A Comparative Study of EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions towards ELF and its Pedagogical Implications

Fikri GEÇKİNLİ[1]

[1] English as a Lingua Franca, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul, Turkey   0000-0002-3572-5939

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

English has become the international language as a result of globalization. And English's status has already begun to have an impact on English language education. As a result of these changes in the language, it is vital to figure out whether there has been a paradigm shift in how EFL teachers and students think about it. The goal of this study was to find out how tertiary-level EFL teachers and students felt about English's status as an ELF and its pedagogical implications. The study enrolled 570 Turkish EFL students and 52 EFL teachers from an English preparatory program at a foundation institution, who were chosen using convenience sampling. Both groups' data were obtained using the same questionnaire based on the relevant literature. While EFL teachers were more enthusiastic about ELF than students, both groups were concerned about its pedagogical consequences. In supporting ELF as a concept, the findings of this study are similar to those of earlier research, but they also show some discrepancies in taking a neutral posture rather than preferring native English-oriented teaching in ELT classrooms, as was the case in previous research.

1. Introduction

English as a lingua franca (a common language spoken by people from all over the world) describes the acceptance of English as a common medium of communication by speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Jenkins, 2006). Furthermore, according to Jenkins (2000), Seidlhofer (2001), and Walker (2010), English has become a lingua franca (ELF) for international faculty members at the university level. Furthermore, ELF research undertaken in higher education settings has revealed that effective communication is more crucial than attaining native-like English (Archibald et al., 2011; Baker, 2009; Cogo, 2012). Despite English's prominence as an ELF in academics, its application in English teaching is still limited. Native speakerism exists among non-native English speakers, as Kirkpatrick (2007) and Wu (2014) demonstrated, along with a lack of precision in comprehending ELF.

Munro (2008) asserted that a commitment to native English in language education is implausible and is likely to disappoint EFL teachers and students. In comparison, English exams and textbooks, in particular, demonstrate a native-English-centered approach to English instruction. As a result, English pedagogy must be revised to reflect the language's changing realities, particularly in expanding circle countries.

English allows tertiary students and academic staff to engage in exchange programs such as Erasmus since it serves as a common medium of communication amongst speakers of various first languages around the world. As a result, students and academic staff are likely to be frustrated by the unorthodox use of English in a range of communicative circumstances in educational settings due to a lack of knowledge of ELF. Despite this, EFL teachers and students, who are the key players in education, have gotten little attention when it comes to ELF.

Pre-service (Coşkun, 2011; Öztürk et al., 2009; Soruç & Griffiths, 2021) and in-service EFL teachers (Bayyurt, 2008; Sarandi, 2020; Sönmez & Akyel, 2014; Soruç, 2015, 2020) are the primary focus of existing research, with little attention dedicated to EFL students.

This study included EFL students and contrasted their perspectives with those of teachers since earlier research on the issue mainly focused on EFL teachers. A tertiary-level English preparation program would be more efficient if these two groups could agree on their views on language instruction. In other words, the difference in perceptions of what constitutes effective English practice among EFL students and teachers may have a negative impact on learning outcomes. The goal of this study was to gain insight into modern English teaching by exploring the perceptions of tertiary-level EFL teachers and students toward ELF and its pedagogical consequences.

1.1 Literature

The importance of English as a worldwide language has been highlighted through international travel, commerce, and conferences, to name a few. Berns (2009) suggested that English is extensively utilized as a lingua franca as a common medium of communication by non-native English speakers. ELF, according to Jenkins (2011), is the use of English for communication by people whose native languages are not the same. It is also critical for native English speakers to review their language usage when traveling abroad in order to converse effectively with people who speak various languages. Non-native English speakers benefit more from using English as a lingua franca than native English speakers because their language repertoire is expected to facilitate communication in multilingual contexts, such as mixing codes in the event of a communication breakdown or using the interlocutor's first language(s) and other regional languages (Canagarajah, 2013).To this end, ELF research does not consider English as a language with a fixed set of norms originating from speakers associated with a particular geographical location. Rather, world Englishes emphasize varieties (e.g., Nigerian English, Jamaican English) that have developed within specific geographic boundaries (Jenkins et al., 2011).

Cogo (2012) argues that the global growth of English has several intrinsic consequences for the way the language is used, understood, and taught. As a result, in addition to addressing the notion itself, ELF study sought to examine how it was performed by communities of practice at a variety of communicative events. According to Wen (2014), research on ELF has advanced to the point that it may be considered a distinct discipline. In that regard, yearly ELF conferences have been held with significant participation since 2008, indicating a growing interest in the subject as a research area. Moreover, in 2012, a specialized academic journal (JELF) was launched on this topic. Additionally, Wen (2014) asserts that many PhD dissertations focus on ELF. The following portion of this paper summarizes some of this research.

According to Cogo (2012), early research on ELF focused primarily on the concept of ELF as a variety; however, as it progressed, it became clear that ELF was far too dynamic to be a variety, and this approach was abandoned in favor of an examination of communication practices. Most research on ELF has focused on phonology (Jenkins, 2000), lexicogrammar (Breiteneder, 2005, 2009; Cogo & Dewey, 2006), and pragmatics (Firth, 1996; House, 2002; Meierkord, 2002) in academic and business English. Knapp emphasized the importance of studies describing the functional and structural characteristics of ELF for English pedagogy (1985). Jenkins (2000) responded to this call by conducting a study elucidating the form and function of ELF.

English is the most commonly used language on the earth, according to Seidlhofer (2001), and empirical research is needed to better grasp this word. Jenkins (2000) and Seidlhofer (2001) went a step further in their research and related ELF to English language pedagogy, which supports this point of view. Despite its standing as the world's lingua franca, Jenkins (2011) stated that ELF speakers did not have the same rights as native English speakers when it came to utilizing the language. Seidlhofer (2001) created the VOICE corpus, which contains dialogues between speakers from various linguacultural backgrounds, to further conceptualize ELF. Mauranen (2003) developed the ELFA corpus for academic contexts as a result. Kirkpatrick (2010), for example, paved the way for the creation of an Asian corpus (ACE). These efforts to better understand ELF prompted scientists to conduct more research. The current emphasis of ELF research has been on multilingualism in general (Jenkins, 2015). As a result, Jenkins (2017) predicted that the English language

would spread worldwide in various forms to meet the needs of communities of practice in multicultural settings.

Naturally, research into ELF has pedagogical implications in the field of ELT. Though no detailed explanations on this subject have been provided to date (Jenkins, 2011). It is critical to uncover EFL teachers' and students' perspectives on this subject in this context. In Europe, students chose to subscribe to ELF despite teachers' indecision (Jenkins, 2011). Nevertheless, some researchers continue to be skeptical of ELF research findings. To illustrate, Subtirelu (2013) argued that students did not wish to abandon native English as a means of instruction in ELT classrooms, and thus their preferences could not be ignored. To make such assertions more credible, it becomes critical to establish if the students' choices are educated or not. Hence, it is vital to continue eliciting information about EFL teachers' and students' perceptions regarding ELF. Consequently, the information obtained from the aforementioned language education stakeholders may be utilized to assist in developing a curriculum for an English preparation program.

In Turkey, studies focused mostly on EFL teachers' perceptions of ELF (Bayyurt, 2008; Biricik Deniz et al., 2016, 2020; Coşkun, 2011; Sönmez & Akyel, 2014; Soruç, 2015, 2020; Soruç & Griffiths, 2021), with EFL students' perspectives receiving less attention (Griffiths & Soruç, 2019). The goal of this study was to examine the perspectives of Turkish EFL teachers and students at the tertiary level on ELF and its pedagogical consequences in the context of an English preparatory program at a foundation university, in order to contribute to the growing body of knowledge on the subject. It was also noted that there had been insufficient research done in this specific situation to compare and contrast the opinions of both the teachers and the pupils. As a result, the findings of this study were expected to have ramifications for English teachers and students, as well as curriculum creation for an English preparatory school. As a result, this study was directed by the following research questions:

- What are the similarities and differences in the perspectives of ELF among Turkish EFL teachers and students?
- What are the opinions of Turkish EFL teachers and students on English varieties, ELF characteristics, and English learning objectives?
- What are the commonalities and differences amongst Turkish EFL teachers' assessments of ELF's pedagogical implications?
- What are the perspectives of Turkish EFL teachers and students on English teachers, target language culture, global cultures, and English exams?

2. Methodology

This section of the study details the setting and participants, the instrument used to collect data, the procedure used to collect data, and the data analysis. Because an existing situation was being investigated, the study was designed around the use of a survey model. As a result, this research design quantifies the participants' understandings, allowing for quantitative data collection for use in the study (Creswell, 2014).

2.1 Setting and Participants

The research was conducted in the English preparation program of an Istanbul-based foundation university. Students enrolled in English-medium departments were needed to finish a one-year preparatory education because this university offered departments that provided education in both English and Turkish. Classes in the English preparatory program was held five days a week, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:50 p.m., Monday through Friday. Each week, there were 28 hours of class time scheduled, with each class hour lasting 50 minutes. The study included 52 EFL teachers and 570 EFL students who were enrolled in this university's English preparatory program at the time of the investigation. In terms of gender distribution, there were 20 male EFL teachers and 32 female EFL students: 255 male EFL students and 315 female EFL students. Because the researcher had easy access to the study's target demographic, convenience sampling was used in this examination (Dawson & Trapp, 2001).

2.2. Data Collection Instrument

To obtain responses from EFL teachers and students on the concept of ELF and its pedagogical implications, this study used two 5-point Likert scales developed and validated as part of the researcher's doctoral dissertation (Geçkinli, 2020). The scales were created following the most prominent points raised in the relevant literature (Biricik Deniz et al., 2016; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Coşkun, 2011; Jenkins, 2015; Seidlhofer, 2011; Sönmez & Akyel, 2014; Soruç, 2015; Ton & Pham, 2010). ELF-related concepts were verbalized so that participants could reflect on the subject despite their lack of conceptualization. To this purpose, the scales were created in English and then translated into the participants' home language to overcome linguistic barriers. Before administering the scales, the researcher pretested the item wordings with EFL teachers and students for any ambiguous or imprecise statements and conducted factor analysis. Finally, the reliability ratios for both the ELF and the pedagogical implications of ELF scales were. 71, which was deemed acceptable (George & Mallery, 2003). The survey items included in both scales to assess the perceptions of EFL teachers and students were identical to allow for comparisons between the groups. While the first section of the first scale elicited responses from EFL teachers and students on their perceptions of the concept ELF through 13 questions on three factors: English varieties (4 items), ELF features (5 items), and English learning objectives (13 items), the second section of the first scale elicited responses from EFL teachers and students on their perceptions of the concept ELF through 13 questions on three factors (4 items).The first part of the second scale gathered demographic information, while the second section included 13 questions to elicit opinions from participants about the educational implications of ELF. English teachers (5 items), target language culture (2 items), worldwide cultures (2 items), and English exam (2 items) were the topics of the questions (4 items).

2.3. Data Collection and Analysis

Permission to gather data was acquired from both the university administration and the head of the English preparatory program prior to the study. The first step was to set a time for data collection with the teachers because there were fewer of them. After that, participants were given a consent form informing them that all information acquired would be kept totally confidential and that participation in the study was completely voluntary. Finally, the procedure for collecting data from EFL teachers was accomplished. Similarly, data collecting from students took place during a time span agreed upon with the course's professors, and identical processes were used to collect data from students. In addition, the same questionnaire was given to both teachers and students to see if there were any similarities or discrepancies in their thoughts on the ELF concept and its instructional implications. To do statistical analysis, SPSS 25 was utilized to analyze the data. To examine the data acquired while analyzing the differences between EFL teachers and students, independent samples t-tests were utilized. In determining the extent to which participants showed a preference for ELF in their responses, the overall mean scores for the entire questionnaire and its subdimensions (English varieties, ELF features, English learning objectives, English teachers, target language culture, global cultures, English exams) were taken into account. These are some survey question examples that illustrate these factors, accordingly.: *I think English must be taught considering the different uses in the world; I think achieving communication is more important than using correct English grammar; One must aim to be as fluent in English as a native speaker; I believe that the best way to learn English is from native English speakers; I believe English language classes should focus exclusively on American or British cultures; I think international cultures (Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Latin America) must be taught in English language classes; I believe listening exams should include non-native English accents (e.g. Turkish, Indian, and Chinese).* Reverse coding was used to the inquiries that ran contrary to the ELF perspective in order to make them compatible with the ELF-aligned queries.

2.4. Ethical

Our investigation began with a request to the social sciences ethics committee at Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University. The committee has approved the ethical request. Throughout the data collecting procedure, all participants were informed of the study's purpose and scope and the critical nature of their voluntary participation. Participants indicated that they consented to participate in the research willingly.

3. Findings

The first research question looked into the similarities and differences in perceptions between EFL teachers and students concerning the concept of ELF. The findings are summarized in Table 1, which shows the overall findings.

Table 1. *T-test Results from Independent Samples Comparing Turkish EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of ELF*

	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Overall Perceptions towards ELF	Students	570	3.24	.46	-4.066	620	**.000***
	Teachers	52	3.52	.54			

Note. ** p≤.05

The findings of the independent sample t-test for perceptions of ELF among English teachers and students are presented in Table 1. As evidenced by the fact that their "p" values are less than "0.05" (p=0.000), there is a statistically significant difference between teachers' and students' conceptions of the idea of ELF. Table 2 gives results for the factors that make up the ELF questionnaire to support in the validation of the aforementioned general conclusions.

The second research question focused on the similarities and differences in perceptions of Turkish EFL teachers and EFL students about English varieties, ELF traits, and English learning goals.

Table 2. *T-test Results from Independent Samples Comparing Turkish EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of ELF*

Factors	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
English Varieties	Students	570	2.94	.68	-7.629	620	**.000***
	Teachers	52	3.70	.75			
ELF Features	Students	570	3.90	.71	1.952	620	.051
	Teachers	52	3.70	.69			
English Learning Objectives	Students	570	2.72	.74	-3.569	620	**.000***
	Teachers	52	3.11	.75			

Note. ** p≤.05

Table 2 demonstrate comparisons of EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of the factors included in the ELF questionnaire. Within this context, the findings reveal significant discrepancies in the perspectives of two groups on the factor's English varieties and English learning objectives. Given these two factors, EFL teachers' perspectives are more consistent with an ELF perspective than EFL students' perceptions. Concerning the factor identified as ELF features, the findings indicate no significant differences in perceptions between EFL teachers and students. In other words, the findings indicate that both groups endorse the features of ELF.

The third research question looked at how Turkish EFL teachers perceived and differed in their perceptions of the pedagogical implications of English as a lingua franca.

Table 3. *T-test Results from Independent Samples Comparing EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of the Pedagogical Implications of ELF*

	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Overall Perceptions towards Pedagogical Implications of ELF	Students	570	2.96	.49	-6.166	620	**.000***
	Teachers	52	3.40	.49			

Note. ** p≤.05

Data on EFL teachers' and students' impressions of the pedagogical implications of ELF are presented in Table 3. Since the statistics show, there is a significant difference in opinions on the educational implications of ELF between the two groups, as their "p" values are smaller than "0.05" (p=.000). Table 4 examines the following sub-dimensions in order to elaborate on these broad-spectrum findings.

Table 4. *T-test Results from Independent Samples Comparing Turkish EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Pedagogical Implications of ELF Factors*

	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
	Students	570	2.73	.81			
English Teachers					-3.928	620	**.000***
	Teachers	52	3.18	.67			
	Students	570	3.39	1.0			
Target Language Culture					-.536	620	.592
	Teachers	52	3.47	.77			
	Students	570	3.20	1.0			
Global Cultures					-4.467	620	**.000***
	Teachers	52	3.86	.82			
	Students	570	2.91	.79			
English Exams					-4.320	620	**.000***
	Teachers	52	3.41	.87			

Note. ** p≤.05

Table 4 contains comparisons of EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of the factors underlying the ELF questionnaire's pedagogical implications. Thus, the findings indicate significant discrepancies between the two groups' perceptions of three factors, namely English teachers, global cultures, and English exams. In comparison to EFL students, EFL teachers tend to be better aligned with the ELF perspective on the three characteristics described above. The data show that there are no significant differences between the groups when it comes to the factor described as target language culture. Given that the values for the opposing perspectives on target language culture match the mean agreements in Table 4, reverse coded in favor of ELF, one may conclude that neither students nor teachers are convinced of the critical importance of target language culture in ELT instruction.

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to explore the perspectives of EFL teachers and students on English as a lingua franca and its educational consequences. The outcomes of the pertinent data acquired from EFL teachers and students are compared and contrasted in the next section. When EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of the role of English as an interlanguage were compared, it was observed that they differed significantly. As a result, we might conclude that EFL teachers are more conscious of English's contemporary standing as a worldwide language franca.

Several variables, including English varieties, ELF traits, and English learning objectives, were used to further investigate EFL teachers' opinions on the idea of ELF. In terms of English varieties, the results show that EFL teachers are better knowledgeable about the numerous Englishes spoken around the world than EFL students. When it comes to EFL teachers' and students' opinions of ELF qualities, communication success is valued more than accuracy in the English language by both sides. Students, as opposed to teachers, are more convinced of the need of obtaining native-like proficiency when comparing their judgments of suitable English learning objectives.

The findings also indicate that EFL teachers appear to be more knowledgeable about the current situation of English as a vehicular language and the variety of ways in which this language is dealt with in different contexts. One possible explanation for their increased cognizance is that EFL teachers now have an increasing opportunity to interact with non-native English speakers. For instance, they are very likely to contact non-native English speakers in higher education settings who speak English in highly unconventional ways, both in terms of their accents and the forms they acquire.

Sarandi (2020), Soruç (2015, 2020), Sönmez and Akyel (2014), Coşkun (2011), Öztürk et al. (2009), Kuo (2006), Sifakis (2008), Zabitgil Gülseren and Sarıca (2020) and Timmis (2002) all revealed in their studies that EFL teachers, by contrast, adhered to mother tongue English norms and viewed native English speakers as ideal models. Nonetheless, when EFL teachers were allowed to make informed choices and provided with the necessary opportunities, they were very likely to adopt an ELF perspective in English pedagogy (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015; Soruç & Griffiths, 2021).

The discrepancy between this study's findings and the literature could be explained by the increasing availability of non-native English practices via various media tools and the increasing internationalization of university environments. As a result, these findings may be interpreted as EFL teachers gradually accepting the shifting role of English as an interlanguage. Additionally, we can assert that teachers' perceptions of English are changing due to globalization's compelling force for a shift in how this language is handled.

Students, on the other hand, prefer to take a neutral attitude when it comes to the current state of English as a worldwide communication tool. Nonetheless, this ambiguity cannot be understood as a lack of understanding of English's lingua franca function on the part of pupils. In the same way, it is impossible to claim that pupils do not want to compromise on native English norms. It is possible that their aloofness stems from a disconnect between the English they are taught in school and the English they are exposed to outside of school hours. Jenkins (2007) claims that English users must be exposed to many versions of the English language in various situations in order to modify their views toward the language.

Students are also more prone to attribute a gatekeeping role to native English varieties since, for the past decade, their norms have acted as the only guides for accuracy and greater job chances. They are certain to come across a variety of unorthodox forms of Englishes on the internet, where the majority of the content is offered in English (Schütz, 2005). Furthermore, English is the predominant language of instruction in a number of educational institutions. While native English variations are still common in tertiary education, university students are much more likely to have divergences from these types of English outside of their formal courses. As a result, students' hesitation about taking ELF may be exacerbated by the difficulty of deciding between what is ideal and what is practical in terms of the current situation of the English language.

When it comes to the pedagogical implications of this language, it was also revealed that there were considerable discrepancies in the attitudes of EFL teachers and students. As a result, when it comes to adopting ELF viewpoints into classroom procedures, EFL teachers have a more hopeful outlook than pupils.

When comparing the views of the two groups regarding EFL teachers (native and non-native), it was observed that the participating teachers were more supportive of English teachers in ELT classrooms with a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds than the students in terms of the sub-dimensions of pedagogical implications of ELF. Although neither EFL teachers nor students placed much emphasis on the target language's culture in the ELT classroom, when the means of these two groups were studied more closely, it was discovered that teachers were more supportive of developing a culture consistent with ELF. When it came to global cultures, EFL teachers were more supportive than EFL students of their inclusion in ELT classrooms. Teachers were more supportive of incorporating international English use into testing than supporting native English standards when it came to English tests.

Although instructors were more responsive to the instructional implications of ELF than students, their perceptions in that regard remained close to the line between hesitant and agreeing. This could be due to ELT pedagogy's long-standing high appreciation for native English models. Similarly, Seidlhofer (2011) remarked that, despite the fact that traditional SLA approaches are challenged via the lens of ELF, there is still a gap between what ELF research says and what is actually done in ELT pedagogy. While EFL teachers tend to be aware that their pupils will be less likely to utilize the English they learn in the future to engage with native English speakers, they appear to be wary of losing their native English-oriented perceptions. They typically promote native varieties as the most functional models for international communication as a result of their dedication to the native-oriented ELT sector.

Overall, the conflict between contemporary English communication standards and the impositions of traditional EFL pedagogy appears to have an impact on both teachers and students; however, the findings of this study show that the impact is greater on students. Despite the fact that native English pedagogy influenced EFL students more than EFL teachers, Kumaravadivelu (2005) claims that the dominance of native English language pedagogy and associated testing practices foster outdated beliefs about the language not only among teachers, but also among students. Furthermore, traditional English pedagogy's tendency to depict English as valid or invalid makes it difficult to meet the needs of learners in today's increasingly multilingual communicative situations. As a result, ELF research predicts that English will be used in polyglot scenarios in the future, and recommends for EFL students to be prepared for these situations (Seidlhofer, 2002).

Despite the survey's near-unanimous conclusions, English teachers had an uncertain opinion of ELF's instructional applications, as the numbers in Table 3 show. Because ELF is not a codified language variety, EFL instructors may find it difficult to expressly agree on the teaching implications of ELF. This makes sense from the perspective of the teachers, who are more confident in their teaching methods when the norms for the language they are required to teach are defined or preset. ELF, on the other hand, is unable to give a distinct English model for use in English classes. Because English as a lingua franca transcends geographical boundaries and has inherent traits of fluidity and flexibility, it cannot be limited to a single variety, as Cogo (2008) points out. ELF is also designed to serve as the principal form of communication in pluricentric and multilingual situations as a contact language (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). Jenkins (2015) proposes that, rather than focusing just on codification, the ELF perspective's major concern should be communication techniques and accommodation procedures.

EFL students' opinions of the current position of English as a lingua franca and the pedagogical implications of this position appear to be substantially more impacted by native English ideology than EFL teachers' perspectives. Because of their lack of understanding of English's current role as a lingua franca, along with the overwhelming influence of native English ideology, EFL students are prone to become confused and adopt native English ideology. According to Canagarajah (2006), local language policymakers should play a bigger role in integrating an ELF perspective into ELT teaching by incorporating issues like diversity and context into English language training. Similarly, Holliday (2005) and Jenkins (2007) claim that strongly embedded native speaker-oriented perceptions of ELT continue to influence how ELF is perceived in the modern era.

English teachers, as comparison to pupils, have a stronger understanding of English's role as a global lingua franca and support ELF's pedagogical implications in their classrooms. In other words, teachers tend to be more conscious of English's global nature and hence more open to implementing its related recommendations into their classroom teaching. They do, however, work in an industry dominated by native English ideology, so their application of the pedagogical consequences of English as a lingua franca in the classroom is not fully autonomous. In this sense, the support of other education stakeholders in their broader surroundings, such as the management of the institution where they work and government education policy, is critical. Both English language teachers and students, as well as tertiary-level English preparatory institutions, are expected to profit from the findings of this study. To begin, English teachers should have access to in-service training programs that help them understand English's status as a lingua franca and how to use it effectively in the classroom. Teachers should be encouraged to examine how they may transfer their ideas on English's position as a lingua franca into classroom practice following these awareness-raising seminars, so that the awareness-raising training they get is not entirely theoretical. To help students in this challenging endeavor, assistance should be offered at both the institutional and educational policy levels. EFL students depend heavily on language instruction provided by higher education institutions, which is often geared at native English speakers.

As a result, increasing their awareness of English's role as a lingua Franca is critical in promoting a democratic and egalitarian approach to foreign language instruction. As a result, it is the responsibility of instructors and educational institutions to raise student awareness of this issue and provide them with the information they need to make informed judgments. In terms of English preparation programs, they should examine their English education curriculum in light of the ELF study's findings in order to create a curriculum that is current with the most recent changes in the English language.

Because the data in this study were collected quantitatively, the tools used to collect them in future studies can be varied for triangulation purposes. In terms of constraints and future directions, the study's low number of teacher participants could be increased. While this study only included EFL teachers and students, other studies may include school administration, another important stakeholder in language instruction. Finally, while this study focused on the context of a university English preparatory program, future research could look into different language education settings. Overall, the purpose of this study was to assist stakeholders in tertiary level English preparatory programs as well as contribute to the body of ELF research by investigating EFL teachers' and students' opinions of ELF and its pedagogical implications.

5. References

Archibald, A., Cogo, A., & Jenkins, J. (2011). *Latest trends in ELF research*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Baker, W. (2009). The cultures of English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(3), 567-592. https://doi.org/gfvvh7

Bayyurt, Y. (2008, March 6-8). *A lingua franca or an international language: The status of English in Turkey* [Paper Presentation]. ELF Forum, Helsinki, Finland.

Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. (2015). Developing an ELF-aware pedagogy: Insights from a self-education programme. In P. Vettorel (Ed.), *New frontiers in teaching and learning English* (pp. 55-76). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Berns, M. (2009). English as a lingua franca and English in Europe. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 192-199. https://doi.org/bvswxx

Biricik Deniz, E., Kemaloğlu Er, E., & Özkan, Y. (2020). ELF-aware pre-service teacher education: practices and perspectives. *ELT Journal*, *74*(4), 453-462. https://doi.org/hg2m

Biricik Deniz, E., Özkan, Y., & Bayyurt, Y. (2016). English as a Lingua Franca: Reflections on ELF-Related Issues by Pre-Service English Language Teachers in Turkey. *The Reading Matrix*, *16*(2), 144-161.

Breiteneder, A. (2005). The naturalness of English as a European lingua franca: The case of the 'third person - s'. *Vienna English Working Papers, 14*(2), 3-26.

Breiteneder, A. (2009). English as a lingua franca in Europe: an empirical perspective. *World Englishes*, *28*(2). 256-269. https://doi.org/fn93x2

Canagarajah, S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *26*(1), 197-218. https://doi.org/fgfnzd

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Cogo, A. (2008). English as a Lingua Franca: form follows function. *English Today*, *24*(3), 58-61. https://doi.org/b66csp

Cogo, A. (2012). English as a lingua franca: Concepts, use, and implications. *ELT Journal*, *66*(1), 97-105. https://doi.org/c7j57g

Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2006). Efficiency in ELF Communication: From Pragmatic Motives to Lexico-grammatical Innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *5*(2), 59-93. https://doi.org/hg2f

Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analyzing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. Continuum.

Coşkun, A. (2011). Future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. *Journal of English as an International Language*, *6*(2), 46-68.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Dawson, B., & Trapp, R. G. (2001). *Basic & Clinical Biostatistics* (3rd ed.). Lange Medical Books-McGraw-Hill.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversational analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 237-259. https://doi.org/ccgr5b

Geçkinli, F. (2020). *English as a lingua franca: Turkish EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions* [Doctoral dissertation]. Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *Using SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Griffiths, C., & Soruç, A. (2019). Contextual differences regarding students' perceptions of English as a lingua franca according to subject major and nationality. *The Journal of Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(1), 53-69.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

House, J. (2002). Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca? In K. Knapp & C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Lingua Franca Communication* (pp. 245-268). Peter Lang. https://doi.org/hg2s

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 157-181. https://doi.org/d737mn

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(4), 926-936. https://doi.org/d3nz4g

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice*, *2*(3), 49-85. https://doi.org/ghgk5t

Jenkins, J. (2017). The future of English as a Lingua Franca? In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 594-605). Routledge. https://doi.org/hg9m

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, *44*(3), 281-315. https://doi.org/ccp3zb

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). Researching English as a lingua franca in Asia: The Asian Corpus of English (ACE) project. *Asian Englishes*, *13*(1), 4-18. https://doi.org/gmq3ch

Knapp, K. (1985). Englisch als internationale lingua franca und Richtlinien [English as an international lingua franca and principles]. In K-R. Bausch, H. Christ, W. Hüllen, & H-J. Krumm (Eds.), *Forschungsgegenstand Richtlinien* (pp. 84-90). Narr.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Routledge. https://doi.org/hg9q

Kuo, I. (2006). Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, *60*(3), 213-221. https://doi.org/dpgch8

Mauranen, A. (2003). The Corpus of English as Lingua franca in Academic Settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(3), 513-527. https://doi.org/bfr47k

Meierkord, C. (2002). 'Language stripped bare' or 'Iinguistic masala'? Culture in lingua franca conversation. In K. Knapp & C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Lingua Franca Communication* (pp. 109-133). Peter Lang. https://doi.org/hg2s

Munro, M. (2008). Foreign accent and speech intelligibility. In J. G. Hansen Edwards & M. L. Zampini (Eds.), *Phonology and second language acquisition* (pp. 193-218). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/hg37

Öztürk, H., Çeçen, S., & Altınmakas, D. (2009). How do non-native pre-service English language teachers perceive ELF? A qualitative study. *English as an International Language Journal*, *5*, 137-145.

Sarandi, H. (2020). ELF in the context of Iran: Examining Iranian in-service teachers' attitudes. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *14*(1), 69-86.

Schütz, R. (2005). *English - The international language*. Schütz & Kanomata. https://www.sk.com.br/sk-ingl.html

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. https://doi.org/d5gsjk

Seidlhofer, B. (2002). The shape of things to come? Some basic questions about English as a lingua franca. In K. Knapp & C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Lingua Franca Communication* (pp. 269-302). Peter Lang. https://doi.org/hg2s

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.

Sifakis, N. (2008). Challenges in teaching ELF in the periphery: The Greek context. *ELT journal*, *63*(3), 230-237. https://doi.org/cvqk65

Sönmez, G., & Akyel, A. S. (2014). Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of English as a lingua franca. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, *5*(1), 1-19.

Soruç, A. (2015). Non-native teachers' attitudes towards English as a lingua franca. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *30*(1), 239-251.

Soruç, A. (2020). English as a Lingua Franca and Good Language Teachers. In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from Good Language Teachers* (pp. 67-79). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/hg38

Soruç, A., & Griffiths, C. (2021). Inspiring Pre-service English Language Teachers to Become ELF aware. *RELC Journal*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/hf9k

Subtirelu, N. (2013). What (do) learners want (?): a re-examination of the issue of learner preferences regarding the use of 'native' speaker norms in English language teaching. *Language Awareness*, *22*(3), 270-291. https://doi.org/hf9h

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view. *ELT Journal*, *56*(3), 240-249. https://doi.org/crnwqc

Ton, N. N. H., & Pham, H. H. (2010). Vietnamese teachers' and students' perceptions of global English. *Language Education in Asia*, *1*(1), 48-61. https://doi.org/bjz96f

Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press.

Wen, Q. (2014). What is ELF: Essentialist versus non-essentialist views. *Foreign Languages in China*, *11*(3), 4-11.

Wu, J. H. (2014). A survey on the language attitude of college English teachers from the ELF perspective. *Foreign Language Education*, *35*(2), 55-58.

Zabitgil Gülseren, Ö., & Sarıca, T. (2020). Native language inclination of students and teachers at a public secondary school: Native language (Turkish) usage in English language lessons. In V. Krystev, M. S. Dinu, R. Efe, & E. Atasoy (Eds.), *Advances in social science research* (pp. 181-203). St. Kliment Ohridski University Press. https://doi.org/hf9m