EXPLORING ELT PRACTICES, TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL PROFILE AND BELIEFS
Analysing data from the PRIN survey and envisaging pedagogical projections

MARINA MORBIDUCCI
SAPIENZA UNIVERSITY

Abstract – This paper presents selected findings emerging from the survey related to the PRIN Prot. 2015REZ4EZ questionnaire, created and administered by the Unit 3 of the same PRIN project. This tool of investigation was specially devised in order to research and acquire the main values and beliefs ascribable to a volunteer group of teachers, operating in the Italian territory and catering for different levels of education in the national system. From the authentic data collected, it is possible to draw an overall profile of those professionals engaged in the diversified educational contexts above referred to. Even though still connected to and partially influenced by a SE and native-speaker's model authority, there is evidence of the presence of an active ELF-aware perspective emerging from the respondents; the qualifying questions where this aspect specifically occurs are analyzed in details, particularly in relation to which sociolinguistic model of English are those teachers inspired by in their teaching. Furthermore, those values and beliefs, in connection to the pedagogical approach of choice, are interpreted from a prospective point of view, envisioning their potential developments in the future, also projecting them into the frame of reference provided by a social constructivist model as designed by Kurt Kohn in *MY English* (2018) and further developments (forthcoming 2020). The emancipation of the ELF users and their adaptive appropriation of the lingual capabilities inherent in the ELF-aware approach, together with the acknowledgement of the ELF-users' expressive means affordable according to that perspective, are highlighted, also in terms of individual and collective creativity, from the side of both teachers and learners, in the variegated educational contexts.

Keywords: ELF; ELT; teachers' beliefs; ELF-aware pedagogical approach; *MY English* social constructivist model.

1. Introduction

Drawing on previous ELF findings as expressed in the theoretical premises illustrated in the overall description of the PRIN Research Prot. 2015REZ4EZ, and taking into account the specific aims of Unit 3 of the same project, this paper intends to describe the tools identified to investigate teachers' preferences and choices in terms of attitudes, beliefs and best

practices when it comes to the self-perception of their professional profile in ELT. In particular, reference will be done to the questionnaire and survey specially devised for that research purpose, and related findings will be commented with a focused attention on the resulting gains viewed from a pedagogical perspective.

Therefore, the present investigation revolves around three interlaced perspectives with three main goals in mind:

1. firstly, to identify the extent to which teachers' pre-existing beliefs can influence the ELT practices usually adopted by in-service professionals active in the Italian national territory;

2. secondly, to address the question whether a change in attitude and beliefs, and a deeper familiarity with updated sociolinguistic stances could eventually inspire a different pedagogical approach to support their actual teaching;

3. thirdly, to formulate and launch the hypothesis that applying the gains of an updated sociolinguistic framework to the pre-existing approaches might result as a decisive step towards renovated didactic practices, as expansion of an ELF-aware informed approach.

For this reason, in this paper the three interlaced perspectives generate a threefold purpose: documentative, investigative, and propositive, and the notion of 'exploration' will be applied to both theoretical and practical issues.

More precisely, as for the first level of analysis, we selected - from the larger pool of authentic data provided by the PRIN survey - those elements which proved to be more significant from the point of view of teachers' beliefs as far as their teaching practice is concerned; in the second level, we interpret the data under the light of a possible expansion toward a more conscious pedagogical approach inspired by an ELF-aware sociolinguistic frame; finally, in the third part, we propose the application of Kohn's "MY English" constructivist paradigm, heading towards a stronger conceptualization of learners' emancipation and creativity.

2. Theoretical background to the PRIN Research and Unit 3 specific objectives

2.1. Theoretical background to the PRIN Research

The theoretical frame of reference of this paper is represented by some of the founding tenets which inspired the PRIN Project Prot. 2015REZ4EZ itself since its inception. Namely – as it emerges from the title of the concluding PRIN Conference held at University of Salento, Lecce, on 4-6 December 2019, titled "Uses of English as a Lingua Franca in domain-specific contexts

*L*₀ingue e
*L*₀inguaggi

of intercultural communication" – the areas of investigation were represented by: English as a Lingua Franca, ELF in migration contexts, ELF in digital media and ELF and pedagogy. This last one is the selected field of research constituting the axis around which the present article revolves. Therefore, the specific topics of language learning and processing, ELT practices in the multicultural classroom, teachers' beliefs and values and ELF-aware didactic choices, will be focused on under those perspectives above mentioned. The ELF-aware approach visible in professional discourses and practices is here investigated with the specially devised tool, that is, the PRIN questionnaire which will be described in the following pages.

As a starting theoretical premise, we acknowledge the fact that nowadays there is evidence of an appropriation of the English language by non-native speakers

> who no longer perceive it as a 'foreign language', but rather as a 'lingua franca' through which they can express their own linguacultural uses and rhetorical repertoires, experiential schemata and, ultimately, socio-cultural identities. Such professional discourses regard ELF used [also] in […] (c) the multilingual classroom in today's western societies.[1]

The notion of contact language globally attributed to ELF and universally acknowledged by world-wide scholars as well as international users emphasizes the fact that "ELF communication can be enhanced by strategies of meaning co-construction and register hybridization accounting for ELF speakers' different native linguacultural backgrounds",[2] therefore affording for differentiated and adaptive language policies and pedagogies at the educational level. Since the ultimate goal is to open up "this area of enquiry to a critical debate so as to further a fuller understanding of ELF as a crucial dimension of today's international communication",[3] the classroom practices of professionals operating in the field are to be included in the frame of analysis of ELF potentialities and enhancement. As a matter of fact, one of the main purposes of our PRIN research was to find out to what extent ELT professionals, aware of the ELF users' discursive, pragmatic and sociocultural dimension, were also acting, and inter-acting, in their best practices in the classroom, boosting ELF virtual communicative effectiveness without conforming to native speakers' norms and models. Also from a pragmatic standpoint,

---

[1] Guido M.G., Principal Investigator, PRIN Research Prot. 2015REZ4EZ, "Introduction", 2015, p. 4 (henceforth, Guido (2015)).

[2] Guido (2015, p. 4).

[3] Guido (2015, p. 4)

> it is tenable for teachers to move away from the sole dependence on idealized native speaker models of appropriateness, politeness, and formality in their pedagogical practice and instead incorporate a non-essentialist viewpoint into formal instruction. (Taguchi, Ishihara 2018, p. 80)

Starting from the assumption that "[o]nly lately, has a number of distinguished linguists […] developed a new line of research on ELF as an independently functioning use of language",[4] we reckon that in our present times, even in school environments, ELF is not perceived any more as some defective version of the native language, but rather as the profitable re-appropriation of the linguistic resources of English that all users have at their disposal. With a form of adaptive appropriation, applicable also in educational settings, it is possible to manifest and consolidate a firm criticism to

> the established Anglocentric discourse practices reinforcing the conventional belief that the 'Standard English' grammar code and the pragmatic behaviours ascribed to English-as-a-native-language usage provide shared norms in intercultural transaction globally adopted across cultures.[5]

Even though a linguistic model based on "an idealized native speaker is still perpetuated",[6] "a principled education to ELF accommodation strategies needs to be developed to protect the linguacultural expression of the identities of those who are marginalized"[7] or, at least, whose voice – as ELF users - is not acknowledged as having the same rights of being listened to as with ENL speakers.

2.2. PRIN Unit 3 specific objectives

In accordance with the overall aims above mentioned, the specific objectives of Unit 3 in the PRIN Project can be illustrated as follows:

> The Roma Tre Unit, will also start from the assumption, underlying this Project, that ELF is not some defective version of the L1 but a use of linguistic resources in its own right, challenging the pedagogic belief that since ELF uses do not conform to ENL rules and usage conventions, it is really only learner English at various stages of interlanguage.[8]

More precisely, the focused goal of Unit 3 was to provide

---

[4] Guido (2015, p. 4).
[5] Guido (2015, p. 4).
[6] Guido (2015, p. 5).
[7] Guido (2015, p. 5).
[8] Guido (2015, p. 5).

evidence that ELF users, while 'incompetent' in reference to such prescribed norms, are nonetheless capable of achieving appropriate communicative outcomes on their own terms if innovative language teaching, and language-teaching training, is developed.[9]

In this sense, Unit 3 action and research was strongly inspired by Seidlhofer' and Widdowson's pronouncements, as also reported in "Competence, Capability and Virtual Language" (Seidlhofer, Widdowson 2017), where the two eminent scholars pointed out some research directions and questions to be urgently addressed:

> [a]s has been extensively exemplified in the ELF literature, users of English as a lingua franca are capable of using language to communicate in contextually appropriate ways even though in so doing they may not conform to the norms of Standard English or the usage of native speakers, which are generally taken to provide the benchmarks of competence in the language. This raises the question of what kind of construct competence is and how far it accounts for the ability to communicate. And if 'incompetent' users manage to be capable communicators, then what is the nature of this capability? (Seidlhofer, Widdowson 2017, p. 23)

Obviously, the very notion of "competence" is being examined under a critical perspective, and its very definition, "variously labelled as sociolinguistic, strategic, multilingual, inter-cultural and so on" (Seidlhofer, Widdowson 2017, p. 24), questioned. From Chomsky's competence's original formulation – where, as Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2017, p. 24) remind us, "an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community" was postulated – the concept of competence has undergone a series of re-definitions, moving from Hymes's (1972) "communicative competence" onwards, with the contribution of various linguists: "Hymes' familiar definition of communicative competence is […] based on the concept of an enclosed community, a 'normal' member of which can make certain judgements about a particular message form" (Seidlhofer, Widdowson 2017, p. 32). On that line of enquiry, Seidlhofer and Widdowson underline the element that in this form of "competence" the pragmatic aspect becomes crucial and that the

> [p]ragmatic function is obviously not simply the direct projection of a conventionalized semantic system but the exploitation of the code potential of which this system is one realization. It is of course true that such a system has meaning potential in the sense that, like any grammar, it allows for creativity in the Chomskyan sense – the production of infinite formal permutations. But

---

[9] Guido (2015, p. 5).

> this is strictly confined creativity bound by conformity to the conventionalized systemic rules that define the actual language. The meaning potential that serves the variable and ever-changing communicative needs of language users cannot be, and clearly is not, so confined. (Seidlhofer, Widdowson 2017, p. 29)

The notion of creativity, which is a fundamental outcome in pedagogical applications, will be further analyzed in this paper, but for now, as earlier underlined, we should ask what happens when "incompetent speakers" become, in full evidence, successful communicators. Seidlhofer and Widdowson argue that "incompetent users can be capable communicators and indeed their capability in many ways depends on their incompetence" (Seidlhofer, Widdowson 2017, p. 32). They suggest that the "linguistic hybridity of ELF use" is the manifestation of

> the dynamic interplay of the different factors in the communicative process, these forms are compounded expediently from whatever linguistic resources are immediately available to the participants, whatever their competences in the source languages might be. It is not that they are monolingual, or bilingual or multilingual or plurilingual, or translingual, or interlingual – they are just **lingual**, and being lingual involves the adaptable creative use of the potential of virtual language. In other words, it involves the exercise of a general **lingual capability.** (Seidlhofer, Widdowson 2017, p. 33) (emphasis mine)

Following this line of enquiry, in the Unit 3 of the PRIN project, the notion of ELF was assumed as realization of such "lingual capability", therefore as an entity capable of creating occurrences of "language authentication", where non-native speakers appropriate their underlying linguistic resources, also "according to their L1 parameters (Widdowson 1979)", "justifying ELF variability" and therefore "challenging the notion of ENL as the only 'authentic variety of English'".[10]

The objectives that Unit 3 identified as research priorities were:

1. tracking down the changes currently occurring in the EU language policies and educational systems, also "geared at facing situations where the main means of communication for people is English. In most contexts English has emerged as a lingua franca (ELF), thus modifying features of communication and extending the notion of contact language and interculturality";[11]

---

[10] Guido (2015, p. 4).
[11] Guido (2015, p. 9).

2. investigating how such "change in perspective has inevitably affected the notion of communicative competence and challenged the field of English language teaching and native speakerism";[12]

3. "revisiting teachers' […] beliefs about what English is and what needs to be taught and learnt in rapidly changing societal conditions";[13]

4. meeting "the need to foster awareness of current developments at school and, especially, in ELF teacher education programs";[14]

5. pointing to the ultimate outcome of developing an ELF-aware pedagogical model for the English Language Teaching and Teacher Education.[15]

It is in strict connection with the above mentioned aims that the shaping of the questionnaire - to be submitted in a national survey to a large number of teachers - was envisaged.

2.2.1. The questionnaire

The questionnaire was the product of a "joint enterprise" of the participants in the Unit 3 of the PRIN Project 2015REZ4EZ. It was devised as a privileged tool of inquiry to gather authentic data coming from professionals engaged in ELT in the Italian territory, working in different levels in the national educational system.
        As formulated by Unit 3 Coordinator, Lucilla Lopriore,

> [t]he need to investigate the current status of English language teaching and language education in Italy and to identify teachers' understandings of what teaching English implies, triggered the research design of this study and led to the development of the two teachers' questionnaires. (Lopriore 2019, p. 28)

In order to get into further details, we can add that the questionnaire was administered to two groups: 1. one made of 196 teachers – mostly non-native speakers – working in different schools spread in the nation-wide context (covering 12 different regions and 177 provinces), predominantly at high school level; 2. the other one comprising 75 language experts - primarily native-speakers - working as CELs at university level.[16]
        The questionnaire consisted of three parts: 1. the first one, regarding questions 1-11, was devoted to demographic information; 2. the second part,

---

[12] Guido (2015, p. 9).
[13] Guido (2015, p. 9).
[14] Guido (2015, p. 9).
[15] Guido (2015, p. 9).
[16] For a more detailed description of the findings concerning this second group see Sperti and Newbold (2019, pp. 59-74).

with questions from 12 to 14, concerned the respondents' familiarity with terms and notions related to English varieties and their respective conceptualizations; 3. finally, the third section, in questions 15 to 24, investigated the respondents' current practices adopted in ELT. The number of respondents, their distribution in the Italian territory and professional belonging to different educational institutions – as above specified – was significant and reputed valuable in statistical terms. Therefore, the data emerging from the survey were interesting both quantitatively and qualitatively, in accordance with a Mix Method Research (MMR) approach as postulated by Creswell (Creswell 2009).

According to the PRIN project operational premises, the main goal of the survey was

> to investigate the use of ELF variations in multilingual classrooms […] in face-to-face and online teaching, and in pre- and in-service teacher education contexts, to develop an ELF awareness informing ELF pedagogy, assessment and evaluation.[17]

The results provided interesting elements attesting the growing significance of ELF in ELT in differentiated teaching contexts and levels. The lapse of time in which the investigation was carried over went from the Fall term 2017 to the Spring term 2018.

The rationale behind the making and shaping of the questionnaire is clearly expressed by Unit 3 coordinating investigator, Lucilla Lopriore:

> [t]he team regarded teachers' beliefs, practices and attitudes important for understanding and improving educational processes, because they are closely linked to teachers' strategies for coping with challenges in their daily professional life, they shape students' learning environment and influence student motivation and achievement. It was thus decided to include in the questionnaire items that would elicit teachers' personal response in terms of their practices and that would unveil their self-concept as well as their attitudes and beliefs. (Lopriore 2019, p. 29)

With such agenda in mind, the resource of an online survey is indubitably highly effective, providing a powerful research tool; as a form of investigative instrument – readily available and reliable in the collection of authentic data – it had already been employed in other research cases, and – as for the author of this paper, for instance – also as research tool in an ELF survey run in 2014 (Morbiducci 2016). That survey, made public in 2015, enquired on the main beliefs regarding the use of English in spoken interactions via social media, as expressed by a large group of students

---

[17] Guido (2015).

attending English courses of English at first and second year of the BA curriculum at Department of Oriental Studies – ISO, Sapienza University, Rome (Morbiducci 2015, 2016).

In the case of PRIN Unit 3 questionnaire, it was forged on the specific inspiring principle behind the PRIN national survey, that is, the need "to investigate the current status of English language teaching and language education in Italy and to identify teachers' understandings of what teaching English implies" (Lopriore 2019, p. 28):

> [t]hese questionnaires were meant to investigate teachers' practice, as well as their attitudes and beliefs in a time of change where English is no longer a 'foreign' language, but it is largely the result of several linguacultural exchanges while being more and more used as 'lingua franca'. (Lopriore 2019, p. 5)

Actually, what emerged in terms of beliefs and attitudes shaping classroom action is that teachers are already well beyond the traditional ELT practices informed on the previously uncontested principle of the superiority of the native speaker model; the findings resulting from the survey showed the transformative progression that the teaching practice is experiencing, not only for the always renewing teaching resources available, but particularly for the newly emerging beliefs related to the current status of English as lingua franca. What is sure is that we are clearly "beyond the native speaker" model, as postulated by Widdowson (1994, 2003), Canagarajah (1999) and other outstanding linguists (Chomsky 2018; Cohen 2018; Holliday 2006; Mahboob 2010; McKay 2002; Seidlhofer 2011).

Vivian Cook, for instance, in his *Going beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching*, also suggested not to concentrate only on the L2 native speaker, but rather exploit the students' L1, as they are "speakers in their own right" (Cook 1999, p. 185). Similar concepts are expanded in following research and works by the same author (Cook 2007; Cook, Li 2016).

Interestingly, Cook pointed out that

> [b]ecause L2 users differ from monolingual native speakers in their knowledge of their L2s and L1s and in some of their cognitive processes, they should be considered as speakers in their own right, not as approximations to monolingual native speakers. In the classroom, teachers can recognise this status by incorporating goals based on L2 users in the outside world, bringing L2 user situations and roles into the classroom. […] The main benefits of recognising that L2 users are speakers in their own right, however, will come from students' and teachers' having a positive image of L2 users rather than seeing them as failed native speakers. (Cook 1999, p. 185)

As evident, Cook argues that "language professionals should not take for granted that the only appropriate models of a language's use come from its

native speakers" (Cook 1999, p. 185); according to the eminent applied linguist, the prominence of the native speaker in language teaching should not "obscure" the success of the L2 users, and should not create unattainable goals for L2 learners who are to be viewed as "multicompetent language users rather than as deficient native speakers" (Cook 1999, p. 185). If, on the one hand, "the prominence of the native speaker in language teaching has obscured the distinctive nature of the successful L2 user and created an unattainable goal for L2 learners" (Cook 1999, p. 185), it is here recommended that "L2 users be viewed as multicompetent language users rather than as deficient native speakers" (Cook 1999, p. 185), since English learners can be seen as L2 users both in and out of the classroom setting.

Ian McKenzie (2016), on his turn, suggests that ESL speakers should not be considered eternal learners who can never reach perfection, but rather, when they effectively interact with native or non-native speakers, successful communicators in ELF.

2.2.2. The questions

The questions we would like to examine as evidence of our research hypothesis of a mutated scenario regarding teachers' attitudes and beliefs are #12, #17 and #21 in the PRIN questionnaire above described, respectively covering the following elements: 1. familiarity with ELT notions; 2. views of successful English teaching; 3. description of best practices. In our opinion, from the answers gathered for those questions, teachers' main tenets, their professional profile and didactic practices clearly emerge.

2.2.3. Question #12

In question #12, for example, which recited: "How familiar are you with the following terms?" and the terms being: Standard English (SE), World Englishes (WE), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), English as an International Language (EIL), English as a Native Language (ENL), English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), Communicative competence, Intercultural competence, and Language & Cultural Mediation, the replies were as follows:

	NOT AT ALL	NOT VERY FAMILIAR	SOMEHOW FAMILIAR	VERY FAMILIAR	TOTALE	MEDIA PONDERATA
12.1. Standard English (SE)	0,63% 1	1,89% 3	10,69% 17	86,79% 138	159	3,84
12.2. World Englishes (WE)	5,66% 9	6,29% 10	32,70% 52	55,35% 88	159	3,38
12.3. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)	1,26% 2	7,55% 12	26,42% 42	64,78% 103	159	3,55
12.4. English as an International Language (EIL)	1,89% 3	11,95% 19	27,04% 43	59,12% 94	159	3,43
12.5. English as a Native Language (ENL)	1,26% 2	8,81% 14	27,67% 44	62,26% 99	159	3,51
12.6. English as a Second Language (ESL)	0,63% 1	0,63% 1	16,35% 26	82,39% 131	159	3,81
12.7. English as a Foreign Language (EFL)	0,00% 0	1,89% 3	13,21% 21	84,91% 135	159	3,83
12.8. Communicative competence	0,00% 0	2,52% 4	16,98% 27	80,50% 128	159	3,78
12.9. Intercultural competence	0,00% 0	10,06% 16	31,45% 50	58,49% 93	159	3,48
12.10. Language & Cultural Mediation	2,52% 4	13,21% 21	38,99% 62	45,28% 72	159	3,27

Table 1
Question #12.

We can see that, if we consider only the "very familiar" range, the replies showed SE being the definition reaching the highest score (86,79%), followed by EFL (84,91%), and ESL (82,39%); these three labels represent concepts that belong to the so-to-say "traditional" values of the in-service teachers who have been only very partially exposed in their university curricular courses to the notions of ELF, WE and EIL. As a matter of fact, in our survey, EIL results being a "very familiar" definition only to just slightly more than half of the respondents (59,12%); the same could be said for Intercultural competence (58,49%) and World Englishes (55,35%). The definition which scores lowest in terms of familiarity is Language & Cultural Mediation, which is probably considered a distinct area in terms of language teaching. It is interesting to note, instead, how Communicative competence scores the fourth highest result (80,50%). This comparison makes us figure out that

> the perceived familiarity of the respondents with the labels and definitions of SE, EFL, ESL and Communicative competence proved how the notion of SE is still quite resistant, mitigated, on the other hand, by the familiarity with "Communicative competence" (Morbiducci 2019, p. 53)

Communicative Competence, probably because of the presence of the term "communicative" – therefore evoking the well-known and popular communicative method applied in ELT –[18] paves the way towards the notion of ELF (64,78%) as contact language, in sequence the highest score immediately following. Our interpretation is that ELF, viewed as a linguistics means to communicate among speakers of different languages and linguacultural systems, probably is somehow paralleled to "Communicative competence";[19] in any case, it is interesting to note that the score of ENL (62,26%) is lower than the one of ELF, therefore discarding the fixity and priority of the native-speaker myth. Furthermore, the space opened by the expressed familiarity with the concept of Communicative competence[20] represents

> the positive aspect and profitable ground of pedagogical intervention, insofar the strict notion of SE can be made more 'open', or 'porous' especially if we assume the social constructivist perspective postulated by Kohn as we will shortly introduce. (Morbiducci 2019, p. 53)

The replies showed that there is the possibility of expanding and reinforcing the teachers' familiarity with these sociolinguistic variables by way of an appropriate professionals' developmental strategic action.

One of the goals of the PRIN Unit 3, as a matter of fact, was also to forge a teacher trainer plan that was actually realized during the last year of the research experience (2018-2019). It is interesting to note that from the qualitative answers given to the definition of ELF, in particular, it is possible to envisage a great pedagogical potential, as all the respondents pointed out the "contact" and "communicative" interactive aspect of the linguistic means represented by ELF. In connection with this, we should add that approximately 80% of the respondents had taken part in teachers' education

---

[18] This interpretation is also confirmed in one of the qualitative replies given to question #14: "Please define the terms chosen in #13 in your own words", where respondent n. 53 specifies: "communicative teaching is the method I prefer".

[19] See also some of the qualitative comments in question #14: "Lingua franca is the language that people of different nationalities use to communicate" (respondent 61); "ELF is used as a 'common' language to communicate among non-native speakers" (respondent 84); "English used as a means of communication for speakers of different languages" (respondent 107); "The language as it is used all over the world in different contacts" (respondent 144); "English as a vehicle of communication all over the world" (respondent 149); and so on.

[20] In the following question in the questionnaire, #13, which asked "Please choose 2 or 3 of the following terms you feel you are 'very familiar with' ", Communicative competence has a higher score (69,18%) than Standard English (68,55%), a significant figure pointing to the priority of communication as main value and pedagogical aim in the teachers' mind and corresponding didactic action.

courses (as asked in #15), which proves how crucial teachers' development occasions are in their professional growth and profile.[21]

2.2.4. Question #17

Strictly linked to the ranking of professional values expressed by the very agents, in question #17 participants were asked to "Please indicate what you think would make a successful English teacher today". Together with the predictable answers regarding the statement "to have a native-like command of English", we could also find the assertion "to be able to adapt teaching plans, activities and materials according to the learner needs & contexts of use":

> it seems as if, once again, good practices engaging the principles of flexibility, adaptability, exploitation of the unexpected communicative potentialities arising in localized contexts, and – last but not least - creativity, are all qualities which favour success in teaching. (Morbiducci 2019, p. 54)

Let's have a closer look at all the percentages represented in question #17, which are expressed on a Likert scale, ranging from 0 to 5, from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree":

Q17 Please indicate what you think would make a successful English teacher today:

Risposte: 140   Saltate: 56

17.1. To have a native-like command of English	0,71% 1	0,71% 1	5,00% 7	25,71% 36	32,86% 46	35,00% 49	140	3,94
17.2. To regularly attend teacher education courses/seminars	0,71% 1	0,00% 0	2,14% 3	22,14% 31	22,14% 31	52,86% 74	140	4,24
17.3. To collaborate with colleagues of other subject matters	0,71% 1	0,00% 0	5,71% 8	30,00% 42	28,57% 40	35,00% 49	140	3,91
17.4. To integrate the use of digital technology in English language teaching (ELT)	0,71% 1	0,00% 0	6,43% 9	20,00% 28	32,86% 46	40,00% 56	140	4,04
17.5. To encourage learners to use social media and to bring samples of authentic English into the classroom	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	4,29% 6	15,71% 22	31,43% 44	48,57% 68	140	4,24
17.6. To engage students and develop a good rapport with them	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	1,43% 2	3,57% 5	25,00% 35	70,00% 98	140	4,64
17.7. To participate in European projects (e.g. e-Twinning, Erasmus, Tandem, etc.) using digital media & telecollaboration	0,00% 0	4,29% 6	7,14% 10	20,00% 28	27,86% 39	40,71% 57	140	3,94

---

[21] This is also testified by the reply 17.2: "To regularly attend teacher education courses/seminars" to the following question #17, with an average score of 4,24%, and 52,86 % of "strongly agree" on a Likert scale.

	0STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	2	3	4	5STRONGLY AGREE	TOTALE	MEDIA PONDERATA
17.8. To be able to adapt teaching plans, activities and materials according to learner needs & context of use	0,00% 0	0,71% 1	0,71% 1	5,71% 8	20,71% 29	72,14% 101	140	4,63
17.9. To prepare students for international English certifications	0,71% 1	4,29% 6	7,14% 10	17,14% 24	35,71% 50	35,00% 49	140	3,88
17.10. To select different forms of assessment & self-assessment and evaluation criteria according to different learning tasks	0,71% 1	1,43% 2	2,86% 4	15,71% 22	35,00% 49	44,29% 62	140	4,16
17.11. To select materials from the Web & use authentic audio/video materials including texts in non-standard English	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	2,86% 4	14,29% 20	29,29% 41	53,57% 75	140	4,34
17.12 To be open to including varieties of English besides Standard English in teaching	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	5,00% 7	17,14% 24	40,71% 57	37,14% 52	140	4,10
17.13 To regularly watch TV series and films in English at home	0,71% 1	2,14% 3	5,00% 7	14,29% 20	31,43% 44	46,43% 65	140	4,13
17.14 To refer to and use the CEFR descriptors when planning activities and assessment tasks	0,00% 0	4,29% 6	8,57% 12	28,57% 40	30,00% 42	28,57% 40	140	3,70

Table 2
Question #17.

The rationale and pedagogical aim behind the formulation of question #17 is clearly explained by Lopriore:

> [b]eing a teacher is one of those jobs where personal and professional life almost always overlap, mostly because of the commitment needed in the job itself. Teachers' mental lives represent the 'hidden side' of teaching, as teacher learning and teacher knowledge are central attributes of teachers' mental lives (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Freeman, 2002). It was thus important to devote a substantial part of our survey to the investigation of teachers' personal understanding of their job and of what they regarded as a successful achievement, since success in teaching is often related to success in life, and, in the teaching job, success is closely related to learners' achievement. (Lopriore 2019, p. 31).

As already suggested (Morbiducci 2019, p. 54), in question #17 we consider as the most decisively noteworthy element the fact that the respondents expressed a clear preference for those relational and social factors typifying the teacher/learner rapport. Aspects such as "to engage with students and develop a good rapport with them" got 4,64% average score (Q. 17.6), together with "to be able to adapt teaching plans, activities and materials according to learner needs and context of use" (Q. 17.8), which scored 4,63%

average preferences: these two data – which both present the highest two scores in percentage out of the fourteen different options available – confirm that what teachers consider as most influential in reaching success in their profession is building up a constructive and harmonious interpersonal relationship with their students, based on their professional effort to interpret the learners' needs and contextual situations and on shaping their educational strategic choices accordingly. These social and affective values seem to overcome the more exquisitely technical aspects, paving the way to a reconsideration of their priorities, in which the traditional tenet of a native-like command of English (Q. 17.1), with 3,94% average score, is in any case ancillary to "to be open to including varieties of English" (Q. 17.12), reaching 4,10% average score. As noticed, respondents manifested a great openness to new paradigms in their teaching, in terms of didactic materials to include and sociolinguistics approaches to opt for, this latter element also representing a triggering ideological impulse towards change and innovation.

2.2.5. Question #21

Question #21, reciting as follows:

> Q21 Think about your own teaching context(s). Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about English Language Teaching. (Please use the following scale from 0 - (strongly disagree) to 5 - (strongly agree)):
>
> Risposte: 140   Saltate: 56

that is, asking respondents to express their opinions on a Likert scale, comprised the following options:

21.1 English language learners prefer to have native speakers of English as their teachers	4,29% 6	3,57% 5	22,86% 32	34,29% 48	20,00% 28	15,00% 21	140
21.2 Teachers should correct learners' errors in class because these tend to cause a breakdown in communication	3,57% 5	17,14% 24	27,86% 39	30,00% 42	15,71% 22	5,71% 8	140
21.3 The students' L1 and sociocultural identity are resources that can enrich English language teaching	0,00% 0	2,14% 3	7,86% 11	16,43% 23	40,71% 57	32,86% 46	140
21.4 Non-native English language teachers should adopt standard English as their target model	7,14% 10	6,43% 9	15,00% 21	25,00% 35	27,86% 39	18,57% 26	140
21.5 Teachers should encourage students to experiment with new language forms to communicate meaning	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	2,14% 3	13,57% 19	40,71% 57	43,57% 61	140
21.6 English language teachers should aim at promoting a "successful user of English" model for their learners	1,43% 2	2,86% 4	5,00% 7	20,71% 29	30,00% 42	40,00% 56	140

21.7 Developing communicative strategies is more important than learning to use correct grammar	0,71%\n1	3,57%\n5	7,14%\n10	18,57%\n26	30,71%\n43	39,29%\n55	140
21.8 English language learners should also be exposed to varieties of English including English spoken by non-native speakers	0,71%\n1	0,71%\n1	4,29%\n6	12,86%\n18	30,00%\n42	51,43%\n72	140
21.9 English language teachers should avoid using authentic materials which contain non-standard forms of English	42,86%\n60	21,43%\n30	14,29%\n20	10,00%\n14	10,00%\n14	1,43%\n2	140
21.10 Language learners' communicative competence should include their ability to negotiate meaning with both native and non-native interlocutors	0,00%\n0	0,00%\n0	2,14%\n3	13,57%\n19	30,00%\n42	54,29%\n76	140
21.11 English language teachers should include in their teaching video or audio recordings/multimedia of a variety of non native English speakers	0,71%\n1	1,43%\n2	5,00%\n7	22,86%\n32	34,29%\n48	35,71%\n50	140
21.12 When it comes to English language learners' assessment and evaluation, teachers should only refer to standard English	12,86%\n18	15,71%\n22	19,29%\n27	22,14%\n31	20,71%\n29	9,29%\n13	140
21.13 English language learners should preferably be exposed to and asked to notice and compare samples of both native and non-native speakers using English, through the use of authentic videos	0,71%\n1	3,57%\n5	7,14%\n10	25,00%\n35	36,43%\n51	27,14%\n38	140
21.14 English language assessment criteria should include learners' use of communicative and mediation strategies	0,71%\n1	2,86%\n4	1,43%\n2	15,00%\n21	41,43%\n58	38,57%\n54	140
21.15 English language learners should use correct language forms when speaking English	0,71%\n1	7,14%\n10	12,14%\n17	32,14%\n45	27,14%\n38	20,71%\n29	140

As we can see, question #21 articulates fifteen different stances corresponding to the main beliefs and values more frequently endorsed by teachers, as from previously ascertained experience and data.[22]

Each of the pronouncements above referred to belong to diversified areas of teaching intervention, from the employment of different didactic resources to the adoption of various criteria of assessment, from error correction to communicative practices enhancement, from native to non-native speakers models of interaction, from affective to cognitive variables, and so forth; however, being ELF our main focus, we will observe more closely only the options in which the ELF sociolinguistic variety and ELF-aware didactic approaches to be chosen are at stake.

---

[22] As for a thorough analysis of ELF-aware didactic practices in Italian educational and professional settings see also Lopriore 2017 and Vettorel 2017.

First of all, the typical prejudice that "English language learners prefer to have native speakers of English as their teachers" (Q. 21.1), at least from what emerges from the respondents' point of view, is somehow dismantled, as such predicament only reaches 15% average score, proving once again that the kind and quality of human relationship between learner and educator is reputed more important than the mere linguistic variety represented by the teacher (at least from the students' point of view according to the teachers' opinion; in any case, an almost similar percentage, 18,57%, is indicated in Q. 21.4, where teachers, this time, were inquired about their view concerning SE models for themselves); secondly, we notice a relevant form of sociocultural openness from the part of the respondents, if we consider their replies in Q. 21.3, for instance, where 32,86% average score shows considerable appreciation of different sociocultural identities as profitable resources in the classroom, valuing them as an opportunity of enrichment; thirdly, we would like to point out the very high percentage of the average score, 43,57%, at Q. 21.5, where teachers were asked about their view in encouraging creativity in communicative resources used by students ("Teachers should encourage students to experiment with new language forms to communicate meaning"). This opinion, which highlights the focus on communicative capabilities, is reinforced in Q. 21.7, scoring average 39,29%, where communicative resources are deemed more relevant than the use of correct grammar; but what is really outstanding is the average score, 54,29%, reached by Q. 21.10 – the highest percentage in the whole articulated question #21 – in which language learners' communicative competence is seen as including "the ability to negotiate meaning with both native and non-native interlocutors": once again there emerges the appreciation of diversified sociolinguistic backgrounds and linguacultural systems acting as backdrop to the successful learner of English. The social constructivist model *MY English* described by Kurt Kohn (2018) is an illuminating example in such direction, as we will see in the following paragraph.

3. *MY English*: Kurt Kohn's social constructivist model and its potential pedagogical projections

Once re-proposed the most indicative findings emerging from the PRIN survey, the challenge is to project them into a pedagogical frame which might enhance the constructive potentialities of growth and development therein contained, for both teachers and students.

Therefore, in this section firstly we will approach the model presented by Kurt Kohn, named "MY English", featuring in the *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* in 2018. Subsequently, we will try to juxtapose Kohn's

predicament to the most qualifying aspects of pedagogical intervention as emerging from the analysis of the questions in the survey above mentioned.

3.1. Kurt Kohn's MY English: *main features and possible applications*

The seminal model, above mentioned, put forward by Kurt Kohn in 2018 has been object of analysis – by the author of this paper – in different occasions during the academic year 2019-2020: at AIA Padua University Conference, in September 2019; at PRIN Lecce University Conference, in December 2019; at PRIN RomaTre Conference, in January 2020 (in this last event, at the presence of Prof. Em. Kurt Kohn himself). In addition to this, in the *RILA* issue 2019/1, the same model was discussed in the contribution titled "ELT current practices, professional profile and beliefs: exploring implications within a global an ELF-aware perspective" (same author).

In the *RILA* article just referred to, the following points were highlighted as pivotal in Kohn's perspective:

1. Teachers' ELF apprehension and the normativity issue;
2. Speaker satisfaction and success in ELF communication;
3. Teaching towards ELF competence;
4. Intercultural telecollaboration.

In the same paper, it was pointed out how Kohn's pronouncements focused on the teachers' "conceptualization of ELF competence [as] deeply shaped by [their] explicit or implicit attitude and stance towards social constructivist assumptions and beliefs" (Kohn 2018, p. 13), therefore, in full agreement with the topic of this present article which investigates teachers' beliefs and values in the light of ELF awareness.

As for point 1., just above mentioned, "Teachers' ELF apprehension and the normativity issue", we could see how in the PRIN survey teachers responded showing a relaxed attitude about the sociolinguistic model to adopt in their didactic action: that sort of "apprehension" – meant in its double meaning (Morbiducci 2014, p. 106) – about the priority to be given to nativespeakerism seems resolved in their replies, as previously analyzed in the section 2. In Kohn's conceptualization, teachers' ELF apprehension is juxtaposed with the normativity issue. In describing "the core issue of the conflict between ELF research and ELT practice" (Kohn 2018, p. 7) he clarifies how traditionally "teachers' negative assessment of the pedagogical values of ELF is closely linked to opposing perceptions of SNSE" (Kohn 2018, p. 7). Kohn specifies: "Against this backdrop, teachers are likely to perceive any suggestion to incorporate pedagogical insights from ELF research as rejecting SNSE, the hallmark of their pedagogical beliefs (e.g.

Lingue e Linguaggi

"Do you want me to teach incorrect English?")" (Kohn 2018, p. 7). But what happens when teachers prove that they have gone beyond these typical pedagogical beliefs, endorsing a more flexible view and stance? "The pivotal force driving this antagonism between ELF and ELT is a conceptual fusion of SNSE with normativity" (Kohn 2018, p. 7) which teachers showed to have overcome or at least somehow reconciled and harmonized, as emerging in our PRIN survey. In this way, what Kohn had hoped for: "If we want to successfully create a sustainable 'pedagogical space for ELF in the English classroom (Kohn 2105)', we need to address and deconstruct the nature of teachers' (and learners'?) normativity orientation towards SNSE" (Kohn 2018, p. 8). And this is exactly what is attested in question #21 of the PRIN survey. Teachers replying to that question proved that it is possible to dissociate SNSE paradigms from the preferred pedagogical concept of adoption for their teaching practice. In addition to this, in the same question, also the authentic ELF communicative prerogatives are valued positively, which takes us to point 2. from Kohn's elements above mentioned constituting "MY English" model, that is: "Speaker satisfaction and success in ELF communication". The relevance and high appreciation of the communicative aspect in the ELF-aware approach has already been underlined as emerging with strength in the responses and percentages of preference indicated in the PRIN survey. For instance, in question #12, "Communicative competence" is one of the terms which respondents feel most familiar with, and in question #21.7, developing communicative strategies is considered more important than correct grammar. In addition to this, if "[i]n authentic ELF communication, ELT norms have been shown to be frequently ignored, even creatively transformed (Seidlhofer 2008, 2011, 2018)" (Kohn 2018, p. 9), it is exactly the notion of creativity that we would like to emphasize in Kohn's model. Obviously, creativity in ELF is a topic that has already deserved great attention from the part of the ELF scholars (just to quote one, Pitzl 2018), but what we would like to highlight as emerging from Kohn's perspective is that focused potential of learners' emancipation in it contained.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note the development of Kohn's model from its description in 2018 to its expanded and commented version in 2020. As for K. Kohn's view, in a recent article titled *Foreign language teaching from a pedagogical lingua franca perspective* (Kohn 2020a, 2020b), he further evolves his model, suggesting that

> "[a]ccording to a social constructivist understanding, foreign language teachers should enable their learners to reflectively explore their own foreign language communication and to negotiate and refine their requirements of communicative and communal success" (Kohn 2020b, p. 1).

*L*ingue e
*L*inguaggi

Following Kohn's view, teachers can provide those appropriate didactic occasions to empower students in such direction, thus "enabling" them to

> succeed in activating their communicative capabilities (…) when deploying their verbal resources to understand their partners and to find expression for what they want to convey. The processes and outcomes involved are generally depicted as **strategically creative**, richly variable and **communicatively successful** in terms of intelligibility. (Kohn 2020b, p. 1) (emphasis mine)

This virtuous and "successful" process leads to learner's emancipation in an active and non-ephemeral fashion. Kohn's analysis is convincing as his social constructivist insight seems to reconcile EFL and ELF in a unified pedagogical vision, especially because he recommends that

> our pedagogical concern regarding issues of normativity and native-speakerism should not be focused so much on the repertoire and skills specified by the target language model but rather on the conditions of learning and teaching towards this model." (Kohn 2020b, p. 3)

It is the teachers' responsibility to activate the process of learners' emancipation, exactly proposing a pedagogical model that allows the realization of such condition in genuine and effective ways:

> are speaker-learners granted the kind of pedagogical space and guidance that would help them appropriate the target model for their own communicative and communal needs and purposes? (Kohn 2020b, p. 3)

According to Kohn (2018b, pp. 3, 38),

> [t]he key pedagogical problem in foreign language teaching should not be seen in whether speaker-learners are exposed to some kind of standard native speaker input variety as the language taught. Rather, the problem is whether and to what extent they are **pedagogically encouraged and supported to take on a more emancipated role** by drawing on their ordinary social constructivist creativity when 'acquiring' their own signature brand of the input variety taught. (emphasis mine)

We totally agree with Kohn's social constructivist perspective, because his pedagogical lingua franca approach (Kohn 2018, 2020a) "takes a different stance by shifting the pedagogical scope from ELF 'input' to ELF 'involvement'" (Kohn 2020b, p. 4). Through learners' authentic involvement, teachers can increase the "learner agency from communicative participation to thematic appropriation, collaborative languaging and empathetic rapport" (Kohn 2020b, p. 7), and so doing they can "contribute to the emergence of more emancipated non-native speaker identities" (Kohn 2020b, p. 7). The "speaker satisfaction" element listed in Kohn's model as point 2. is

successfully and constructively accomplished because

> [t]he social constructivist perspective on language learning draws attention to
> the processes of individual and collaborative creative construction by which
> 'learners' develop and appropriate their own English and their own ways of
> using it in intercultural ELF contexts guided by their own communicative and
> communal requirements of success and **their satisfaction as 'speakers'**.
> (Kohn 2020b, p. 3) (emphasis mine)

In this way teachers can authentically activate a form and style of learning
heading towards ELF competence, as indicated by the statutory definitions of
the current status of ELF as sociolinguistic variety of use and contact among
speakers of linguacultural systems in the whole globe. What we care about as
educators is not simply the possibility of means of communication, but also
the potentiality of intellectual growth and linguistic emancipation of the users
themselves. Teachers can face the challenge, take the risk, and become the
inspirers of such important process of change in perspective. The social
occasion of co-construction of a different community via language

> is influenced by a number of individual and social shaping forces including, in
> particular, available and perceived input manifestations of the language taught,
> learner attitudes, motivation and effort, other languages, teaching approach,
> and the community learners' want to be part of. (Kohn 2020a, p. 4)

In order to conclude our argumentation in support of Kohn's (2020a, p. 4)
ELF pedagogical stance,

> [p]referably guided by an attitude of emancipated autonomy, learners rely on
> their personal requirements of success when monitoring their communicative
> and communal performance, and they use them as beacons for their learning. It
> is with reference to their requirements that learners **assume agency for their
> own learning**. (emphasis mine)

We certainly endorse Kohn's view when he claims that "[s]ince the overall
goal of school education is to prepare students for life, learner emancipation
is an old promise, continuous hope, and ultimate challenge" (Kohn 2020a, p.
5).
       Indeed, it is an articulated and ambitious pedagogical project to
achieve, but the times are ripe for such shift and achievement, at least the
teachers' beliefs and attitudes as unveiled in the PRIN survey seem to
encourage ELF experts towards this agenda.

4. Conclusions

As we presented in the Introduction, this paper revolves around three axes, representing respectively: 1. previous theoretical ELF findings creating the foundation of our PRIN research; 2. investigation of teachers' attitudes, beliefs and best practices regarding their professional profile in ELT, with the tool of a specially devised questionnaire; 3. reflection about Kohn's social constructivist model "MY English", and its projection in future pedagogical frames.

The three perspectives are interlaced, and through them we tried to postulate a view able to fill the gap typically and inveterately existing between theory and practice in the teaching profession.

Under the particular light of an ELF-aware approach, our aim was to unify theoretical stances with pedagogical outcomes, keeping in mind, as initial research question, Sifakis's posture, that is, investigating to what extent "research in ELF is able to impact, and therefore inevitably change, English language teaching and learning in all its facets" (Sifakis 2018, p. 156).

In such challenging predicament, many factors are called into question, "most notably pedagogy, language learning material design and implementation, assessment, policy, and, by extension, teacher education" (Sifakis 2018, p. 156).

These are all elements that were explicitly investigated in the PRIN questionnaire which represented the backbone of our research action.

However, reporting about the state of the art of teachers' attitudes and beliefs regarding their teaching practices which involve syllabus design, resources implementation, assessment and evaluation tools, and professional development more in general, is not enough for a real change to take place.

One step further is necessary, and this is constituted, in our view, by a liberatory approach provided by the ELF-aware stance which counts as its main tenets, just as Kohn suggests, "five interlaced ELF competence dimensions", that is, "awareness, comprehension, production, communicative interaction and non-native speaker creativity" (Kohn 2018, p. 1).

If we subscribe ideologically to the learners' emancipatory move in the terms described by Kohn's paradigm, as above reported in part 3., perhaps a substantial improvement in the pedagogical impact of an ELF-informed approach can become a true reality. This is our wishful thinking, in any case.

Bionote: Marina Morbiducci is Associate Professor at Sapienza University. Her research focuses on ELF, Translation Studies, Teachers' Development, Assessment and Evaluation. She is member of AIA, ESSE, AISNA, EAAS, and TESOL-Italy since 1994. As member of the PRIN project

titled "English as a Lingua Franca in Domain-specific Contexts of Intercultural Communication: A Cognitive-functional Model for the analysis of ELF accommodation strategies in unequal migration contexts, digital-media virtual environments, and multicultural ELF classrooms" (Prot. 2015REZ4EZ), she delved into pedagogical issues. She organized several conferences on the state of the art of ELF and its teaching. Among her publications: the special issue *English Lingua Franca: Expanding Scenarios and Growing Dilemmas*, "Lingue e Linguaggi" 24 (2017); *Teacher's beliefs in constructing and ELF-inspired identity*, in "RILA" 1 [LI] (2019); *ELF, MUN, TIGs: Three realities in a CLIL context* (with Donna Tatsuki), in A. Graziano (ed.), *CLIL, Learning Technologies, Innovation,* Cambridge Scholars Publishing (forthcoming).

Author's address: marina.morbiducci@uniroma1.it

References

Canagarajah S. 1999, *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English language teaching,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Chomsky N. 2018, *Learning Pragmatics from Native and Nonnative Language Teachers*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol.

Cohen A. 2018, *Learning Pragmatics from Native and Non-Native Teachers*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol.

Cook V. 1999, *Going beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching*, in "TESOL Quarterly" 33 [2], pp. 185-209.

Cook V. 2007, *The goals of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multi-competence among second language users?,* in Cummins J. and Davison C. (eds.), *Handbook of English Language Teaching*, Springer, London/New York, pp. 237-248.

Cook V. and Li W. (eds.) 2016, *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Multi-competence,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Creswell J. W. 2009, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Holliday A. 2006, *Native-speakerism*, in "ELTJournal" 60 [4], pp. 385-387.

Hymes D.H. 1972, *On Communicative Competence*, in Pride J.B. and Holmes J. (eds.), *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, pp. 269-293.

Kohn K. 2018, *MY English: A social constructivist perspective on ELF*, in "JELF – Journal of English as a Lingua Franca" 7 [1], pp. 1-24.

Kohn K. 2020a, *A pedagogical lingua franca approach: Emancipating the foreign language learner*, in "LEARN Journal", pp. 1-13.

Kohn K. 2020b, *Foreign language teaching from a pedagogical lingua franca perspective*, in "Status Quaestionis" 18, pp. 1-23.

Lopriore L. 2017, *Voicing beliefs and dilemmas from WE- and ELF-aware reflective teacher education contexts,* in "Lingue e Linguaggi" 24, pp. 225-237.

Lopriore L. 2019, *New perspectives in ELT: Teachers' attitudes and identities*, in "RILA" 1, pp. 27-34.

Mahboob A. (ed.) 2010, *The NNEST Lens: Non Native English Speakers in TESOL*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.

McKay S.L. 2002, *Teaching English as an International Language*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Morbiducci M. 2014, *Idioms and Emotions from an ELF Perspective*, in Landolfi L. (ed.), *Crossroads. Language in (E)motion*, Naples, Edizioni University Press, pp. 105-113.

Morbiducci M. 2015, *ELF and Creativity: Idioms and Metaphors as Language Boosters*, in Landolfi L. (ed.), *Living Roots Living Routles*, Naples, Il Torcoliere, pp. 137-152.

Morbiducci M. 2016, *ELF and Creativity: The Role of Idioms in International Students' Interactional Exchanges via Social Networks. A Case Study from Sapienza Unieversity, Rome*, in Sciriha L. (ed.), *International Perspectives on Bilingualism*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, pp. 129-142.

Morbiducci M. 2019, *Teachers' beliefs in constructing an ELF-inspired identity*, in "RILA" 1 [LI], pp. 50-58.

Newbold D. and Sperti S. 2019, *Collaboratori linguistici in Italian universities: What light do they shed on the development of English Lingua Franca?*, in "RILA" 1 [LI], pp. 59-74.

Pitzl M.-L. 2018, *Creativity in English as a Lingua Franca, Idiom and Metaphor*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin.

Seidlhofer B. 2011, *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Seidlhofer B. and Widdowson H. 2017, *Competence, capability and virtual language,* in "Lingue e Linguaggi" 24, pp. 23-36.

Sifakis N. 2018, *ELF-awareness in ELT: Bringing together theory and practice*, in "JELF – Journal of English as a Lingua Franca" 7 [1], pp. 155-209.

Taguchi N. and Ishihara N. 2018, *The Pragmatics of English as a Lingua Franca: Research and Pedagogy in the Era of Globalization,* in "Annual Review of Applied Linguistics" 38, pp. 80-101.

Vettorel P. 2017, *The plurality of English and ELF in teacher education. Raising awareness of the 'feasibility' of a WE- and ELF-aware approach in classroom practices*, in "Lingue e Linguaggi" 24, pp. 239-257.

Widdowson H. 1979, *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Widdowson H. 1994, *The Ownership of English*, in "TESOL Quarterly" 8 [2], pp. 377-389.

Widdowson H. 2003, *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press., Oxford.