. If other
2   people can accept your English, it means your English is intelligible to
3   them (.) but I think I am <u>struggling</u>. I don't think I'm going to use it
4   myself (.) because I think nobody would use English this way in formal
5   occasions. Such use of English is <u>just</u> for the purpose of entertainment.
6   So it should be limited to the situation where entertainment is the
7   purpose (.) I just feel I am in <u>chaos</u>.

The evaluation of difference from NSE appeared to be difficult for PYM. She talked about her belief that intelligible English is acceptable. At the same time, she expressed her choice that she would not use English that is in conflict with NSE. Inferably, she had more concerns than just the one with intelligibility, though she seemed to give top priority to intelligibility. Another concern seemed to be her idea about what was observed to be accepted in formal occasions. That is to say, she had the concern with the judgement which seemed to be based on social expectations. Obviously, her belief in *intelligibility is everything* (8.1) conflicted with her understanding of social expectations. At the same time, it deserves noticing that she kept saying that it was a hard decision, as seen in her use of phrases *struggling* (8.3) and *chaos* (8.7). Her conflict inside was therefore clearly revealed.

5) Change

Change was found in a small number of participants' attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF. PCZ was one of them. In the beginning of the conversation, PCZ had a strong bias against Chinese speakers' own English (see pp.157 above). As the interview progressed, his attitude became less negative. Extract 9 was drawn from PCZ's response to my question concerning why he could not accept Chinese speakers' ELF:

Extract 9

1. PCZ I mean, this might relate to our traditional English education. If I was
2.   told one day that you don't need to indicate singular form and plural
3.   form by using different forms, you don't have to follow such rules for

---

He made reflection on his own attitude and talked about the possibility of his attitudinal change. The willingness of talking about the possible change can be understood as PCZ's change in his attitude.

PNC was another example. She expressed her rejection to consider Chinese speakers' own English as acceptable. But she quickly changed her idea to accept Chinese speakers' own English when she was presented with the idea that Chinese speakers' own English might suggest 'a new standard' (10.8-9).

Extract 10

1	PNC	… if so, grammar seems to be ignored. If so, you seem to mean that one
2		can use English in any way as he wishes. If so, you seem to follow no
3		standard. If you don't follow (this) one standard, you actually follow no
4		standard.
	[A few turns later]	
5	PNC	The reason is, I think things like grammar are fixed, there is a standard, a
6		standard, that is, a standard provided by them.
7	R	Hmm, does the new English emerging in Chinese speakers' way of using
8		English, <u>does it mean a new standard</u>?
9	PNC	Hmm, it would be all right then. As long as there is a standard, it is fine.

5.3.1.2. Perceptions of Chinese speakers' English (RQ1)

Except for a few participants who reported to have little idea of Chinese speakers' English, most participants contributed their perceptions of Chinese speakers' ELF, which were categorized with two codes: interlanguage and successful language.

1) Interlanguage

Most of the interview participants' views of Chinese speakers' English were associated with the concept of interlanguage. Those interviews pointed to a common theme that NNESs were in the process of approaching the ultimate goal for NSE. For example, SJF expressed her frustration that an NNES 'might not be able to reach the goal in the end'. A lot of metaphors were used to describe Chinese speakers' English. For example, PLJ used the metaphors *by-product*, *outtake* and *plateau* to describe Chinese speakers' English. PTR described Chinese speakers' English as *under-cooked rice*. PCZ described it as *baby English*. The metaphors *by-product* and *outtake* suggested that Chinese speakers were in the situation that they failed to achieve the expected *primary product*

164

and successful *take* that could finally be accepted. The metaphor *plateau* suggested that Chinese speakers will eventually break through the *plateau* and reach the goal. With the metaphor *under-cooked rice*, PTR claimed that Chinese speakers' English was not disastrous but neither was it desirable. The *baby English* metaphor suggested that Chinese speakers should work hard to learn to speak English like NESs. All the metaphors suggested that the English used by Chinese speakers now was learner English that resulted from Chinese speakers' process of imitating NSE.

The theme 'NSE' was 'our ultimate goal' was prominent. As SJF assumed, 'everyone is working towards the same ultimate goal', i.e. NSE. This is particularly evident in the term 'approximating' NSE as found in the data. In SZB's words, 'the more you are close to NSE, the better your English is'. Such a view was reflected in two ways. In one way, the participants gave favourable comments on NSE or took NSE for granted. Generally, the negative view of Chinese speakers' English either pointed to Chinese speakers' English as English at low level, or implied that Chinese speakers' own way of using English was bad. It is therefore not surprising that some participants felt unhappy with their own English although they reported to have experience of communicating successfully with foreigners.

2) Successful performance

The theme that Chinese speakers' ELF was Chinese speakers' English in successful performances emerged in some of the interviews. Interestingly, such a view was likely to co-exist with the view of Chinese speakers' ELF as bad English. For example, PTR made unprompted comments on some Chinese speakers' English as follows:

Extract 11
1 PTR   Their English might be, according to the norms, I mean the authenticity 2   view, their English is very bad. But they have <u>no problem</u> in 3   communication <u>at all</u>.

While PTR realised the gap of Chinese speakers' English in 'authenticity view', he shifted his focus by using 'but' and emphasized the achievement of Chinese speakers with the phrase *no problem … at all* (11.2-3). A very similar view was expressed by PWB:

> *Extract 12*
>
> 1 PWB Around me, those who can speak <u>quite well</u> are those who often work
> 2   with foreigners. They can express themselves fluently, either on the phone
> 3   or talking face to face with foreigners. […]But if you ask me how <u>accurate</u>
> 4   their pronunciation or something is, few of them can qualify.
> 5   R   […] would you, en, feel, say, admire those (who speak NSE), or would
> 4   you feel nothing special?
> 5 PWB I cannot say I would admire them […]
> 6   R   So you mean you won't-
> 7 PWB -speaking of English, such a thing, you know, in Saige Plaza in
> 8   Guangdong, a well-known electronic market in China. […]You would see
> 9   the market full of foreigners, who are doing business with the Chinese
> 10   dealers there. Most of the time, they only use a few simple English
> 11   expressions. You know how to say the product in English. Then, when
> 12   they negotiate prices, they used the calculators. They just press the
> 13   numbers. How much is the annual turnover in Saige? Very huge.

PWB observed successful ELF communication between Chinese speakers and foreigners. He obviously disliked the association between good users of English and near-NES. He first gave examples of his colleagues who did not have 'accurate' pronunciation (12.3) but spoke English 'quite well' (12.1). When the researcher forced him to think whether he would admire people who could speak NS-like English, he gave more examples of the business dealers. His focus was on the achievement of Chinese speakers who, in his view, did not speak NSE. In other words, Chinese speakers' English was evaluated by him as to whether it helped to achieve a communicative purpose and get things done. In addition, he indicated that he would not necessarily admire those who could speak standard NSE (12.5). He disagreed with the view of Chinese speakers' English as interlanguage but highlighted Chinese speakers' English in relation to Chinese speakers' successful performances and explained how it helped Chinese speakers to fulfil their communicative purposes in ELF settings.

SZB, a non-English major, used the examples of Chinese celebrities and governmental officers to illustrate his view that non-native-like use of English helped to achieve good performances. One example he used was a Chinese TV programme host and journalist:

> *Extract 13*
>
> 1   SZB   But do you think Shui Junyi's English is good? His pronunciation is not
> 2   correct at all. It is actually very bad. But his communications with

3	foreigners are very fluent.

Interestingly, all of the participants who acknowledged the achievement of Chinese speakers of English used negative words, for example, 'bad' and 'incorrect', to describe the achievers' English. This might suggest that different evaluation criteria co-existed in the commenters' minds. One criterion, as pointed out by PTR (see 11.1-2, p157), is the traditional view of 'authentic' English. Another criterion was the achievement of ELF communicative purposes. Importantly, however, those participants were likely to highlight the achievement of Chinese speakers. This seemed to undermine the traditional bias over the intercultural communication-oriented English adapted by Chinese speakers from NSE.

5.3.2. Identities

5.3.2.1.　　Learner vs. user (RQ2)

1) Learner of NSE

It is common to find in the data that the participants viewed themselves as learners of NSE. As PTR acknowledged, 'we are still inclined to learn from them [i.e. NESs]'. Such an identity was revealed in the participants' view of NESs as the authority on English and NNESs as learners of NSE. English was perceived as 'their' (i.e. NESs') language which 'we' (i.e. Chinese speakers) and other NNSs are learning. These views are well illustrated the interview with PHH:

Extract 14

```
 1  PHH  Err, […] if I am talking with a British or an American, if he says that my
 2        English is very bad, then, I will think that my English is bad indeed,
 3        because he is a native speaker of English.  Your English with a little
 4        Chinese accent should be more likely to be understood by him than
 5        by other non-native speakers. If a native speaker cannot understand what
 6        you mean, this means your English is really rubbish. But if a non-native
 7        speaker who cannot understand your English says that my English is bad, I
 8        could think that your English is worse than mine, because you are not a are
 9        native English speaker and you also a learner of English. So it is hard to
10        tell whose English is worse than the other.
```

With an NES as the judge of his English, PHH projected the identity as an unsuccessful learner. With an NNES as the judge of his English, he projected the identity as a peer learner (14.9). According to what he said, with the same comments on his English, he would show his agreement with the NSE judge but challenge the NNES judge. The

167

word *indeed* (14.2) gave emphasis to his strong belief in the NES judge's authority. His different treatment of identity projection suggested he viewed not only himself but also other NNESs as learners of NSE.

While some participants, for example, PHH and PTR, were likely to talk about identity issues in their real-life experience, other participants tended to talk about the identity issue in their expected encounters with NESs. That is to say, with or without experience of dealing with NESs, the participants projected themselves as learners of NESs. SAN represented the participants who had no previous encounters with NESs:

Extract 15

1 SAN They are, we are learning their language, I think my English is certainly
2   worse than theirs, you must learn from them, I think, I think, I personally
3   think, we should, I am learning their language, of course I must learn
4.   from them. Their language, no need to say how standard it is, it is quite
5.   like how Beijing folks' Mandarin is standard, it must be much better
6.   than our Henan-accented Mandarin.

SAN took for granted NNESs as the ones who sought communication with NESs:

Extract 16

1 SAN You are learning others' language, the way, the way of thinking of course
2   should be changed, you should accommodate to their-
3   R   -Why don't they accommodate to our (way)?
4 SAN You are now @@ you can't say that, accommodating to us, just give you
5   an example, <u>I am the person who wants to communicate</u> with you, I
6   mean, if now I as a Chinese and you as a foreign, you would like to
7   learn Chinese from me, of course you should make me understand what
8   you mean, if you're a foreigner, I think I should learn from you,
9   then I'll think <u>I might need to accommodate more to you</u>, right?

SAN not only viewed himself as the people who actively sought communication, but also he thought he actively takes the responsibility to make the communication successful (16.5, 16.9). His learner perspective was confirmed in his argument that NNESs should learn from NESs. The communication in English was viewed as the process in which the power relation was dominated by NESs while NNESs took the responsibility to accommodate and suit the purpose of communication.

168

2) ELF user

It deserves noting that a group of participants projected or considered an ELF user identity while they were talking about their communication with NNES interlocutors in their real life. In particular, those who viewed NNESs as learners of NSE were found to change their perspective when they came to the point of discussing NNES-NNES communication. NNESs were viewed as partners in the communication, where meaning negotiation was held as possible and necessary. The participants showed their awareness of accommodation in ELF communication. For example, PHH projected an ELF user's identity when he talked about his experience of dealing with Arabian speakers. It should be mentioned that he considered accommodation as necessary and not *unpleasant* for the purpose of communication (17.11-12):

Extract 17

1	PHH	I think Chinese speakers' English is quite intelligible, not like Arabian
2		speakers' accent, wow, theirs is just difficult (to understand).
3	R	So difficult, how do you manage to understand then?
4	PHH	So @@
5	R	Then?
6	PHH	repeat@
7	R	Then they repeat?
8	PHH	If we can't manage (to communicate orally) after all, email, @@
9	R	You mean you would use all means in order to achieve the communication
10		with them? Will you find it interesting?
11	PHH	If you cannot understand or be understood, 'pardon' is needed of course.
12		Otherwise, what shall we do? There must be nothing to do with being
13		'pleasant', '<u>unpleasant</u>' or 'implesant'. That's communication, although
14		none of us is a good speaker of English. We are just communicating.

An emerging theme is that users of English are those who use English'. This was repeatedly found in the data. According to Cook (2002), L2 users are those who use all linguistic resources to achieve real life purposes, whereas L2 learners are those who learn certain language for future use. Cook's argument is of relevance to ELF research. As Seidlhofer (2009) and Cogo (2009) argue, ELF users are those who use ELF in communicative practices. Such a view was found in the interview data. SZB was an example of the participants who made sense of user identity in this way:

Extract 18

1	SZB	I think that (you should) clearly define the user of English, the user of
2		English. Definitely not (all) the 1.3 billion Chinese (are users of English).

169

3	How many of them speak English?

SZB's question in one way revealed his position that a user of English was defined as a person who spoke English. Similarly, some participants assumed that not many people were users of English, while other participants (e.g. SFY) held that 'there are many Chinese users of English' in China at 'different proficiency levels'. Although with diverging views of who were counted as Chinese speakers of English, the two groups shared the perspective that users of English were those who actually used it. Such a perspective was shared by participants from English, non-English majors and professional backgrounds. For example, SQX considered herself as a user of English and explained what she meant by users of English:

Extract 19

1.   R [...] would you consider yourself as a user of English?
2.   SQX [...] I think I would consider myself as a user of English [...]
3.   R Oh, you mean, how do you define a user (of English)? What kind of people
4.   can be considered as a user (of English)?
5.   SQX A user, I think, eh, (.) at least he should use this language to communicate,
6.   no matter whether he is communicating via written form or, or, or, spoken
7.   form, that kind of communication. By doing that, he can be considered
8.   as a user, I think.

The definition that SQX gave of a user of English was based on the purpose of their contact with English. It can be inferred from the above extract that a user was one whose contact with English was for the purpose of real life use, while a learner was one who contacted English for the purpose of learning. This mirrors Cook's distinction between a L2 learner and a L2 user (see pp.169 above).

Similarly, some participants distinguished user identity from learner identity with the function of English that was realised for them. That is to say, a user uses English to fulfil its function as a communicative tool, while a learner does not contact English with the focus on its communicative function. For example, SXK justified himself as a user of English, by giving a few examples of how English was used for different functions:

Extract 20

1   SXK I consider myself as a user of English.
2   R Eh, what do you mean?
3   SXK [...] treat English as a tool, with which we can better obtain what we

---

4	want. That's it. For example, if I want to communicate with others in
5	English, I would think that I have achieved my purpose as long as our
6	English is intelligible to listeners, they can understand what I mean. And
7	when I have learned English, I can understand an article written by other
8	people in English. That is good. I don't mind whether [there is anything
9	incorrect] somewhere in my use of English. I am not in examination, for
10	example, when I have to make response to an error-correcting task. I am
11	not picky. I think it is good that I can understand. <u>My attitude towards</u>
12	<u>English is a user's attitude.</u>

3) ELF learner

In this thesis, ELF learner and ENL learner are distinguished in terms of what kind of English is viewed as the target language. In this sense, the ELF learner identity is associated with learners who are learning English for ELF use, whereas the ENL learner identity relates to the target language as NSE.

Some participants disagreed that they were users of English given that they rarely use English to communicate. In a similar vein, a few university students considered themselves as learners of English because they were usually exposed to English for the purpose of learning. For example, SQS explained why he self-identified himself as a learner of English:

Extract 21		
1	SQS	To be honest, I can only be considered as a learner rather than a user.
2		Even though I am an English major<u>, I have actually very very rare use</u> of
3		English. Even if you consciously force yourself to speak English, you
4		cannot find one who you can speak English with. This is the reason […]

As seen in this extract, the positioning of himself as a learner was solely related to the situation that SQS had no opportunity to speak English (21.2). For SQS, what made a user of English a user was the behaviour of using English. He appeared to be frustrated that he had few opportunities to use his English for real life communication. It is inferable that he regarded the learning of English as the preparation for the communication with others in real life communications. In this sense, SQS projected an ELF learner identity as opposed to an ENL learner identity.

The user/learner identity positioned in relation to interlocutors reflected how much the participants were looking for NESs for reference and how much they perceived NSE as

their target language. By contrast, the user/learner identity perceived in relation to English contact reflected how much the participants considered English, rather than NSE as their target language. For those participants, whether they used English for ELF communication was the quality of a user of English. This made them independent from NSs and NSE. In light of this, it is fair to claim the difference between the two types of positioning. Importantly, the second type of positioning offers positive insight regarding how the participants perceived themselves as independent from the mere NSE focus and thus suggests the development of Chinese speakers' own English.

5.3.2.2. L1 Chinese identity vs. near-NES identity (RQ2)

According to Schneider (2007), NNESs go through a process from aligning themselves with NES cultural identity to aligning themselves with their L1 cultural identity in developing their own Englishes. The interview data provided rich resources for our understanding of how the participants positioned themselves between L1 Chinese identity and NES cultural identity through their use of English.

As Jenkins (2007) points out, it is a complex issue that speaking NES-like English is a part of their identity but being seen as an NSE is not.That is to say, speaking NES-like English relates to an identity as a competent English user but not an identity as a member of the NSE cultural group (Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh 2006). This is echoed in the present study. For example, SPL explicitly expressed her concern for *identity* (22.4) in native English, which she described as the English that enjoyed global acceptance:

Extract 22

1 SPL   As far as I see, American English and British English are more widely
              accepted around the world and more popular. I think it would be long time
              before China English is to be accepted as their alternative.
2   R If you can choose, what kind of English would you like to use?
3 SPL At present, I think I still opt for the English that is accepted globally.
    […]
4 SPL […] this relates to an <u>identity</u>.
5   R Relating to an identity, what kind of identity?
6 SPL It suggests what proficiency level, what level my English is at
7   R You mean this is a way of recognizing your identity, suggesting your
8   English proficiency-
9 SPL -It must be an indicator of my English proficiency.

For many participants, whether one could use NSE, was an indicator of one's English proficiency. Interviewees were generally found to acknowledge their happiness in the idea of being misrecognized as native speakers[43]. Some responses to the question how they would feel if they were misrecognized as British or American speakers constantly pointed to the idea of a high proficiency of English. By contrast, some responses to the question how they would feel if they were easily recognized as Chinese speakers related to the idea of bad English or English that needed improving. In SWZ's words, being recognized as a Chinese speaker of English implied *how come your English is so bad?*. Among others, SLN's data clearly showed how such associations were built up:

Extract 23

1   R Somebody might say, when you speak English, if not seeing you, he would
2   think that it is a British, or an American speaking. Do you hope-
3 SLN -If so I will be very happy, @@
4   R @@,If somebody said to you, when you speak English, even if not seeing
5   you, he would think that it is a Chinese speaker. What would you feel about
6   such a comment?
7 SLN @@ Then I would feel, oh dear, my English is not standard, then I need,
8   there is a lot of room for me to improve (my English).
9   R You mean-
10 SLN -I will have to work very hard and practice and learn.

However, no data suggested that the participants desired to be integrated into NES culture. That is to say, the participants seemed to disconnect the relationship between NES-like English and NES cultural identity. Noticeably, some participants expressed their hope that they would like their English to sound *standard* and they simultaneously indicated their unwillingness to project near-NES cultural identity in their English. PNC's view was typical:

Extract 24

1   R So you must hope to hear that your English sounds like British or American
2   speakers' English, right?
3 PNC Not necessarily. It seems to me that it suggests that you grew up there. I
4   don't feel good. I think, when I was in university, there were some
5   university students who enjoyed speaking English, although you could
6   easily tell that they were Chinese speakers. Their pronunciation is good,

---

[43] Jenkins (2007) asked her research participants whether they would feel happy with the idea of being misrecognized as NESs. She found that the participants who were happy with such an idea did not necessarily desire near-NES cultural identity but just associated near-NES identity with good user identity. Following her, I used the same question and received similar answer that corroborate her research results.

7		with <u>few mistakes</u>. But you could still tell that they didn't have British or
8		American accents but Chinese accent. But they spoke well… I think, those
9		simultaneous interpreters' accents, you must be able to tell that they are
10		Chinese speakers. But, you would still feel that their English is very
11		<u>standard</u> and sounds very intelligible.

Following her aspiration for NSE, PNC dismissed the idea of speaking like a NES. Her argument triangulated with the findings that some participants saw Chinese speakers' English as a successful language. She even went further and suggested that speaking English demonstrating Chinese speakers' L1 Chinese identity could be part of a good user identity as well, although she did equate good English with the English having *few mistakes* (24.7) and being *standard*(24.11). In light of this, she was different from those who took for granted that only NSE was good English whereas the English revealing L1 Chinese identity was bad. While PNC disliked the connection between NSE and near-NES identity, PNC imagined that it was possible to have L1 Chinese identity in using NSE. She represented the group of participants who realized the link between English and identity and struggle to bring L1 Chinese identity and NSE together.

We can see the disconnection between English and cultural identity in some participants' minds, in that NSE was sought to indicate competent user identity but being NSE-like was disliked. On the other hand, NSE was a burden for some participants who saw the link between English and cultural identity. To understand this burden, I shall now present the data that revealed different attitudes towards L1 Chinese identity in Chinese speakers' English. This part of the data offered an insight into the participants' choice for L1 Chinese identity and thus seemed to be more revealing with regards to their attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English.

Most respondents recognized L1 Chinese speaker identity in Chinese speakers' English. This corroborated the questionnaire study. For example, SPL had clear awareness of her L1 Chinese speaker identity in her English:

Extract 25		
1	SPL	I know I am a Chinese speaker. I definitely have my Chinese way of thinking
2		and way of expressing ideas when I use English. I think this is reasonable.

The participants were found to hold positive, negative and neutral attitudes towards the L1 Chinese identity in Chinese speakers' English. I have discussed the EFL-based

perceptions of L1 Chinese identity, that is, L1 Chinese identity is likely to be associated with bad learner/user identity. In this section, I shall focus on some perceptions of L1 Chinese identity, which were found to shed light on our understanding of the participants' ELF orientation underneath their perceptions. At least three types of attitudes towards a Chinese speaker identity can be identified.

Firstly, a few participants acknowledged their L1 Chinese identity in English. This is evident in PDB's words:

Extract 26

1	R	I have a question for you. A, I hope my English makes people easily
2		recognize me as a Chinese speaker; B, I hope my English makes people take
3		me as, er, a speaker form Britain or America, like this-
4	PDB	-We don't have the experience of studying abroad, so we don't have strong
5		opinion for this question. <u>Our English will definitely be recognized as</u>
6		<u>Chinese speakers' English</u>.
7	R	Hmm, so-
8	PDB	-I can't compare and say
9	R	Hmm, you can't compare. So you just think this is the reality
10	PDB	Right. I won't (.) have the intention to make people misrecognize me as
11		either an American or a British, to make them feel (.), even on our
12		business trip in Europe, it seemed to me that none of us would have thought
13		of making people misrecognize him as either a British or an American, none
14		of us would pretend to be a speaker like that, @@, it seems to me that few
15		people would hold such an attitude.

In response to the question thrown to him individually, PDB used the words *we* and *our* (26. 4-5) to express his idea that he was one of the Chinese speakers. He also used the modifier *definitely* to highlight the perceived situation that Chinese speakers' English was recognizable (26.5-6). While he did not particularly talk about his attitude towards the situation, he explicitly expressed the idea that he had no desire for near-NES identity. His position was typical in the data.

Secondly, a few participants indicated their positive attitude towards an L1 Chinese identity in English. For example, SHD considered L1 Chinese identity as 'proud' (27.3):

Extract 27

1	R	If you were recognized as a Chinese speaker, if the judge associates this
2		with your English,
3	SHD	Eh, if so, I think I, eh, today, eh, it is also a <u>proud</u> thing to be a Chinese
4		speaker. @@

Like many other participants, SHD considered NES-like English as the indicator of good English, as identified in other places in the conversation. No evidence was found to suggest the perceived link between NSE and near-NES identity. However, she welcomed L1 Chinese identity on the other hand. She represented the group of participants who felt happy with L1 Chinese identity and meanwhile showed aspiration for NSE. This verified the finding that speaking NSE was one thing but aligning with NESs was another thing in many participants' minds.

Thirdly, a few participants desired Chinese speaker identity in English and rejected NS-like English. This view was mainly held by English majors. For example:

Extract 28

1	SJJ	I mean, if I imitate the (native speaker) pronunciation, I imitate exactly, then
2		you can't tell whether I am a British or a Chinese, […]that is not the way
3		that I can accept […] with my Chinese accent, I mean, you can recognize
4		me as a Chinese speaker once you hear my pronunciation. This is the
5		desired effect. I mean, eh, there is a kind of, eh, identity.

SJJ came up with the notion of *identity* (28.5) without being prompted. He made the strong argument that *the desired effect* (28.4-5) was his English revealing his L1 Chinese identity. He showed strong awareness and a good understanding of the link between English and identity. JJ considered L1 Chinese identity and Chinese speakers' own way of using English as dependent upon each other. Compared with the other two types of attitudes, SJJ's idea showed more common ground with ELF research. Importantly, SJJ was not alone in the sample[44].

The discussion of L1 Chinese identity in English reflected the ELF perspective on NNESs' need for the projection of their L1 cultural identity. In the current study, while L1 Chinese identity was recognized, welcomed and even desired, near-NES identity was either unwanted or overlooked. As discussed earlier, NSE was desired to the extent that NSE was considered as the indicator of English proficiency. No evidence pointed to the desire to NSE community membership. Some evidence showed the rejection to such a membership. Despite the imagination of integrating L1 Chinese identity in NSE (for example, NC), most participants who felt the need for L1 Chinese identity downplayed their need for NSE and even called for Chinese speakers' own English.

---

[44] Another participant was SLX as seen in extract 43, pp.186.

176

Importantly, some participants were found to struggle when they were asked to choose between NSE and their own English, given their awareness of the link between English and identity. The link between NES identity and a good user/learner identity and that between Chinese speaker identity and a bad user/learner identity were most evident in SQX's struggle to make a choice between a good user identity and Chinese speaker identity. As she said, she would like her English to sound *fluent* and *authentic* (29.1-2) on the one hand and to project her Chinese speaker identity (29.4) on the other hand. She considered the two as conflicting with each other and therefore felt *struggled* (29.1):

Extract 29
1 SQX I feel <u>struggled</u>. I do think that an English major should speak the very <u>fluent</u> 2   and authentic English. But sometimes, I hope I can, I think (.) I still have that 3   kind of emotion in my use of English, I would like to implant my (first) 4   language<u>, my (first) culture into the use of English</u>.

This group of participants adds complexity to the issue of Chinese speakers' positioning with their use of English. Among them, NSE and near-NES identity appeared to be a catch-22. Given the perceived link between NSE and good user identity, they felt awkward when making a decision on how to project L1 Chinese group identity and a good user identity at the same time.

5.3.2.3.   Multi-level identity in a glocal community (RQ2)

With the interviews, I sought to find out how the participants projected or considered multi-level identity in ELF communication. Limited data contributed to the insight into this issue. SWH, an English major, was one of the few contributors. He made comments on the use of ELF, from which I drew some points related to L1 Chinese community membership, Easterners' community membership, and global community membership simultaneously assigned to Chinese speakers of ELF:

Extract 30
1. SWH Speaking of our Chinese culture actually, definitely it is profound and 2.   comprehensive. There're a lot of things that foreigners don't have in their 3.   cultures. If we involve it in <u>our use of English</u>, it is helpful to some 4.   extent to the development of English itself. It is more comprehensive, 5.   compatible with more ways of thinking. If so, I think English will 6.   develop in a better manner into the language that involves more 7.   comprehensive ideas and contents. (Such a language would) not only

With the pronoun *our*, SWH claimed L1 Chinese community membership (30.1). He perceived L1 Chinese community as distinctive from other communities (30.2). The string *a lot of things that foreigners don't have in their cultures* revealed that he made sense of the cultural repertoire shared by L1 Chinese speakers but not featured in speakers of other L1s. Further, he drew a line between Westerners and Easterners (30.8) by grouping Westerners' cultures and Easterners' cultures. This suggests that he perceived Easterners and Westerners as members of two distinguishable groups. It is inferable that he considered *our use of English* (30. 3) as a way of claiming Easterners' group membership. Chinese speakers were considered as both L1 Chinese community members and Easterner group members. Moreover, he expressed his idea that ELF (i.e. an 'internationalized language') (30.10) should be the repertoire shared by both Westerners and Easterners, representing their different cultures. This suggested his perception of ELF as the shared repertoire of global users of English. In turn, a sense of global community could be captured.

Extract 30 shows SWH's concern for the wider community of which L1 Chinese speakers and speakers of other L1s had co-membership on the one hand and SWH's aspiration for the solidarity among L1 Chinese speakers on the other hand. These two kinds of concern were simultaneously found in some other participants as well. Another example is SXL:

Extract 31

```
 1.    R  Do you have any ideas about or comments on the questionnaire?
 2.  SXL  You see, now there is American English, British English, hmm, I mean
 3.        there are many kinds of English. Our Chinese speakers' English should
 4.        also be acknowledged. Its status should be raised. Hmm, I feel proud. I
 5.        mean, if it is accepted by the international society, as a Chinese speaker,
 6.        I will have a sense of national pride […]
```

SXL presented the idea that Chinese speakers got integrated into *the international society* through their use of English (31.5). The association between '*a Chinese speaker* identity and *national pride* (31.5-6) revealed a strong sense of belonging to the group of Chinese speakers. Multi-level identity in Chinese speakers' English was presented as both international membership and Chinese group membership. This extract thus

178

illustrates how Chinese speakers position themselves in the multiple communities that they belong to at the same time.

5.3.3. Beliefs

5.3.3.1 Target language: ENL or ELF (RQ3a)

The belief of target language as ENL was predominant. Earlier discussion of the perception of Chinese speakers' ELF as an interlanguage provided good evidence of such a belief. Here are a few more examples to illustrate the belief:

Extract 32

1   PCZ   As a Chinese speaker, you should speak in the same way as they [i.e.
2   NESs] do if you want to speak <u>their language</u>.

Extract 33

1.   SJJ   Authentic grammar must be followed. You are learning <u>their language</u>. You
2.   can't break their grammatical rules.

Extract 34

1   SLC   This has been accepted by them, and then I accept it as well, as the
2   language I'm learning is <u>their language</u>.

As seen in the above extracts, the target language for Chinese speakers/learners of English was labelled as *others' language* or *their language* . In many interviews and follow-up FGs, the notions *foreigners*, *others*, *they* and *them* were frequently used to refer to NESs when the participants were talking about issues related to good English. When I came across the said notions in interviews, I asked the participants to clarify who they referred to. Their responses pointed to NESs, as illustrated in extract 35 drawn from the interview with SPZ:

Extract 35

1   R   […] So what kinds of accents do you think are good accents?
2   SPZ   Good accents are like that (.) that (.) like foreigners' accents generally. How
3   can I describe? Something like their intonation and rhythm.
4   R   Who are the foreigners you referred to? From Iran? From Middle East?
5   From India?
6   SPZ   They (i.e. those with good accents) should be those from Britain or

---

7	America. Because their English is the English we have the most exposure
8	to […]

The belief in ENL as NNESs' target language can also be found in the comments related to confidence, or in PHH's words, the *face*. For example, PXZ assumed that NSE would make a Chinese speaker more confident when talking with foreigners. Other participants, for example, PHH, claimed that Chinese speakers were shy in speaking English because they could not use NSE. PYM admitted that she was not confident in speaking English because of her worry about her accent which was not NES-like.

Interestingly, however, one theme that emerged was the argument that ENL was the target language but ENL was not necessarily to be followed. This was particularly evident in many participants' view that ENL should be learned in classrooms but not necessarily followed in real life communication, as seen in the interview with PWQ:

Extract 36

1 PWQ Right, for communication, I don't think accent is the major factor
2   [of successful communication]. But if you are learning a
3   language, you must achieve the best [result]. For example, to teach
4   pronunciation, the teacher must, it is not acceptable that the teacher of
5   pronunciation has accent, because the students will follow him. This is not
6   that (acceptable).

PWQ showed her awareness that accent should not be an issue in successful communication. Yet, she considered accent as a big issue for achieving target competence. She used *the best* to describe the ultimate goal for L2 learners (36.3). The unsaid message was evident through the context, that is, NSE was the target language.

PYS, a salesman who dealt with American customers in his daily work, offered an interesting example of the two sided belief in ENL as the target language:

Extract 37

1   R Are you happy with your own English?
2 PYS No. I hope I can achieve, of course, it is impossible, for now, I hope I can
3   speak English like their English. I think their pronunciation sounds nicer
4   indeed, sometimes when I hear their English, their English sounds nicer
5   indeed.
6   R So the unattainable goal, shall we still seek to achieve?
7 PYS Definitely I would not like to seek. <@>But to answer your question, of
8   course I should speak of the ultimate goal <@> […] I only need that an
9   American wouldn't feel difficult when he listens to me speaking

---

10		English[…]
11	R	So you hope your interlocutor can acknowledge […] when you talk to each
12		other.
13	PYS	I don't need to be acknowledged. I am all right as long as he can easily
14		communicate with me. It shouldn't be the case that the communication is
15		difficult. I don't need him to acknowledge me. Anyway, he is not my boss
16		who pays me salary@ @

In response to my question regarding his attitude towards his own English (37.1), PYS said 'no' and quickly turned to talk about his aspiration for near-NSE (37.2-3). However, the string *but to answer your question, of course I should speak of the ultimate goal* (37.7-8) suggests the need for rethinking his idea of ENL as the target language. The adverbial phrase *of course* and the model verb *should* suggests that ENL as the default goal was a golden rule. It is inferable that PYS had a strong belief in ENL as the target language and never thought of challenging it. However, the string *but to answer your question* suggested that PYS was talking about the golden rule in principle.

PYS held a positive attitude towards NSE, as revealed in his repetitive comment on American speakers' English (37.3-5). However, he indicated that he would not mind whether his English was considered by his American customers as good but whether his English was intelligible. According to him, he would never seek to achieve NSE. He used the adverb *definitely* to emphasize his position (37.7). Nor did he feel frustrated by his own English although he could not speak near-NSE in his daily work. In particular, he made a joke that being acknowledged as a near-NES would not bring him any economic benefit (37.15). These points combine to suggest that he seemed to promote the golden rule but not to practice it at all.

The complexity of PYS's belief in ENL as the target language emerged. While he held the strong belief in ENL as the target language, he still made fun of it and seemed to marginalize it. What made him serious was the intelligibility of his English, the communicative function of English and economic benefit that could be realized through English. In this sense, practical motives behind PYS's use of English were clearly shown.

PYS's view was prevalent in the data. This can help us to understand why many participants claimed to desire NSE but regarded their own English as acceptable, given the practical motives.

5.3.3.2 Ownership of English: NES or global users of English (RQ3a)

With the term 'ownership of English', I sought to understand the participants' view as to who had the symbolic power of English. That is to say, who did the participants think had the role of gatekeeping the creativity in English? In particular, who did the participants think had the role of gatekeeping Chinese speakers' creative use of English in their intercultural communication?

The belief was widely found in interview data that NESs were the gatekeepers of the creativity in English and of Chinese speakers' creativity in English as well. SPL, for example, indicated that the major concern she had when she was evaluating the acceptability of some examples of the creative use of English was whether NESs could understand the differences from NSE:

Extract 38

1 SPL […] I think language is used for communication. If a Chinese speaker's
2   English can't make a native speaker of English understand, I think his
3   English must be confusing.
4   R Make a native speaker understand?
5 SPL He might not understand Chinese culture. He might feel weird
6   with the expression. He might not understand the expression then.

SZB held the belief that NES ownership was 'the essence' of English (38.3) in his discussion of the legitimation of Chinese speakers' English:

Extract 39

1   R […] So why should we follow their [i.e. NESs'] norms? Why can't we
2   have our own norms?
3 SZB NORMS? I think this involves <u>the essence</u> of language. After all, their
4   countries are where English originated. We can establish our norms. But if
5   so, we are making it (English) pointless.
6   R What do you mean by the point of English?
7 SZB I mean, for example, examination. I am tested English. I am tested
8   American English or British English. What you suggested is <u>obviously</u>
9   China English.

The analogy of Chinese in relation to L1 Chinese speakers was used by SZB to argue for the importance of NESs' role in creating and safeguarding the norms of English. In response to my question concerning whether Chinese speakers could have their own norms as alternative to NSE norms, SZB was surprised, as shown in his loud voice and question intonation. Clearly, he had a strong belief of English in terms of *where English*

originated (39.4). He further explained what made English English by referring to what was considered as English in the examination system. The message was that English was American English or British English. The adverb *obviously* (39.8) suggested his emphasis on the incompatibility of Chinese speakers' English with what he thought as the criterion of English. He seemed to repeat Trudgill's (2002:151) claim that 'the true repository of the English language is its native speakers'. This is exactly what Widdowson (1994) has criticised as the belief in the NES ownership of English. According to Widdowson (1994), it was wrong to ascribe NESs with the gatekeeping role only because of their nativeness.

As revealed in extract 39, the belief in NES ownership was particularly evident in the discussion of the legitimation of Chinese speakers' ELF. Although many participants considered Chinese speakers' ELF as tolerable and/or successful, nobody agreed to the idea that Chinese speakers' own English should be legitimized as independent from NSE.

Another participant, PHH, expressed a similar idea with his focus on what Chinese speakers cannot do to English:

Extract 40

1	PHH	Right. You can use it in a flexible way if your listener can understand
2		you. But you can't regard errors as legitimate, because wrong is wrong.
3		This might be the special nature of language.
4	R	Well, in the early age of English, there was only British English. Later,
5		there emerged American English, and then Australia English. Those
6		Englishes were developed on the basis of British English.
7	PHH	It should be viewed as dialects of British English, a dialect.
8	R	So, can our Chinese speakers' English develop into kind of dialect?
9	PHH	I don't think it is very likely. Because (.) Chinese speakers don't have the
10		culture background of English. The entire social environment is different,
11		it is impossible. You can adapt to it, and mildly decorate it. Decoration,
12		rather than modification.

There was an emerging voice which seemed to present a belief that challenged the link between NESs' gatekeeping role and their nativeness. A few participants showed their awareness of NESs' symbolic power and associated such a power with national development. PLJ, for instance, voluntarily brought up the idea of symbolic power in relation to national strength:

> *Extract 41*
>
> ```
>  1  PLJ  […] in the future if China's influence increases, it [i.e. Chinese speakers'
>  2       English] should be allowed to exist. I mean, why is Chinese speakers'
>  3       variety of English not accepted, or, why few people accept it? Because
>  4       English, English involves a kind of standard,[…] it [the use of English] is
>  5       judged by its providers. If the providers are very powerful, definitely the
>  6       standard will be promoted quickly; if the providers are not powerful
>  7       enough, or we can say, if they have little symbolic power, the standard will
>  8       not be acknowledged by other countries, or others. It really depends on the
>  9       symbolic power, and whether the country [i.e. China] is powerful or not
> 10       […]
> ```

In this extract, PLJ indicated that only those powerful communities could have their English accepted as legitimate whereas less powerful communities could only be norm-dependent (41.9). The spread of English, in his view, resulted from the power of NES countries and cultures, but Chinese speakers had no other choice but follow NSE because China was powerless in gaining other countries' attention. Nevertheless, he predicted that China's growth would influence the spread of English among Chinese speakers and lead to a change in attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English (41.1).

Clearly, PLJ's belief was different from SZB's, although both participants believed in the gatekeeping role of NESs. LJ owed the role to NES countries' development and accepted the possibility of Chinese speakers' ELF being developed into its legitimacy. By contrast, SZB saw NESs' gatekeeping role as naturally given because of their nativeness. In turn, SZB rejected the idea that CHELF was legitimate in its own right.

5.3.3.3 NNES conformity vs. NNES creativity (RQ3a)

A theme emerged as the belief that NNES conformity was necessary for intelligibility and NNES creativity would cause unintelligibility. For instance, the interview with PCZ revealed his belief like this, which was very strong. Extract 42 presented below recorded the conversation about his view of accuracy vs. ambivalence. The extract followed his criticism of his colleagues' English as '不严谨', a Chinese adjective which can be understood as either 'inaccurate' or 'ambivalent'. Such a Chinese adjective was repeated a few times and gave the impression that he was very negative towards his colleagues' English. Following him up, I asked him to clarify his idea and started this sequence:

184

1	R	So do you mean accuracy in meaning or accuracy in form?
2	PCZ	It is the same thing, in meaning and in form, we should be accurate in both.
3	R	For example, […] *She go to school every day.* This example. In terms of
4		meaning and forms, do you think…
5	PCZ	I particularly hate English like this. The difference between singular and
6		plural forms is not indicated, third-person, it is missing.
7	R	Here, the form is not accurate. But in terms of meaning, will this
8		(difference) cause ambiguity?
	[…]	
9	PCZ	-I know, this sentence won't cause any ambivalence, as you have *every day*
10		at the end of this sentence. But in many occasions, ambiguity is easily
11		caused. We cannot say that because this (inaccurate) expression
12		causes no ambiguity, other (inaccurate) expressions will not cause
13		ambiguity either. Some inaccurate expressions won't cause ambiguity,
14		but ambiguity will be caused in many occasions.
15	R	Then, for the (inaccurate) expressions, your tolerance…
16	PCZ	I cannot tolerate either.
17	R	Then why?
18	PCZ	Possibly because of my personality […] I just cannot tolerate such things.

He made rapid response and gave weight to both meaning and form in terms of accuracy. Nevertheless, when I attempted to obtain a better understanding of his attitudes by using an example of 'deviation', he responded before I finished my words and expressed his criticism of 'inaccurate' forms immediately (42.5-6).

When I further forced him to think about intelligibility in relation to creativity, his attitude towards this issue was found to be uncertain. The uncertainty was presented by the thinking process. He first tried to find out whether the translation in Chinese was intelligible or not. After that, he made the judgment that the example 'deviation' in English was intelligible. However, his lack of confidence in this judgment was presented by the tag question 'right?'. He also asked me whether I thought it was intelligible (42.11-12). Going through the thinking process, he finally made a decision that the example 'deviation' would not cause ambivalence but this example could not justify the intelligibility of other 'deviations' (42.17-18).

With my inquiry into his perceptions related to intelligible creativities, he asserted that he could not tolerate them either. Following my question of why he had such an attitude, he owed to his personality that he was a strict person. It is thus possible to infer his rejection to the forms that did not conform to NSE, no matter whether they were intelligible or not. All of these combine to suggest that he was focused on forms of

English and put intelligibility aside in his attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English. With the understanding of the strong belief in NSE as the default target language, it is not difficult to understand the comments related to the intelligibility issue.

Some participants, for example, SWH and SLC, both English majors, assumed that 'inaccurate pronunciation will cause difficulty in communication', while other participants, for example, PYM, indicated their uncertainty of the intelligibility of NNSE. As will be discussed later, the hesitant participants were likely to have little experience of using ELF.

A second theme emerged as the belief that NNES creativity contributed to the projection of L1 cultural identity and the realisation of particular communicative purposes. The same finding was retrieved in the questionnaire study[45].

The interview with SLX offered evidence of the belief in the contribution of Chinese speakers' creativity in English to Chinese cultural identity:

Extract 43
1 SLX I think <u>we are Chinese speakers after all</u>. If we speak English in that way 2   (i.e. NESs' way) after all, other people in the world might not be able 3   to recognize where I am from, if we don't see each other. I don't like this. 4   I think now your pronunciation is just Chinese speakers' pronunciation, 5   I think anyway @@ I feel proud of this (pronunciation), my pronunciation is 6   like this, this actually shows our Chinese speakers' features (of using 7   English).

SLX held a strong opinion about Chinese speakers' group identity. She emphasized that 'we are Chinese speakers' with the adverb phrase *after all* (43.1) and kept using the pronoun *we* to position herself as one member of the group consisted of Chinese speakers. While she believed that copying NESs' way of using English would disguise her Chinese group identity (43.3), she argued that Chinese speakers had shared features of using English that would not make 'other people in the world' unable to tell where she was from. Clearly, she held the belief that Chinese speakers should not copy NES in order to assert L1 Chinese group membership.

Another participant, SLW, talked about the English that was 'Chinese-flavoured' and welcomed the sense of humour in the use of such language.

---

[45] See page 137.

> *Extract 44*
>
> 1 SLW   Because that (kind of) use breaks the basic rules of English. I mean, the
> 2   grammatical rules […] If you change it, English can be called English.
> 3   Although Chinese-flavoured English is used this way, I just feel that kind
> 4   of use has made itself unlike English. Because you, you should know there
> 5   is the difference between *he* and *she*, if you change this, this is not
> 6   acceptable.
> 7   R   So you think these [differences] should still be corrected.
> 8 SLW   But *for long time no see, people mountain people sea,* I feel fun and I think
> 9   they are tolerable.

As seen in this extract, SLW categorized the use of English that was different from NSE into two groups. She separated 'Chinese-flavoured' use of English (44. 4) from 'that kind of English use', which, in the context, can be inferred as the English that showed no distinctiveness of Chinese culture from other L1 speakers of English. As discussed earlier, many participants were struggling between the conformity to NSE and the need for their own way of using English (see pp.141-145 above). SLW seemed to seek a compromise between the two ends of this push-pull situation. Her positive attitude towards Chinese speakers' distinctive use of English suggested that she saw the value of Chinese speakers' creativity in conveying a sense of humour.

The findings reminded me of Cogo and Jenkins's (2010:278) argument that 'ELF speakers exhibit linguistic variation in order to project cultural identity, promote solidarity, and share humour and the like'. I therefore looked into the data and see whether I could find the data informing me of Chinese speakers' creative use of English for the purpose of promoting solidarity in ELF communication.

PTR talked about his and his colleagues' ELF experience in which NNESs' 'overuse' of some NSE words were considered as useful in building up the solidarity among NNESs interlocutors in ELF communication:

> *Extract 45*
>
> 1 PTR   We often come across such situations. Because they are non-native speakers
> 2   of English, their (English), their (English), if compared with native
> 3   speakers' English, is more practical and simplified. He would think, this
> 4   word, he wouldn't like to change for another word, because he only knows
> 5   this word, for example, the word *confirm*, he would use *confirm* all the time,
> 6   not any other word, he would, for example, if you say *ensure*, he would be
> 7   very annoyed, he would possibly not understand.
> 8   R   So in such circumstances, you would choose

9 PTR	Right, <u>the word we all feel happy with</u>. I know what *confirm* means, he
10	knows it as well. So we *confirm*.

In this extract, Chinese speakers were viewed as speakers rather than learners of English in the practice of English communication. Although it is visible that PTR considered NESs as superior to NNESs in using English (45.2-3), PTR considered accommodation as important in ELF communication among NNESs. He showed his concern for the solidarity between them (i.e. him and his colleagues) and other NNESs, by avoiding the use of English which he thought might annoy his or their interlocutors. The word *confirm* seemed to be an overused word according to his account. However, the overuse made them 'all feel happy' (45.9). In turn, it is possible to interpret that PTR considered the overuse to be a strategy for promoting solidarity among NNESs.

5.3.3.4   English vs. Englishes (RQ3a)

The interview data provided an insight into the participants' beliefs in a monolithic variety of English and/or pluralistic forms of English. Some participants showed their awareness of different Englishes, while others indicated that they first came into contact with the notion of 'Englishes in plural' via the questionnaire.

According to Seidlhofer (2001:135), 'what constitutes a language, and in particular English as a global language, is necessarily a discursive construct in need of deconstruction'. She suggests that English should be deconstructed and the notion Englishes in plural take the place of the traditional view of English as the single language that all learners and users target. Following this, it is necessary to find out whether the participants viewed English as a single NSE variety.

Interestingly, every participant indicated a positive attitude towards the notion of pluralistic Englishes in response to my question as to how they thought of the phenomenon that different kinds of English existed. A common reaction was the assumption that the phenomenon resulted from the development of English in its due course. For example, SLW made sense of Englishes with the metaphor of the spread of news:

Extract 46	
1 R	Now you know British English, American English, and Indian English.
2	There are also Singaporean English, Nigerian English and others. So many

3		Englishes. What do you think of this phenomenon?
4	SLW	That is normal.
5	R	What do you mean?
6	SLW	English is spoken everywhere around the world. It is like a kind of product
7		introduction. An introduction of language into different places. Do as
8		Romans do when you're in Rome, right? English will change of course if
9		it is affected by local cultures. It is like the spread of news. The spread will
10		cause many versions. English is just like that.

However, a predominant theme emerged as the complex belief in English. On the one hand, they showed an understanding of pluralistic forms of English, as SLW did. On the other hand, they hoped that there would be a monolithic variety of English, which they believed would boost communication. This complexity was typically represented in the interview with PWQ, who showed her knowledge of Englishes at different places throughout the interview (see extracts 47-49).

Extract 47

1	PWQ	Actually, (speakers from) every different country, every different country
2		speak English with different accents, Singaporeans, like the example given
3		by our teacher before, in, in in an airport, the flight number 2233 was
4		pronounced as /tu//tu/tui//tui/, yes, it is said so, different, [speakers from]
5		every different country are different [in using English].

Extract 48

1	PWQ	As my boyfriend is a foreigner, I talk with him, his mother tongue is not
2		English, his mother tongue is French, his home country was a colony of
3		France. Err, I, I can speak French, so I use English to communicate with
4		him. He speaks English with French accent, that is it. But <u>but usually we</u>
5		<u>don't have problems in communication.</u>
[...]		
6	PWQ	His grammar and vocabulary must be stronger than me, but his accent
7		doesn't sound nice, because his accent is like /b/ /d/ /b//d/, because
8		French people speak this way.

Extract 49

1	PWQ	English, like Black English and White English, for example, they didn't say
2		'I'm gonna' etc. This was used by Black people, but now White people also
3		use expressions like this, I'm gonna, etc, when they sing or in films, right?
4	R	Hmm, Hmm, so how do you think about such phenomenon, do you think
5	PWQ	This is a matter of course.
6	R	A matter of course?
7	PWQ	Yes.
8	R	Do you mean this is because language becomes more-

```
 9 PWQ   -flexible
10     R   More flexible?
11 PWQ   Yes.
12     R   Good thing or-
13 PWQ   -this is a good thing
14     R   Good thing
15 PWQ   So everyone will speak the same language in the future, everyone can
16           communicate without any problem.
```

PWQ acknowledged that different L1 speakers used English in different ways, which led to different Englishes, for example, French English, Indian English, Black American English and Singaporean English. She gave an example of Singaporean English (47.3-5) and her boyfriend's French English (48.6-8). Despite her strong awareness of inevitable L1 transfer in relation to different kinds of English, she imagined that there would be a single kind of English which would cause no problem for any interlocutors in communication (49.15). It is inferable that different Englishes would cause communicative problems in her view. This reflects her view of Englishes as 'fixed' entities. As Cogo and Dewey (2012) argue, the key to successful communication is not the conformity to a set of linguistic forms but the use of pragmatic strategies, among which accommodation is important and proved to be efficient (Cogo 2009).

This interpretation can be confirmed with a look at how she talked about her communication with her boyfriend who was a French speaker of English (see extract 48). In response to my question whether she had any experience of using English for international communication, she talked about her boyfriend and voluntarily made comments on his English (48.1-4). She ended her comment with the statement 'but usually we don't have problems in communication' (48.4-5). The use of *but* suggested that she thought she was introducing a new point that contradicted what she had said earlier. That is to say, she assumed that ELF communication between a Chinese speaker and a French speaker would encounter problems, although she did not think there were problems between her and her boyfriend. Despite her ability to make sense of Englishes in plural, PWQ seemed to be uncertain about the communicative success between interlocutors using different kinds of English.

This illustrated the complexity of understanding the participants' beliefs in term of the EFL vs. ELF distinction. Their attempt to grasp the idea of different kinds of Englishes seemed to dissociate them from the traditional EFL perspective on English as distributed by NESs to NNESs. On the other hand, their uncertainty about the

communicative effects revealed their difficulty in viewing ELF communication as the process in which interlocutors accommodated to each other and adapted English for their purposes. As Seidlhofer (2011:81) argues, 'in ELF situations, speakers of any kind of English, from EFL, ENL, and ESL contexts, need to adjust to the requirements of intercultural communication'. It was therefore impossible to exclusively fit the participants' beliefs of English or Englishes into either the EFL perspective or the ELF perspective. Rather, the EFL perspective and the ELF perspective seem to work together and affect the participants' attitudes and arguments. It is therefore possible to say that the participants undermined the EFL perspective to some extent but needed to have a better understanding of the concept of ELF in order to be more confident in variability in English.

5.3.3.5   Fixity vs. fluidity (RQ3a)

An overarching argument for ELF researchers to conceptualize ELF is the fluidity of English. I was interested in knowing what beliefs the participants held for English regarding to the fixity and fluidity dichotomy.

As shown in the questionnaire study, many participants expressed their tolerance of difference from NSE and argued that the use of language should be focused on communicative function and weight should also be given to L1 Chinese identity (see pp.141-143 above). However, the fundamental issue was whether ELF users' appropriation of English could be considered as legitimate. That is, whether the participants held the belief that NNESs could appropriate or adapt English in their own right. When I considered this issue, the data seemed to suggest that the participants did not have an awareness of appropriation. For example, PHH expressed his idea that NSE should be kept intact:

Extract 50		
1.	PHH	Speaking of Chinese English, I think, you shouldn't move away from
2.		British and American English norms, because, you can have your own
3.		characteristics, but, but you cannot have it independent from existing
4.		norms.
5.	R	Err, characteristics, you mean-
6.	PHH	Err, you can have your own phrases, for example, *baozi*, *youtiao*, this kind
7.		of things, which are not found in other countries. Then, you can, err, create
8.		some lexis. And (.) I mean (.) only lexis, but (.) the use of English itself,
9.		involving its grammar, its proposition, and the order how nouns are put
10.		together, all of these can't be changed. These make the foundation (of a
11.		building). You can add bricks and blocks to it. But you cannot overturn the

12.	foundation and rebuild another one.

This extract represented the view of Chinese speakers' own English that was prevalent in the data. Chinese speakers' own English was labelled with 'China English' or 'Chinese English'. The participants referred to what they thought to be acceptable 'China English' or 'Chinese English' to some loan words in English that were originated in Chinese culture. The need to project L1 Chinese cultural identity was expressed through the endorsement of the use of particular words, for example, *baozi*, *youtiao* ect. (50.4). However, the conception of China English or Chinese English was associated with NS norms of English. Chinese speakers' English continued to be considered as dependent upon NS norms of English, although some expressions that can be introduced into NSE were considered as acceptable. The focus on NSE (50.1-2) and the insistence on the conformity to NSE revealed the participants' difficulty in accepting appropriation as necessary to ELF communication.

PNC clearly expressed her belief in the fixity of English:

Extract 51

1	PNC	… if so, grammar seems to be ignored. If so, you seem to mean that
2		one can use English in any way as he wishes. If so, you seem to follow
3		no standard. If you don't follow (this) one standard, you actually follow
4		no standard.
[…]		
5	PNC	The reason is, I think things like grammar are fixed, there is a standard,
6		a standard, that is, a standard provided by them.
7	R	Hmm, does the new variety emerging in Chinese speakers' way of
8		using English, does it mean a new standard?
9	PNC	Hmm, it would be all right then. As long as there is a standard, it is fine.

This extract was in the context when PNC was talking about her opinion of Chinese speakers' own English. She disagreed with the idea of the legitimation of Chinese speakers' English. The belief in the need for a standard was revealed in her repetitive reference to 'standard'. When the researcher brought up the point that the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English could suggest a new standard, PNC compromised and accepted the notion of Chinese speakers' own English.

The belief in the need for a fixed standard might be understood in two ways. In one way, as Mair (2003:xi) pointed out, the need for a standard reflected the misconception of 'English as decontextualized structural systems which can be described by listing

192

their phonetic, grammatical and lexical features'. That is to say, the participants failed to perceive English in terms of its contextual use. Rather, the participants viewed English as a set of systems that can be prescribed as so-called grammar. This might relate to their experience of formal education, which I will discuss later with other examples, for instance, extract 58. In this sense, the participants failed to see the fluidity of language use and therefore the appropriation of ELF for the purpose of communications in different contexts.

5.3.3.6 Beliefs related to L1Chinese (RQ3a)

The participants were found to frequently use their understanding of L1 Chinese to make sense of English. Analogy to L1 Chinese was a common phenomenon in the interview data. Here are some examples:

Extract 52

1 SZL   Since one starts to learn English, one would always hold the view that we
2   are learning foreign countries' (language), it is like the case in which
3   foreigners are learning our Chinese. They would feel that our Chinese is
4   very good.

Extract 53

1 PTR   […]We have the orientation that we are learning from them. Hmm, the
2   orientation. We don't have the orientation that they should learn from us.
3   It is reasonable that they learn Chinese from us. After all, our Chinese, er,
4   has a long history. As for English, however, we are followers after all.
5   Followers, er, in many aspects. They, they have their authentic use of
6   language. We haven't mastered their language. Now if we are creating
7   our own use of English, there must be a conflict.

Extract 54

1 SAN   Hmm, imagine if I am a Beijing folk, I speak Beijing Mandarin. I would
2   feel the Mandarin spoken by Henan folks is not as standard as mine. You
3   can produce some sounds well. You can produced the sounds as I do.
4   Even if you use some words which I still feel you are correct, he will still
5   regard himself as the standard in his mind. Just like that.
  […]
6   R   What do you want to say with English on earth?
7 SAN   With English, I think, er, non-standard speakers should learn from
8   standard speakers.

In extract 52, SZL assumed that L1 speakers' language should be the example followed by L2 speakers. She extended her assumption of L1 Chinese to her assumption of L2 English. In extract 53, PTR highlighted the authenticity of English by making an analogy to Chinese in relation to its historical development. He insisted that the authentic language should be learned, in terms of either Chinese or English. In extract 54, SAN talked a lot of his idea of Chinese when I asked him for his idea of English. Undoubtedly, he was making sense of English through the analogy to Chinese. He finally came to the conclusion that users of non-standard NSE should learn from users of standard NSE. As seen in these examples, the participants' understandings of L1 Chinese and L2 English correlated with each other. This corroborates Widdowson's (2003) observation that L2 English speakers' perceptions of their L1s feeds into their perceptions of L2 English.

The three examples illustrated the participants' beliefs in L1 speakers' role as examples of language use, in authenticity and in the dichotomy between standard and non-standard language users. These beliefs thus suggest the influence of Chinese background on the participants' language attitudes and identities in relation to CHELF.

5.3.4. Contextual factors

In previous sections, I have discussed attitudes, identities and beliefs separately. The interview data also provided an insight into how the participants reflected on their own attitudes towards and beliefs of Chinese speakers' English. Their self-reflection contributed to their perceptions and formed a part of the data that compensated their attitudes, identities and beliefs. Importantly, this part of the data reflected how their perceptions were socially constructed.

In particular, one part of the interview data suggested that attitudes, identities and beliefs were not simply working together within an individual participant. Particularly, some participants held beliefs that resembled ELF perspective but demonstrated negative attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English or projected/considered ENL learner identity in Chinese speakers' English. The conflicts suggest that understanding the participants' perceptions requires an inquiry into the factors that go into the gap or the conflict. Some factors were elicited that exerted influences on the participants' perceptions, including the concern for gatekeeping practice, education, experience of

194

using ELF, and the observation of language change. Given the research purpose, I have my focus on the first three factors and give some examples here.

5.3.4.1.   Gatekeeping practice (RQ3b)

Almost all of the participants mentioned their education experience and their concern for examination when they were talking about their perceptions of Chinese speakers' English and NSE. The concern for gatekeeping practice was found to have important influence on the participants' choice between NSE and Chinese speakers' English and on their positioning themselves in relation to NESs. Such a concern was demonstrated in how the participants highlighted current examination requirements and emphasized predominant social expectations that they believed valued NSE norms. For example, PYM, who used English daily in her work, explicitly expressed her idea that she had to endeavour to approximate NSE because of the mainstream view of what was acceptable English. However, she also expressed her belief that a language which enabled communication was acceptable:

Extract 55

1 PYM   […] I think a language is acceptable as long as you can use it to
2   communicate […] I don't want to copy authentic English accent but I
             have to. Otherwise other people would laugh at you.
3   R   Why?
4 PYM   They compare your English with that authentic kind of English […]
5   I have no choice. I have to face up to the reality that everybody is working
6   to get close to the authentic [English].

A similar view was expressed by SLN, an English major, who showed great concern for examinations and highlighted the point that she had to follow the requirements that were in favour of NSE:

Extract 56

1   SLN   I think language is used for the purpose of communication [...] it is all
2   right as long as the use of English can make the users understood [each
3   other]. I don't mind how close it [i.e. our English] is to the standard NSE
4   […] However, it is the reality that we are required to do so (i.e. to use the
5   standard NSE), of course I will seek to use the standard (NSE)[…] the
6   criterion that schools use, that teachers use, is not agreeing with what we
7   said just now, the English is all right as long as the user makes himself
8   understood. For this reason, me and students around me, because the
9   reality hasn't been changed yet, I will still work towards the standard
10   (NSE), I will seek the standard (NSE).

The two examples (extracts 55 and 56) provide significant evidence of the negotiation between the participants' agency and social factor. They were unhappy with the option they had regarding the use of English, as seen in their highlighting point that they had to face 'the reality' (55.5 and 56.4), despite of their belief of the acceptability of English in relation to its communicative function. The gatekeeping role of NSE obviously worried PYM and SLN and made them make a decision to follow NSE in order to meet the social expectations and requirements.

5.3.4.2.   Education (RQ3b)

Education was found to be a prevalent factor that influenced the participants' attitudinal development. It was common to see in the interview data that the participants struggled when talking about their views of Chinese speakers' English with differences from NSE. While they thought the variations could be tolerated, they would autonomously judge them as 'errors'. As SQS said, 'we have taken many exams, in which the grammar is crucial… if there is an error, I would feel weird'. SDX gave an account of how his attitudes were developed in his school education. Interestingly, he not only clearly indicated his perception of 'deviations' but also emphasized his mind-set. He reflected on his perceptions of 'errors' in this way:

Extract 57

1 SDX   We are learning English. That is, we are learning their language. We
2   should learn (the language) with the perspective of their culture and their
3   language. So we think subconsciously they are errors in our mind,…

Following his reflection, I asked how such a perception has developed. He explained that he was taught by his teachers over years of English education. In the excerpt, it was apparent that his attitudes and beliefs of English were developed through years of English education whereby Chinese learners were encouraged to learn the culture and the language of NESs. PCZ expressed a similar idea in a more reflective way:

Extract 58

1.   PCZ This might be resulted in the <u>English education</u>.
2.   R Why?
3.   PCZ <u>Since we started to learn English in middle schools, teachers have told us</u>
4.   <u>that grammar should be like this.</u> Now the use (of English) is found not to

---

5.		follow such grammar. I think such use is wrong. In my mind, this is a
6.		wrong thing. This has become my mind-set: only that way is correct;
7.		another way might be wrong. It is hard to say whether a certain way
8.		should be considered as correct or wrong. Just because I use the point of
9.		reference that I have accepted to evaluate, I don't feel comfortable. But
10.		language is actually created by people, and set by people. It can be set like
11.		this, or like that. Our standard is such a standard, then we can't accept
12.		[the use of English reflecting] another standard.

In this extract, PCZ referred to his experience of English education, which was grammar-focused (58.3-4). The point he made seemed to suggest the influence of grammar-focused education on his focus on formulaic conformity. While most participants were likely to discuss how their attitudes and beliefs had developed through education regarding what errors were, some participants were found to be influenced by some challenging voices brought into English classrooms. All of these participants were found to be English majors. As seen in one example, SWH explained the difference in his beliefs before and after he had learned from his teacher/s about the concept of core English. While he would insist on 'the most standard and the most authentic English' in his early years of learning English, he would accept that standard NSE was not necessary and that users of English could add something belonging to themselves.

5.3.4.3.   (Observed) ELF experience (RQ3b)

ELF experiences or observed ELF experiences seemed to play a role in developing the participants' perception. Most participants were found to use what they had experienced or observed to justify their perceptions. As presented earlier, SZB illustrated Shui Junyi's non-Std. NSE to argue that communication rather than accuracy should be the focus of users of English (see pp.166-167); PWB used the business dealers' ELF experience to argue for the focus on pragmatics (see pp. 165-166). SJJ thought of the successful communication in NNSE and started to struggle with his earlier rejection of 'erroneous' English:

Extract 59		
1	SJJ	Sometimes I think, for example during the days of Olympic Games, or of
2		World Expo, many people, their grammar might be <u>erroneous</u>, but they
3		could roughly express their ideas, they did communicate.
4	R	Hmm, do you accept the English that they used?
5	SJJ	(.) Actually <u>I don't accept it within my heart. But it really worked. Why</u>?

In this extract, SJJ expressed how his presumption was challenged by his observation. As he said, '*I don't accept it within my heart*' (59,5). His observation of successful performances in ELF during Olympic Games made him question *why* (59.5) his previous rejection of *erroneous* (59.2) English was not supported by the ELF experience.

By contrast, some participants expressed their uncertainty of variations in English and linked their uncertainty with their little experience of using ELF. Their uncertainty was likely to relate to intelligibility. As PYM said, she did not have the experience of using English to orally communicate with foreigners and therefore had no idea whether Chinese speakers' English would be intelligible to foreigners' ears. In extracts 11, 12, 13 above, the participants PTR, PWB and SZB all talked about their positive views of variability of English by giving examples of successful performances in ELF.

In short, those examples illustrated how the participants' perceptions were influenced by their observations of ELF experiences or their own ELF performances.

5.3.4.4. Socio-economic changes (RQ3b)

An interesting theme emerges in the participants' reflections on their attitudes is the opinions regarding socio-economic changes in the global context. As seen in the data, some interview participants expressed their views of socio-economic changes while they were trying to justify their perceptions of CHELF-related issues. For example, PHH brought in the issue of global socio-economic change while he was making an effort to justify his attitude towards variability of English:

Extract 60

```
 1  PHH  I should explain this way. Why I keep saying 'as long as you make
 2        yourself understood'? Because we are doing foreign trade. You don't
 3        really have many encounters with British or American speakers. British
 4        and American, you see, their international influences keep dropping. We
 5        are now in the situation, to be specific, that the business partners are most
 6        likely to come from Middle East, South America, and Asia. Each of those
 7        people speaks English with the influence of his dialect, with his accent. If
 8        so, you will think it is fair enough as long as you can make yourself
 9        understood. You can't require each of them to speak in the way that
10        British or American speakers do.
```

This extract shows how PHH associated his belief regarding variability of English with his perceptions of the socio-economic change in the global context. Throughout the interview, PHH repeatedly expressed his view that the tolerability of variances was only

198

dependent on whether communication could be achieved (60.1-2). He talked about his life experience and he indicated his observation that was of great relevance to ELF research: NESs are often not present in ELF communication (60.2-3). The words *you see* showed that he was making an analysis and trying to interpret what he observed. He was drawing upon his perceptions of NESs' influences in the world and, further, the socio-economic change that Chinese speakers were faced up (60.4-6). He contextualized his argument, as seen in the clause *if so* (60.7-8), before he made conclusion that communicative success could justify the tolerability of variability. Therefore, how he made sense of the socio-economic changes came into play in shaping his attitudes towards variability of English.

Likewise, some participants' perceptions of CHELF were found to be associated with their view of China's growth in global economy. For example, in extract 41 above, PLJ talked about 'symbolic power' (41.9) and expressed his view that the development of CHELF legitimacy went along with the growth of Chinese economy (see discussion on pp. 184 above): *in the future if China's influence increases, it (Chinese speakers' English) should be allowed to exist* (41.1-2).

Therefore, a strong link was seen in some participants' accounts between the legitimacy of CHELF and China's socio-economic influence in the world, between the issue of what kind of English to be used and the perceptions of what was happening in the wide and global context. That is to say, the socio-economic influence was a factor contributing to the participants' perceptions.

5.4.   Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the findings of the participants' attitudes, identities and beliefs related to their perception of Chinese speakers' own English. The findings have helped to explain the conflicts in attitudes that were discussed in chapter 4 and have demonstrated the complexity of the participants' perceptions of Chinese speakers' ELF. Further, the investigation revealed the co-existence of the EFL perspective and the ELF perspective, based on which we saw the complicated pictures of the participants' attitudes and identities. While the EFL perspective seemed to prevail in the interviews, the ELF perspective was found to emerge. The EFL-related beliefs included the belief of NS-like English as the target language, the lack of the awareness of appropriation of English and the wish for a monolithic variety of English. By contrast, we also see ELF-

related perceptions, for example, the view of Chinese speakers' English as successful performance, the projection of ELF users' identities and ELF learners' identities, and the multilevel identities in CHELF. Importantly, the influence of Chinese language and culture background is visible in the participants' identities and beliefs. This adds to my argument that CHELF users engage with different communities of practice and their identity projection in different communities is influenced by their first language and culture background. Most likely, the participants struggled between their EFL-related beliefs and ELF-related ones. The investigation into their self-reflection on their attitudinal development added the complexity of their perceptions and contributed to the emergence of contextual factors behind their attitudes, identities and beliefs. The contextual factors offered possible interpretations that the participants were socially constructed to be EFL-oriented. The participants' concern with gatekeeping practices, the influence of education, their observation or experience of ELF communication, and their perceptions of socio-economic changes in the global context were found to operate in their perceptions related to CHELF. In light of these, will the intervention of an ELF conception make a difference in the participants' attitudes and beliefs (RQ4)? This is actually a major issue which I am going to explore in chapter 6. By looking at how the participants interacted with each other in FGs, I have examined how their perceptions were changed and developed.

Chapter 6 Understanding attitudinal development with focus groups

6.1. Introduction

In chapters 4 and 5, I investigated attitudes, identities and beliefs that were related to Chinese speakers' English in intercultural communication. In chapter 5, I also looked at interview participants' self-reflection on their own attitudinal development and identified contributing factors of their attitudes and beliefs. This chapter presents the findings of FGs. I identified some factors that came into play in the participants' attitudes and identities, by observing how the participants' attitudes and identities were developed, amended or consolidated during the course of the FG discussions. The influence of an ELF conception is particularly to be explored.

6.2. Procedure

Four FGs were conducted (see appendix 10 for detailed information of the FG participants, pp.303). Group A included 9 English majors who were not interviewed; group B consisted of 11 non-English majors who were not interviewed; group C was comprised of 4 BA English majors and 4 MA non-English majors, all of whom were interviewed; and group D brought together 3 MA English majors, 1 BA English major and 5 MA non-English majors, none of whom were interviewed.

The focus group design is presented in Appendix 4. The group discussions followed my presentation of the ELF concept, which were drawn from Jenkins (2009a), and my introduction of some variations in English, drawn from corpus studies (Xu 2008) on Chinese speakers' use of English. Hand outs were given to the participants, with the focus on the knowledge of the spread of English and examples of Chinese speakers' use of English (see Appendix 5).

Transcription of the FG data followed the same conventions as the interview transcriptions were conducted (see pp.152 above), except that the codes for group members were different: for example, AB refers to participant AB. As all participants were students, the differentiation of students from professionals in interview data transcription was not applicable for focus group data transcription. However, whereas I numbered lines for the interview data, I numbered turns for the FG data for the sake of

clarity. With my purpose of examining the dynamics of the group discussions, the focus was on each turn that a participant took as to how a participant supported or challenged each other's view and how a participant maintained or changed his/her own arguments cross different turns. However, I also paid attention to particular wording of their arguments and ideas in order to achieve a good understanding of their discussions on particular issues. In my discussion, I refer to different turns in different extracts by numbering the turns in extracts, for example, 66.6 means turn 6 in extract 66.

The value of the FG method in relation to my research questions was justified earlier (see pp. 97-98 above). I would like to discuss how I analysed the FG data in this chapter. The analysis was generally a data-driven process. I looked carefully at what happened in the FGs and paid attention to critical moments of the group interactions in order to understand what constructs or issues influenced the directions of the group discussions.

Stevens (1996) provides a framework that researchers can use to handle group interaction. Central to the framework is how and in what context a statement is revised or reinforced. This draws attention to the issues that cause change or help consolidate certain arguments. Necessarily, researchers should pay attention to group decisions as opposed to decisions made by individuals. Wibeck, Dahlgren and Öberg (2007) consider the co-construction of new ideas as an important part of group interaction. This highlights both the majority and the minority voices on particular issues in group negotiations. That is to say, what arguments are consolidated and what arguments are marginalized offer insights into the issues being examined. Importantly, group difference and similarity can be compared to help achieve a better understanding of particular issues. This is achieved by examining the link between group features and group decisions. To put it differently, the correlations between independent variables and dependent variables and those between dependent variables with regards to particular issues can be investigated. Following these points and bearing my research focus in mind, I developed my thematic framework, as presented in table 6.3.

Table 6.3: Thematic framework of FGs

6.3.1   Co-constructed perceptions
6.3.1.1   Complex perception
6.3.1.2   NSE learner identity
6.3.1.3   ELF perspective

6.3.   Results

Two major themes emerged in the FGs with regards to perceptions of Chinese speakers' ELF. One theme dealt with group decisions that were generated with my attention paid to 'what' perceptions were co-constructed in different groups. Another theme deals with influencing factors behind attitudinal development with my focus on 'how' group decisions were made through group negotiation and interaction.

6.3.1.   Co-constructed perceptions

Discussions in the four groups developed in different directions and led to different group decisions. The individual participants' perceptions revealed through group discussions validated the findings from the interviews. Despite different directions of discussions, the four groups represented the views which reflected both EFL and ELF perspectives. The co-construction and negotiation of meaning among group members who represented different viewpoints seemed to showcase the development of EFL perspective-based beliefs and ELF perspective-based arguments and make the wrestling visible between the two perspectives.

6.3.1.1.   Complex perceptions

Group A and group D contributed to the theme of complex perceptions of Chinese speakers' ELF. In group A, the discussion on the issue of whether Chinese speakers' ELF should be considered as acceptable started with a debate between two sides. While one side (ZR and DQ) argued for the acceptability of Chinese speakers' ELF, another side (JC) disagreed. The concern that a standard was needed for ELT brought the two sides together and resolved the tension between them. As seen in extract 61, the group concluded their discussion of the acceptability of Chinese speakers' ELF, with the members from two sides echoing each other. The group consensus was thus reached that Chinese speakers' ELF was tolerable for the purpose of ELF communication, but not acceptable for pedagogy (61.1).

Extract 61 (group A)

1. JC   Actually there is no disagreement here… Actually, we have the shared position on this issue. Teaching that she worried about won't be affected. Standard is followed when teaching. But when we communicate, we can compromise. No disagreement (among us).
[many participants echo]
2. ZR   [Right. Right.
3. DQ   [Right. The standard is there. With a kind of mutual compromise, the exchange of information can be realised. This is reasonable.

Group D co-constructed a term *tolerable error* to describe their perception of Chinese speakers' English. Before they came to this common ground, group members were divided. Some members claimed that Chinese speakers' ELF should be 'allowed', whereas some members argued that the English should be corrected. One participant, ZH, made short utterance that 'it [i.e. Chinese speakers' ELF] should be acceptable' (62.1) in a low voice and nobody responded. The group became unified when LT made the point that errors that would not cause communicative breakdown should be tolerated. Extract 62 presents their common ground on the issue of the acceptability of Chinese speakers' English.

Extract 62 (group D)

1. ZH   I think our shared opinion is that the errors should be allowed
2. YA   Be tolerated.
3. M   Everybody thinks so?
4. YA   If they were considered as errors, that is too harsh. I think the errors are tolerable. They are intelligible.
5. LT   These errors do not affect any fundamental things.
6. ZW   This is an error, but it is an intelligible error-
7. YA   -accepted
8. ZW   Error is error, and should be recognized as error in its nature.
9. ZH   But not errors fundamentally.
10. YA   No seriously bad effects
11. GJ   It is all right as long as we can communicate normally
12. YA   This is not the issue that we should be very strict with
13. M   So you consider these as errors, but you can tolerate.
14. GJ   But in terms of our attitudes, I think they should still be corrected.
15. YA   Because this is a process of (our use of English) being standardized.

Most group members agreed with ZW that 'error is error, and should be recognized as error in its nature' (62.8). Their agreement demonstrated a strong belief that error should not be reconsidered as legitimate. On the other hand, they used positive words, for example *tolerable* (62.4), *intelligible* (62.4 and 62.6) and *accepted* (62.7), to

204

describe errors. Efforts were made to justify their tolerance for difference from NSE, by describing the errors as not *fundamentally* (62.9) or *seriously bad* (62.10). The repetitive use of *but* (62.6, 62.9, and 62.14) demonstrated their attempts to reduce the tension between illegitimacy and tolerability in their attitudes towards difference from NSE. Such an attempt is particularly evident in YA's contribution to the group opinion. As she said, difference from NSE did not deserve harsh criticism (62.4 and 62.12).

6.3.1.2. NSE learner identity

Group B co-constructed NSE learner identity and expressed their shared frustration in being unable to change this identity. Extract 63 was taken from the FG after one participant, KC, expressed his idea that difference from NSE was acceptable at the macro level. I followed this up and borrowed his word *mobility* (63.1) in order to move the direction of the group discussion onto the topic whether they could accept difference from NSE at the micro level:

Extract 63 (group B)	
1. M [Pointing to the examples listed on the hand out]	[…] what do you think of the <u>mobility</u> [i.e. difference from NSE] like these?
2. KC	(They are) all right if intelligible to interlocutors.
3. HX	What <u>we</u> can do is <u>just</u> to <u>correct</u> as much as <u>we</u> can
4. LF	Yeah, <u>learners</u> would try to <u>approach NS Englishes</u> as much as they can, but they remain [far from the goal of NS-like English].
5. WX	Our teachers, our teachers with whom we started to learn English-
6. LJ	-First teachers play a crucial role
7. WX	Right. First teachers are really important, they must have a kind of proficiency close to [NSs]-
8. LL	-I think this is absolutely a problem which can't be fixed.
9. YY	I think every learner of English would hope to-
10. SJ	- just hope.
11. LF	I agree.
12. YY	I think, every one, when he starts to learn English, hopes to [approach English
13. HX	[hopes to, but-
14. YY	-But what he can achieve in the end, what level of proficiency he reaches, varies (from person to person) according to his own situation-
15. HX	-Individual learning experience-
16. YY	-Nobody would say that he hopes to approach his own English, his own first language.
17. HX [5]	Yeah.
18. M	Anything else?

| 19. HX | That is just a hope. Whether people can achieve is hard to expect. |
| 20. SJ | Yeah. |

KC made a response that intelligibility could justify the acceptability (63.2). Nobody responded to his idea. HX expressed the idea that correction was the only choice. She used the pronoun *we* (twice in 63.3) to indicate that she was representing the group. Noticeably, she was not confident in what she said. A kind of frustration was revealed. HX expressed her efforts in making her English more 'native-like' by saying *as much as we can* (63.3). It deserves noticing that she used the adverb *just*, which can be interpreted as her awareness of limited choice. That is to say, the only thing for her to do was to work hard to approximate the English that is 'correct'. The string *as much as we can* also suggested that she was hesitant as to whether they could manage to correct all 'errors'. While KC's view was marginalized, HX's view engaged other members. The contributions made by different participants led to a consensus on a gap between learning NSE and achieving NSE competence. NSE learner identity was projected in their belief that everyone learned English, i.e. NSE, as explained by LF (63.4). When YY talked about the hope that a learner of NSE might have (63.16), there was brief silence. Possibly, other group members felt difficult in responding. HX's emphasis on the difficulty in achieving NSE competence was echoed by SJ. Compared with the interruptions and co-construction of meaning and sentences in the middle of the discussion (63.7-16), the silence and unwillingness to speak might suggest a shared frustration with the unattainable goal for NSE and to change their identities as NSE learners.

6.3.1.3.   An ELF perspective[46]

Through the whole discussion, group C members jointly made sense of issues related to Chinese speakers' own English. The predominant voice shared common ground with an ELF perspective. Although uncertainty was expressed at times, group members showed their willingness to know more about the ELF perspective. Extract 64 represents a particular moment when the group co-constructed an ELF perspective on the 'errors' made by Chinese speakers. While some members showed a kind of ELF perspective, FT seemed to find difficult to use an ELF perspective to form his own attitude towards the

---

[46] See pp.305-306.

206

'errors' made by Chinese speakers. Nonetheless, he expressed his curiosity about PL's viewpoint which was obviously different from a traditionally EFL-oriented perspective.

Extract 64 (group C)

1. PL […]Actually, when two people communicate, the most important thing is idea. That is to say, <u>two interlocutors are exchanging ideas rather than language forms</u>. In my view, when two interlocutors, no matter where you are from, as long as you can communicate ideas[…] that is all right. The listed [examples of difference from NSE] here are all differences in terms of language forms. <u>People from different countries have different ways of speaking, different pronunciations, different biological features, or pronunciation features.</u> All these factors are related to each other. I don't think it is necessary to unify. Neither can you achieve the absolute unification.

2. FT Say there are two interlocutors. They realise the purpose of communication or exchanging ideas.

3. PL I don't think language forms are very important.

4. FT Errors in language forms are acceptable to you?

5. PL Right

6. DX You can't say they are errors. […] as you [i.e. PL] said, two interlocutors communicate their ideas, you can't focus on a certain string, focus on the form of language, because you are mutually exchanging your ideas.

7. PL When two interlocutors communicate, what is important is not what utterance you make-

8. DX -right-

9. PL -how you articulate, but-

10. DX -but what ideas you express

[2 turns omitted]

11. HW […] In my view, these so-called errors made by Chinese speakers are actually reflecting China's, Chinese speakers' way of speaking, or Chinese speakers' culture and custom. As we said, they are just different from Westerners' English in terms of forms. So we actually don't necessarily have to view them as errors. They are just used by Chinese speakers, who speak in a way different from that of Westerners…

12. PL I think this is also a process in which English keeps being enriched.

13. HW Right.

14. PL […] English has borrowed a lot from French, German and other countries' languages. It is a process in which languages from different cultures integrate into each other. During the process in which different cultures learn from each other and mutually integrate, English is developed continuously. Then different cultures and ideologies are enriched continuously.

15. HZ I agree with this viewpoint. I accept, partially accept.

16. M Partially accept? What are accepted and what are not?

17. HZ The errors which can be corrected should be corrected of course. But those errors, especially pronunciation errors made by Chinese speakers, say 90% above of Chinese speakers, must be acceptable, should be acceptable for them [i.e. NESs].

| 18. M | Do you accept? |
| 19. HZ | Of course I accept, as I might speak this way as well. |

PL opened this sequence with her argument against the focus on the formulaic forms of English in intercultural communication (64.1). She talked about the purpose of communication and criticised the unrealistic expectation for a unified form of English in use. PL's idea of users in relation to their differences in English use revealed her WE-orientedunderstanding of 'varieties' in relation to speech community (64.1). However, her idea stimulated FT (turn 2) and DX (turn 6) to make sense of English variation in relation to communication practices. DX's view highly corresponded with Widdowson's (1994) and Seidlhofer's (2011:94) argument that 'English is a dynamic process, and naturally varies and changes as it spreads into different domains of use and communities of users' and therefore the spread of English involves 'the processes of variation and change that are activated by it'.

FT endeavoured to make sense of PL's idea. He repeated PL's point (64.2) and expected a clarified answer to the question as to whether errors in terms of formulaic forms were acceptable (64. 4). PL was confident in confirming her idea (64.3 and 64.5). DX followed up and paraphrased PL's idea (64.6). Clearly, DX and PL took turns to reiterate the idea that PL expressed (see 64.1) and tried to convince FT why formulaic errors should not be viewed as unacceptable.

HW joined the alliance formed between DX and PL by offering an alternative explanation to the 'errors' made by Chinese speakers (64.11). He proposed to view the 'errors' made by Chinese speakers as indicators of L1 Chinese culture and identity. In particular, he suggested the distinction between 'difference' and 'error'. This view echoes Jenkins's distinction (2009) between the EFL and ELF perspectives. Supporting HW, PL sought to explain the acceptability of 'errors' from the angle of language change (64.12). According to her, creativity in English resulted from the influence of other L1 cultures. HZ appeared to be critical in accepting PL's argument (64.15). He offered his viewpoint that not all errors made by Chinese speakers should be considered as acceptable (64.19). He made a distinction between the errors made by Chinese speakers as a group and the errors made by individual Chinese speakers. He strongly argued for the acceptability of the errors made by Chinese speakers as a group. Here it is possible to see that HZ was viewing Chinese speakers as members of a community in

their shared way of using English. Importantly, it is interpretable that HZ did not view Chinese speakers' shared way of using English as 'anything goes'.

Apparently, the group had developed a positive attitude towards the 'errors' made by Chinese speakers. Throughout the sequence, efforts were made to justify the acceptability of difference from NSE.

6.3.2. Factors influencing attitudinal development

6.3.2.1.   Belief in the NES ownership

Belief in NES ownership was particularly evident in group A. Earlier in the group discussion of how the participants should treat Chinese speakers' own English, the group decision was made that Chinese speakers' own English should be tolerated in real life ELF communication but NSE should be targeted for ELT practice. It is inferable that the group saw the gap between tolerability and legitimacy, as they excluded Chinese speakers' own English for classroom pedagogy. With the conversation progressing, group A members came to the point of discussing the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English. The group then divided. MJ led one side arguing for the gatekeeping role of NESs, while the majority of the members took the other side challenging the gatekeeping role of NESs. The minority led by MJ won over. The process revealed how other members struggled to challenge NESs' gatekeeping role and lost their ground little-by- little. In turn, their discussion informed us of the strong and resistant belief in NESs' gatekeeping role. Interestingly, some issues were brought up in the challenge to the NES ownership. Extract 65 presents part of this process:

Extract 65 (group A)

1. JC   We agree that native English speaking countries are norm providers. I am not changing my mind now. If they can accept our use of English, the promotion of our English will need less effort. But their acceptance is influenced by the rest 1.7 billion speakers [i.e. NNESs]-

2. JI   -But if you think this is correct or something, if you write this on your examination answer sheets or something, how do you think the teachers will react?

3. AW   Currently, this is wrong of course. As she [i.e. MJ] said, native speakers don't accept this, so, so this is still wrong at the present. But just like what happened to *long time no see*, which has been accepted by <u>them</u>. It is possible for *give you some colour to see see* to be accepted. Then it will not be wrong any more.

4. MJ   So the norm providers remain to be native speakers.

5. JC   I'd like to continue with my point. They are norm providers. But they are

---

> not dictators, they are not the boss, they can't make us do this or that. They need to communicate with us. We were talking about native speakers as a big group. But what if individual native speakers come to China. They need to do business with us. In order to communicate with us, won't they accept <u>this kind of English</u>? You can't deny the possibility that more and more native speakers turn to accept this kind of English over time…We might never use this kind of English in our exams, as we know this is wrong. But written forms are not our major forms of communication. In oral communication, the errors in oral English are possible to be accepted.
>
> 6. AW   Oral English must be more flexible.
> 7. MJ   Even if we look for the future, this kind of English will still be judged according to native speakers' standard. Either now or in the future, you shouldn't consider this kind of English as acceptable or correct until it has been accepted by native speakers [So the standard remains native speakers.
> 8. ZR   [<lower voice> by both parties <lower voice>

In the beginning of this sequence, JC first expressed her agreement to the role of NESs as the norm providers of English and then raised the issue of NNESs' influence on NESs. It was possible to see that JC only argued for the marginal role of NNESs in language change, if taking into account JC's arguments in other places than in this sequence. She highlighted the necessity of correcting 'errors' for ELT purposes. Simultaneously, she showed her enthusiasm in Chinese culture and suggested more loan words could be borrowed from Chinese to NSE. However, she argued for the incorporation of loan words into NSE instead of the appropriation of English by NNESs. Her idea was exactly the same as expressed by many interview participants like PHH (see pp.191-192 above) who supported the inclusion of Chinese loan words into NSE. However, JC's argument for even a marginal role of NNESs in language change attracted criticism. JI expressed her strong disagreement, even before JC finished her turn, by raising the issue of the penalty for differences from NSE (65.2).

AW brought in a dynamic perspective (65.3). She showed her awareness of the current situation in which 'errors' were defined by NESs but claimed possible change in the future by referring to the example *long time no see*. Noticeably, however, she continued to seek the acceptance by 'them', i.e. NESs (65.3). An alliance seemed to have formed between JC and AW. The two shared the belief in NESs' role as gatekeepers and also the belief in NNESs' active involvement in language change.

The alliance was particularly evident in JC's attitude (65.5) towards 'this kind of English' like *give you some colour to see see*. JC argued in favour of the English

borrowed from Chinese and showing Chinese culture, but excluded other 'errors' that disagreed with NSE norms. However, she seemed to argue for the potential of 'this kind of English' to be accepted (65.5). Possibly, she was convinced by AW's example *long time no see*. It was also possible that she sought an alliance with the members who had generally similar ideas to her that NNESs were contributing to the language change process. Nonetheless, their arguments failed to challenge the gatekeeping role of NESs, as MJ pointed out (65.4).

JC seemed to be unhappy with the result that MJ summarized. She made another attempt to enhance her argument for the influence of NNESs on NESs' English (65.5). Firstly, she claimed that NESs could not force NNESs. Secondly, she focused on NESs' interest in accepting some examples of Chinese speakers' use of English. Thirdly, she limited her acceptance of 'erroneous' use of English to oral communication. AW echoed her in terms of limiting 'erroneous' use of English to oral communication (65.5). This further confirmed the alliance between AW and JC.

Clearly, JC and AW struggled to resist NNESs' role as passive receivers of native English. However, the two could not break through the belief in the NSE ownership. JC's arguments made her struggle emerge. While she kept accepting NESs as norm providers, she repeatedly denied the submissiveness of NNESs. Importantly, she was the first person in the group who made these two points simultaneously. She seemed to have the concern that NESs' gatekeeping role was associated with NNESs' submissiveness. Otherwise, she would make no attempt to disconnect the two issues. Yet, she was cautious about NESs' stance. She talked about the benefits for NESs to accept NNESs and limited NNES-like use of English. This seemed problematic in that she focused on NESs' benefit rather on NNESs' benefit, whereas she assumed that NNESs voluntarily support NESs' gatekeeping role. Undoubtedly, the gatekeeping role continued to be assigned to NESs.

Subsequently, MJ explained that the key to the gatekeeping role was the power to approve or disapprove (65.7). Through her clarification, she claimed her advantage in the debate. She emphasized her point that NESs were the people who had the power. ZR attempted to correct MJ's point that NESs were the only gatekeepers (65.8). She considered the gatekeeping role was shared by both NESs and NNESs. However, she spoke in a lower voice and did not explain this further. A possible reason was that she was not confident in her own idea. This was interpretable when I looked back to her

arguments at the beginning of the group discussion (the data is shown in extract 80 below with which I discuss ZR's change in detail). She changed from strongly arguing for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English to echoing that Chinese speakers' own English was an indicator of the failure to achieve near- NSE competence.

BH joined in to challenge MJ, by bringing in the idea that nobody could claim the authority in English (66.1):

Extract 66(group A)

1. BH   Standard is not stipulated by particular persons. Not a particular organization would say, we stipulate the standard, what we stipulated is the standard.
    [many participants laugh, but MJ does not]

2. MJ   The standard [we are talking about] is not something in text forms or like a document. It is not something that is printed out and posted and let you know this is standard. It is just the standard in people's mind. That is to say, people would accept this kind of English only if native speakers accept…

3. BH   So the standard in people's mind. But it is not fixed.

4. JC   We don't disagree. In my view, I don't disagree that they [i.e. NESs] are the persons who approve this kind of English. But they should also negotiate with many other people prior to their approval or disapproval

5. MJ   Influenced by other people [i.e. NNESs]-

6. JC   -I don't think we are conflicting

7. MJ   This is just a matter of time. They will be influenced. But they are the final gatekeeper…

8. JC   Exactly. What we discussed earlier was not different. In terms of communication, we seek to achieve the common sense. By common sense, it is not the case that he as a native speaker decides the standard. You agree with the standard as well. The standard is not unchanged but <u>changeable</u>. I don't think we are having a different idea now. <u>They have the leading power, and they do have</u>. But this is not to say [they are not influenced by NNESs].

His challenge prompted laughter. Except MJ, all other participants laughed. This can be interpreted as the division between MJ on the one hand and the other members on the other hand. In MJ's view, BH seemed to misunderstand what a standard is. She clarified her understanding of a standard and repeated NES's role (66.2). BH defended himself and expressed his idea that the key point was the flexibility of English (66.3). BH's idea seemed to suggest his argument for the appropriation of English by NNESs. However, he did not say much and thus led to ambiguity. What could be confirmed was that he challenged what MJ said about the gatekeeping role assigned to NESs. The tension seemed to increase while BH problematized MJ, who seemed to have control over the discussion.

212

Before anybody reacted to BH's idea of the flexibility of English, JC sought to reconcile with MJ by echoing MJ's view of NESs' role in approving and disapproving English (66.4). JC clearly played the role of a negotiator between the two sides of views and kept saying that the two sides did not conflict with each other. She tried to take BH's point that the standard was 'changeable' (66.8), although she was apparently influenced by MJ. She repeatedly explained her agreement to both sides before she came up with the idea of the 'leading power' of NESs. Noticeably, she was not interrupted by anyone but voluntarily stopped her argument with her turn unfinished. It is not difficult to infer what the unsaid words could be, as I specified in the brackets.

However, the result that JC negotiated to achieve seemed not to be satisfactory. A new perspective was brought in by AW to challenge MJ:

Extract 67(group A)

1. AW   But if you change to another perspective. We are always creating things and changing English. If you think this way, aren't we contributing to kind of standard? We're also, we are creating, so we are providers of norms as well, aren't we? We are in active position.
2. MJ   But at the end of the day, it is still native speakers who decide approve or disapprove. Only their approval can make our use acceptable…
3. JC   I have another question for you guys … I went to English Corner when I was in my first year of university and met an Indian guy. I personally think his English was very bad, very non-standard, and very unpleasant. His pronunciation was not standard. His grammar was possibly, I am not sure, I didn't pay attention to his grammar to see whether there were errors or not. But his English must be different from native speakers' English for sure. So in that situation, I communicated with him. His English was acceptable internationally, as known as Indian English. Everyone acknowledged this set of standard. But when he was talking with me, I felt that I couldn't communicate with him. In such a situation, <u>should I turn to a British speaker and ask him to judge our English and tell us what we should do between us</u>?

AW's articulation confirmed the struggle that JC had earlier. While JC was reluctant to spell out the submissiveness associated with NESs' gatekeeping role, AW made explicit this issue and shouted her view that Chinese speakers were norm providers (67.1). Such a voice emerged after the interaction between the dominant argument for NESs' gatekeeping role and different undermining voices. AW's articulation reminded me of Brutt-Griffler's (2002) argument that NNESs were agents driving behind the spread of English rather than submissive to the distribution of NSE.

We can see the split in the alliance between AW and JC. While AW became more independent from NESs, JC developed a stronger belief in NESs' role of gatekeeping. However, AW's voice seemed to draw JC back to her alliance. While MJ repeated her view (67.2), JC brought in her experience of dealing with Indian speakers in intercultural communication and asked a rhetorical question (67.3), which was very similar to ELF researchers' (e.g. Jenkins 2006) question to mainstream EFL perspective adherents: In intercultural communications with the absence of NESs, should NESs remain to be the judges of English? AW's turn appeared to have a strong influence on JC who was hesitating. In light of this, AW's self-awareness was a possible trigger for JC's turning point. To put it differently, the reflection on Chinese speakers' position in English and their position in relation to NESs seemed to make a difference. Further, it is fair to say that the reflection on Chinese speakers' identity seemed to be a factor contributing to the reflection on the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English.

Extract 68 (group A)

1. MJ   …Indian English is accepted because it agrees with the whole system of English. *Indian* is just a moderator. Indian English is a kind of [native speakers'] English.
2. JC   Won't Chinese speakers develop their English according to their system and accepted by them as well?
3. MJ   They will accept if you conform to their system. But the precondition is still that you should conform to their system… Don't you think that every learner of English in the world refers to their English norms? No matter whether it is Indian English, Australian English or other Englishes, they all originate from the original English…You must be approved by them before your English is accepted by the world.
4. XC   Will you stop the use if they don't approve?
5. HJ   According to what you said, *British* is just a moderator as well, British English, a kind of English.
    [many participants laugh]
6. MJ   British English, it is not, well, there is American English, American English is very popular in the country, possibly because America is more powerful. It has the power to make you, well, the so-called hegemony. Just imagine if American is not so powerful and Britain remains to be the hegemony. Do you still think that American English could be developed into the competitor of British English? I don't think it is possible. This is decided by its economy. It is powerful. That is hegemony.
7. JI   If China becomes stronger in the future, will Chinese be in the same situation?
8. AW   That is not doubtful.
9. XZ   Wrong. Our teacher has said that Chinese is difficult to be popularized.
10. MJ   Difficulty doesn't mean impossibility… No matter whether you are talking about language or culture, you can't ignore economy, politics, and military. As long as you're strong enough, others will learn your language…

MJ's reaction (68.1) to JC's question revealed her assumption that Indian English was a kind of NSE. It is not surprising that she had such an assumption, if we look back at her repeated idea that the authority of English was assigned to NESs. Again, JC made an attempt to settle the conflict between Chinese speakers' role in language change and NESs' role in gatekeeping (68.2). Her articulation still reflected her strong attachment to NSE. She talked about the possibility of Chinese speakers conforming to NSE norms and claiming the ownership of their English. Apparently, she avoided discussing the issue of the English used by Chinese speakers in the way which was different from NESs' use of English. The avoidance possibly suggested a lack of confidence in addressing the issue of Chinese speakers' creativity in relation to NSE. Again, we can see her struggle between her awareness of Chinese speakers' agency and her belief in the symbolic power of NESs.

Subsequently, MJ repeated her view of NESs as the gatekeepers of English (68.3). Further, she made clear her assumption that any variations in English were approved by speakers of 'original English' before they become legitimate. Her argument attracted questions in no time. XC threw a question to MJ as to whether the creativity could be stopped (68.4). With such a question, XC seemed to challenge NESs' influence on NNESs' use of English in real life. Following XC, HJ questioned MJ's logic in her argument. According to HJ, he did not see the difference between Indian English as a variety and British English as a variety (68.5). HJ's comment triggered laughter of many other participants. This can be interpreted as a way of some silent agreement by the members who laughed in the context in which almost all speakers were making efforts to challenge MJ

MJ chose to address HJ's challenge (68.6), although HJ came after XC. A possible reason was that MJ regarded the defence of her logic as more urgent. Another possible reason was that the second commenter's voice was more likely to stay in MJ's memory due to what Miller and Campbell (1959) label as 'recency effect', that is, people tend to pay more attention to what are most recently heard. I would opt for the first possibility. In the context when HJ's comment triggered laughter, MJ might feel pressured to address this issue. She started with an attempt to explain what she thought of British English. However, she was soon stuck, as we can see that she did not finish her sentence 'it is not…' before she quickly turned to talk about American English. She came up with the notion of *hegemony* and brought up the idea that the development of a variety

depended on the economic development of the speakers. What she said (68.6) obviously conflicted with her prior insistence that the speakers of 'original English' should decide the acceptance of other Englishes. Despite the inconsistency, MJ was confident in her belief of the influence of economy on language development. She further applied her belief to the prediction of the development of Chinese (68.10).

XC asked the question again as to whether NESs' negative view of Chinese speakers' English would stop the existence of this kind of English (69.1):

Extract 69 (group A)

1. XC   I have another question, the expressions, for example, people mountain people see, give you some colour to see see. They are actually created by us, when they are accepted by native speakers. Who do you think make the rule?
2. MJ   What do you mean by the rule?
3. XC   Who are the norm providers?
4. MJ   The culture inside the expressions, just in terms of culture at the surface level, is still belonging to us. But the expressions are accepted because they approved… so who do you think should be considered as the norm providers?
5. XC   If they don't accept, will you stop the use of English like this?
6. MJ   … You can still use it, but you will still regard it as erroneous.

XC's question resembled Kirkpatrick's (2006) metaphor that the lack of a birth certificate could not deny the existence of a baby. That is to say, NNSEs exist no matter how they are perceived. Using the metaphor, Kirkpatrick argues for the legitimacy of NNSEs. It is necessary to make a decision as to whether XC had the answers to the questions she asked herself. The discoursal context suggested that MJ led a side highlighting the symbolic power of NESs, whereas other participants, for instance, AW, ZR, BH and HJ, disagreed with MJ's position. XC asked the questions to MJ rather than others. She used the examples of Chinese speakers' creativity in English. This resembled AW's argument (67.1) for the reconsideration of Chinese speakers' role in language change. MJ's position was made clear a few times before XC first asked her question (68.4). XC asked MJ to decide who should be considered as the norm providers with regards to the English created by Chinese speakers (69.1-3). It is inferable that XC saw MJ's position as unable to address the creative use of English by Chinese speakers. When MJ consolidated her idea of NESs' symbolic power, XC asked MJ whether the creative use could be stopped if NESs rejected. This confirmed her intention to challenge NESs' symbolic power claimed by MJ. In light of this, XC's

216

answer to the question who should decide the acceptability of Chinese speakers' English was different from MJ's. However, MJ remained confident in her own argument. She reinforced her position by answering XC's question and emphasizing again the point that the use did not justify the legitimacy (69.6).

Looking back to MJ's argument for linguistic hegemony in relation to politics, economy and national development (68.10), we can see MJ changed her argument when the issue was turned back to Chinese speakers' own English. MJ did not bring up her belief of the influence of economy any more. Rather, she insisted on NESs' gatekeeping role. Thus, a sharp contrast was seen between what she said about the development of Chinese and what she said about the development of Chinese speakers' own English. This suggested MJ's strongl rejection to associate Chinese speakers' own English with the notion of legitimacy.To put differently, MJ robustly criticized the view of Chinese speakers' English as legitimate.

Immediately after MJ, ZR took a long turn and expressed her changed perception with regards to Chinese speakers' own English (70.1). ZR's change signalled the influence of MJ's view on the group discussion and the failure of the group members who attempted to challenge the ownership of NES.

Extract 70

1. ZR   As far as such things are concerned, I think Chinese speakers' English, it gives us the impression that it is possible to develop further. <u>But</u> the process is very slow, very slow. How to say? We've just considered the situation in which we communicate with foreigners, that is, the native English speaking countries such as Britain and America. However, […] <u>it is not seen that in the countries, small countries, for example, Arabian countries, or countries like these, people learn English according to our way of using English.</u> Rather, they also look to American English for reference when they speak English. That is why I think the development is slow.
2. AW   China is developing fast economically. And the communication-
3. ZR   -Do you think they would look for Chinese speakers for reference?
4. MJ   Impossible. It is impossible that learners of English follow Chinese speakers' own standard.
5. ZR   Impossible that learners follow-
6. MJ   As if in your classroom, the teacher would teach you either British English or American English, or Australian…
7. ZR   Right. We think, our <u>Chinese speakers' English might be acceptable for those who are from native English speaking countries when we communicate with them</u>. However, when we communicate with people from those small countries, other countries in the world, the interlocutors won't be able to understand us.

At the start of group discussion, ZR was confident in Chinese speakers' own English and argued that Chinese speakers should not submissively follow NSE norms. I will discuss ZR's attitudinal change in more detail later (see section 6.3.2.3). Here I would like to draw attention to her reflection on her 'impression' that Chinese speakers' English deserved acknowledgement (70.1) and her frustration that had been developed through the group discussion in favour of the NES ownership of English. ZR started with her self-reflection on her previous confidence in Chinese speakers' English and soon changed her discourse direction with the word *but*. She took a new factor into consideration, imagining Chinese speakers' encounters with other NNESs. She assumed that other NNESs would have difficulty in understanding Chinese speakers' English. By bringing this new issue, she changed to suspect the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English. Her change from the confidence in Chinese speakers' English to the suspect of Chinese speakers' English seemed to suggest her realisation of the gap between the illusion and the reality.

AW seemed to remain positive towards Chinese speakers' own English, as she was making effort to persuade ZR to change (70.2). Apart from China's economic development, AW attempted to give another reason for ZR to become positive again. However, she was interrupted by ZR (70.3). This revealed ZR's difficulty in taking in other views as she seemed to make a decision on the issue of the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English. ZR showed her major concern for the acceptance of Chinese speakers' own English in a wider community (70.1) and further explained this concern (70.3 and 70.7).

In response to AW's positive attitude, ZR seemed to seek support from AW by asking for the confirmation of the possibility that Chinese speakers' English can be accepted by other NNESs (70.3). However, her illusion was abruptly broken by MJ, who indicated the strong belief in the impossibility (70.4) and highlighted the symbolic role of NESs in current situation (70.6). Eventually, ZR changed to stand with MJ, although she attempted to maintain her argument for the acceptability of Chinese speakers' English by limiting this kind of English to some imaginary situation. This was interpreted with the string 'Chinese speakers' English might be acceptable' for NESs. It became clear that ZR stopped arguing for Chinese speakers' English in its own right.

To conclude, the group dynamics revealed the wrestling between two sides with regards to either the defence of or the challenge against NESs' symbolic power. The process appeared to be dramatic. MJ was the major speaker who argued for NESs' symbolic power. Many other participants made attempts to challenge her argument but failed.

MJ's arguments had a lot of pitfalls and inconsistences. For example, her misassumption of Indian English as a kind of English 'approved' by NESs before it was legitimized. Another example is her argument for NESs' symbolic power. While she sometimes assigned the sole power to the speakers of 'original English' in the development of other Englishes, she considered the economic hegemony as the only factor behind the development of any Englishes.

Other participants made great efforts to challenge MJ. The only moment when MJ was successfully problematized was HJ's criticism of her logic. However, she resolved her awkwardness by bringing up the notion of hegemony. Apart from the criticism of MJ's logic, three important issues were brought up, which seemed to offer opportunities to problematize MJ's argument. The major issue was Chinese speakers' active involvement in the process of language change. A second issue was the awareness of ELF communication without the presence of NESs. A third issue was the impossibility to stop NNESs' creativity. However, those issues were resolved by MJ who simply emphasized on the gatekeeping role of NESs..

It is necessary to understand why the majority who would have developed strong arguments lost the debate to MJ who had conceptual pitfalls and worked with little support from others. As seen in the analysis, the majority who attempted to challenge MJ could not resolve the issue that NESs have the final say in approving NNSEs. This point was not challenged at all. It was striking that they kept hoping that Chinese speakers' English could be 'approved' by NESs, while they argued for Chinese speakers' contribution to the development of their own English. It seemed that they could not break through the centralized belief in NESs' approval, while they struggled to argue for the attention to the marginal role that Chinese speakers play in their own language development. In particular, JC indicated a few times that the acknowledgement of Chinese speakers' influence did not undermine NESs' symbolic power.

The indicator that MJ won the debate was ZR's change in her attitude. At the beginning of the group discussion, ZR strongly argued for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English, and talked about her perceived association between China' development and Chinese speakers' own English. However, she became frustrated with the development of group discussion and sceptical for the development of Chinese speakers' English. In short, group A was overwhelmed by the centralized belief of NSEs' symbolic power, despite the struggle for Chinese speakers' agency in the development of their own English. ZR, like many other participants, was disempowered and lost their confidence little by little with MJ's repetitive emphasis on NESs symbolic power. Thus, while the participants who struggled seemed to need empowering with comprehensive conceptual support, the belief in NSEs' symbolic power needs to be decentralized. This is a tentative conclusion, and further inquiry is needed.

6.3.2.2.   Gatekeeping practice

Group C stood out of the four groups in that it was the only group which showed positive attitude towards Chinese speakers' own English and argued for its acceptability. Nevertheless, their efforts seemed to be undermined when the issue of NES norms-based examination emerged. To understand this point, I shall present extract 71, which shows the process through which the group struggled to identify what was in the way of Chinese speakers' own English being accepted as legitimate.

Extract 71 (group C)

1. M   As for English like these [i.e. the examples of Chinese speakers' 'deviant' use of English on the hand out], would you like to accept it [this kind of English] as standard?
2. HW   <u>This must be a very long journey</u>. [all participants laugh] I think, my position is like this, I don't object it. <u>But at present</u>, I don't think it is realistic to expect most people to accept it and to expect teachers to use it for the purpose of ELT.
3. DH   <in a low voice>If I am the teacher, I don't want them to carry out the standard including English like this<in a low voice> @@. Because I've already learned their English, now you want me to change, is it confused?
4. M   What do you mean?
5. DH   I mean-
6. WJ   -you are used to that, aren't you?
7. DH   Since I first learned English, I've been exposed to their correct (English), the way British and American use English. Now a kind of Chinese English comes out, my own English, I have to follow that (Chinese English), I have to teach student (Chinese English), I really feel confused.
8. DX   If others are using Chinese English, don't criticize it. You can accept it as correct, can't you? If your students speak Chinese English, you don't

220

		correct them. That is it.
9.	DH	If I am talking with others who speak (Chinese) English, I can communicate and let it go. But if my students (speak Chinese English), I will still correct them, <u>at the moment</u>.
	[3]	
10.	FT	Actually I think the key is examination. Examination needs a standard.
11.	HW	[Right right right. Actually I think
12.	HZ	[Examination. You use English in a wrong way, then you are wrong. You will be marked down. What shall you do? Right?
	[all participants laugh]	
13.	HW	So in current situation in China, for students in particular-
14.	HZ	-In communication, it is all right if the English is intelligible. But examination is another thing. Everybody knows about the education system in China
15.	HW	[Right right right.
16.	HZ	[We are not learning (English) to communicate.
17.	M	You are not learning (English) to communicate. This is interesting.
	[all participants laugh]	
	[5 turns omitted]	
18.	HZ	The (ELF) concept you talked about is for the purpose of communication, not for the purpose of examination, two different things.

The sequence started with the moderator's invitation for the opinion of the legitimation of the 'errors' made by Chinese speakers (71.1). HW was the first to make a response (71.2). He opened his turn by predicting the challenge for the issue of legitimacy rather than simply indicating his personal acceptance or rejection. Before the issue of legitimacy was raised in this extract, HW showed his strong endorsement for Chinese speakers' English that was different from NSE in other places of the group discussion. In this sequence, however, HW expressed his attitude in a subtle way. The prediction of the legitimation as 'a very long journey' seemed to suggest that the consideration of the legitimation involved a lot of issues and thus marginalized personal intention. He used double negation to imply his acceptance of Chinese speakers' own English immediately before he used 'but at present' to shift his focus and suggested he would take a different position in a specific context. HW talked about the reason why Chinese speakers' own English was not welcomed but detached himself from the nominalized situation, as he gave the impression that he was talking about his assumption of others' reaction.

All of these combined to suggest that HW was cautious with the discussion of the legitimation issue. At the surface level, he seemed to have no objection to the legitimation. Nonetheless, he highlighted the challenge and indicated little confidence in the feasibility of the legitimation. In turn, he seemed to send the negative message that the legitimation of Chinese speakers' English was daunting. It is therefore interpretable

221

that he was not actually embracing the idea of the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English due to his concern for the context. This seemed to suggest his hesitation and unwillingness to reject the idea of legitimating Chinese speakers' own English, but there was a lack of optimism on the potential for the acceptance of such English by a bigger group in the social context.

HW's phrase *a very long journey* (71.2) triggered laughter form all participants including himself. The laughter can be interpreted as the group's cohesion on HW's strategy of dealing with the moderator's question. This was confirmed with the overall lack of enthusiasm in the discussion of the question that the moderator raised and the content in the responses they made afterwards.

DH echoed HW's opinion by putting herself into the shoes that HW imagined (71.3). She expressed the idea that she would not welcome the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English if she was a teacher. Noticeably, she said so in a low voice. It is necessary to pay attention to the context. The group had achieved consensus that 'errors' made by Chinese speakers should not be evaluated upon whether the forms agreed with NSE. The group confidence was built up. At the point when the issue turned to legitimation, HW showed his pessimism in his encounter with the issue. DH took the turn after HW. This can be interpreted as her attempt to make sense of what HW had said. In turn, her utterance in a low voice seemed to suggest that she was thinking aloud in order to address the change from confidence to pessimism led by HW. She further expressed in a normal voice her confusion in the imagined situation if NSE was taken over by Chinese speakers' own English.

Interestingly, while the moderator regarded it as necessary to ask DH for clarification, WJ (71.6) showed his understanding of DH's articulation and interrupted her to help her to co-construct the description of such an imagined situation, in which an ELT practitioner regarded the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English as questionable. DH's explanation confirmed WJ's understanding (71.7). This suggested the shared feeling at least among HW, DH and WJ. DX provided a solution to DH's problem and showed his disagreement to the others' hesitation with regards to the issue of legitimacy (71.8). However, DH defended her own attitude by treating Chinese speakers' English according to different purposes: while she could let it go in real life communication, she could not accept Chinese speakers' English used by her students. Such an idea

resonated with the viewpoint co-constructed in group A. That is to say, she saw a gap between the English used for real life communication and the English as legitimate in classrooms. It needs to be noted that she used *at the moment* to define the valid time of her argument (71.9). That is to say, she is open to possible change in the issue of legitimacy. This made her attitude still different from that was co-constructed in group A (see pp.209-211 above). In the meantime, DH's explanation consolidated what HW expressed in turn 2. Following her turn, there was short silence. It was possible that the strengthened argument convinced other members, who were not excited with the group decision on the issue of how to take positions regarding the legitimation of Chinese speakers' English. A second possible interpretation was the deliberation upon the point made by HW and DH.

The silence was broken by FT, who only took a few turns during the whole discussion. He brought up the issue of examination (71.10), which seemed to have greatly engaged other group members. As observed in the process, participants were eager to take turns with the prompt given by FT, although HZ appeared to be dominant. HW echoed HZ a few times. No disagreement to HZ's idea was expressed. HZ offered explanation to FT's point. His attitude reflects a conflict between what the participants considered as acceptable with their ELF perspective and what they considered as safe for practical reasons (71.18).

In light of this, the silence following DH (71.9) suggested the preparation for the problem-solving process. The problem was pointed out by HW (71.2) that Chinese speakers' English was not possible to be accepted by the wider community. FT (71.10) made an attempt to resolve the issue by finding out what was there to undermine the wider acceptance. His contribution was acknowledged by other group members.

A big argument was made by HZ, as he said, 'we are not learning (English) to communicate' (71.14). This argument echoed many ELF researchers' (e.g. Dewey 2012) observations that ELF needs to be introduced into the classroom. When the moderator repeated HZ's words, she caused the laughter of all participants. Subsequently, other participants made attempts to make HZ's point clearer (where 5 turns were omitted) and therefore showed their endorsement to what HZ said. It is clear that the whole group agreed to the perceived gap between what was acceptable in their views and what was accepted in social reality. The sequence ended up with HZ's summary (71.16), which showed his perception that the ELF conception had not been

integrated into ELT yet and in turn Chinese speakers' own English can only be considered tolerable but not legitimate. This is actually an overarching argument made by the group members, as echoed in HW and DH's articulations. The problem was thus resolved to the extent that the challenge had been identified as the concern for examinations. In light of this, NSE norms-based ELT practice was a big obstacle in accepting the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English. This finding mirrors Ranta's study (2010) that university students are open to ELF communication but insist on NSE norms for classroom purposes.

To recap, the group members shared the viewpoint that Chinese speakers' own English was justifiable for itself. On the other hand, they achieved the consensus that the legitimation of Chinese speakers' English conflicted with the social reality, in which NSE norms were socially accepted as the golden rules. The shared awareness of the conflict was developed through group discussion. The concern for the gatekeeping role assigned to NSE norms was a big obstacle in the way of the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English in the participants' attitudes.

6.3.2.3.   The influence of an ELF conception

Group C revealed a good understanding of the ELF concept and demonstrated a process in which an ELF conception empowered participants in dealing with the issue of legitimizing Chinese speakers' own English. In group A, however, the seemingly good understanding of the ELF concept was not well employed to support group members' arguments for Chinese speakers' own English in conflict with NSEs.

I compared group A and group C in terms of their responses to the question of how they thought of the ELF conception. Both groups seemed to have good understanding of ELF conception at the surface level. While group A had more tensions between group members in their interaction, group C seemed to have stronger group cohesion. I took the group compositions into consideration. Group A consisted of all English majors with both first degrees and second degrees. Group C consisted of an equal number of English majors and non-English majors. It was possible that the non-English majors treated English majors as 'experts' in language and tended to listen to them. However, this seemed to be difficult to support. Non-English majors actively got involved in the discussions and presented their ideas. Group members were all interviewed. This allowed my observation of their attitudinal change or development.

224

In the meantime, group A seemed to have a kind of 'power' issue as BA English majors were mixed with MA English majors. However, this seemed not to be a problem, in particular when MJ as a BA student won over the discussion with little support, although other participants including MA students took turns to challenge her. While the marginalized 'power' issue suggested little effect on group composition, MJ's confidence in NESs' symbolic power was highlighted.

Having resolved the possible effects of group compositions, I examined how the similar start with the ELF conception ended up with different conclusions between group A and group C. The examination revealed whether and how an ELF conception operated throughout the group discussions, whether and how a good understanding of the ELF concept made a difference in attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English.

I shall present how two participants (DX in group C and ZR in group A) developed or changed their perceptions in different interactive contexts. Their attitudinal changes will offer us some insight into the interactive contexts, which will inform us of the influence of an ELF conception on the group discussions.

DX in group C

The group discussion appeared to be a journey for DX, through which DX developed his understanding of ELF communication and critical thinking of Chinese speakers' own English. The influence on DX's attitudinal development seemed to be elusive most of the time, while noticeable influences were found in some places in the group discussion. For this reason, it is not possible to always show the context of DX's attitudes at different points. Nonetheless, an examination of DX's attitudes along the progress of discussion suggests his development in the small social context formed by group C members.

In the beginning, DX expressed his confusion with an ELF conception in terms of the process of accommodation. As he said,

Extract 72 (group C)

1. DX   We learn the English used by those who speak English as their first language. But we definitely made some changes in our process of learning from them. The changes, I mean, we might use English in the way which is different from their use. But I might speak English, my English might not be understood by them, by those who are from Britain or other countries.

225

> What you talked about, er, the agreement achieved temporarily, right? Well, I am not saying I don't understand. But that process, I still think a little bit (confused).

Subsequently, he showed his confusion with the idea of flexible language, when HW dismissed the idea of a fixed standard of English.

Extract 73 (group C)

1. HW   I don't think there should be a, or a fixed (standard). Like what you said just now, agreement achieved temporarily. After that, after we have finished the communication (between us), (in) the communication with others, there should be another agreement achieved, or another third-party language will be used for the purpose of communication.

2. DX   You use so many third-party language, a third-party language with this one, and a third-party language with another one, how can (you use English this way)?

[many participants laugh]

Then, he expressed his belief in what made an error. In his view, intelligibility could not justify the legitimacy of 'errors'. He was not convinced that an 'error' should be reconsidered according to its function in communicative contexts. As he said,

---

Extract 74 (group C)

1. DX   Although you can make yourself understood, but sometimes, it (i.e. an error) is still a kind of, for example, if you say *she go to school*, you said you understood what I meant, you understood what I meant. But it is still a kind of error.

Along with the development of group interaction, DX was found to reflect on his own attitude. The following sequence showed his self-reflection:

Extract 75(group C)

1. DX   Like when you speak Mandarin. If I say *jigai*, that is an error, isn't it? If I say *jigai*, will you think this is an error? You will still know that I mean j*ixie*, right? It is intelligible to other people. But such a mutual thing. It is like, if I say *jigai*, you would say, this guy seems, Well, <u>I better not to say more.</u>

2. HZ   I think there should be a standard. But privately, in everyday talk, everyday communication, if communication is not failed, there should be no problem.

226

> 3. DX   Actually, for the purpose of communication in the subconscious level, I
> don't think *jigai* is wrong. But that is a kind of common sense. That is, it
> is a kind of standard: if you say *jigai*, as long as that kind of common
> sense (i.e. NSE ideology) exists, you are making an error.

The sequence started with DX's use of an analogy to Mandarin Chinese (75.1). He
recognized the intelligibility of 'errors' but felt hesitant to accept 'errors'. He used a lot
of questions to ask for other participants' confirmation and support. He showed his
worry about how non-standard use of a language would affect his image in the eyes of
other people. However, he did not finish his sentence 'this guy seems…' and stopped
with his statement, 'I better not to say more' (75.1). This can be interpreted as his
hesitance to link 'errors' with a negative image with his awareness of the
communicative context. It is possible to infer that the context was not offering support
to the idea of 'errors' being treated as errors. HZ expressed his belief in the link
between intelligibility and acceptability in terms of the use of a language: *if
communication is not failed, there should be no problem*. Following HZ, DX made his
decision. He firstly clarified his position that he did not regard an 'error' that met the
end of communication as an error. He showed his awareness of why such an error was
defined as an error. He realised that an error was defined with the reference to the well-
accepted NSE norms. Further, DX was found to make new sense of ELF
communication in terms of form vs. meaning (75.1 and 75.3).

Later, DX started to develop an understanding of the ELF concept in the group
discussion of some issues:

Extract 76(group C)

1. DX   Say, an English word, there is the British way of speaking it, the American
way, the Australian way, and the Chinese way and the Japanese way.
Different ways are all correct. <u>There is nothing with superiority or
inferiority</u>. When Chinese speakers are using English in a certain way, the
British should <u>switch</u> in their mind. He (i.e. the Chinese interlocutor) is
talking about this (expressed in Chinese speakers' way). He (i.e. the British
interlocutor) won't think this is an error. Instead, he (i.e. the British
interlocutor) will think this is just a different way of speaking. Actually, this
(i.e. the communication like this) will work to promote the development of
English language, because you enriched English, you do so in terms of both
language forms and meanings. Actually this helps to push English to
develop non-stop. That is my view.

2. LJ	I want to say something. As you said, there is British way, American way and Australian way to express the same idea. Is that because of the first languages which are different from each other? In my view, for example, *and*, we pronounce it as /ændə/. (The use of English) like this. This must owe to the problem in (English) teaching.
3. DX	[laughs, signals disagreement and turns to look at HW]
4. HW	I think you are, my understanding is that you are still using the standard native speaker English as your standard, right? You are regarding American English and British English as your standard.

DX showed his awareness of the variability of English (76.1). He made a strong argument that 'there is nothing with superiority or inferiority' among different ways of using English. This was in a sharp contrast with his earlier worry that non-native speakers' English affected one's image (75.1). He considered it necessary that 'the British should <u>switch</u> in their mind' when they speak to non-native speakers. In comparison with his earlier confusion of the idea of accommodation in ELF communication, it is possible to infer that a sense of accommodation in ELF communication had been developed until this point. Further, he showed his anticipation for the change in other people's attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English. As he said, 'he (i.e. the British interlocutor) will think this is just a different way of speaking'. Towards the end of turn 1 (76.1), he talked about the implication of accepting Chinese speakers' own way of using English. The long turn seemed to be his summary of what he had gained in the discussion.

In comparison, LJ seemed to feel confused between a difference perspective and a deficiency perspective. She questioned DX's view in a subtle way and gave an example of 'erroneous' pronunciation (76.2). DX's reaction confirmed his attitudinal development. His body language (76.3) suggested that he disagreed with LJ's idea and looked for HW's endorsement, as HW was the person who had presented a lot of ideas that were consistent with the idea that DX had just expressed. Not surprisingly, HW showed a good idea of what made an error in LJ's perspective (76.4).

In the end, DX showed his enthusiasm in Chinese speakers' own English and made a suggestion. He emphasized the necessity of Chinese speakers' own English being accepted:

Extract 77 (group C)

> 1. DX So you can collect the use of English (by Chinese speakers) through a large-scale survey. I mean, you can, I mean the necessity, I mean, it is necessary for this (English used by Chinese speakers) to be acknowledged.

The journey DX went through provided an insight into the exploration that the group did. It is necessary to point out that DX was not only influenced by ELF conception. The group members used their knowledge and their perceptions of other subjects or life experience to make sense of what ELF communication is. For example, DX used the analogy to Mandarin while he was considering the acceptability of 'errors' in NSE. However, the awareness of NES in relation to the belief of errors, the reflection on the form vs. meaning in communication, and the understanding of accommodation in communication are major concerns that ELF researchers have. In this sense, the group showed their growth in the ELF conception in collective terms, although some participants appeared to have a more comprehensive understanding than others.

ZR in group A

In group A, ZR's perception went through a different journey.

> *Extract 78 (group A)*
>
> 1. M … their English is different from native speakers' English, some features are emerging in their use of English, what do you think of the features? The features like these are traditionally considered as 'errors', what do you think of them?
> 2. JC … I still think they should be avoided. If everyone (makes these errors), for example, the extra vowel, or unintelligible use (of English), the communication would be hindered…
> 3. DQ But as far as I see, because I worked (with foreigners) before, I just feel, errors like these… it seems to me that the easterners and westerners have different organism of pronunciation… I personally think, if the communication, the communication between interlocutors is not hindered, the 'errors' are acceptable. I came across a customer who was a French, his English was just like, was often produced with his pronunciation like that. Although we Chinese speakers are hard to approximate the standard pronunciation, their pronunciation is very scary too. I think it is all right if the communication is not hindered, I mean, if we can get the business done…
> 4. JC I have the same idea as you have… I, as a teacher of English, when I teach my students, I can't let you go if you can't produce *slow* and *snow* correctly, I can't ignore how you produce nasal sound. But when you actually use English in real life, it is all right as long you and your interlocutor can reach agreement and understand each other. But I mean, can these errors be accepted by the general public? It won't be a good thing if every Chinese speaker thinks nasal sound has no difference from lateral sound, right? …

5. ZR	… Why English is developing so fast? That's because Britain has long developed and enjoyed the international influence. But our China, we <u>passively</u> learn English. Now our country is prospering, we are getting more involved in the international (community), why can't people from other countries learn our language, I don't mean our Chinese, I mean, our English is developing in our own way. They should actively learn the development in our use of English. In this way, we'll learn from each other rather than we <u>submissively</u> learn from them. If so, our use of English, for example, some erroneous use, can be accepted by them… Communication will accordingly become easier. So I think the errors, in some ways possibly, can indicate the development of Chinese speakers' English, and boost the world's understanding of us.

[silence]

This sequence starts with the moderator's invitation for the views of traditional so-called 'errors', the examples of which were on the list that the moderator used as a stimulus during the introduction. In response, LC (78.2) delivered the message that she objected to the examples of difference from NSE and, in particular, her belief that the differences, e.g. the use of 'the extra vowel', would lead to communicative difficulty. That she paralleled 'the extra vowel' with an unintelligible use of English can be interpreted as her belief in the link between 'incorrect' use of English and 'unintelligible use' of English. In light of this, JC's perception of 'errors' in a traditional SLA sense was crystal clear: 'errors' should be avoided as they caused communicative difficulties.

Tension emerged when DQ explicitly challenged JC's perception (78.3). DQ started his turn with the word 'but', which signalled his different perception. He first expressed his disagreement with JC who suggested that the errors should be avoided, by using what Potter (1996:133) labels as 'category entitlement', that is, a strategy with which research participants talk about their life experience in order to support their arguments. DQ talked about his work experience before he claimed that some errors were inevitable. Then he expressed his position that intelligible errors were acceptable. Thus DQ used his life experience to disagree with JC on three points. Firstly, some errors were inevitable. Secondly, some errors were intelligible. Thirdly, some errors were acceptable.

According to Potter (1996), the fact-like argument is likely to win over. DQ's argument was made on the basis of his life experience. It is very likely that he successfully problematized JC's argument (78.2) in terms of the relationship between 'errors' and 'intelligibility', as we can see the result that JC shaped her argument (78.4) in response

to DQ's challenge. The tension became subtle in the group. JC enhanced her argument for correct formulaic NSE by treating ELF communication and classroom teaching differently and limiting her argument to ELT. She asked a rhetorical question: 'can these errors be accepted by the general public'?, as she did not seek an answer from other members. Following the question, she simply expressed her viewpoint that the widespread acceptance of errors *won't be a good thing*. This implied her view of 'errors' as illegitimate and her dislike of the popularization of 'errors'. Thus, the differentiation brought to the fore the conflict between tolerance and legitimacy. Noticeably, she did not provide further justification for her dislike. This revealed her strong belief that 'errors' were bad, as she was persistent even though she was problematized. Further, the use *right?* implied her attempt to elicit endorsement in the group. In response to the disagreement expressed by DQ, JC maintained her argument by focusing on the issue of the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English.

In such a context, ZR joined in and increased the tension between the positions held by JC and DQ respectively. While DQ argued for the acceptability of variation that does not hinder intelligibility, JC objected to the acceptability of variation from NSE and expressed her belief that variation from NSE would cause unintelligibility. In this sense, ZR was in the situation of thinking about variation in relation to intelligibility and legitimacy.

ZR expressed her aspiration for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English and owed the widespread of NSE to the development of Britain (78.5). This view aligned with Crystal (1997:7): 'a language becomes an international language for one chief reason: the political power of its people – especially their military power'. The word *but* revealed the contrast between NESs and Chinese speakers in ZR's mind. Negatively loaded words passively and submissively were used to describe Chinese speakers' learner identity in using English. Obviously, ZR was not happy with what she perceived as the situation which Chinese speakers were facing. She talked about the development of China and invited the consideration of the acceptability of 'errors' made by Chinese speakers. She associated language development with the development of the country to which its speakers belonged. Based on the association, she argued for the acceptability of Chinese speakers' own English. By doing so, she indicated her vigorous objection to the negative view expressed by JC regarding legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English.

Subsequently, AW brought up her concern for the standard. She seemed to have raised a controversial issue which attracted most participants' support. AW associated her need for a standard with ELT practice. This echoed the discussion whether ELF was possible to teach. In such a context, ZR appeared to be confident and offered her view on a standard:

Extract 79(group A)

1. AW   <u>What you guys are saying</u> make me very worried. I am going to be a teacher in the future. No standard, there would be no standard to teach at all, according to <u>what you guys are saying</u>. If so, the ELT practice must change.
[many participants echo]
2. XC   A standard is still needed when teaching student.
3. AW   [Right. Like what you said the sound of *th*
4. ZR   [The standard is that we can communicate. I mean, it should be all right if the communication is not hindered, the purpose of communication can be realised, and interlocutors can understand each other.

However, ZR started to weaken her argument when her strong stance was problematized by DQ, who suggested that ZR misunderstood the ELF conception:

Extract 80 (group A)

1. DQ   I think her worry is also reasonable. Because she is teaching, that is, for pedagogic purpose-
2. JI   - A standard is certainly needed
3. DQ   But what we are talking about is something in the domain of use. Another point I'd like to make is[…] the notion of China English brought up by the researcher today. The reason she brings up this concept is that she sees the difference [from NSE] as the result from the interactive process of communication. Like the difference between Indian English and American English. The difference is there, right? [...]Now we have this kind of China English in our EC. It exists. I think this must be the reason for this research topic. Indian English is different from American English. Our China English must be different from American English as well, right? This is what she has the concern for, [turning to the moderator] there is a gap, right?
4. ZR   We are trying to approach in that direction (i.e. towards the target language as NSE), but we are impossible to achieve the best, the ultimate goal, to speak like them (i.e. NESs). I am talking about this standard. The standard is not abandoned. But interlocutors try to get closer to each other (around the standard).
5. JC   Actually there is no disagreement here… Actually, we have the shared position on this issue. Teaching that she worried about won't be affected. Standard is followed when teaching. But when we communicate, we can compromise. No disagreement (among us).
[many participants echo]
6. ZR   [Right. Right.

232

> 7. DQ   [Right. The standard is there. With a kind of mutual compromise, the exchange of information can be realised. This is reasonable.

DQ's contribution echoed JC's viewpoint and suggested his sympathy for AW's concern (80.1). So far, the group division was changed, with the majority including DQ, JC, XC, AW and JI on one side and the minority including only ZR on the other side. While the majority had a concern for the NES norms-based ELT practice, ZR considered the possibility for Chinese speakers' own English to have its endonormative norms. Interpretably, the issue of the NES norms-based ELT practice drew the majority of the group members together. In the meantime, a rebellious and marginalized voice was heard from ZR in support of the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English.

The conversation was continuous and enabled us to see what happened next. DQ's distinction between ELF conception and ELT practice started to undermine ZR's position. In response to DQ's reminder, ZR shaped her argument and agreed with 'the ultimate goal' for NS-like English. Comparing her position now (see 80.4) with her argument earlier (see 79.4) that *the standard is that we can communicate*, we can see that ZR compromised and changed to view successful communication as a secondary standard when NS-like English cannot be achieved (80.4). To put it differently, while she emphasized successful communication previously, she viewed successful communication as a goal secondary to an ultimate goal for NSE.

At this point, the group members seemed to have reached a consensus and their discussion seemed to have resolved the conflict between the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English and NES norms-based ELT practice. As JC summarized, *actually there is no disagreement here* within the group. The legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English was not mentioned anymore. The NES standard continued to be accepted for pedagogic purposes, while the 'compromise' to NNS-like English was considered as tolerable. When JC was summarizing the group decision, all other participants were echoing her. Importantly, ZR echoed as well (80.7). She was a person who changed dramatically in her attitudes towards the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English.

ZR had a good understanding in the ELF concept, which seemed to shed light on her argument for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English. While she was keen in her argument for the legitimacy in the beginning, she ended up giving up the legitimacy of

Chinese speakers' own English. Two critical moments when ZR changed her positions have been identified.

One was when DQ problematized her understanding of the ELF conception. DQ made a point that the ELF conception might not be applicable to Chinese speakers' own English and consequently she did not argue against the need for NES standard any more but changed her mind to limit ELF understanding to ELF use only. That is to say, ZR accepted DQ's incomprehensive understanding that ELF was nothing to do with ELT. In this sense, ZR seemed to need a more comprehensive understanding of ELF to stay persistent in her argument. The turning point of her attitude change was her acceptance of a peer member's (i.e. DQ's) misconception that ELT was a classroom behaviour which was not described by ELF conception. ZR was thus discouraged to consider the ELF conception for the purpose of ELT practice. ZR's retreat implied her cautiousness in applying the ELF conception to ELT practice.

A second critical moment was during the process through which her peer members were endeavouring to challenge the NES ownership. As discussed earlier, ZR was frustrated with the idea that Chinese speakers' English was only used by Chinese speakers and other NNESs were still using and learning NSE (see pp.217-218 above). Her difficulty in maintaining her confidence in Chinese speakers' English can be found in her failure to make sense of ELF communication in the context of English globalization. She was persuaded by the point that NSE standards were followed by other NNESs than Chinese speakers and she further developed her idea that Chinese speakers using their own English would not be able to communicate with others who follow NSE. At least two points can be made here. Firstly, she needed the knowledge that English was spreading around the world to the extent that variation was inevitable and using a unified form of English was impossible. Secondly, she had an insufficient understanding of ELF communication which involves accommodation and appropriation, apart from her incomplete knowledge of the spread of English.

By comparing MJ's performance and ZR's performance in the same discussion group, it is possible to say that comprehensive conceptual support would help the participants to stay strong in their argument. MJ as an undergraduate student majored in English showed her conceptual belief in NSE in relation to symbolic power in English and won over other members who worked together to challenge her. ZR started with her

234

understanding of ELF conception and argued for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English. She became less and less powerful in her arguments throughout the group discussion. The critical moment of her change was when she was criticized of her misunderstanding of ELF concept, as discussed above. Thus, it is possible to conclude that ZR needed a good understanding of the ELF concept to maintain her confidence related to Chinese speakers' own English.

Whereas ZR was becoming less and less confident in her argument for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' own English, DX in group C gradually developed into a participant who was keen in embracing Chinese speakers' own English. He came across the conflict between NS norms and ELT as well but he suggested a solution to ELT practitioners:

Extract 81 (group C)

1. DX   If others are using Chinese English, don't criticize it. You can accept it as correct, can't you? If your students speak Chinese English, you don't correct them. That is it.

In different contextual interactions, ZR and DX experienced different voyages. While insufficient understanding of the ELF conception seemed to frustrate ZR's confidence in the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English, a growing comprehension was found to build up DX's confidence in the same issue. In this sense, it is possible to say that an understanding of the ELF conception made a difference in the participants' perceptions of the issues related to the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English.

6.4.   Conclusion

This chapter reported the findings from four FGs, which formed the third part of the research, following the investigation into the participants' attitudes at the surface level of the questionnaire and their beliefs uncovered through the interviews. With the rich data retrieved from the FGs, the findings identified in earlier stages were reinforced but a deeper level of comprehension was also made possible. For the sake of limited space, I did not repeat the findings that were presented in chapter 4 and chapter 5 but had my focus on the groups as opposed to the individual participants, although the attitudes and beliefs of individual participants and the group attitudes and perceptions were interrelated to each other and mirrored each other.

In the FGs where different opinions interacted with each other, the attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English was found to be simplified and yet sophisticated. In terms of simplification, the four groups were found to have the same attitude towards Chinese speakers' own English, that is, the argument for the tolerance but the attempt to avoid the issue of the legitimacy. On the other hand, the gap between tolerance and legitimacy informed me of the sophisticated nature of the participants' attitudes. Given such a picture, the investigation was conducted into possible factors that stood in the way to the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English in the participants' attitudes. While a comprehensive knowledge of ELF communication was found to boost the participants' confidence in the legitimacy of Chinese speaker's own English, a shortage of ELF awareness was found to keep the participants following the traditional SLA perspective. The existing ELT practice based on standard NSE was found to be an overwhelming challenge to the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English in the participants' perspective.

Chapter 7 Conclusion

7.1.   Introduction

This chapter seeks to provide a summary of the thesis. For this purpose, it will restate the rationale of this project and represent the theoretical framework in brief in order to justify the formulation of the research questions. After that, efforts will be made to revisit the study in terms of its methodology and research findings, which will be presented in a format of answering the research questions. The limitations of this research will be discussed towards the end to suggest possible areas for future research. The contributions and implications of this project will be considered before they lead to the conclusion of this thesis.

7.2.   Research rationale

Previous studies on the English used by Chinese speakers are likely to follow two approaches. Fitting in the traditional SLA orientation, researchers tend to focus on Chinese learners' English, with the purpose to help Chinese learners to master NSE and approximate NSE competence. Motivated by Kachru's (1992) call for a 'paradigm shift', China/Chinese English research has developed. Researchers adopt the WE paradigm and argue for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English, with the focus on the English used by Chinese speakers for the purpose of intranational communication. However, the English used by Chinese speakers for the purpose of intercultural communication continues to be criticised as learner English or interlanguage.

This study was inspired by the blossoming research on ELF, which questions why NSE norms should be followed by all users of English in the era of English globalization, especially when NESs are not present in the intercultural communication. Both theoretical and empirical studies have contributed to the argument that ELF speakers use, adapt and appropriate English in order to suit their own purposes in intercultural communication and they have their rights to do so. Within such a theoretical context, I question the criticism of Chinese speakers' English, which does not conform to NSE, used by Chinese speakers in intercultural communications.

With this study, I sought to contribute to the ELF research by investigating the extent to which Chinese speakers' English used in intercultural communication can be accepted

as legitimate. I also sought to understand the possibility for Chinese speakers' English used in lingua franca communication to develop into an English having its own endonormative norms and thus provide a reference for English education policy making in China.

7.3.   Theoretical framework

Adopting an ELF perspective, I argue that Chinese speakers' English used for intercultural communication is legitimate in its own right. Based on Jenkins's (2009) distinction of EFL vs. ELF, Chinese speakers' English, that is different from NSE, can be considered as the result of Chinese speakers' adaption and appropriation of English in order to suit their own purposes in different lingua franca communication contexts. Following Seidlhofer's (2011) reconceptualization of variety, ELF used by Chinese speakers, defined as CHELF in this thesis, is not a variety that is to be codified in its traditional sense but one that has the nature of fluidity and flexibility. An issue needing to be cleared up is that Chinese speakers' linguistic results are interpreted in this thesis as the representations of the use of English at different moments in their whole process of using ELF. Borrowing Dewey's (2007) interconnected perspective on ELF in relation to community, I consider CHELF link CHELF speakers with the global community of ELF. In order to make sense of Dewey's interconnected perspective, I revisited Wenger's (1998) conception of community of practice. Seidlhofer's (2011) reconceptualization of community is also influential on my conceptualization of CHELF community. Importantly, the studies on Chinese speakers' distinctive use of English provide the empirical support to my argument that Chinese speakers' use of English is influenced by their Chinese and culture background, which helps to categorize CHELF as ELF used by Chinese speakers rather than other L1 speakers..

It is necessary to explain how I apply Seidlhofer's (2011) and Dewey's (2009:76) point that ELF involves the conceptualization of a 'virtual' community, which challenges the notion of 'speech community' that is geographically defined in its traditional sense. I agree with them and CHELF is not conceptualized as a localized variety confined within China but as fluid and associated with Chinese speakers who are from China and who are involved in international communication. In other words, CHELF conceptualizes the English that Chinese speakers use to engage with non-L1 Chinese interlocutors in ELF communications and simultaneously to demonstrate their L1 Chinese identity. In this sense, CHELF research is different from China/Chinese

238

English research, which has its focus on English as a localized variety used by Chinese speakers among themselves within the country.

WE research, in particular, Kachru (1992) and Schneider (2007), offers insights into how attitudes and identities can suggest the development the legitimacy of NNSEs which are localized. According to them, NNESs go through the processes from aspiring NSE to accepting their own Englishes, from aligning with NESs through distancing from NESs to constructing their identities linked with their own speech communities where English is used a second language. Clearly, WE research has its limitation with its focus on fixed boundaries in a traditional geographical sense. However, I still consider the value of WE research regarding the roles of attitudes and identities in the development of NNSE legitimacy, understanding that CHELF is not localized but influenced by Chinese speakers' L1 language and culture background. That is to say, CHELF users' identities are not considered to link with the 'fixed' geo-political boundary of China but the influence of linguistic, socio-cultural and socio-historical contexts of Chinese speakers is taken into account. In this sense, an investigation into how Chinese speakers perceive their own English is necessary in order to find out the extent to which Chinese speakers' English which is different from NSE, in Chinese speakers' intercultural communications can be accepted as legitimate and then developed into the English highlighting Chinese speakers' identity as CHELF users rather than learners of NSE.

7.4. The study

7.4.1. Research questions

This study was conducted in order to offer an insight into the possibility of Chinese speakers' use of ELF being considered as acceptable in Chinese speakers' perspectives. For this purpose, this thesis seeks to answer four research questions:

1. How do Chinese speakers perceive their own way of using ELF?
2. How do Chinese speakers perceive their identity in ELF?
   a. How do Chinese speakers perceive their cultural identities in their use of ELF?
   b. How do Chinese speakers perceive themselves as learners or users of ELF?

      c. How do Chinese speakers position themselves individually or
         collectively in the global community of ELF use?

3. What factors contribute to Chinese speakers' attitudes towards their use of
    ELF in their own way?

      a. What beliefs are related to their attitudes and identities?

      b. What contextual factors are related to their attitudes and identities?

4. Can an ELF conception make a difference in their attitudes?

7.4.2. Methodology

The philosophical orientation towards this research followed pragmatism. The decision
on this orientation was based on my research purposes. While I sought to understand
how the research participants made sense of their own way of using ELF in relation to
their own beliefs, experience and prior knowledge, I was also interested in whether an
ELF conception or language-related knowledge could empower the participants in a
way that they felt more confident in their own English as different from NSE, given the
status quo that NSE norms are set as the default yardstick for NNESs. The multiple
purposes could not be met with either a single neutral stance or a sole transformative
orientation. Nonetheless, pragmatism motivated me to stick to those research purposes.
With the emphasis on practice and problem solving, pragmatic researchers encourage
plural approaches and different methods in order to achieve research results. The
challenge for pragmatic researchers is how to avoid the criticism of 'whatever works'. I
was thus cautious in both the research design and the fieldwork in order to make sure
that every instrument in use was necessary and every question I asked was necessary.

With a pragmatic perspective, I conducted mixed methods research (MMR), combining
quantitative and qualitative methods. Three research instruments were selected,
including questionnaires, interviews and FGs. The questionnaires provided an initial
understanding of the participants' attitudes, identities and beliefs that influence their
evaluations of Chinese speakers' own English. With quantitative methods, possible
effects of the biographic backgrounds were examined and possible correlations between
attitudes, identities and beliefs were considered. Qualitative methods were used in
dealing with open questions in questionnaires, interviews and FGs.

Interviews enabled the penetration into the participants' attitudes, identities and beliefs.
The comparison between questionnaire responses and interview findings allowed for the

verification of some findings and, on the other hand, the emergence of new gaps in understanding the participants' attitudes, identities and beliefs. With the FGs, attention was paid to groups as opposed to individual participants, although the understanding of group behaviour inevitably required the examination of the responses of those individuals who formed the groups. Simultaneously, how individuals changed or developed their perceptions reflected the group dynamics. A few participants formed different groups and negotiated their attitudes and beliefs. The dynamics of their interaction allowed the emergence of critical issues that changed or pushed the development of group discussion. The comparison of different patterns of interaction revealed possible factors that made differences.

The fieldwork took place in China over six months. The participants included both university students and those with professional backgrounds (but English teachers were not included) (see pp.80 above). Researcher reflexivity was involved. L1 Chinese was used to collect the data in order to make the participants feel comfortable in expressing their ideas. By doing this, the researcher aligned herself with the participants and this solidarity helped to collect more in-depth data. At the same time, the researcher made it clear a few times that she had no position on the issues in discussion in order to avoid the participants being kind to offer what they thought the researcher would like to hear. This did not mean that the researcher did not bring up new conceptions and knowledge in the process of the data collection. In particular, an ELF conception and the knowledge of English globalization were introduced to stimulate FG discussions. How the participants were influenced or not influenced was taken into account. The possible influence of such an input was considered in my analysis of the FG data.

7.4.3. Research findings

In answer to RQ1, the findings suggested that the participants had complex perceptions of Chinese speakers' own way of using English. For many participants, Chinese speakers' own way of using English was tolerable but not legitimate. They were likely to make efforts to justify the tolerability of the English, by limiting the tolerability to some domains where they thought legitimacy was not necessary, for example, in informal communication. Correspondingly, some participants perceived Chinese speakers' own English as an interlanguage, and other participants perceived Chinese speakers' English as a successful language in itself. Importantly, however, there were some participants who criticized Chinese speakers' way of using English in negative

terms but also acknowledged the value of Chinese speakers' English in positive terms. The term 'tolerable error' created by an interview participant and similar terms co-constructed by some FG members might best describe the complexity in Chinese speakers' perceptions of Chinese speakers' own English.

In answer to RQ2 the findings demonstrated that the participants saw multifaceted identities in Chinese speakers' use of ELF. The participants were likely to align themselves with other Chinese speakers, either positively or negatively. Some participants perceived such alignment as the projection of Chinese speakers' L1 cultural background. Some participants aligned themselves with other Chinese speakers and perceived such alignment as associated with bad English. No participants asserted that they desired a NES identity in their use of English. It is important to note that participants rejected an alignment with NESs and chose to view English as identity-free. In their view, speaking NSE or near-NSE was an indicator of good user/learner identity.

The participants' views of the projection of learner/user identity provided interesting insight into their beliefs. Some participants projected themselves along with other NNESs as learners of NSE. Their projection of learner/user identity corresponded with a traditional EFL perspective, according to which ENL was the target English and NNESs were followers of the English and/or norms provided by NESs.

A considerable group of participants challenged mainstream EFL perspective and accepted that a user of English was one who uses English. This learner/user distinction was not decided with reference to NSE. Rather, many interview participants projected the identity of an ELF user and that of an ELF learner. The identity of an ELF learner was connected with the desire to use ELF in the future.

Multi-level identity in Chinese speakers' ELF was found. With such a kind of identity, the participants viewed Chinese speakers as belonging to the global community at large. Chinese culture was highly valued and viewed as an important resource on which Chinese speakers of English can draw in order to make English more suitable to represent Chinese speakers' communicative needs in Chinese speakers' encounters with non-Chinese. In this sense, Chinese speakers brought in their understanding of their socio-cultural background in their discussion of ELF use, which exerts influence on their perceptions of their identities in ELF encounters. In this sense, the participants

viewed themselves as individual users of ELF in the global community. They also considered themselves as belonging to the L1 Chinese group.

In answer to RQ3, the ELF perspective, the EFL perspective and beliefs of L1 fed into the participants' attitudes and identities. The ELF perspective was seen in the emerging data regarding the belief of the target language as ELF, the belief of the global ownership of English, the belief of Englishes in plural, and the belief of NNES creativity in relation to NNES identity, sense of humour, and solidarity. The EFL perspective was seen in the belief of the target language as ENL, the belief of the NES ownership of English, the belief of a monolithic English variety, the belief of NNES conformity in relation to intelligibility, and the belief of language in fixed and formulaic forms. Different beliefs worked together and helped to explain why some participants were hesitant or held conflicting attitudes. Whereas NSE was considered as the default goal for Chinese speakers and learners, the participants tended to view NSE as a target language at the macro level that they did not really seek to achieve. This explains why there was no link between the participants' aspiration for NSE and the importance they attached to approximating NSE, as first revealed in the questionnaires. Noticeably, the participants were likely to evaluate Chinese speakers' English with reference to NSE, but they also had a second reference point, that is, the needs for identity projection and for communicative function (Bamgboṣe 1998, Cogo and Jenkins 2010). This was also first identified in the questionnaires and then confirmed in the interviews. The complexity of the participants' perceptions of Chinese speakers' own way of using ELF revealed the intertwining between the ELF perspective and the EFL perceptive among the participants and within the individuals.

In addition to the beliefs, three contextual factors were identified with the data, including the concern for gatekeeping practice, education and ELF experience. Some participants had self-reflections on their own belief development. Education and ELF experience appeared to be important in shaping and developing their perceptions and beliefs. Interestingly, however, attitudes and beliefs were not seemingly working together. Conflict existed between the beliefs that resembled the ELF perspective and the attitudes that appeared to be negative towards Chinese speakers' English or permissive to the legitimation of such English. This was evident in both the interviews (section 5.3.4) and the FGs. In particular, one FG showed good understanding of ELF conception and strong beliefs that resembled the ELF perspective. However, the

participants became conservative when they were asked whether they welcomed the legitimation of Chinese speakers' English. The concern for gatekeeping practice seemed to silence the participants who were active in the discussion of Chinese speakers' own English.

In answer to RQ4, the findings suggested a positive answer. The ELF conception did make a difference in the attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English. By comparing patterns of discussions in different groups, for example, the comparison between ZR in group A and DX in group C in particular, I found that   a better-developed understanding of the ELF concept helped to increase the participants' confidence in Chinese speakers' ELF and to boost their ability to critically understand NSE in relation to Chinese speakers' own English.

In particular, two participants from two different FGs were compared. One participant, DX, started with an EFL-oriented perspective and criticised differences from ENL as errors. He developed his ELF perspective along with the progress of the group discussion and consequently he not only changed his attitude towards differences from ENL but also associated Chinese speakers' creativity with Chinese speaker identity. Importantly, he developed a good sense of the form vs. function issue and was able to give suggestions to his co-member in the group that 'errors' found in classroom teaching should be viewed as alternative to 'correct' English.

Another participant, ZR, started with a favourable attitude towards Chinese speakers' English by arguing that Chinese speakers' difference from ENL should be accepted as instances of Chinese speakers' own English. In a group that was dominated by the strong belief in the NSE ownership of English, she gradually lost her confidence and finally became permissive for the potential of Chinese speakers' English to be developed into its legitimacy. It was striking that many group members made attempts to challenge the NSE ownership of English in ZR's group but ended up frustrated. Some turning points of their group discussion suggest that ZR and other group members were in need of certain conceptual support in order to win their argument against the gatekeeping role of NSE. Noticeably, ZR started to lose her confidence when she was criticized as misusing the ELF concept that was introduced by the moderator. By comparing DX and ZR, I argue that an ELF conception empowers people.

244

7.5. Limitations and directions for future research

I consider a few limitations of this study. The first limitation relates to the selection of participants. The uneven distribution of biographic features among the participants suggests the difficulty in making generalisations from the findings. However, quantitative tests were conducted and different biographic features had no or nearly negligible influences on attitudes and beliefs. In addition, many findings resonate with Jenkins's (2007) study which was conducted in a different context. It is believed that more studies conducted in other contexts, either similar or different, could use the present study as a reference and boost the understanding of attitudinal issues within different groups of ELF users who are from other first language and cultural backgrounds.

The second limitation is that the findings were drawn in the data provided by the participants, all of whom had at least university education backgrounds. There are some Chinese speakers who are involved in intercultural communication, for example, taxi drivers, hotel staff members, and waiters and waitresses in restaurants, whose might not have university education backgrounds. As the study strongly suggests the influence of education experience, the attitudes of the participants might not agree with the attitudes held by this group of speakers who do not have corresponding education backgrounds. Future research is needed to understand the attitudes of those who have not university education backgrounds. By comparing the attitudes of those who have university education backgrounds and those who do not have,, it is possible to have a better understanding of the role of education in shaping Chinese speakers and learners' attitudes.

The third limitation is that the FG participants were all selected from the student group, whereas the questionnaire respondents and the interview participants included both students and those with professional backgrounds. One of the findings generated from the FGs points to the concern for gatekeeping practice. The participants were worried about examinations which were known to be based on NSE norms. I used the term 'gatekeeping practice' in this thesis to emphasize the concern for NESs' gatekeeping role. Although similar voice was heard among the interview participants from professional backgrounds, it is not certain how professionals would weigh up between NESs' gatekeeping role and other beliefs they held. For example, some professionals were positive towards Chinese speakers' English and some professionals explicitly

expressed their unwillingness to seek NSE competence. In this sense, the concern for gatekeeping practice which emerged in the negotiation within the groups formed by students might or might not apply to the participants who were from professional backgrounds.

In addition, the influence of the ELF conception was established with the FG study. As seen in the FGs, however, different participants made sense of the ELF concept in different ways. It is uncertain how the participants from professionals would make sense of the ELF concept and in turn how they would develop their discussions of certain issues that were identified in the FGs with students. This opens an area for future research. FGs of professionals might lead to similar or different results.

Another limitation is the setting of the research. The location was in China. It is uncertain whether I would get similar results among Chinese speakers in other countries especially those overseas Chinese students and Chinese professionals who work in countries other than China. This opens up a research area for the future, which can provide more in-depth insights into the attitudes, identities and beliefs of Chinese speakers of ELF.

Finally, the findings provide insights into university students and professionals' perceptions of NSE, which, as observed by many researchers (e.g. Jenkins 2009b, Seidlhofer 2009a), prevails in NNES contexts. The reasons behind their aspirations can be sought in both conceptual beliefs and contextual factors. However, language policy makers and teachers' perceptions can be an interesting area for future research in order to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the influences on the attitudes towards NSE at the language policy level and in teaching practice. The insights will help us to understand of possible changes in language policy level.

7.6.   Implications and contributions

Based on an ELF perspective, this thesis has posed a challenge to the traditional EFL oriented criticism of Chinese speakers' English as learner English. The study is different from the WE paradigm-based research on a localized variety in China. Rather, I conceptualize the English used by Chinese speakers for international communication as fluid and subject to Chinese speakers' appropriation of English due to their purposes of engaging in intercultural communication. I label this kind of English as CHELF

(Chinese speakers' English as a Lingua Franca) in order to argue for its legitimacy. CHELF is not 'a' geographically confined 'variety' but a kind of English associated with L1 Chinese identity of Chinese speakers who are agents in intercultural communication. This study thus has added a new perspective on Chinese speakers' English and challenged the resistant view of their English as learner English.

This study has offered a profile of Chinese speakers' attitudes, identities and beliefs related to their own way of using ELF. The interrelationships among attitudes, identities and beliefs were established and contextual factors were identified. The results can inform us of the development of Chinese speakers' ELF to the extent that attitudes and identities are important indicators of the language as used by its speakers. Despite the widespread aspiration for NSE and the negative attitudes towards Chinese speakers' ELF as not conforming to NSE norms, an emerging voice presented the re-evaluation of Chinese speakers' ELF. Attempts were made to challenge the persistent belief in the NES ownership. There was a sign of the willingness to project Chinese speakers' L1 cultural identity in contrast to the concern for the loss of identity resulting from copying NSE. These emergences suggest undercurrents towards the acceptance of Chinese speakers' ELF.

Importantly, the research findings provide insightful implications for English language education in China, suggesting the need for a paradigm shift in English pedagogy. There are comprehensive discussions about pedagogic implications of ELF research (e.g. Seidlhofer 2011, Dewey 2011, Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey 2011, Cogo and Dewey 2012, Dewey 2012), covering different aspects of pedagogy: classroom teaching practices, language policy, English language tests, teaching materials, and teacher education. According to them (ibid.), a paradigm shift in English pedagogy is needed, involving the change from the emphasis on NSE forms to the focus on ELF practice, from the aim for correct English to the goal for appropriate English, from the exclusive focus on NSE to the inclusion of different Englishes in syllabus. All these themes discussed in relation to ELF are supported by the current study, with the focus on the Chinese context. This can be discussed in terms of the participants' attitudes towards CHELF.

The struggle, uncertainty, inconsistency and conflict residing with the participants' attitudes towards variation in English reflect the negotiation between what they think to be appropriate for particular purposes and what they think to be accepted in the social context. Some participants (e.g. PNC in extract 24, SLN in extract 56) feel like to accept

variations in English given their communicative purpose or identity concern, but on the other hand, they believe that they should go for the English that is socially accepted as 'correct'. Conversely, one participant (i.e. SJJ) felt like to reject variations in English given their non-conformity to NSE (see extract 33), while he felt difficult to hold his position given his observation of successful ELF experiences (see extract 59). A few participants (e.g. PYM in extract 8) expressed their views that acceptability of variations in English was dependent on their intelligibility, but showed their uncertainty of the intelligibility of non-conformity and related their uncertainty to their lack of ELF experience. All these conflicting views were taken by the participants, with some of them feeling struggling and others feeling hesitating to decide their position on the legitimacy of CHELF. It is also common to see in the data that the participants (e.g. PCZ, see section 5.3.1.1, DX, ZR, see section 6.3.2.3) had inconsistent positions throughout the interviews and the group discussions. The struggle, uncertainty and inconsistency combine to imply the participants' attempts to weigh up between the emphasis on NSE forms and the focus on ELF practice, between the focus on communicative function/ identity projection and the concern for socially accepted norms, between the way of English use that was acceptable for them and the way of English use that was actually socially accepted in their views. Interestingly, some participants negotiated between the conflicting constructs which I listed and achieved a kind of 'in-between' position. That is to say, CHELF was tolerable but not legitimate. An important evidence of this was some participants' construction of the term 'tolerable error' to refer to CHELF (e.g. PHH in extract 3, focus group D in extract 62). In one way, CHELF was considered as tolerable given its communicative function; in another way, CHELF was erroneous given its non-conformity to NSE. All in all, the participants' views reflected the conflicts between what was considered as advantageous[47] and what was considered as appropriate. This further reflects the conflict between the socially informed orientations and the participants' needs and wants. This thus strongly suggests the need to adapt the current English education to suit Chinese learners and users' needs and wants.

In addition, the pro-Std. NSE attitude reflected in the current study seems to be at odds with the development of English in the changing context. I use the term pro-Std. NSE

---

[47] 'Advantageous' is used to describe the view that a certain kind of English agrees with gatekeeping practice and social expectations to enable people to achieve certain benefits. This relates to what Kachru (1986a: 1) comments on the 'linguistic power' of English.

attitude to refer to the attitude held by the participants who emphasized the necessity to conform to Std. NSE and the intolerance of variations in English. The mismatch also suggests the need for a change in the current English education in China so as to enable Chinese learners and users to fit in the development of English in a wider global context. Importantly, the mismatch points to the need to rethink the current model of English at the language policy-making level: should Chinese speakers and learners still focus on NSE only and treat English as a foreign language? The answer emerging in this study is clear: no.

The call for a pedagogic change in the Chinese context follows the discussion in the literature (ibid.), as mentioned above. Specifically, a pedagogic change can involve the inclusion of English teachers from different first language backgrounds, the exposure to global Englishes rather than merely native speaker Englishes, the teaching focus on communicative efficiency rather than on formulaic conformity, the attention to accommodation skills rather than a predetermined set of Std. NSE norms, the emphasis on the awareness of adjusting to interlocutors' repertoires, and the evaluation of English proficiency levels according to the efficiency of using and adapting multilingual resources rather than the approximation to NSE as the only reference points. Clearly, the limited exposure to different Englishes, the teaching focus on formulaic conformity to NSE and a predetermined set of Std.NSE norms, and the evaluation system based on NSE norms were repeatedly found in the current study when the participants expressed their views of CHELF or variations in English. In this sense, the themes listed above regarding the change in English pedagogy are relevant to the Chinese contexts.

Further, the current study strongly suggests the need for the inclusion of ELF conceptualization in English pedagogy. As Cogo and Dewey (2012:171-172) points out, how 'language is conceptualized in ELT professional practice is fundamental' to pedagogy. Undoubtedly, the paradigm shift in English pedagogy will have influence on students' perceptions of English. However, I shall particularly focus on the implication of the current research for English pedagogy in terms of student understanding of English language and argue that student awareness of ELF should be raised via the inclusion of ELF conception in syllabus. There are three major considerations behind this focus.

Firstly, a growing body of literature has discussed the importance of ELF awareness in teacher education programme (e.g. Jenkins et al 2011, Cogo et al 2012). An emerging

body of teacher training materials includes the idea of raising teachers' awareness of ELF. For example, Harmer (2007) writes about the development of World Englishes in discussing teaching practice; Walker (2010) considers an ELF orientation in teaching pronunciation. Although not very comprehensive, the teacher training materials show the growing impacts of ELF research on teacher training programme. However, as Freire (1993) points out, learners should not be treated as empty containers which knowledge can be poured in. In light of this, it is necessary to let students construct their understanding of English by themselves rather than simply impose on them the way that English is understood by the teachers. While the proposal for a paradigm shift involves different aspects of English education and teacher education, it is important to make sure that students understand the conception of ELF going along with the paradigm shift. The current study demonstrates that the participants reflected on their own English and NSE. The inclusion of ELF conception aims to facilitate students to reflection on existing models of English themselves and offer them alternative choice regarding what kind of English to learn and use.

Secondly, the current study generally demonstrates the influence of the context on attitudes, identities and beliefs. The participants' attitudes and beliefs were influenced by their concerns with gatekeeping practice, education, ELF experience and socio-economic changes in the Chinese context (chapter 5). In this sense, the change in social context will lead to the change in their attitudes. The proposal for the inclusion of ELF conception in English education is compatible with the hope for a change in social context. Among the contextual factors identified in the current study, education is particularly an important factor in developing and shaping students' perspectives. Many participants, including both students and professionals, referred to their education experience in their reflection on variations in English and some of them explicitly indicated that they developed their attitudes and beliefs via English education (see section 5.3.4.2). By contrast, ELF experience was found to be useful (see section 5.3.4.3) but seemed to be weak in changing the participants' attitudes towards the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English. Many participants showed their tolerance of variations in English, but they still appeared to be difficult to accept the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English (e.g. PHH in extract 3, focus group D in extract 62). For example, PHH, a professional who indicated his use of accommodation skills in ELF communication, his priority of communicative function over linguistic forms, his tolerance of variations, also indicated his strong belief in NSE as the benchmark of

250

English. A possible reason is that the strong belief in the authority of NSE was deep-seated in the participants' mind and difficult to be challenged by other contextual factors. Given this, conceptual intervening could be useful in challenging the 'mind-set', a word coming from PCZ's interview (58.6). With such an assumption, focus groups were conducted to investigate the possible influence of an ELF conception. The findings showed that the participants in the group which had developed more positive understanding of ELF conception had achieved more comprehensive understanding of English in relation to variation and become more independent from NSE norms (see section 6.3.2.3 with the examples of DX and ZR). I therefore argue that the inclusion of ELF conception in the syllabus will help to increase Chinese students' comprehension of English in the changing context of English globalization.

Thirdly, there is heated debate in academic field regarding the relevance of ELF for teaching practices, with the focus on the issue whether ELF is possible to be taught (e.g. Seidlhofer 2004, Jenkins 2007, Sifakis 2009). Interestingly, similar concern was found in the focus groups in the current study. For example, both focus group A and focus group C concluded that ELF conception is for the purpose of communication but not for classroom teaching and learning (see extract 80, extract 71). That is to say, challenges are ahead regarding the implementation of incorporating ELF into classroom teaching. Raising student awareness will help to overcome the challenges by making students understand that ELF awareness is not simply about what linguistic features to be taught but also about how Englishes can be used for different purposes.

The ELF conception includes linguistic diversity, fluidity, the ownership of English, the difference between EFL and ELF, the function of NNESs' non-conformity to NSE, and the awareness of context in relation to English. A considerable body of literature has discussed these issues, for example, Widdowson (1994), Brumfit (2001), Jenkins (2009a), Seidlhofer (2011) and Cogo and Dewey (2012). Although it is challenging to introduce the studies to students in English language classrooms, it would be constructive to introduce the development of English globalization and the debate about English variations, and make known to students some projects with the focus on ELF performances, for instance, the VOICE project, the ELFA project and the Lingua Franca Core research.

According to Cogo and Dewey (2012: 170), 'the wider social, political and cultural concerns are essential in language learning and teaching'. That is to say, the inclusion

of ELF conception can involve the thinking of social, political and cultural factors in relation to English that is learned and to be learned in classrooms. Importantly, the ELF conception is related to the background of English globalization. In China, where English has been long perceived as a foreign language (see chapter 1), it is necessary to introduce the changing situation in which Chinese speakers and learners are facing regarding the use and the status of English. Further, the awareness of English in relation to identity projection is needed to be raised. As seen in the current study, some participants (26% of the questionnaire respondents) showed their awareness of identity in relation to English. It is necessary to raise the awareness that English is not identity free (op.cit. House 2003).In short, this study has established that favourable attitudes, identities and beliefs are not sufficient to push the development of Chinese speakers' ELF. Contextual factors are necessary for consideration, in particular, among my participants. Mainstream ELT practice appeared to be a big challenge faced by the development of Chinese speaker' ELF. In addition, the interplay between the traditional EFL perspective and the emerging ELF perspective existed in the participants' attitudes, identities and beliefs. The influence of education upon the attitudinal development was reported and the influence of the ELF conception was identified. This offers an important implication for pedagogy, an area that is starting to be researched in ELF (e.g. Dewey 2012), and supports Jenkins and Seidlhofer's (2001) suggestion that attitudes towards ELF should be adjusted within classrooms (see also Jenkin 2005a, 2005b). For Chinese speakers in particular, this study adds to the voices that Chinese speakers should develop the awareness of 'acting interculturally' (Feng 2009:283) and that Chinese learners should develop English proficiency for an 'imagined global community' (Gu 2010:139). The inclusion of the ELF conception in pedagogy would help new generations of Chinese speakers of ELF with their confidence in using their own English. In this sense, we have every reason to believe in a positive future where Chinese speakers' ELF could develop into its legitimacy and exist as CHELF in its own right. This study will shed light on the attitudes and beliefs about English in other contexts which resemble China to certain extent in terms of ELF use and, in turn, may encourage the development of Englishes used by other L1 groups of ELF speakers.

7.7. Conclusion

In the context of the globalization of English, Chinese speakers, who are from China and constitute a large group of ELF users with growing influences in economy and

culture, are faced up to a few controversial issues rooted in the persistent belief in favour of NSE norms. ELF research urged by the unprecedented spread of English calls into question the assumption that NSE norms should be followed by all users, despite that they have their own and different purposes for using English, no matter whether NESs are present in intercultural communication. This coincidence has motivated me to look for ELF research for reference in order to address the issue of what norms should be followed by Chinese speakers.

In a traditional SLA oriented perspective, Chinese speakers' English is criticized as learner English or interlanguage. The WE paradigm has encouraged China/Chinese English research, which argues for a national variety. Inspired by the prospering ELF research, I argue for the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English used for intercultural communication in its own right. I label this English as CHELF (Chinese speakers' ELF). CHELF is different from a localized 'variety' and describes the fluidity regarding how Chinese speakers are using ELF in global communications. It is not a geographically based 'variety' but a kind of English that is associated with Chinese speakers' identity, which is influenced by Chinese language and cultural background where Chinese speakers are from . The instances of linguistic innovations are interpreted as the evidence of Chinese speakers' adaptation and appropriation of English in their ELF communication but not viewed as features that are to be codified.

Encouraged by the theoretical foundation in ELF research, I turned to empirical data in order to understand the extent to which CHELF is acceptable as legitimate in Chinese speakers' own perspective. The justification of doing so lies in the link between the development of NNSE legitimacy and NNESs' attitudes and identities that has been discussed by both WE and ELF researchers. The research results suggest a complexity in the participants' attitudes, identities and beliefs. The interplay between the EFL perspective and the ELF perspective residing in the participants' attitudes and beliefs suggests both challenge and possible change in Chinese speakers' perceptions of their use of ELF. The gatekeeping practice in favour of NSE was a major challenge for the development of CHELF. Nonetheless, education and ELF experience were found to be important factors that helped to develop beliefs at a profound level, and the ELF conception was found to exert a positive influence on the confidence in Chinese speakers' own English. In light of this, the growing research on ELF will benefit ELF users in acknowledging their own way of using English. Further, the study suggests the

need for a paradigm shift in China's English pedagogy in order to support Chinese learners of English in developing their language proficiency which suits their real life purposes of English use. I therefore would like to conclude by asserting my confidence in Chinese speakers' own English being developed into CHELF in its own right.

Appendix 1 Examples of Chinese speakers' creativity in English

Phonology

Through the analysis of the pronunciation of thirteen mainland Chinese students in Singapore, Deterding (2006) has identified the following features shared by Chinese speakers in a phonological aspect.

- Extra final vowel

An added vowel following a final plosive and at the same time followed by the next word is the most salient feature emerging from the data, so that *and* sounds like /ændə/. As Deterding (2006) notes, their use of an extra final vowel contrasts with the likely practice of dropping /d/ in the word *and* in British English and American English. This difference, according to Deterding (2006), might result from Chinese speakers' English learning experience.

- Absence of reduced vowels

In contrast with British or American English, Chinese speakers are likely to produce a full vowel to stress on 'the unstressed syllables of polysyllabic words' and represent strong forms of monosyllabic function words where native speakers are more likely to produce weak forms (Deterding 2006: 183). Deterding (2006) owes such a difference to Chinese speakers' learning practice and their mother tongue transfer.

- Stressed final pronouns

Another marked feature appears to be the stress on final pronouns as in the case that stress is placed on *him* in *around him*.

- Nasalized vowels

Chinese speakers are likely to have heavier nasalization for vowels than expected in Std. NSE. Deterding (2006: 185) ascribes this feature to 'the influence of Standard Chinese'.

- Voiceless dental fricatives

The use of /s/, rather than other sound, in place of /θ/ is widely found in Chinese speakers' pronunciation. This confirms the findings obtained in Jenkins's (2000) lingua franca core.

- Voiced dental fricatives

The use of either /d/ or /z/ to substitute /ð/is found in Chinese speakers' pronunciation. This, again, agrees with Jenkins's (2000) lingua franca core.

- Other replacement strategies involves /h/ pronounced as /x/, /ʒ/ pronounced as /r/ and /l/ pronounced as /n/ are found to be adopted by Chinese speakers in Deterding's (2006) study. However, Deterding (2006) points out the necessity for further inquiry into such strategies as these are tentative findings that apply to only a few of his research participants.

- The fricatives /v/ and/z/ and glide before initial /ɪ/

Deterding (2006) argues that Standard Chinese comes into play when Chinese speakers come across the fricatives /v/ and/z/ and the glide before initial /ɪ/. The likely strategies are the avoidance of the fricatives /v/ and/z/ and the insertion of /j/ before initial /ɪ/, as found in some Chinese speakers' pronunciation.

- Vocalized /l/

Many occurrences of vocalized /l/ are found in Chinese speakers' pronunciation. Nonetheless, Deterding (2006) points out similar findings in the research on other varieties of English and further suggests that this occurrence might contribute to the evolution of Std. NSE.

Lexis

Lexical borrowing

Examples (selected from Yang 2005) are mainly related to the following aspects:

- Food, for instance, *baozi* （包子）, *mantou*（馒头）, *meigancai*（梅干菜）, and *gong bao ji ding* （宫爆鸡丁）；

- Medicine, for instance, *zang hong hua*（藏红花）, *ren shen guo* （人参果）, and *chong cao* （虫草）；

- Musical instruments, for instance, *suona* （唢呐）, *dizi*（笛子）, and *guzheng* （古筝）;

- Socio-political phenomenon, for instance, *mangliu*[48] （blind outflow or blind current 盲流）, and *mingong*[49] (migrant worker 民工); and

- Folk culture, for instance, *nianhua* （Chinese New Year pictures 年画），*menshen* (door guardians in Chinese methodology 门神)，*gongfu* (martial art 功夫).

Loan translation

Examples (selected from Yang 2005) include: *Cross-straits*, *peaceful reunification*, *development point*, *red envelopes*, *migrant workers*, *floating population*, *eating tastes*, *living habits* and others.

Syntax

Chinese speakers' spoken English was found by Xu (2008) to have the following syntactic features:

- adjacent default tense, for instance, *Last year, I write a letter… I write two letters every week.*

- null-subject/object utterances, for instance, *I have been teaching for about three years, before I came here. And then _____ continue to… to teach to earn some money.*

- co-occurrence of connective pairs, for instance, *Yes, although it's not as big as Beijing, but I like it,…*

- subject pronoun copying, for instance, *I think…the … people in Beijing, they understand the accent, but there's some difference in the pronunciation.*

- yes-no response, for instance, *You do not want to make a living by playing guitar on the street. Yes, of course not.*

- topic comment, for instance, *You know, I think this society, the people get more and more practical.*

- Unmarked OSV, for instance, *Yes, I think many many easy words we have forgotten.* and

---

[48] This term is used to describe the social phenomenon that people move from the rural areas to look for jobs in cities without proper permits. See Li (1995: 263) for more details about the phenomenon.
[49] This term associates with a social group whose members migrate from rural areas to cities and undertake labouring work in cities. See Yen (2005: 34) for more details.

- inversion in subordinate finite wh-clauses, for instance, *It's actually… um… it is made in the kind of … I don't know what is… how should I put it, but it is made of bamboo.*

<p align="right">(Xu 2008)</p>

Appendix 2 Chinese speakers' perceptions of Chinese speakers' English Questionnaire

(Chinese version)

问卷调查：中国的英语使用者如何看待中国人使用的英语

请根据您的真实情况与想法选择相应的选择项，并对问答题自由回答。您的参与纯属自愿。您的答卷内容将被匿名保密处理，并只将用于研究目的。除了研究者本人，您的答卷内容不会泄露给其他任何人。填写完整后请发送至：ywang0103@hotmail.com 或 yw5g08@soton.ac.uk

1. 年龄：18-22　　23-29　　30-35　　36-40　　41 以上

2. 性别：男 / 女

3. 职业：_____

4. 学历：大学（包括大专）/　　硕士　　/　　博士

5. 你阅读英语（包括文章资料网页等各类读物）吗？

   经常　　　有时候　　　极少　　　从不

6. 你收听收看英语电影电视广播节目吗？

   经常　　　有时候　　　极少　　　从不

7. 你所听所看的英语通常属于下列哪种英语，请用数字 1、2、3 排序，最常接触的排第一位，最少接触的排第三位。没有接触的则空格。

   _____国内人说的英语

   _____以英语为母语的人（包括英国人、美国人、澳大利亚人，加拿大人，新西兰人）所说的英语

   _____其他国家的人所说的英语

8. 你说英语吗？

   经常　　　有时候　　　极少　　　从不

9. 你用英语写东西（比如短信，电邮，书信，日记，文章等）吗？

   经常　　　有时候　　　极少　　　从不

10. 你掌握或使用英语是为了和下列哪组人群打交道？请用数字 1、2、3 排序，最有可能打交道的人群排第一位，没有可能的人群则空格。

    _____国内人

    _____以英语为母语的人（包括英国人、美国人、澳大利亚人，加拿大人，新西兰人）

    _____其他国家的人

11. 请选出符合你的一种情况。

1) 我希望我说起英语来一听就知道我是中国人。

2) 我希望我的英语听起来像英美等以英语为母语的人一样。

12. 你会为了哪种目的而选择说英语？可多选，请选出所有符合你情况的答案。

(1) 交换信息

(2) 显示时尚

(3) 表示你受过良好教育

(4) 显示你跟国内人不一样

(5) 因为交谈对方说英语

(6) （还有其他目的？请注明）_____

13. 就目前情况来说，你认为英语对于国内人来说有什么功能和作用？

14. 你预期在将来，英语对于国内人来说有什么功能和作用？

15. 你听说过 Chinglish 这个名词吗？ 听过 / 没听过

16. 你听说过 China English 这个名词吗？听过 / 没听过

17. 看到 Chinglish 和 China English 这两名词，你想到了什么？（你的任何想法对于我来说都会很有价值，请自由回答。）

18. 你希望自己能说下列哪种英语？(可多选)

1) China English

2) British English

3) Chinglish

4) American English

5) Australian English

6) 随便哪种都可以

7) 上述选项都不符合，请补充你的答案：_____

19. 你认为你自己实际上所说的英语可以被称作是……（可多选）

   1) China English

   2) British English

   3) Chinglish

   4) American English

   5) Australian English

   6) 上述选项都不符合，请补充你的答案：_____

20. 你认为国内人说的英语在整体上可以被称作是……（可多选）

   1) American English

   2) China English

   3) British English

   4) Chinglish

   5) Canadian English

   6) 上述选项都不符合，请补充你的答案：_____

21. 国内人说的英语在整体上给你什么样的印象？你的任何想法与回答对于我来说都会具有很大价值，请自由回答。

22. 英国人有 British English, 美国人有 American English,印度人有 Indian English，你希望有一天中国的英语使用者也发展出自己的英语模式吗？

   1) 非常希望

   2) 希望

   3) 有点希望

   4) 有点不希望

   5) 不希望

   6) 非常不希望

23. 在你对一个人的英语口语水平进行评价时，你认为下列标准重要吗？请根据你的看法打分：5=非常重要，4=重要，3=有点重要，2=不太重要，1=不重要 0=根本不重要。

1)	说话流利	5 4 3 2 1 0
2)	语法像以英语为母语的使用者那样准确	5 4 3 2 1 0
3)	能够清楚表达意思	5 4 3 2 1 0
4)	用词地道	5 4 3 2 1 0
5)	口音像以英语为母语的人那样地道	5 4 3 2 1 0
6)	符合英语为母语的人的思维表达方式	5 4 3 2 1 0
7)	符合中国人的思维表达方式	5 4 3 2 1 0

24. 请你评价在你大学时期的中国英语老师的英语。你同意下列表述吗？5=完全同意，4=同意，3=有点同意，2=有点不同意，1=不同意，0=完全不同意。

1)	他/她的英语听起来舒服	5 4 3 2 1 0
2)	他/她的英语让人听得懂	5 4 3 2 1 0
3)	他/她的英语口音跟英美等英语母语使用者一样	5 4 3 2 1 0
4)	与来自英美等以英语为母语的国家的老师相比，你更愿意跟这中国老师学习英语	5 4 3 2 1 0

25. 就你个人来说，你可以接受下列英语用法吗？请根据你个人的可接受程度打分。5=完全可以接受；4=可以接受；3=勉强可以接受；2=不太可以接受；1=不可以接受；0=根本不可以接受。

1) Good good study, day day up.	5 4 3 2 1 0
2) People mountain, people sea.	5 4 3 2 1 0
3) I will give you some colour to see see.	5 4 3 2 1 0
4) She go to school everyday.	5 4 3 2 1 0
5) Your daughter will attend Beijing University next year, isn't it?	5 4 3 2 1 0
6) Informations	5 4 3 2 1 0
7) Although it's not as big as Beijing, but I like it.	5 4 3 2 1 0
8) Some of my college classmates they like to dress up very much.	5 4 3 2 1 0
9) Some other kind of jobs I also want to try.	5 4 3 2 1 0

262

10) Last year, I write a letter to my parents.	5 4 3 2 1 0

26.　　对于上述表达你有什么想法？或者说，你认为什么样的英语表达是可以或者应该被接受的，什么样的英语表达是不可以或不应该被接受的。你的任何想法与回答对于我来说都会具有很大价值，请务必跟据你的想法自由回答。

如果愿意让我了解您的更多想法，请留下您的联系方式，我将不胜感激。您的姓名及联系方式将被匿名保密处理，并将只用于研究目的。除了研究者本人，不会泄露给任何第三方。

姓名：　　　电话：　　　电子邮件：

Questionnaire: Chinese speakers' perceptions of Chinese speakers' English
(English version)

Please complete the questionnaire truly according to your own situation and your own thinking. Feel free to answer open questions. Your participation is completely voluntary. Your answers to the questions will be kept confidential and anonymous and used for research purposes only. Your answers will not be disclosed to anybody except me as the researcher. Please send the completed questionnaire back to the following address, when applicable: ywang0103@hotmail.com or: yw5g08@soton.ac.uk

1. Age：18-22   23-29   30-35   36-40   41+

2. Gender：male / female

3. Occupation (Subject, if you are a student)：_____

4. Education：undergraduate /   master   /   PhD

5. Do you read English materials (including books, articles, those on websites and others)？

    Often   sometimes   rarely   never

6. Do you watch or listen to English-medium TV or radio programme？

    Often   sometimes   rarely   never

7. Which type/s of English have you been exposed to? Please use numbers to rank the types of English according to your experience with them. Use 1 to indicate the type of English with which you have the most experience, use 2 to indicate the type of English with which you have less experience, and use 3 to indicate the type of English with which you have least experience. If you have never been exposed to any type of English, just leave the gap before the type of English blank.

    _____Chinese speakers' English
    _____Native speakers' English (native speakers include Britons,
        Americans, Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders)
    _____Other speakers' English

8. Do you speak English?

    Often   sometimes   rarely   never

9. Do you write (for example, text messages, emails, letters, diary or essays) in English?

    Often   sometimes   rarely   never

10. Which of the following groups of speakers are your target interlocutors when you learn or use English? Please use numbers to rank the groups. Use 1 to indicate the

group with which you think you are most likely to communicate, use 2 to indicate the group with which you think you are more likely to communicate, and use 3 to indicate the group with which you are least likely to communicate. If you do not think you are going to communicate with a particular group, please leave the gap before the group of people blank.

_____Chinese speakers' English
_____Native speakers' English (native speakers include Britons, Americans, Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders)
_____Other speakers' English

11. Please circle which statement suits you.

1) I hope I could be easily recognized as a Chinese when I was speaking English.

2) I hope my English would sound like native speakers' English.

12. For what purpose/s, would you choose to speak English? Please choose as many as applicable.

1) To exchange information

2) To show that you are fashionable

3) To show that you are well educated

4) To show that you are distinguishable from other Chinese

5) Because the people who you are speaking with are speaking English.

6) Other purposes? (Please specify)_____

13. In terms of the current situation, what do you think of the function and role of English for Chinese speakers?

14. How could you predict the function and role of English for Chinese speakers in the future?

15. Have you ever heard of the term Chinglish? Yes/ No.

16. Have you ever heard of the term China English? Yes / No.

17. What ideas come to your mind when you see or hear the terms Chinglish or China English? (Any of your ideas will be invaluable for me and my research. Please feel free to write anything.)

```
```

18. Which type of English would you like to speak if you can choose? (Please feel free to choose as many as applicable.)

    1) China English

    2) British English

    3) Chinglish

    4) American English

    5) Australian English

    6) Any kind of English

    7) None of the given choices is applicable. I have my own answer (if so, please specify) _____

19. How do you label your own English (please feel free to choose as many as applicable)

    1) China English

    2) British English

    3) Chinglish

    4) American English

    5) Australian English

    6) None of the given choices is applicable. I have my own answer (if so, please specify) _____

20. How do you label Chinese speakers' English in general? (please feel free to choose as many as applicable)

266

1) American English

2) China English

3) British English

4) Chinglish

5) Canadian English

6) None of the given choices is applicable. I have my own answer (if so, please specify) _____

21. What ideas come to your mind if I would like you to say something about Chinese speakers' English in general? (Any of your ideas will be invaluable for me and my research. Please feel free to write anything.)

22. British people have British English, American people have American English, Indian people have Indian English. Do you anticipate one day when Chinese speakers have their own English model?

1) I strongly anticipate.

2) I anticipate.

3) I slightly anticipate.

4) I don't strongly anticipate.

5) I don't anticipate.

6) I don't anticipate at all.

23. Do you think the following criteria important if you are to evaluate a person's spoken English? Please choose appropriate numbers to indicate. 5=very important，4=important，3=a little important，2=not very important，1=not important, 0=not important at all.

1) Speaking **fluently**.	5 4 3 2 1 0
2) Using grammar in the **accurate** way that **native speakers** of English do. (Native speakers include Britons, Americans, Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders.)	5 4 3 2 1 0

3) **Clearly** expressing ideas.	5 4 3 2 1 0
4) **Authentic** native English expressions and **idioms**	5 4 3 2 1 0
5) **Authentic accent** (native speaker-like accent)	5 4 3 2 1 0
6) Agreeing with the way **native speakers** of English think (Native speakers include Britons, Americans, Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders.)	5 4 3 2 1 0
7) Agreeing with the way **Chinese speakers** think.	5 4 3 2 1 0

24. Could you evaluate your Chinese (as opposed to foreign) college English teachers' English according to the following statements. 5= strongly agree, 4=agree, 3= mildly agree, 2=mildly disagree, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree.

1) His/her English sounds/sounded comfortable.	5 4 3 2 1 0
2) His/her English is/was intelligible.	5 4 3 2 1 0
3) He/she has/had native speaker-like accent.	5 4 3 2 1 0
4) In comparison with native-speaker English teachers, I prefer Chinese teachers of English. (Native speakers include Britons, Americans, Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders.)	5 4 3 2 1 0

25. Do you **personally** accept the following English expressions? Please state your evaluation of their acceptability. 5=completely acceptable, 4=acceptable, 3=a little acceptable, 2=a little unacceptable, 1=unacceptable, 0=completely unacceptable.

1) Good good study, day day up.	5 4 3 2 1 0
2) People mountain, people sea.	5 4 3 2 1 0
3) I will give you some colour to see see.	5 4 3 2 1 0
4) She go to school everyday.	5 4 3 2 1 0
5) Your daughter will attend Beijing University next year, isn't it?	5 4 3 2 1 0
6) informations	5 4 3 2 1 0
7) Although it's not as big as Beijing, but I like it.	5 4 3 2 1 0
8) Some of my college classmates they like to dress up very much.	5 4 3 2 1 0
9) Some other kind of jobs I also want to try.	5 4 3 2 1 0
10) Last year, I write a letter to my parents.	5 4 3 2 1 0

26. Do you have any comments or something that you would like to say regarding the above expressions (in Q25)? Or, what kinds of English expressions do you think are acceptable or should be accepted? What kinds of expressions do you think are not acceptable or should not be accepted? Whatever you think will be of great value for me and my research. Please feel free to write anything that comes to your mind.

If you feel happy to let me know more about what you think, please let me know how I can contact you. I highly appreciate your interest in, your ideas about and your comments on this study. Your contact details will be treated as confidential data and only used for research purposes. Except me, no other party would have the opportunity to your data.

Name:_____ Phone/mobile No.:_____

Email:_____

Appendix 3 Interview design

1. Opening topics:
   - The feeling about the questionnaire survey
   - The feeling about the research topic as described in the information sheet
   - Any question about the research

2. Issues to be explored:
   - Experience of using English
   - Social context of English for Chinese speakers
   - Social context of their attitudes
   - The function of English for Chinese speakers
   - Attitudes towards English, towards their own English, and towards native speaker English
   - Awareness of ELF, awareness of different Englishes
   - Attitudes towards Chinese speakers' English in intercultural communication
   - Native-like or Chinese-like?
   - Would you like to be recognized as a Chinese speaker of English or be misrecognized as a native speaker of English?
   - Do you consider yourself as a user or a learner?
3. Closing question:
   - Any free comments stimulated by the project

4. Expected key words in participants' answers:
   - good/bad/broken/ok, communicate, intelligible,
   - native speakers of English, foreign speakers,
   - necessity to conform to native speaker norm,
   - anything goes,
   - hot, craze, English everywhere,
   - examination, gatekeeper,
   - error, creativity,
   - authentic/inauthentic,
   - native speaker norm, culture, our culture, their languageBeing recognized as a Chinese speaker is good/not good/bad;
   - Being misrecognized as a native speaker of English is good/not good/bad
   - User/learner
   - Our English/their English
   - Learning/using
   - Power, economy, politics, strength, technology
   - Global village, local flavour

Appendix 4 Focus group design

1. Self-introduction
2. Video-recording information and consent form
3. Discussion structure (encouraging participants to engage in the discussion)
4. Introduction
   - the spread of English (see hand out for the figures of English speakers around the world),
   - the ELF concept (based on Jenkins 2009a)
     - What is a lingua franca? A language which is used between people who share no first language in order to achieve communication.
     - Communicative success justifies the use of forms
     - Accommodation and code-switching can be useful
     - Co-construction of meaning between two parties of conversation
     - Flexibility rather than fixed forms in terms of language use
   - Chinese speakers' variations in English (see hand out for examples)
5. Ideas to be explored through discussion
   - Feelings about English as a lingua franca
   - Feelings about China English features
   - Attitudes towards difference between native speaker Englishes and non-native speakers' use of English in real life
   - Attitudes towards the goal of English
   - Attitudes towards Chinese speakers' own English (see hand out for the examples of Chinese speakers' variations in English)
6. Closing

   Any free comments on the project

Appendix 5 Hand out given to focus group members

(English version)

The spread of English

Görlach（2002）：370 million native English speakers, 220 million second language English speakers, 240 million other speakers of English

Jenkins（2003）：337,407,300 native English speakers, 235,351,300 second language English speakers.

Jenkins (2009)：329,140,800 native English speakers, 430,614,500 second language English speakers.

Crystal（2008）: 2 billion English users around the world

Examples of Chinese speakers' English

- Extra vowel：and /ændə/.

- Nasalized vowels

- /ʒ/ pronounced as /r/

- indistinguishable between /v/ and /z/

- indistinguishable between /l/ and /n/

- Stress on final pronouns

Syntax：*This morning I bought a book.*

Before I left the office, I had finished the work.

Pragmatics：*Have you eaten?*

英语传播：

Görlach （2002）：以英语为母语的使用者 3.7 亿，以英语为第二语言的使用者 2.2 亿，其他 2.4 亿英语使用人口。

Jenkins（2003）：337,407,300 母语英语使用者，235,351,300 英语使用者以英语为官方语言，（2009）：329,140,800 母语英语使用者， 和 430,614,500 英语使用者以英语为官方语言。

Crystal （2008）世界范围内使用英语的人口大约为 20 亿

中国英语使用者的"错误"使用： （举例）
发音：
- 多余的元音：and
- 鼻音
- /ʒ/发作 /r/
- /v/ ， /z/不分
- /l/ ， /n/不分
- 重音落在词尾

语序：*This morning I bought a book.*
Before I left the office, I had finished the work.

语用：Have you eaten? (吃了吗？)

Appendix 6 Research information sheet

(English version)

Participant Information Sheet

Study Title: Chinese speakers' perceptions of their English in intercultural communication

Researcher: Ying Wang
Ethics number: 6271

Please read this information carefully before deciding to take part in this research. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?
I am a PhD student from Modern Languages, University of Southampton. This is my PhD research project, partially funded by the Overseas Research Scholarship. I aim to find out the extent to which English used by Chinese speakers in China can be recognized as legitimate English against the backdrop of English globalization, which has given rise to Englishes in plural, i.e. native Englishes, such as British English and American English, and non-native Englishes such as Indian English and Nigerian English. This project is an empirical study of Chinese speakers' perceptions of English as it is used by Chinese speakers based in China. By doing this, the insiders' attitudes towards English used by themselves can be understood. This will provide us with the references when making decisions regarding English learning and use by Chinese speakers. Specifically, this project attempts to investigate how Chinese speakers interpret the function and the role of English for Chinese speakers in China, how they evaluate the use of English by Chinese speakers in China, and how they foresee the future of the English as used by Chinese speakers in China.

Why have I been chosen?
In order to have a comprehensive view of the attitudes of Chinese speakers as insiders towards the English as used by Chinese speakers themselves, samples are considered to include both institutional and non-institutional Chinese speakers of English. Chinese people who are over16 years old, and who have ever learned English or used English, are considered as potential participants.

What will happen to me if I take part?
This research project will be divided into three stages. The first stage is questionnaire survey, which might need you around 15 minutes. Based on the analysis of the questionnaire survey, interesting participants might enter the second stage, i.e. solo interview, which might need you 40- 60 minutes. Where appropriate, a follow-up solo interview might be needed. It might last around 40 minutes. Based on the analysis of solo interview, interesting participants might enter the third stage of this project, that is, focus group discussion, which might need you around 90 minutes. The participation is

completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any stage of the research without any reason.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?
Your participation will help you to reflect on your English experience, stimulate your critical thinking of English use and learning. By allowing your voice heard, you can help to provide an insight into the English used by Chinese speakers, and thus provide reference for the policy making process in the future. You will build up your confidence in English use when you have gone though the whole process of this project.

Are there any risks involved?
No.

Will my participation be confidential?
I shall abide by the Data Protection Act/ University policy. Based on the policy, your data collected at the first two stages will be kept anonymous and any information you give will not be identifiable as yours. Data collected from you will be coded and kept on a password protected computer. Therefore, your information will only be used for research purpose and your information will not be disclosed to anybody except me. There might be difficulties to assure the anonymity at the third stage, i.e. focus group, as other participants within the same focus group might recognize you. However, data collected from you will be coded and kept on a password protected computer. They will only be used for research purposes.

What happens if I change my mind?
You have the right to withdraw at any time through the research without any reason. Your legal right will not be affected.

What happens if something goes wrong?
If something goes wrong, you can contact Dr Martina Prude, Head of Research Governance, address as follows:
Research Governance
Corporate Services
Building 37, Level 4, Room 4055
University of Southampton, Highfield Campus
Southampton, SO17 1BJ
Tel: 023 8059 (2)5058
mad4@soton.ac.uk

Where can I get more information?
If you have any questions regarding this research project, please feel free to contact me: yw5g08@soton.ac.uk.

278

研究项目说明

研究项目：中国英语使用者如何看待中国人使用英语

研究员：王颖

道德标准：6721

请仔细阅读下列说明，然后决定是否参与该项研究。如果同意参与，您需要填写一份同意参与研究声明。

这个项目是关于什么的?

我是英国 University of Southampton 现代语言系博士生。这是我的博士论文研究项目，获英国政府海外研究奖学金赞助。英语全球化催生了各种英语变体。除了以英语为母语的人群所使用的英语变体，比如我们所熟悉的英式英语和美式英语等，还有以英语为非母语的人群所使用的英语变体，比如印度英语和尼日利亚英语。该项目旨在了解在英语作为通用语的今天，中国人使用的英语在多大程度上被认可为一种英语变体。该项目针对在中国范围内的中国英语使用者，了解他们如何看待中国的英语使用群体所使用的英语，从而了解局内人对这个群体所用英语的态度。这将为日后制定英语学习与使用的策略与计划提供参考依据。具体说来，通过该项目，我将调查中国的英语使用者如何诠释英语对于中国英语使用者的作用与功能，如何评价中国英语使用者的英语使用现状，以及如何展望他们在未来的英语使用状况。

为什么选我参与该项研究？

为了全面了解中国英语使用者作为局内人对于他们自己所使用英语的态度，研究调查样本包括国内大学校园内外的英语使用者。年满 16 周岁以上，具有英语学习或英语使用经历的中国人，都符合样本筛选条件。

如果参与该项目的话，我需要做些什么？

该研究项目分为三个阶段。第一阶段是问卷调查，大致需要您三十分钟的时间。在研究员进行问卷调查分析之后，将对答卷内容有意思的参与者进行采访，也就是第二阶段。在此阶段，大致需要每个参与者 30-60 分钟。在必要的情况下，可能需要进行第二次采访，大致需要 40 分钟。在分析各次访谈内容之后，该项目进入第三阶段，安排谈话内容有意思的参与者进行小组讨论。讨论大约需要您 90 分钟。您的参与纯属自愿，您可以在任何阶段撤回您所提供的信息，并且不需要任何理由。

参与对我有什么益处呢？

您的参与将有助于您重新审视自己的英语学习及使用经历，激发您对于英语学习及使用的批判性思考。您的观点将有助于揭示中国人使用英语的发展状况，从而为将来确立语言政策提供有力依据。在您经历该项目的过程之中，您使用英语的自信心将会明显加强。

如果参与，会涉及任何风险吗？

不会。

如果参与，我的资料会被保密处理吗？

研究员严格遵守数据保护法案之大学规范。根据该项规范，在该研究项目第一及第二阶段所收集的数据将被匿名处理，确使您所提供的信息不会暴露您的身份。

您所提供的数据将被编码，并保存于受密码保护的电脑里。因此，您的信息将只被用于研究目的，除了研究员本人，您的信息不会泄露给其他任何人。对于该研究项目第三阶段，即小组讨论，所收集的信息，有困难确保匿名，因为参与同组讨论的人或许能够辨认出您的身份。但是，在小组讨论中所收集的数据同样会被编码，并保存在受密码保护的电脑里。所有数据都将只用于研究目的。

如果我改变主意，怎么办？

您有权在该项研究的任何时候退出或撤回您所提供的信息，不需要任何理由。您的法律权利不受影响。

如果出现问题，怎么办？

如果出现问题，您可以跟 University of Southampton 的 Research Governance 负责人 Martina Prude 博士联系，联系地址如下：
Research Governance
Corporate Services
Building 37, Level 4, Room 4055
University of Southampton, Highfield Campus
Southampton, SO17 1BJ
电话: +44 23 8059 5058
电子邮件：mad4@soton.ac.uk

我从哪里可以了解关于该项目的更多信息？

如果您希望对该项目有更多了解，欢迎与我联系：yw5g08@soton.ac.uk

Appendix 7 Interview consent form

CONSENT FORM (Version 1)

Study title: Chinese speakers' perceptions of their English in intercultural communication

Researcher name: Ying Wang
Study reference: Version 1, 14/09/09
Ethics reference:6721

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet (version1, 14/09/09) and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study

I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study

I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected

I agree for my interview to be recorded and I understand the recording will be destroyed after the transcripts have been validated.

Name of participant (print name)………………………………………………………

Signature of participant……………………………………………………………..

Name of Researcher (print name) …………………………………………………

Signature of Researcher……………………………………………………………..

Date………………………………………………………………………………

Appendix 8 Questionnaire results

Table 4.1 Biographic information of questionnaire respondents

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Age	Valid	18-22	252	32.8	32.8	32.8
		23-29	408	53.1	53.1	85.8
		30-35	77	10.0	10.0	95.8
		36-40	23	3.0	3.0	98.8
		41+	9	1.2	1.2	100.0
		Total	769	100.0	100.0	
Gender	Valid	Male	310	40.3	40.3	40.3
		Female	459	59.7	59.7	100.0
		Total	769	100.0	100.0	
Profession	Valid	English major student	221	28.7	28.7	28.7
		non-English major student	281	36.5	36.5	65.3
		professional	267	34.7	34.7	100.0
		Total	769	100.0	100.0	
Education	Valid	undergraduate	404	52.5	52.5	52.5
		master	363	47.2	47.2	99.7
		phd	2	.3	.3	100.0
		Total	769	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.5: Description of English use

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How often do you read English-medium material?	769	1	4	1.99	.729
How often do you listen to English-medium material?	769	1	4	2.02	.775
How often do you speak English?	769	1	4	2.22	.706
How often do you write in English?	769	1	4	2.44	.767
Valid N (listwise)	769				

Table 4.7 Comparing student group and professional group

Group Statistics					
	Student group or professional group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference in NSE	student	502	2.4701	.99020	.04419
	professional	267	2.6094	1.06744	.06533

Independent Samples Test			
		Difference in NSE	
		Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F	6.221	
	Sig.	0.013	
t-test for Equality of Means	t	0.99	1.013
	df	500	499.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.323	0.311
	Mean Difference	0.08814	0.08814
	Std. Error Difference	0.08903	0.08699
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference — Lower	-0.08678	-0.08277
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference — Upper	0.26306	0.25905

Table 4.8 Comparing English majors and non-English majors

Group Statistics					
	Profession	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference in NSE	English major student	221	2.5195	.87912	.05914
	non-English major student	281	2.4313	1.06945	.06380

Independent Samples Test			
		Difference in NSE	
		Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F	6.221	
	Sig.	0.013	
t-test for Equality of	t	0.99	1.013
	df	500	499.008

Means	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.323	0.311
	Mean Difference		0.08814	0.08814
	Std. Error Difference		0.08903	0.08699
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-0.08678	-0.08277
		Upper	0.26306	0.25905

Table 4.9 Comparing male respondents and female respondents

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference in NSE	Male	310	2.5055	1.08631	.06170
	Female	459	2.5272	.97229	.04538

Independent Samples Test				
			Difference in NSE	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		4.273	
	Sig.		0.039	
t-test for Equality of Means	t		-0.290	-0.284
	df		767	612.795
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.772	0.777
	Mean Difference		-0.02175	-0.02175
	Std. Error Difference		0.07497	0.07659
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-0.16882	-0.17216
		Upper	-0.12542	0.12566

Table 4.10: Comparing undergraduates and postgraduates

Group Statistics					
	Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference in NSE	undergraduate	404	2.5787	.99764	.04963
	postgraduate	365	2.4518	1.03975	.05442

Independent Samples Test	
	Difference in NSE

285

		Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F	1.37	
	Sig.	0.242	
t-test for Equality of Means	t	1.727	1.723
	df	767	751.656
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.085	0.085
	Mean Difference	0.12693	0.12693
	Std. Error Difference	0.0735	0.07366
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference — Lower	-0.01736	-0.01767
	Upper	0.27122	0.27153

Table 4.11: Comparing different age groups

Descriptives

The acceptability of the English that is different from NSE

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean — Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
18-22	252	2.5179	.92411	.05821	2.4032	2.6325	.00	5.00
23-29	408	2.4799	1.05901	.05243	2.3768	2.5830	.00	5.00
30-35	77	2.6766	1.12166	.12783	2.4220	2.9312	.00	5.00
36-40	23	2.5304	.93732	.19545	2.1251	2.9358	.00	4.50
41+	9	2.9000	1.00623	.33541	2.1265	3.6735	1.30	4.50
Total	769	2.5185	1.01915	.03675	2.4463	2.5906	.00	5.00

ANOVA

The acceptability of the English that is different from NSE

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.846	4	.962	.925	.448
Within Groups	793.851	764	1.039		
Total	797.698	768			

286

Table 4.12: comparing different age groups

Approximation to NSE							
Descriptives							
		18-22	23-29	30-35	36-40	41+	Total
N		252	408	77	23	9	769
Mean		3.3383	3.0484	3.0325	2.663	2.8333	3.1278
Std. Deviation		0.92222	1.00732	1.08621	1.17408	0.86603	1.00301
Std. Error		0.05809	0.04987	0.12379	0.24481	0.28868	0.03617
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	3.2239	2.9504	2.7859	2.1553	2.1676	3.0568
	Upper Bound	3.4527	3.1464	3.279	3.1708	3.499	3.1988
Minimum		0	0	0	0	1.25	0
Maximum		5	5	5	5	4.25	5

ANOVA					
Approximation to NSE					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	20.185	4	5.046	5.124	.000
Within Groups	752.449	764	.985		
Total	772.635	768			

Table 4.13: Chi-square test for the influence of gender on the choice between Chinese speakers' English and NSE

Tick the situation that suits you better. * Gender Crosstabulation					
			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Tick the situation that suits you better.	I hope I could be easily recognized as a Chinese speaker when speaking English.	Count	47	33	80
		Expected Count	32.2	47.8	80.0
	I hope my English would sound like native English speakers' English.	Count	259	419	678
		Expected Count	273.3	404.7	678.0
	I don't mind.	Count	4	7	11
		Expected Count	4.4	6.6	11.0
Total		Count	310	459	769

		Expected Count	310.0	459.0	769.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.631[a]	2	.002
Likelihood Ratio	12.355	2	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.284	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	769		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.43.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.128	.002
	Cramer's V	.128	.002
N of Valid Cases		769	

Table 4.14: Chi-square test for the influence of major on the ranking of Chinese speakers as expected interlocutors in English

Chinese speakers as your expected interlocutors with whom you use English to communicate * major

Crosstabulation

Chinese speakers your expected interlocutors with whom you use English to communicate?		Major		Total
		English major student	non-English major student	
I would never expect to use English to communicate with them.	Count	22	32	54
	Expected Count	23.8	30.2	54.0
No.1	Count	61	111	172
	Expected Count	75.7	96.3	172.0
No.2	Count	52	53	105
	Expected Count	46.2	58.8	105.0
No.3	Count	86	85	171
	Expected Count	75.3	95.7	171.0
Total	Count	221	281	502
	Expected Count	221.0	281.0	502.0

288

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.365[a]	3	.025
Likelihood Ratio	9.436	3	.024
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.356	1	.012
N of Valid Cases	502		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.77.

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.137	.025
	Cramer's V	.137	.025
	Contingency Coefficient	.135	.025
N of Valid Cases		502	

Table 4.27 Bivariate test on the correlation between 'sounding comfortable' English and NES-accented English

		Sounding comfortable.	Similar to the accent of British or American speakers of English.
Sounding comfortable.	Pearson Correlation	1	.534[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	769	769
Similar to the accent of British or American speakers of English.	Pearson Correlation	.534[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	769	769
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Table 4.28: Bivariate test for the correlation between near-NES accent and student preference

		A	B
A	Pearson Correlation	1	.326[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	769	769
B	Pearson Correlation	.326[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	769	769
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			
A. Similar to the accent of British or American speakers of English. B. I prefer the said Chinese teacher than teachers from native English speaking countries, if I were to choose my teacher of English.			

Table 4.30 Independent t-test on the effect of profession on the attitudes towards the legitimation of Chinese speakers' own English

Group Statistics					
	Student group or professional group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Do you anticipate one day when Chinese speakers have their own English as an accepted model of English?	student	502	2.74	1.680	.075
	professional	267	3.21	1.747	.107

Independent Samples Test				
			Do you anticipate one day when Chinese speakers have their own English as an accepted model of English?	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		2.403	
	Sig.		0.121	
t-test for Equality of Means	t		-3.588	-3.546
	df		767	524.651
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0
	Mean Difference		-0.463	-0.463
	Std. Error Difference		0.129	0.131
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-0.716	-0.719
		Upper	-0.21	-0.206

Table 4.31: Correlations

		Do you anticipate one day when Chinese speakers have their own English as an accepted model of English?	Difference from NSE
Do you anticipate one day when Chinese speakers have their own English as an accepted model of English?	Pearson Correlation	1	-.198[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	769	769
Difference from NSE	Pearson Correlation	-.198[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	769	769
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Table 4. 32: Correlations

		Do you anticipate one day when Chinese speakers have their own English as an accepted model of English?	Approximation to NSE
Do you anticipate one day when Chinese speakers have their own English as an accepted model of English?	Pearson Correlation	1	.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.352
	N	769	769
Approximation to NSE	Pearson Correlation	.034	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.352	
	N	769	769

Table 4.34: Testing the correlation between the desire for NSE and the importance attached to the approximation to NSE

Approximation to NSE		I hope I could be easily recognized as a Chinese speaker when speaking English.	I hope my English would sound like native English speakers' English.	I don't mind.	Total
N		80	678	11	769
Mean		2.5125	3.2094	2.5682	3.1278
Std. Deviation		1.09941	0.96792	0.68091	1.00301
Std. Error		0.12292	0.03717	0.2053	0.03617
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	2.2678	3.1365	2.1107	3.0568
	Upper Bound	2.7572	3.2824	3.0256	3.1988
Minimum		0	0	1.5	0
Maximum		5	5	3.5	5

ANOVA

Approximation to NSE

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	38.251	2	19.126	19.949	.000
Within Groups	734.383	766	.959		
Total	772.635	768			

292

Tables 4.36-4.38 provide complementary information about details of responses to Q23, 24 and 25, but the discussion in the text does not involve such details.

Table 4.36: Means for the evaluation of Chinese ELT practitioners' English

Profession		A.	B.	C.	D.
English major student	Mean	4.00	4.43	2.66	3.16
	N	221	221	221	221
	Std. Deviation	.884	.714	1.132	1.517
non-English major student	Mean	3.71	4.05	2.70	2.76
	N	281	281	281	281
	Std. Deviation	1.118	.883	1.122	1.643
professional	Mean	3.44	3.98	2.68	2.08
	N	267	267	267	267
	Std. Deviation	1.182	.965	1.295	1.526
Total	Mean	3.70	4.14	2.68	2.64
	N	769	769	769	769
	Std. Deviation	1.101	.888	1.186	1.626
Note	A. Sounding comfortable. B. Intelligible. C. Similar to the accent of British or American speakers of English. D. I prefer the said Chinese teacher than teachers from native English speaking countries, if I were to choose my teacher of English.				

Table 4.37: Mean scores for the importance attached to different dimensions of spoken English.

	English major student			non-English major student			professional			Total		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1. Speaking fluently.	4.43	221	.720	4.35	281	.956	4.25	267	.931	4.34	769	.887
2. Using grammar accurately with reference to native speakers of English norms.	3.07	221	1.080	2.72	281	1.291	2.84	267	1.428	2.86	769	1.292
3. Clearly expressing ideas.	4.81	221	.397	4.65	281	.614	4.67	267	.629	4.70	769	.569
4. Using authentic native speaker English expressions and idioms.	3.58	221	1.116	3.15	281	1.231	3.13	267	1.299	3.27	769	1.238
5. Having authentic native speaker English accent.	3.31	221	1.227	2.88	281	1.357	2.75	267	1.466	2.96	769	1.378
6. Following native English speakers' way of thinking.	3.81	221	1.159	3.20	281	1.388	3.33	267	1.372	3.42	769	1.343
7. Agreeing with Chinese speakers' way of thinking.	2.05	221	1.341	2.32	281	1.543	2.26	267	1.546	2.22	769	1.491

Table 4.38: Means for the scaling task of acceptability

	English major student			non-English major student			professional			Total		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1. Good good study, day day up.	3.37	221	1.384	3.12	281	1.624	2.62	267	1.818	3.02	769	1.658
2. People mountain, people sea.	2.57	221	1.529	2.26	281	1.510	2.14	267	1.666	2.31	769	1.578
3. I will give you some colour to see see.	2.14	221	1.475	2.30	281	1.607	2.00	267	1.698	2.15	769	1.606
4. She go to school every day.	2.39	221	1.456	2.55	281	1.656	2.89	267	1.508	2.62	769	1.561
5. Your daughter will attend Beijing University next year, isn't it?	2.75	221	1.474	2.49	281	1.639	2.67	267	1.480	2.63	769	1.540
6. informations	2.45	221	1.544	2.66	281	1.662	2.82	267	1.507	2.65	769	1.580
7. although it's not as big as Beijing, but I like it.	2.59	221	1.522	2.43	281	1.642	2.93	267	1.399	2.65	769	1.539
8. Some of my college classmates they like to dress up very much.	2.23	221	1.273	1.86	281	1.415	2.50	267	1.431	2.19	769	1.406
9. some other kind of jobs I also want to try.	2.57	221	1.328	2.24	281	1.546	2.73	267	1.385	2.51	769	1.444
10. Last year, I write a letter to my parents.	2.13	221	1.387	2.39	281	1.674	2.79	267	1.456	2.45	769	1.542

Appendix 9 Profile of interview participants

Participant	Age	Sex	Profession/ Major	Use of ELF	Interlocutors	Conceptual knowledge of Chinese speakers' own English
PBD	36-40	M	Project manager in a joint venture	Much	NNESs	No
PCZ	36-40	M	Legal consultant in a joint venture	Some	NNESs and NESs	No
PHH	23-29	M	Export salesman in a Chinese company	Much	NNESs and NESs	No
PJL	36-40	M	Manufacturing technician in a joint venture	Some	NNESs	No
PNC	23-29	F	Secretary in international business department, Chinese company	Much	NESs and NNESs	No
PQW	23-29	F	Saleswoman in domestic business department, Chinese company	Some	NNESs	No
PTR	30-35	M	Export salesman in a joint venture	Much	NNESs	No
PWB	30-35	M	Salesman in domestic business department, joint venture	Some	NNESs	No
PXZ	23-29	F	Administration in a Chinese company	Some	NESs	No

PYM	23-29	F	Secretary in international business department, Chinese company	Some	NESs and NNESs	No
PYS	30-35	M	Export salesman in a joint venture	Much	NESs	No
SAN	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SXK	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SHY	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SPJ	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SPZ	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SZB	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SFY	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SFJ	23-29	F	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SLZ	23-29	F	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SDX	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SWZ	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
STF	23-29	M	MA non-English major in a university	Some	NESs and Chinese teachers	No
SWH	18-22	M	BA English major in a university	Some	NESs and NNESs including Chinese teachers	Yes

298

SJJ	18-22	M	BA English major in a university	Some	NESs and NNESs including Chinese teachers	Yes
SPL	18-22	F	BA English major in a university	Some	NESs and NNESs including Chinese teachers	Yes
SXL	18-22	F	BA English major in a university	Some	NESs and NNESs including Chinese teachers	Yes
SQX	23-29	F	MA English major in a university	Some	NESs and NNESs including Chinese teachers	Yes
SHD	18-22	F	BA English major in a university	Some	Chinese teachers and other NNESs	No
SSQ	18-22	M	BA English major in a university	Some	Chinese teachers and other NNESs	No
SLN	18-22	F	BA English major in a university	Some	Chinese teachers and other NNESs	No
SLC	18-22	F	BA English major in a university	Some	Chinese teachers and other NNESs	No
SWL	18-22	F	BA English major in a university	Some	Chinese teachers and other NNESs	No
SLL	18-22	F	BA English major in a university	Some	Chinese teachers and other NNESs	No
SLH	18-22	M	BA English major in a university	Some	Chinese teachers and other NNESs	No

PBD- He was working as a project manager for a joint venture in China, aged between 36 and 40. He had encounters with foreigners because of his job responsibility. The foreigners were mainly NNESs who had no L1 Chinese background. He reported to have experience of going abroad in Europe for business. He thus was a quite heavy user of ELF.

PCZ- He was working as the legal consultant for a foreign trade company. He was aged between 36 and 40 years old according to the biological data he provided. As he reported, his use of English mainly involved legal document preparation and examination. He had some experience of going abroad for business.

PHH- He was a salesman working for the export department of a company in China. He was between 23 and 29 years old according to the biological data he provided in questionnaire. As he estimated, 70 per cent of the non-Chinese speakers of English he had encountered were non-native speakers of English, while the rest were native speakers of English. He reported that he had the first degree in English majored subject. That is to say, he was a proficient user of English and had rich experience of using ELF.

PJL- He was a male interviewee aged between 36 and 40, working for the manufactory department of a joint venture in China. He had some encounters with foreigners due to his job responsibility. Like most questionnaire respondents, he reported to use English 'sometimes'. He did not say that he had experience of going abroad. He had some, although not much, experience of using ELF.

PNC- She was working for the international business department of a renowned large-scale enterprise in China, aged between 23 and 29. She obtained her master degree in America one year before she was interviewed. She therefore had lot of exposure to both NESs and NNESs.

PQW- She was working for a business company, dealing with domestic business. Her use of English was mainly in other domains than her daily work. Her first degree was in English language. She was in the relationship with a French boyfriend with whom she used English to communicate. She went abroad a few times as a tourist. Therefore, she had a lot of experience of using ELF.

PTR- He was working for the sales department of a joint venture in China, aged between 30 and 35. He had frequent encounters with foreigners because of his job responsibility. He was in an English training course sponsored by his company when I was administrating the questionnaires. I heard him talking on the phone about business

in English. The foreigners he dealt with were mainly NNESs who had no L1 Chinese language background.

PWB- He was a salesman working for a joint venture in China, aged between 30 and 35. His job mainly involved domestic business. He reported to have some experience of dealing with foreigners in some product exhibitions and business fairs.

PXZ- She was a 29-year-old female, working for a telephone network company. Like many other participants in the question survey, her use of English was reported to be 'sometimes' and largely limited to her encounters with native speakers. She represented a large group of questionnaire respondents.

PYM- She was working for the international business department of a high-profile state-owned enterprise in China, aged 23 and 29. She had years of experience working as a translator before she joined the department, although she said that she had not much encounter with foreigners in oral communication. The interview was conducted a few months after she joined the department.

PYS- He was working as a salesman in a joint company in China, aged between 30 and 35. His customers were mainly American as he was responsible for the business network with the partners in the US.

SAN, SXK, SHY, SPJ, SPZ, SZB, SFY, SJF, SLZ, SDX, SWZ, and STF- They were all studying for a Master degree in other majors than English majors, aged between 23 and 29 They all held that English was important and showed enthusiasm in the current research. Most of them came to the interviews with the purpose to learn more about how to become more competent with English.

SWH, SJJ, SPL and SXL – They were English majors doing undergraduate degrees, aged below 23. They attended Hu Xiaoqiong's classes where China English concept was introduced. Their encounter with English was mainly between them and teachers of English, who were from NES countries or NNES countries, for example, Belgium. They had fellow students who were from other countries, who were mostly Indians, Japanese and Koreans.

SQX – She was an English majors doing master degree, aged between 23 and 29. She attended Hu Xiaoqiong's classes where China English concept was introduced. Except her encounter with foreign teachers and fellow students, she had experience of working as a tour guide in English. She had experience of using ELF to some extent.

SHD, SSQ, SLN, SLC, SWL, SLL and SLH- They were English majors doing undergraduate degrees, aged below 23. They did not attend the course where China English concept was introduced. Their encounter with English was mainly between them and teachers or English. They had some encounter in English with fellow students who were from other countries, who were mostly Indians, Japanese and Koreans.

Appendix 10 Profile of focus group participants

Focus group	Participants	Gender	Major	Education background	Interviewed?
Group A (9 members)	ZR	F	English	MA	No
	MJ	F	English	BA	No
	JI	F	English	BA	No
	DQ	M	English	MA	No
	BH	M	English	MA	No
	XC	F	English	MA	No
	AW	F	English	BA	No
	HJ	M	English	BA	No
	JC	F	English	BA	No
Group B (11 members)	LJ	F	Non-English	MA	No
	SJ	F	Non-English	MA	No
	XB	M	Non-English	MA	No
	KC	M	Non-English	MA	No
	HX	F	Non-English	MA	No
	LL	F	Non-English	MA	No
	LF	F	Non-English	MA	No
	ZL	M	Non-English	MA	No
	ZQ	M	Non-English	MA	No
	YY	F	Non-English	MA	No
	BP	M	Non-English	MA	No
Group C (8 members)	DH	F	English	BA	Yes
	PL	F	English	BA	Yes
	HW	M	English	BA	Yes
	WJ	M	English	BA	Yes
	JN	F	Non-English	MA	Yes
	HZ	M	Non-English	MA	Yes
	DX	M	Non-English	MA	Yes
	FT	M	Non-English	MA	Yes
Group D (9 members)	ZW	M	English	MA	No
	XL	F	English	MA	No
	ZQ	F	English	MA	No
	XR	F	English	BA	No
	LT	M	Non-English	MA	No
	GJ	M	Non-English	MA	No
	ZH	M	Non-English	MA	No
	YR	F	Non-English	MA	No
	YA	F	Non-English	MA	No

Glossary

Chinese speakers of English refer to speakers of English who are from mainland China in this thesis.

The term **China English**, in this thesis, relates to the Kachruvian research on Chinese speakers' English with the focus on a localized variety in traditional sense. However, I used the term *China English* in my questionnaire because this is a term that is established due to existing China English research. I understand that the participants might or might not have the knowledge of China English research. But my purpose was to find out whether Chinese speakers would like to have their English reveal their L1 Chinese identity. For this reason, I also used the term **Chinglish** in my questionnaires.

The term **Chinglish** relates to China English research. It is likely to be used by China English researchers in a negative sense to refer to the English used by Chinese speakers who fail to produce China English. The difference between China English and Chinglish resembles the difference between Singaporean Engish and Singlish.

The term **Chinese English** is used as interchangeable as the term *China English*.

The term **CHELF** is used in this thesis as a shorthand of **Chinese speakers' English as a Lingua Franca**. According to Jenkins (2006) and Kirkpatrick (2006), NNESs' English exists without legitimacy. Chinese speakers' English as a Lingua Franca simply captures the English used by Chinese speakers in their intercultural communication. Their English is traditionally judged as 'learner English' because it does not conform to NSE. Following ELF research, I consider the legitimacy of Chinese speakers' English and I understand that empirical study is needed to justify its legitimacy.

CHELF identity is shorthand for the identity related to CHELF. It involves ELF user/learner identity, L1 Chinese identity and multilevel identity of ELF users in the glocal context. See pp.40-8; pp.167-179.

I use the term **ELF perspective** as a shorthand to describe the participants' opinions and ideas that demonstrated their beliefs related to an ELF perspective.

I discussed an **ELF perspective** in chapters 1and 2 (specifically see pp2-7 and pp30-35). In chapter 5, I also discussed attitudes, identities and beliefs that contributed to either the ELF perspective or the EFL perspective as distinguished in Jenkins (2006b). In short, I consider an ELF perspective as capturing the perceptions related to the beliefs of target language as ELF, of the fluidity of English use, of the pluralistic forms of English, of the global ownership of English, and of the value of NNES creativity. By contrast, I consider an **EFL perspective** as capturing the perceptions related to the beliefs of the target language as ENL, of the fixity of English forms, of the monolithic form of English, of the NSE ownership of English, and of NNES conformity.

Bibliography

Agha, A. 2007. *Language and social relations*. Cambridge University Press.

Ajzen, I. and M. Fishbein. 1980. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Printice-Hall.

Alford, J., C. Funk and J. Hibbing. 2005. 'Are political orientations genetically transmitted?'. *American Political Science Review*. 99: 153-167.

Allport, G. 1935. 'Attitudes'. C. Murchison (ed.) *A handbook of social psychology*. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press. 798-844.

Ammon, U. 2000. 'Towards more fairness in international English: linguistic rights of non-native speakers'. R. Phillipson (ed.) *Rights to language: equity, power, and education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Anchimbe, E. A. 2009. 'Local or international standards: indigenized varieties of English at the crossroads'. F. Sharifian (ed.) *English as an international language: perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Multilingual Matters: 271-286.

Baker, C. 1992. *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, W. 2009. *Intercultural awareness and intercultural communication through English: an investigation of Thai English language users in higher education*. University of Southampton. http://eprints.soton.ac.uk.

Bamgboṣe, A. 1998. 'Torn between the norms: innovations in world Englishes'. *World Englishes*. 17/1:1-14.

Barrutia, D. A. 2008. *Say it ain't so*. 《英语不该这样说》。Capital Normal University Press (首都师范大学出版社).

Berg, B. L. 2007. *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Pearson Education, Inc.

Berns, M. 2009. 'World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and intelligibility'. *World Englishes*. 27.3/4: 327-334.

Bhabha, H. 1990. 'The third space'. J. Rutherford (ed.) *Identity: community, culture, difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. 207-221.

Bhatt, R. M. 2008. 'In other words: language mixing, identity representations, and third space'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 12/2: 177-200.

Billig, M. 1987. *Arguing and thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M. 1989. 'The argumentative nature of holding strong views: a case study'. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 19/3: 203-223.

Bisong, J. 1995. 'Language choice and cultural imperialism: a Nigerian perspective'. *ELT Journal*. 49/2: 122-132.

Bjørge, A. K. 2009. 'The impact of backchannelling on the English lingua franca negotiation process'. *Paper presented on The 2nd International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. Southampton. April 2009.

Björkman, B. 2009. 'Spoken lingua franca English in engineering education in Sweden: code features and recipient reactions'. *Paper presented on The 2nd International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. Southampton. April 2009.

Blamire, H. 2006. *Guide to common errors in English*.《常见英语错误例解词典》。Beijing University Press (北京大学出版社).

Bloor, M., J. Frankland, M. Thomas and K. Robson. 2001. *Focus groups in social research*. London: SAGE.

Blumenfeld-Jones, D. 1995. Fidelity as a criterion for practising and evaluating narrative inquiry. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. 8/1: 25-33.

Bolton, K. 2003. *Chinese Englishes: a sociolinguistic history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P.1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Polity Press.

Breiteneder, A. 2009. ''Transitionary', 'linguistical', 'increasement': lexical innovations in ELF'. *Paper presented on The 2nd International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. Southampton. April 2009.

Brewer, J. and A. Hunter. 1989. *Multimethod research: a synthesis of styles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Brumfit, C. 2001. *Individual freedom in language teaching*. Oxford: oxford University Press.

Bruthiaux, P. 2010. 'World Englishes and the classroom: an EFL perspective'. *TESOL Quartly*. 44/2: 365-369.

Brutt-Griffler, J. 2002. *World English: a study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingua Matters.

Bryman, A. 2001. *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. 2006. 'Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done?'. *Qualitative Research*. 6/1: 97-113.

Buchanan, D. 1992. 'An easy alliance: combining quantitative and qualitative research methods'. *Health Education Quarterly*. 19: 117-135.

Butler, S. 1997. 'Corpus of English in Southeast Asia: implications for a regional dictionary'. M. L. S. Bautista (ed.) *English as an Asian language: the Philippine context*. Manila: Macquarie Library.103-24.

Campbell, K. P. and Y. Zhao. 1995. 'English in China'. *World Englishes, 14/3: 377-390.*

Canagarajah, A. S. 1993. 'Critical Ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 27/4:601-626.

Canagarajah, A. S. 2006. 'Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 26: 197-218.

Chambers, J. K. 1995. *Sociolinguistic theory*. Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Chang, Jung. 1987. 'Chinese speakers'. M. Swan and B. Smith (eds.) *Learner English: a teacher's guide to interference and other problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 224-237.

Chen, M. and X. Hu. 2006. 'Towards the acceptability of China English at home and abroad'. *Engish today. 22/4: 44-52.*

Cheng, C. 1992. 'Chinese varieties of English'. B. B. Kachru (ed.) *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 162-177.

Cogo, A. and M. Dewey. 2006. 'Efficiency in ELF communication: from pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation'. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*. 5/2: 59-93.

Cogo. A. 2008. 'English as a lingua franca: form follows function'. English Today 95. 24/3: 58-61.

Cogo. A. 2009. 'Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: a study of pragmatic strategies'. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 254-273.

Cogo, A. and J. Jenkins. 2010. 'English as a lingua franca in Europe: a mismatch between policy and practice. European Journal of Language Policy. 2/2: 271-294.

Cogo, A. and M. Dewey. 2012. *Analysing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. Continuum.

Cohen, L., L. Manion and K. Morrison. 2000. *Research methods in education*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.

Cook, V. 2002. *Portraits of the L2 user*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Coulmas, F. 2005. Changing language regimes in globalizing environments. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 3-15.

Coupland, N. 2003. 'Introduction: sociolinguistics and globazation'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 7/4: 465-472.

Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE.

Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. 2008. 'Two thousand million'. *English Today*. 24/1: 3-6.

Cui, X. 2006. 'An understanding of 'China English' and the learning and use of the English language in China'. *English Today*. 22/4: 40-43.

Cumming, A. 1994. 'Alternatives in TESOL research: descriptive, interpretive, and ideological orientations'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 28/4: 673-703.

Cvetkovich, A. and D. Keller, 1997. 'Thinking global and local'. A. Cvekovich and D. Ketter (eds.) *Articulating global and local*. Boulder. Colorado: Westview Press. 1-30.

Dalton-Puffer, C., G. Kaltenboeck and U. Smit. 1997. 'Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria'. *World Englishes*. 16/1: 115-128.

Datta, L. 1994. 'Paradigm wars: a basis for peaceful coexistence and beyond'. *New Directions for Program Evaluation.* Special Issue: The qualitative-quantitative debate: new perspectives. 61: 53-70.

Davies, J. 2003. 'Expressions of gender: an analysis of pupils' gendered discourse styles in small group classroom discussions'. *Discourse and Society*. 14: 115-132.

Davies, B. and R. Harré 1990. 'Positioning: the social construction of selves'. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behaviour*. 20/1:43-63.

Deterding, D. 2006. 'The pronunciation of English by speakers from China'. *English World-Wide*. 27/2: 175-198.

Deterding, D. and A. Kirkpatrick. 2006. 'Emerging south-east Asian Englishes and intelligibility'. *World Englishes*. 25/3-4: 391-409.

Dewey, M. 2007. 'English as a lingua franca and globalization: an interconnected perspective'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 17/3: 332-354.

Dewey, M. 2009. 'English as Lingua Franca: heightened variability an theoretical implications'. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 60-83.

Dewey, M. 2011. 'Accommodative ELF talk and teacher knowledge'. A. Archibald, A. Cogo and J. Jenkins (eds.) *English - A changing medium for education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

310

Dewey, M. 2012 . 'Towards a post-normative approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF'. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1.1.

Dörnyei, Z., K. Csizér and N. Németh. 2006. Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. 2007. *Research methods in applied linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Du, R. and Y. Jiang. 2001. 'Commenting on China English research over the past twenty years (近二十年 "中国英语"研究述评)'. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research 外语教学与研究*.33/1.

Durkheim, E. 1964. *The division of labor in society*. New York: Free Press.

Duszak, A. 2002. 'Us and others: an introduction'. A. Duszak (ed.) *Us and others: social identities across languages, discourses and cultures*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 1-28.

Eames, J. B. 1974. *The English in China*. London; New York: Curzon Press; Barnes & Noble Books.

Eaves, M. 2011. 'English, Chinglish or China English? – Analysing Chinglish, Chinese English and China English'. *English Today*. 27/04: 64-70.

Edwards, J. R. 1982. 'Language attitudes and their implications among English speakers'. E. B. Ryan and H. Giles (eds.) *Attitudes towards language variation: social and applied context*s. London: Edward Arnold. 20-33.

Edwards, J. 2009. *Language and identity: key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ehrenreich, S. 2009. English as a Lingua Franca in multinational corporations – exploring business communities of practice. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 126-151.

Erling, E. J. 2007. 'Local identities, global connections: affinities to English among students at the Freie Universität Berlin'. World Englishes. 26/2: 111-130.

Essen, A. V. 1997. 'English in Mainland Europe – a Dutch perspective'. World Englishes. 16/1: 95-103.

Evans, B. E. 2010. 'Chinese perceptions of Inner Circle varieties of English'. *World Englishes*. 29/2: 270-280.

Fairclough, N. 1993. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analyzing discourse: textual analysis for social research.* Routledge, London.

Fang, F. 2008. 'People mountain, people sea: a study of four Chinese English idioms on the web'. English Today. 24/4: 46-50.

Farnsworth, J. and B. Boon. 2010. 'Analysing group dynamics within the focus group'. Qualitative Research. 10/5: 605-624.

Feng, A. 2009. 'Identity, 'acting inteculturally' and aims for bilingual education: an example from China'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 30/4: 283-296.

Fern, E. 2001. *Advanced focus group research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Fielding, N. 2008. 'Analytic density, postmodernism, and applied multiple method research'. M. Bergman (ed.) *Mixed method research design: advanced issues and debates*. London: SAGE. 37-52.

Fielding, N. 2010. 'Mixed methods research in the real world'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 13/2: 127-138.

Fielding, N. G. and J. L. Fielding. 1986. *Linking data: the articulation of qualitative and quantitative methods in social research*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Firth, A. 1996. 'The discursive accomplishment of normality: on 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 26: 237-259.

Fishbein, M. 1967. 'Attitude and the prediction of behavior'. M. Fishbein (ed.) *Readings in attitude theory and measurement*. Wiley: 477- 492.

Foddy, W. 1993. *Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: theory and practice in social research*. Cambridge University Press.

Forsythe, D. 2004. *Oral correction*. 《搞定英语口说错误》。World Publishing Corporation (世界图书出版公司).

Freire, P. 1993. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. NY: Continuum.

Fuller, J. M. 2009. ''Sam need gun go war': performances of non-Standard English in the construction of identity'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 13/5: 659-669.

Fuss, D. 1989. *Essentially speaking: feminism, nature and difference*. New York: Routledge.

Gal, S. 1989. 'Language and political economy'. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 18. 345-367.

Gao, L. 2001. 'The lexical acculturation of English in the Chinese context'. *Studies in the Linguistics Sciences*. 31: 73-88.

Gao, L. 2006. 'Language contact and convergence in computer-mediated communication'. *World Englishes*. 25/2: 299-308.

Garnder, R. C. and W. E. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and motivation: Second language learning*. Newbury House.

Garrett, P. 2001. 'Language attitudes and sociolinguistics'. *Dialogue*. 626-631.

Garrett, P. 2010. *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garrett, P., N. Coupland and A. Williams. 2003. *Investigating language attitudes: social meanings of dialect, ethnicity and performance*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Ge, C. 1980. 'On translation from Chinese into English' (漫谈由汉译英问题).*Translation Journal (翻译通讯)*.2.

George, D., & Mallery, P. 2003. *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference.* 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gibbs, G. R. 2007. Analyzing qualitative data. SAGE: London.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giles, H. and A. C. Billings. 2004. 'Assessing language attitudes: speaker evaluation studies'. A. Davies and C. Elder (eds.) *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 187-209.

Giles, H. and P. Johnson. 1981. 'The role of language in ethnic group formation'. J. C. Turner and H. Giles (eds.) *Intergroup behavior*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 199-243.

Giles, H. and P. Johnson. 1987. 'Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance'. *International Journal of the Sociology of language*. 68. 69-99.

Gillham, B. 2000. *Developing a questionnaire*. London, New York: Continuum.

Greene, J. C., V. J. Caracelli and W. F. Graham. 1989. 'Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs'. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 11/3: 255-274.

Gu, M. M. 2010. 'Identities constructed in difference: English language learners in China'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 42: 139-152.

Gumperz, J. J. 1971. *Language in social groups*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. and J. Cook-Gumperz. 1982. 'Introduction: language and the communication of social identity'. J. J. Gumperz (ed.) *Language and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-22.

Görlach, M. 2002. *Still more Englishes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publication.

Guo, H. 2002. 'English loan words in contemporary Chinese and their impact on Chinese grammar: the period from 1980s to the present'. *Journal of Pla University of Foreign Language*.

Haegeman, P. 2002. 'Foreigner talk in lingua franca business telephone calls'. K. Knapp and C. Meierkord (eds.) *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang. 135-162.

Halkier, B. 2010. 'Focus groups as social enactments: integrating interaction and content in the analysis of focus group data'. Qualitative Research. 10/1: 71-89.

Hall, R. A. 1944. 'Chinese pidgin English grammar and texts'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. 64: 95-113.

Han, L. 2007. '"中国英语"研究现状分析' ('Analyzing the current situation of "China English" research'). *外语与外语教学 (Foreign languages and Their Teaching)* 10: 28-32.

Harmer, J. 2007. *The practice of English language teaching (4th ed.).* Harlow: Longman.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The condition of modernity*. Oxford, U.K: Blackwell.

He, D. and D. C. S. Li. 2009. 'Language attitudes and linguistic features in the 'China English' debate'. *World Englishes*. 28/1: 70-89.

Held, D. 1980. *Introduction to critical theory: Horkheimer to Habermas.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt and J. Perraton, 1999. *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heller, M. 1987. 'The role of language in the formation of ethnic identity'. In J. Phinney and M. Rotheram (eds.) *Children's ethnic socialization*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 180-200.

Heller, M. 1988. *Codeswitching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, M. 1992. 'The politics of codeswitching and language choice'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 13. 1/2: 123-142.

Heller, M. 2003. 'Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 7/4: 473-492.

314

Hennink, M. M. 2007. *International focus group research: a handbook for the health and social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ho, W. K. and R. Wong. 2003. *English language teaching in East Asia today*. Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Holliday, A. 2005. *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

House, J. 1999. 'Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility'. C. Gnutzmann (ed.) *Teaching and learning English as a global language*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. 73-89.

House, J. 2003. 'English as a lingua franca: a threat to multilingualism?'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 7/4: 556-578.

Hu, X. 2004. 'Why China English should stand alongside British, American, and the other 'world Englishes''. *English Today*. 78. 20/2: 26-33.

Hu, X. 2005. "China English, at home and in the world." *English Today,* 21/3: 27-38.

Huang, J. 1988. 'positive effects of Sinicized translation from English to Chinese' (应当肯定"西译汉化"现象的积极面)'. *China Translation (中国翻译)*.1.

Huguet, Á. and J. Janés. 2008. 'Mother tongue as a determining variable in language attitudes: the case of immigrant Latin American students in Spain'. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. 8/4: 246-260.

Hydén, L-C ε PH Bülow. 2003. 'Who's talking: drawing conclusions from focus groups – some methodological considerations'. International Journal of Social Research Methodology. 6/4: 305-321.

Hyrkstedt, I. and P. Kalaja. 1998. 'Attitudes toward English and its functions in Finland: a discourse-analytic study'. *World Englishes*. 17/3: 345-357.

Intemann, F. 2005. 'Taipei ground, confirm the last transmission was in English?' C. Gutzmann and F. Intemann (eds.)*The globalization of English and the English language classroom*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

Jagose, A. 1996. *Queer theory: an introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

James, W. 1907 (Reprinted in 2005). *Pragmatism: a new name for some old ways of thinking*. Boston, Mass.: Indypublish.com.

Jenkins, J. 1998. 'Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an International Language?'. *ELT Journal*. 52: 119-126.

Jenkins, J. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language: new models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. and B. Seidlhofer. 2001. "Bringing Europe's lingua franca into the classroom." *The Guardian Weekly* 19 April 2001. http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2001/apr/19/languages.highereducation1

Jenkins, J. 2002. 'A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an International Language'. *Applied Linguistics*. 23: 83-103.

Jenkins, J. 2005a. 'Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: the role of teacher attitudes and identity'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 39/3: 535-543.

Jenkins, J. 2005b. 'Teaching pronunciation for English as a Lingua Franca: a sociopolitical perspective'. C. Gnutzmann and F. Intemann, (eds.) *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom*. Göttingen, Germany; Tübingen, Germany, Gunter Narr. 145-158.

Jenkins, J. 2006a. 'Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. TESOL Quarterly. 40/1: 157-181.

Jenkins, J. 2006b. 'Global intelligibility and local diversity: possibility or paradox?'. R. Rubdy and M. Saraceni (eds.) *English in the world: global rules, global roles*. Bangkok: IELE Press at Assumption University. 32-39.

Jenkins, J. 2006c. 'Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 16/2:137-162.

Jenkins, J. 2007. *English as a lingua franca: identity and attitude*. Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. 2009a. *World Englishes* (2nd ed.) Routledge.

Jenkins, J. 2009b. ' English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes'. World Englishes. 28/2: 200-207.

Jenkins, J. 2009c. '(Un)pleasant? (In)correct? (Un)intelligible? ELF speakers' perceptions of their accents'. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 10-36.

Jenkins, J., A. Cogo and M. Dewey. 2011. 'Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca'. *Language Teaching*. 44/3: 281-315.

Jiang, Y. 1995. 'Chinglish and China English'. *English Today*. 11: 51-53.

Jick, T. D. 1979. 'Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 24: 602-611.

Jones, M. C. and I. Singh. 2005. *Exploring language change*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kachru, B. 1982. *The other tongue*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. 1985. 'Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the OC'. R. Quirk and H.G.Widdowson (eds.) *English language in the*
316

world: teaching and learning the language and literatures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. 1986a. *The alchemy of English: the spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Kachru, B. 1986b. 'The power and politics of English'. *World Englishes*, 5/2-3: 121-140.

Kachru, B. 1992. 'Teaching world Englishes'. B. B. Kachru (ed.) *The other tongue: English across cultures (2nd ed.).* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. 1994. 'Englishization and contact linguistics'. *World Englishes*. 13/2: 135-154.

Kachru, B. 1996. 'World Englishes: Agony and Ecstasy'. *Journal of aesthetic education*. 30/2, Special Issue II: 135-155.

Kachru, B. 2005. *Asian Englishes: beyond the canon*. New Delhi, New York: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, R. B. and R. B. Baldauf. 1997. *Language planning: from practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kaur, J. 2009. 'Pre-empting problems of understanding in English as a lingua franca'. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.107-123.

Kirkpatrick, A. and Z. Xu. 2002. 'Chinese pragmatic norms and 'China English''. *World Englishes*. 21/2: 269-279.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2006. 'Which model of English: native-speaker, nativised or lingua franca?'. R. Rubdy and M. Saraceni (eds.) *English in the world: global rules, global roles.* Bangkok: IELE Press at Assumption University.71-83.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2007. *World Englishes: implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klassen, R. M., W. H. Chong, V. S. Huan, I. Wong, A. Kates and W. Hannok. 2008. 'Motivation beliefs of secondary school teachers in Canada and Singapore: a mixed methods study'. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 24: 1919-1934.

Kvale, S. 1994. 'Ten standard objections to qualitative research interviews'. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*. 25/2: 147-173.

Kvale, S. 1996. *Interviews: an introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE.

Labov, W. 1966. *The social stratification of language in New York City*. Washington DC: CAL.

Lambert, W. E., R. Hodgson, R. C. Gardner, and S. Fillenbaum. 1960. 'Evaluational reactions to spoken languages'. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 60. 44-51.

Leahey, E. 2007. 'Convergence and confidentiality? Limits to the implementation of mixed methodology'. *Social Science Research*. 36: 149-158.

Leech, N. L. 2010. 'Evaluating mixed research studies: a mixed methods approach'. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. 4/1: 17-31.

Li, D. C. S. 2001. 'L2 lexis in L1: reluctance to translate out of concern for referential meaning'. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication. 20/1: 1-26.

Li, D. C. S. 2009. 'Researching non-native speakers' views toward intelligibility and identity: bridging the gap between moral high grounds and down-to-earth concerns'. F. Sharifian (ed.) *English as an international language: perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Multilingual Matters: 81-118.

Li, J. A.(李基安),2006. Warning: "English imperialism" corrupting Chinese culture. (警惕: "英语帝国主义"侵蚀中国文化). Accessed on 15 August 2010. http://myy.cass.cn/file/2006082225803.html

Li, K. (ed.) and M. Lok (translate). 1995. *A glossary of political terms of the People's Republic of China*. The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Li. W. 1993. 'China English and Chinglish (中国英语与中国式英语)'.*Foreign Language Teaching and Research (外语教学与研究)*. 4.

Liao, S. 2009. 'Variation in the use of discourse markers by Chinese teaching assistants in the US'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 41. 1313-1328.

Litosseliti, L. 2003. *Using focus groups in research*. Continuum.

Llamzon, T. A. 1983. 'Essential features of new varieties of English'. R. B. Noss (eds.) *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Regional Language Centre. 92-109.

Llurda, E. 2006. *Non-native language teachers: perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. Springer.

Luk, J. and A. Lin. 2007. *Classroom interactions as cross-cultural encounters: native speakers in EFL lessons*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.

Machin, D. and T. V. Leeuwen. 2003. 'Global schemas and local discourses in Cosmopolitan'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 7/4: 493-512.

Mair, C. 2003. 'Linguistics, literature and the postcolonial English: an introduction'. C. Mair (ed.) *The politics of English as a world language: new horizons in postcolonial cultural studies*. Amsterdam; New York, NY: Rodopi.

Mathison, S. 1988. 'Why triangulate?'. *Educational Researcher*. 17/2: 13-17.

Mason, J. 2002. *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE.

Mauranen, A. 2003. 'Academic English as lingua franca— a corpus approach'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 37. 513-527.

Mauranen, A. 2006. 'Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 177: 123-150.

Mauranen, A. 2007. 'Hybrid voices: English as the lingua franca of academics'. K. Fløttum (ed.) *Language and discipline perspectives on academic discourse*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

McKay, S. 2002. *Teaching English as an international language: rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Medgyes, P. 1994. *The non-native speaker*. London: Macmillan.

Meierkord, C. 2004. 'Syntactic variation in interactions across international Englishes'. *English World-Wide*. 25/1: 109-132.

Meyerhoff, M. and N. Niedzielski. 2003. 'The globalization of vernacular variation'. *Journal of Linguistics*. 7: 534-555.

Miller, N. and Campbell, D. T. 1959. 'Recency and primacy in persuasion as a function of the timing of speeches and measurements'. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 1-9.

Ministry of Education. 2005. Cambridge Young Learners English Test Q and A. (剑桥少儿英语考试问答). Accessed on 16 August 2010. http://www.moe.edu.cn/edoas/website18/level3.jsp?tablename=1580&infoid=15651

Modell, S. 2010. 'Bridging the paradigm divide in management accounting research: the role of mixed methods approaches'. *Management Accounting Research*. 21: 124-129.

Moran-Ellis, J., V. D. Alexander, A. Cronin, M. Dickinson, J. Fielding, J. Sleney and H. Thomas. 2006. 'Triangulation and integration: processes, claims and implications'. *Qualitative Research*. 6/1: 45-59.

Morgan, D. 1997. *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Morgan, D. 1998. *Planning focus groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Morgan, D. L. 2007. 'Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods'. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. 1/1: 48-76.

Mounce, H. O. 1997. *The two pragmatisms: from Peirce to Rorty*. London: Routledge.

Mufwene, S. S. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munday, J. 2006. 'Identity in focus: the use of focus groups to study the construction of collective identity'. Sociology. 40: 89-105.

Murphy, J. P. and R. Rorty. 1990. *Pragmatism: from Peirce to Davidson*. Westview Press.

Murray, H. 2003. 'Swiss English teachers and Euro-English: attitudes to a non-native variety'. *Bulletin Suisse de linguistique appliquée*. 77: 147-165.

Nettle, D. and Romaine, S. 2000. *Vanishing voices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Newman, I. and C. R. Benz. 1998. *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: exploring the interactive continuum*. University of Illinois Press, Carbondale.

Niedzielski, N. A. and D. R. Preston. 2003. *Folk linguistics.* Mouton De Gruyter.

Niglas, K. 2004. *The combined use of qualitative and quantitative methods in educational research*. Tallinn, Estonia: Tallinn Pedagogical University Dissertation on Social Sciences.

Norton, B. 1997. 'Language, identity, and the ownership of English'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 31/3: 409-429.

Norton, B. 2000. *Identity and language learning: gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Longman.

Norton, B. and K. Toohey, 2001. Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*. 35/2: 307-322.

O'Hara-Davies, B. 2010. 'The paradox of English'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 31/2: 107-118.

Omoniyi, T. 2006. 'Hierarchy of identities'. T. Omoniyi and G. White (eds.) *The sociolinguistics of identity*. London: Continuum.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. and N. L. Leech. 2005. 'On becoming a pragmatic researcher: the importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 8/5: 375-387.

Oppenhem, A. N. 1992. *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. London, New York: Continuum.

Pan, C. (潘聪平). 2007. Why CET is still in connection with employment although disconnected from degree? 英语四六级和学位脱钩,为何和就业不脱钩. Accessed on 16 August 2010. http://learning.sohu.com/20071218/n254155343.shtml

320

Pavlenko, A. 2001. 'In the world of the tradition I was unimagined: negotiation of identities in cross-cultural autobiographies'. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*. 5: 317-344.

Pavlenko, A. and A. Blackledge. 2004. 'Introduction: new theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts'. A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge (eds.) *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Multilingual Matters LTD. 1-33.

Pawson, R. and Tilley, N. 1997. 'An Introduction to Scientific Realist Evaluation'. E. Chelimsky and W. Shadish (eds), *Evaluation for the 21st Century: A Resource Book*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage: 405-418.

Pear, T. H. 1931. *Voice and personality*. London: Wiley.

Peirce, B. N. 1995. 'Social identity, investment, and language learning'. *TESOL Quartlerly*. 29/1: 9-31.

Peirce, C. S. 1878. 'How to make our ideas clear'. *Popular Science Monthly*. 12: 286-302.

Pennycook, A. 1994. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman Group Limited.

Pennycook, A. 2003. 'Global Englishes, Rip Slyme, and performativity'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 7/4: 513-533.

Pennycook, A. 2006. *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. New York: Routledge.

Phan, L. H. 2008. *Teaching English as an international language: identity, resistance and negotiation*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. 1999. 'Englishisation: one dimension of globalisation'. D. Graddol and U. H. Meinhof (eds.): English in a changing world. *AILA Review* 13: 19-36.

Pieterse, J. N. 2010. 'Globalization as hybridization'. G. Ritzer and Z. Atalay (eds.) *Readings in globalization: key concepts and major debates*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Pitzl, M. 2009a. 'Diverging from existing norms: creativity in ELF'. *Paper presented on The 2nd International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. Southampton. April 2009.

Pitzl, M. 2009b. '"We should not wake up any dogs": Idiom and metaphor in ELF'. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.298-322.

Platt, J., H. Weber and M. Ho. 1984. *The New Englishes*. London: Routledgeand Kegan Paul.

Pölzl, U. and B. Seidlhofer. 2006. 'In and on their own terms: the "habitat factor" in English as a lingua franca interactions'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 151-176.

Poon, F. K. 2006. 'Hong Kong English, China English and World English'. English Today. 86. 22/2: 23-28.

Potter, J. 1996. Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction. London:SAGE.

Preston, D. R. 1989. *Perceptual dialectology: nonlinguists' views of areal linguistics*. Foris Publications.

Pride and Liu, 1988. Some aspects of the spread of English in China. International *Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 41-70.

Quirk, R. 1985. 'The English language in a global context'. R. Quirk and H. G. Widdowson (eds.) *Language in the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.1-6.

Quirk, R. 1990. 'Language varieties and standard language'. *English Today*. 21: 3-10.

Rampton, B. 1995. *Crossing: language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Ranta, E. 2009. 'Syntactic features in spoken ELF—learner language or spoken grammar?'. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 84-106.

Ranta, E. 2010. 'English in the real world vs. English at school: Finnish English teachers' and students' views'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 20/2: 156-177.

Rao, Z. 2010. 'Chinese students' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers in EFL teaching'. *Journal of Multilingual Development*. 31/1: 55-68.

Reinecke, J. E. 1964. 'Trade jargons and Creole dialects as marginal languages'. D. Hymes (ed.) *Language in culture and society*. Haper& Row: 534

Ritchie, J. and L. Spencer. 2003. 'Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research'. In A. Byram and Burgess, R. (eds). Analysing qualitative data. London: Routledge. 173-194.

Riley, P. 2006. 'Self-expression and the negotiation of identity in a foreign langue'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 16/3: 295-318.

Rorty, R. 1982. *Consequences of pragmatism: essays: 1972-1980*. USA: The University of Minnesota Press.

Rossman, G. B. and B. L. Wilson. 1985. 'Numbers and words: combining quantitative and qualitative methods in a single large-scale evaluation study'. *Evaluation Review*. 9/5: 627-643.

322

Rubin, H. J. and I. S. Rubin. 1997. *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Ryan, E. B., H. Giles and R. J. Sebastian. 1982. 'An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes towards language'. E. B. Ryan and H. Giles (eds.) *Attitudes towards language variation*. London : Arnold. 1-19.

Sadker, M. and D. Sadker. 1997. 'The miseducation of boys: changing the script'. E. Disch (ed.) *Reconstructing gender: a multicultural anthology*. Mountain View. California: Mayfield Publishing Company. 318-348.

Sampson, H. and M. Zhao. 2003. 'Multilingual crews: communication and the operation of ships'. *World Englishes*. 22. 31-43.

Sarnoff, I. 1970. 'Social attitudes and the resolution of motivational conflict'. M. Jahoda and N. Warren (eds.) *Attitudes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 279-284.

Schneider, E. W. 2003. 'The dynamics of New Englishes: from identity construction to dialect birth'. *Linguistic Society of America*. 233-281.

Schneider, E. W. 2007. *Postcolonial English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schuman, H. and S. Presser, S. 1981. *Questions and answers in attitude surveys: exprements on question form, wording, and content*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, San Francisco: Academic Press.

Seale, C., G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium and D. Silverman. 2004. 'Introduction: inside qualitative research'. C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium and D. Silverman (eds.) *Qualitative research practice*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE. 1-12.

Secord, P. and C. Backman. 1964. *Social psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Seidlhofer, B., A. Breiteneder and M. L. Pitzl. 2006. 'English as a lingua franca in Europe: challenges for applied linguistics'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 26: 3-34.

Seidlhofer, B. 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, B. 2003. *A concept of international English and related issues: from 'real English' to 'realistic English'?* Language Policy Division, Council of Europe, Strasbourg. 6-23.

Seidlhofer, B. 2004. 'Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 24. 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. 2005. 'Language variation and change: the case of English as a lingua franca'. K. Dziubalska-Kolaczyk and J. Przedlecka (eds.) English pronunciation models: a changing scene. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 59-75.

Seidlhofer, B. 2006. 'English as a lingua franca in the expanding circle; what it isn't?'. R. Rubdy and M. Saraceni (eds.) *English in the world: global rules, global roles*. London: Continuum: 40-50.

Seidlhofer, B. 2007a. 'English as a lingua franca and communities of practice'. S. Volk-Birke and J.Lippert (eds.) *Anglistentag 2006 Halle Proceedings*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag. 307-318.

Seidlhofer, B. 2007b. 'Common Property: English as a Lingua Franca in Europe'. J. Cummins and C. Davison (eds.) *International handbook of English language teaching*. New York: Springer, 137-153.

Seidlhofer, B. 2009a. 'Common ground and different realities: world Englishes and English as a lingua franca'. *World Englishes*. 28/2: 236-245.

Seidlhofer, B. 2009b.' Orientations in ELF research: form and function'. A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 37-59.

Seidlhofer, B. 2011. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press.

Shu, W. (舒文). 2006.Caution: Chinese being Englishized (当心汉语英语化). Accessed on 15 August 2010. http://news.xinhuanet.com/world/2006-06/08/content_4663965.htm

Shuy, R. W. and R. W. Fasold. 1973. *Language attitudes: current trends and prospects*. Georgetown University Press.

Sifakis, N. 2008. 'Challenges in teaching ELF in the periphery: the Greek context'. *ELT Journal*. 230-237.

Silverman, D. 2001. Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction. SAGE: London.

Silverman, D. 2005. Doing qualitative research. SAGE: London.

Skuttnab-Kangas, T. 1999. 'What fate awaits the world's languages?'. *Media Development Journal of the World Association for Christian Communication*. XLVI 4/1999: 3-7.

Smith, L. E. 1976. 'English as an international auxiliary language'. *RELC Journal* 7/2: 38-43.

Smithson, J. 2000. 'Using and analysing focus groups: limitations and possibilities'. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 3/2: 103-119.

Song, X. M. (宋晓梦). 2005. Should CET Band 4 be a precondition of degree? -------Dialogue with National CET Office administrator (英语四级考试应否与学位挂钩------全国大学英语四六级考委负责人一席谈).Accessed on 15 August 2010.http://theory.people.com.cn/GB/40551/3196019.html

Stevens, P. E.1996. 'Focus groups: collecting aggregate-level data to understand community health phenomena'. *Public Health Nursing* 13/3:170-176.

Strevens, P. 1980. *Teaching English as an international language: from practice to principle*. Pergamon Press.

Sun, L. 1989. 'Researching national variety of English and English in China(英语国别变体的研究和英语在中国)'. *Foreign Languages (外国语)*. 2.

Swann, W. B., Jr. 1999. *Resilient identities: self, relationships, and the construction of social reality*. New York: Basic books.

Syllabus for College English Test, 2005. http://edu.sina.com.cn/exam/2005-12-14/160314239.html

Tajfel, H. 1974. Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*. 13: 65-93.

Tan, P. K. W. and D. K. H. Tan. 2008. 'Attitudes towards non-standard English in Singapore'. *World Englishes*. 27. 3/4: 465-479.

Tang and Zhang. 2009. 'A contrastive study of compliment responses among Australian English and Mandarin Chinese speakers'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 41: 325-345.

Tashakkori, A. and C. Teddlie, 1998. *Mixed methodology: combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. SAGE.

Thomas, J. 1993. *Doing critical ethnography*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Toohey, K. 2000. *Learning English in schools: identity, social relations, and classroom practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Trudgill, P. 2002. *Sociolinguistic variation and change*. Edinburgh University Press.

Unknown. 2005a. Ministry of Education CET Band 4&6 Reform Press Conference (Documentary). 教育部四六级考试改革新闻发布会(实录). Accessed on 15 August 2010. http://news.sina.com.cn/e/2005-02-25/12555202862s.shtml

Unknown. 2005b.英语 4 级与学位: 无明确政策,高校各行其是 (CET Band 4 and degree: not a policy but a practice). Accessed on 15 August 2010. http://news.sina.com.cn/e/2005-01-22/08114912062s.shtml

Unknown. 2007. Question: the relationship between degree and CET Band 4. (关于学士学位授予和英语四级挂钩的问题). Accessed on 16 August 2010. http://www.moe.edu.cn/edoas/website18/level3.jsp?tablename=1896&infoid=27492

Unknown 2009a. 'Top ten Chinglish /Chinese English items making you feel fun'. (票选十大爆笑中式英语). Accessed on 30 May 2009. http://book.sina.com.cn/cul/2009-05-12/1420255899.shtml

Unknown, 2009b. 'Rocket to China: good good study, day day up'. Accessed on 30 May 2009. http://rocketshipx41.blogspot.com/2008/06/good-good-study-day-day-up-up.html

Virkkula, T. and T. Nikula. 2010. 'Identity construction in ELF contexts: a case study of Finnish engineering students working in Germany'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistic*s. 20/2: 251-273.

VOICE project. http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/

Walker, R. 2010. *Teaching the pronunciation of English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wang, F. Z. 2005. *A dictionary of common errors in English*. 《英语常见错误词典》Sichuan Publishing Group. Sichuan Dictionaries Press (四川出版集团，四川辞书出版社).

Wang, R. 1991. 'China English exists in reality (中国英语是客观存在)'. *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages (解放军外国语学院学报)*.1.

Wang, X. X. (王欣欣).2005. In response to 'English imperialism'. (如何对待 "英语帝国主义"). Accessed on 15 August 2010. http://theory.people.com.cn/GB/40540/3367692.html

Weedon, C. 1997. *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Second edition. Blackwell, Malden, MA.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whimbey, A. and J. Lochhead. 1999. *Problem solving and comprehension* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Wibeck, V., M. A. Dahlgren and G.Öberg. 2007. 'Learning in focus groups: an analytical dimension for enhancing focus group research'. Qualitative Research. 7/2: 249-267.

Widdowson, H. G. 1994. 'The ownership of English'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 28/2: 377-389.

Widdowson, H. G. 2003. *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. 2011. 'Distrust the text: translation and the indeterminacy of meaning'. *Paper presented on the 16th World Congress of Applied Linguistics*. Beijing. 23-28 August.

Wiener, P. P. 1949. *Evolution and the founders of pragmatism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

William, S. W. 1836. 'Jargon spoken at Canton'. *Chinese Repository* 4: 428-435.

Wilson, V. 1997. 'Focus groups: a useful qualitative method for educational research?'. *British Educational Research Journal*. 23/2: 209-224

Woodward, K. 1985. 'Language variation and cultural hegemony: Towards an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 66: 85-98.

Woodward, K. 1997. 'Introduction'. K. Woodward (ed.) *Identity and difference*. London: Sage. 1-6.

Woolard,K. and T. J. Gahnug, 1990. 'Changing language policies and attitudes in autonomous Catalonia'. *Language in Society*. 19: 311-330.

Wortham, S. 2002. 'Gender and school success in the Latino Diaspora'. S. Wortham, E. Murillo and E. Hammon (eds.) *Education in the New Latino Diasora. Portsmouth*. New Hampshire: Greenwood Publishing Group. 117-142.

Xie, Z. 1995. 'China English: interference variety in transcultural communication(中国英语: 跨文化语言交际中的干扰性变体)'. *Modern Foreign Languages (现代外语)*. 4.

Xu, Z. 2008. 'Analysis of syntactic features of Chinese English'. *Asian Englishes*. 11/2: 4-31.

Yang, A. X. (杨艾祥). 2003. Criticizing college English examination system: English examinations as disasters upon China? (炮轰大学英语考试制度: 英语考试 "祸国殃民"?) Accessed on 15 August 2010. http://www.people.com.cn/GB/jiaoyu/1055/2156626.html

Yang, J. 2005. 'Lexical innovations in China English'. *World Englishes*. 24/4: 425-436.

Yano, Yasukata. 2001. World Englishes in 2000 and beyond. *World Englishes* 20/2: 119-131.

Yen, Y. 2005. *Calligraphy and power in contemporary Chinese society*. USA and Canada: RoutledgeCurzon.

Ying, N. and X. Zhang. 2010. Scholars' call for the stop of Chinese-English hybrid and the protection of the purity of Chinese language (学者呼吁制止汉英混杂现象,维护汉语纯洁性). Accessed on 16 August 2010. http://news.sina.com.cn/c/2010-04-15/024620075547.shtml

You, X. 2008. 'Rhetorical strategies, electronic media, and China English'. *World Englishes*. 27/2: 233-249.

Yuan, C. L. (原春琳). 2005. Vice minister of education talking about CET Band 4 & 6 reform. 教育部副部长细说四六级考试改革缘由. Accessed on 15 August 2010.

Zhou, P. Z. and W.C. Feng. 1987. 'The two faces of English in China: Englishization of Chinese and nativization of English'. *World Englihses*. 6/2:111-125.