English Applied Linguistics PhD Program

Doctoral School of Linguistics

University of Szeged

Communication Strategies in ELF Interactions:

An Analysis in the ASEAN Context

PhD Dissertation

Winn Myintzu

Supervisor: Dr. Donald W. Peckham

Szeged

2023

Acknowledgements

Abstract

This dissertation provides evidence for how English speakers from the member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), who use English as a *lingua franca* (ELF), employ communication strategies (CSs) in their social practice to arrive at shared understanding. The participants were 20 ELF speakers from nine ASEAN countries, who were international students at Hungarian universities. They were categorized into subgroups according to the research questions of the study. The data mainly included video recordings of naturally occurring ELF interactions and retrospective interviews. The analysis indicates that the ASEAN ELF speakers used different types of CSs, among which *code-switching*, *asking for clarification, lexical support*, *asking for confirmation*, and *non-linguistic strategies* helped them arrive at understanding of each other. These findings are in line with previous studies such as Deterding (2013), Kaur (2010, 2011a, 2011b), Kirkpatrick (2007b), Mauranen (2006) and Pietikäinen (2018). The study indicates that the CSs used by the EFL sub-group, the ESL sub-group, and the mixed group of EFL and ESL were generally the same, and the closeness between speakers in each dyad did not influence their CS use. Regarding frequency, non-linguistic strategies were found to be the most used CSs that facilitated the speakers' understanding. Among the *non-linguistic strategies*, *pointing* was the most used, and in some cases, *non-linguistic strategies* were used as complementary to another CSs. The study reveals that such uses of CSs work well in ELF interactions and thus should be included in explicit teaching, and ELF speakers prioritized comprehensibility rather than high competence in English, findings which are in line with previous literature. This study fills a gap in current ELF research, especially in the ASEAN context.

Dissertation declaration

I declare that all the work presented in my dissertation is the result of my own original research under the supervision of Associate Professor Dr. Donald William Peckham.

I would like to state that no part of this dissertation has previously been submitted for an award of any other degree or any other qualification in my name at this university or any other institution. All the materials previously published or written by other people are clearly attributed and quoted in my dissertation. Apart from these due references, the dissertation is entirely my own work. Some parts of this text have appeared in my recent, related publications, which were done concurrently with my dissertation (i.e., Myintzu, 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2022 a).

I agree that the final version of my thesis can become available via the university's research repository, the university, and search engines.

Signature:

Winn Myintzu
Date: 31 January 2023

Table of contents

List of abbreviations

ACE	Asian Corpus of English
ADB	Asian Development Bank
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AusAID	Australian Aid
A1	CEFR-level A1 (Beginners)
A2	CEFR-level A2 (Pre-intermediate)
B2	CEFR-level B2 (Upper-Intermediate)
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
CMACE	Corpus of Misunderstandings from the Asian Corpus of English
CSs	Communication Strategies
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
ELT	English Language Teaching
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ENL	English as a Native Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
IPA	International Phonetic Alphabet
IT	Information Technology
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
K-12	Kindergarten (K) for 5-6 year-olds through twelfth grade (12) for 17-18 year-olds
Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
L1	First Language
MSG	Monosodium Glutamate
NS	Native Speaker
NSs	Native Speakers
NNS	Non-native Speaker
NNESs	Non-native English speakers

Ph.D.	Doctor of Philosophy
RELC	Regional Language Centre
SEA	Southeast Asia
SEAMEO	Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
USA	United States of America
VOICE	Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English
WTO	World Trade Organization

List of figures

List of tables

Chapter 1
Introduction

Southeast Asia (SEA) is a multicultural and multilingual region. Although there are some mutually understandable languages between some member countries, among all the languages spoken in the region, there is no common language which is understandable by all the people in Southeast Asian countries, and therefore English is usually used to communicate with each other. There is no doubt that multilinguals in Southeast Asia encounter misunderstanding and non-understanding in their communication using English and thus use communication strategies so as not to involve communication breakdowns and to keep the conversation flowing. This dissertation concerns how English speakers from Southeast Asia resolve misunderstanding and non-understanding arising in their communication in order to arrive at shared understanding. In this introductory chapter, the linguistic context of SEA will be introduced, and an outline of the research will follow.

ASEAN, The Association of Southeast Asian Nations nowadays has ten member countries, namely Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, The Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. The map of the ASEAN region, showing each country's borders shared with other ASEAN countries, can be seen in Figure 1. Southeast Asia is a culturally and linguistically diverse region, and linguistic diversity in the region suggests the need for a common language to be used in communicating with each other. Although there are some mutually intelligible languages between some ASEAN member countries (e.g., Malay is the official language of Brunei and Malaysia and also one of the official languages of Singapore [Cavallaro, Ng & Tan, 2020; Haji-Othman & Najib, 2016; Hashim, 2020; Kirkpatrick, 2012b) and thus mutually intelligible among many people from these three countries), there is no common language among all the languages spoken in the ASEAN region which can be understood by all the ASEAN member countries. Therefore, English is used as a common language among the people in the ASEAN region. It may be also the reason why English was used as the working language when ASEAN was founded in 1967 with the five founding member countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand) and became the de facto lingua franca, then later the official working language of ASEAN when the ASEAN Charter was signed (Kirkpatrick, 2012b; Krasnick, 1995). In the ASEAN charter of 2007, it is stated: "English shall be the working language of ASEAN" (ASEAN, 2020, p. 29). However, the language background of each ASEAN member country regarding English is different. (A detailed discussion of this can be found in Chapter 2.)

Kirkpatrick (2008) raises a question concerning this kind of situation: "How do people who speak different varieties of English and people whose level of English may be low communicate with each other using English as a lingua franca?" (p. 28). That is, given the 10 ASEAN member countries and their diverse linguistic nature, how English speakers from the ASEAN region use English in their communication is an important topic to research.

Figure 1

The Map of the ASEAN Region

Source: VectorStock.com

With its motto "One Vision, One Identity, One Community" and given the diverse linguistic nature of the ASEAN region, English had been chosen as the language of ASEAN, but its member countries have had different experiences with English. In Kachru's (1997) three circles model, Brunei, Malaysia, The Philippines, and Singapore are classified as the Outer Circle countries, where English is used as their second language, and where the use of English is common in the government sector as well as in the domain of social interaction. Although Brunei, Malaysia, The Philippines, and Singapore were colonized by the Inner

Circle countries such as the UK or the USA, Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam had not been colonies of any members of the Inner Circle countries and thus are classified as the Expanding Circle countries, where English is included in education as a foreign language for the use of communication with people from the Inner and Outer Circle countries. Concerning Myanmar, whether it is in the Outer or the Expanding Circle is questionable. It had been under British rule till 1948, and even after independence, English had been the primary language in education at the tertiary level until 1964. However, when the government changed the language policy and planned to reduce Western influence, the role of English changed. Recently the government has started trying to restore the role of English, but the educational system is still under the reformation process (Htet, 2020; Soe, 2015; Soe, Swe, Aye & Mon, 2017). Laos and Cambodia, on the other hand, are former French colonies. Low (2020) states that "English is acquired as a second language within the school system or increasingly as a first language in the Outer Circle countries of Southeast Asia" (p. 152). However, English is taught as a foreign language in the Expanding Circle countries. For these reasons, the role of English is different in ASEAN member countries, and so are the English proficiency levels of the speakers.

As a result of globalization and the official statement in the ASEAN charter, the role of English has become vital in each ASEAN country. English is the working language not only among ASEAN member countries but also in contact with other countries. For example, ASEAN has regular contact with member countries of ASEAN plus Three (China, Japan, and South Korea), as well as with member countries of ASEAN plus Five (Australia, New Zealand, China, Japan, and South Korea). English is used in these kinds of situations since it is the official language of ASEAN. According to Schneider (2014), because of the growing use of English in ASEAN plus Three, the ASEAN Expanding Circle countries have become more like the Outer Circle countries. Moreover, China, Japan, and South Korea's attention to English language teaching in their education systems gives them "ESL-plus status" (p. 252).

People from ASEAN countries use English to communicate with people from non-ASEAN countries as well as with their immediate neighbors within the ASEAN region due to the fact that English is the official language of ASEAN and is usually the only option among ASEAN countries. Thus, it is important for them to understand each other through their interaction in which English is used. Kirkpatrick (2010) states that multilinguals need to be internationally intelligible to be able to communicate successfully with others. Being multilingual and having diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds as well as having various levels of English, multilinguals in the ASEAN context can encounter misunderstanding and

non-understanding in their interactions. In order not to involve communication breakdowns and to keep the conversation flowing, speakers use a variety of strategies in their interactions to accomplish this (Deterding, 2013; Kaur, 2011a, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2007b) and this is the main focus of this dissertation.

In his research on misunderstandings in English as a lingua franca (ELF), using the Corpus of Misunderstandings from the Asian Corpus of English (CMACE) which he named, Deterding (2013) finds that the strategies such as *asking for clarification*, *correcting*, *silence*, *providing a backchannel*, *selecting part of the utterance*, *changing the topic*, *laughter*, and *non-awareness* (p. 139) are used by the English speakers to respond to their interlocutors when misunderstandings arise in their interactions. In Deterding's project, which is one of the very few studies on ELF in the ASEAN context, apart from one speaker who is from Nigeria, the other eight speakers are from ASEAN plus Three countries. However, among these eight participants in his study, only four of them are from Southeast Asia (one from Brunei, one from Indonesia, one from Laos, and one from Malaysia); although his book-length study is titled *Misunderstandings in English as a Lingua Franca: An Analysis of ELF Interactions in South-East Asia*, his research only covers a limited number of ASEAN participants. Among the nine recordings that are analyzed in depth in his research, only two recordings are the interactions of ELF speakers from ASEAN. That is why his research is more about the ELF interactions of speakers from ASEAN countries with those from non-ASEAN countries. This dissertation, on the other hand, investigates ELF interactions of English speakers from ASEAN countries only.

In ELF interactions which include English speakers with diverse linguistic and cultural as well as social backgrounds, their communicative styles may vary (Kaur, 2010). Not only because of the diverse linguacultural backgrounds of the ASEAN states but also because of the different histories of English language teaching and the different roles of English in different ASEAN member countries, diversity is "[a] key feature of interaction" (Kaur, 2011b, p. 2704) among the ELF speakers in the ASEAN context. Because of this diverse nature, misunderstanding and non-understanding, which occur in any talk, may be frequent in the ASEAN ELF setting. An interesting point is how ELF speakers in the ASEAN context overcome these misunderstandings and non-understanding to reach a shared understanding in their interactions. That is why the present research is focused on the strategies employed in ELF communication among ASEAN English speakers to make them achieve understanding each other when misunderstanding and non-understanding arise.

To my knowledge, in the literature on ELF research, there are very few empirical studies on how ELF speakers in the ASEAN context deal with their misunderstandings and non-understanding in their interactions. Therefore, this research focuses on ASEAN ELF, particularly on communication strategies used to understand each other in ASEAN ELF interactions, anticipating that this present study will be beneficial for ELF speakers in ASEAN countries and also for other English speakers who communicate with them. Hence the research questions in the present study concern which communication strategies can aid ASEAN ELF speakers to arrive at understanding when misunderstanding and non-understanding arise, and the frequency of those communication strategies employed by ASEAN ELF speakers. The research questions are as follows:

1. Among the communication strategies the ASEAN ELF speakers used in their ELF interactions, which strategies can aid them in achieving understanding with each other? In addition, which non-linguistic strategies are employed by the speakers in the study to aid them in achieving understanding?

    1.1. Among the communication strategies employed by the ASEAN ELF speakers, are the ones used by the EFL sub-group the same or similar to those used by the ESL sub-group?

    1.2. Are the communication strategies used in the mixed group of EFL and ESL the same or similar to those used in the EFL sub-group or the ESL sub-group?

    1.3. Are the communication strategies used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who do not know each other before (i.e., strangers) the same or similar to those used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who know each other well?

2. Among the communication strategies which can help the speakers achieve shared understanding, what is the frequency of their use by the ASEAN ELF speakers?

To investigate these research questions, a close and in-depth analysis, as done in previous studies on ELF by other scholars was employed to investigate instances of misunderstanding and non-understanding and how ASEAN ELF speakers in the present study dealt with their misunderstanding and non-understanding to achieve shared understanding.

The research design for the main study was based on the experiences from two pilot studies. The participants in the main study were 20 ELF speakers from nine ASEAN countries, who were international students attending bachelor to Ph.D. programs at Hungarian universities. The data collection was in the forms of video and audio recordings of ELF

interactions of each dyad, in which two ELF speakers from two different ASEAN countries participated while cooking together. The data from these naturally occurring ELF interactions were analyzed to answer the research questions mentioned above.

Before formally presenting the theoretical framework on communication strategies in Chapter 3, an overview of how English came to be used in each ASEAN country and the current situation of English used in each ASEAN country will be briefly reviewed in Chapter 2.

Chapter summary

ASEAN is a culturally and linguistically diverse region. Although there are some mutually understandable languages between some member countries, among all the languages spoken in the ASEAN region, there is no common language which can be understood by all the ASEAN member countries. English is used as the only working language of ASEAN and as a common language to communicate with each other among the people in the ASEAN region as well as with people from non-ASEAN countries. However, the language background of each ASEAN member country regarding English is different. Being multilinguals and having diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds as well as having various levels of English, these English speakers in the ASEAN context encounter misunderstanding and non-understanding in their interactions. To avoid a communication breakdown and to keep the conversation flowing, English speakers from ASEAN countries use communication strategies in their interactions. This dissertation is focused on the communication strategies among the ASEAN English speakers which make them arrive at shared understanding. In this chapter, the research questions and a brief overview of the research design are introduced which will be seen in detail in Chapter 4.

Chapter 2

Use of English in the ASEAN context

As discussed in Chapter 1, the language background of each ASEAN member country regarding English is different. In this chapter, before moving on to the language background and the role of English in each ASEAN country, the literature on English as a global language, and English as a lingua franca will first be briefly reviewed. Then, English as an ASEAN lingua franca together with the language background of each ASEAN country will be discussed. After that, the meaning of misunderstanding and non-understanding will be explained. Finally, the discussion on English as a lingua franca in English language teaching (ELT), and teaching communication strategies to English learners will come before the chapter summary.

2.1. English as a global language

English has spread across the world. Many scholars including Crystal (2003) and Seidlhofer (2001) assert that the majority of English speakers today are non-native speakers of English. Khodorkovsky (2013) estimates the population of non-native English speakers as approximately 80 percent of the total English speakers. According to Crystal (2003), the role of English has become a *global language*, and "nobody owns it anymore" (p. 2).

To achieve global status for a language, Crystal (2003) asserts that the language has to be either the official language of a country or a priority in the country's foreign language teaching. Looking at English as an example of a global language, it is used as a *second language*, which refers to a complementary language to the first language of the people from a country. This situation can be found in such countries as Ghana, India, and Singapore where English has the role as an official language in these countries. On the other hand, in some countries such as China, Germany, and the like, although English is not an official language in these countries, English is widely taught as a *foreign language* and is becoming the chief foreign language found in schools in these countries. In these regards, English is a global language and can be found around the world.

Being a global language, the ownership of English is said to be reconsidered by scholars such as Bolton (2006) and Kachru (1988). The former asserts that "English is no longer the possession of the British, or even the British and the Americans" (p. 380) whereas the latter states his opinion that "[t]he English language now belongs to all those who use it" (p. 1).

In terms of form, as there are different varieties of English such as Australian English, New Zealand English, Canadian English, and the like in the Inner Circle countries, with the global spread of English, new varieties of English have emerged, often called *new Englishes* such as South Asian English spoken in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka, and the English spoken in former British colonies in West Africa (Crystal, 2003). According to McArthur (1992), *new Englishes* refers to "recently emerging and increasingly autonomous varieties of English, especially in a non-western setting" (p. 688). In this regard, there is the emergence of new varieties of English in Southeast Asia or the ASEAN region.

ASEAN varieties of English may sound different from other varieties such as South Asian English, and West African English. Regarding features of ASEAN English, Deterding and Kirkpatrick (2006) state that there are some common features found in ASEAN English which are different from the English in the Inner Circle countries. For example, they mention that in their data, English speakers from seven ASEAN countries frequently pronounce [t] for [θ] in the syllable-initial position.

Even in the ASEAN region itself, because of each ASEAN country's diverse linguistic background, English in each ASEAN country may sound different. Varieties of English in some ASEAN countries are considered to be new Englishes (Kachru, 1984) such as Brunei English (McLellan, 2020), Malaysian English (Hashim, 2020; Hickey, 2005), Philippine English (Hickey, 2005; Martin, 2020), and Singapore English (Cavallaro, Ng & Tan, 2020; Hickey, 2005) which have their own particular features. For example, in Malaysian English, Hickey (2005) points out that final consonant clusters as in *best* and *recent* are simplified and pronounced as [bɛs] and [ˈriːsɛn] respectively, and that the "[s]tress pattern can vary, e.g. *eduˈcated* and *critiˈcism*" (p. 564, Hickey's original emphasis). Hickey also mentions that non-standard features can be found in Malaysian English such as the use of uncountable nouns as countable nouns as in "*A consideration for others is important.*" (p. 564, Hickey's original emphasis) and "the use of reflexive pronouns as emphatic pronouns: *Myself sick*" instead of saying *I am sick* (p. 564, Hickey's original emphasis). Hickey further states that Malaysian English also uses many Malay words such as *bumiputera* which means a Malay or other indigenous person, *makan* which means food, *kampong* which means village, and the like in their English. Similarly, other varieties of English in other ASEAN countries have their particular features in their English which reflect the culture and language of their own country. (See Brunei English, McLellan (2020); Myanmar English, Aye (2020); Philippine English, Martin (2020); Singapore English, Cavallaro et al. (2020).)

Regarding Englishes in the ASEAN region, Deterding and Kirkpatrick (2006) state:

As English becomes increasingly important as a means of international communication between people of disparate backgrounds, new English lingua francas are emerging, incorporating just those features of English that are necessary for effective communication and also developing new modes of interaction without being too concerned about the language patterns of native speakers in places such as Britain and America. (p. 391)

As discussed in Chapter 1, English has been used as the language of ASEAN since its establishment in 1967. The choice of English as the language of ASEAN "came out automatically […] there has been no regulation for the use of English but it has been used in all the actual situations", and ASEAN member countries "took it for granted" (Kirkpatrick, 2008, p. 27). Since then, English has been used as a common language or a *lingua franca* to communicate with each other among ASEAN countries. Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011) state that "ELF is simultaneously the consequence and the principal language medium of globalizing process" (p. 303). Similarly, in the ASEAN context the *Aseanizing process* is playing the same role. Thus, ASEAN countries, in which English was not widely used and taught before, have to adapt their language policies and include English in their school curriculum. (See detail in 2.3.1. and 2.3.2.)

2.2. English as a lingua franca (ELF)

A number of authors have defined the term *lingua franca*. Kirkpatrick's (2007a) definition of a lingua franca is "the common language used by people of different language backgrounds to communicate with each other" (p. 7). Gnutzmann (2013) defines it as "a language that is used as a medium of communication between people or groups of people each speaking a different native language" (p. 413). For Mauranen (2018), a lingua franca is "a contact language, that is, a vehicular language between speakers who do not share a first language" (p. 7). Therefore, in a lingua franca communication, a language is used as a common language to communicate among speakers of different languages. Different people will choose different languages as a lingua franca, depending on where they are and with whom they use that language. Nowadays, English is widely used all over the world, and English may be the most used lingua franca in the world.

Similar to the term *lingua franca*, the term *English as a lingua franca* (ELF) is also defined by many scholars. Among them, one of the most cited is by Firth (1996) who defines ELF as a "contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of

communication" (p. 240). Similarly, House (1999) and Seidlhofer (2001) state that ELF is used when English is employed by speakers having different linguacultural backgrounds. For Jenkins (2015), ELF is a "multilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice" (p. 73) although it was defined once as a contact language among people without a shared first (and often any other) language. According to Seidlhofer's (2011) definition of ELF as "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (p. 7), this is the role that English plays as a lingua franca among people in ASEAN countries.

Further related definitions of ELF are also in ELF literature. Among them, Mauranen's (2018) is perhaps the most detailed definition of ELF from the point of view of language contact, claiming that in ELF communication, at least one speaker is bilingual, and that that speaker uses English as a second language. Mauranen (2012) also argues that in ELF interactions, each speaker's first language influences his/her English, and each speaker's English meets each other in their interactions, which is termed *second-order language contact* (p. 29). She regards ELF as "a higher-order, or second-order language contact" (2018, p. 10) and thus in the ELF interactions of speakers with diverse first language backgrounds, contact languages of each speaker encounter each other and interact. In the ASEAN context, English is a means to communicate with others who have multilingual and multicultural backgrounds which may influence their ELF interactions at any time. This is in line with Mauranen's term *higher-order contact*.

The ELF definitions above reflect the ASEAN situations, and thus, these definitions are complementary to each other for the ASEAN context. That is, in the ASEAN context, English is used as a contact language among those who have diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds, and thus this is what the term ELF will refer to in this dissertation.

Concerning ELF interactions, according to Ke (2012), both English speakers are either an EFL or an ESL speaker, thus both English speakers have to pay attention to linguistic as well as cultural norms in their communication to understand each other since ELF speakers reflect their own language(s) and own cultural conceptualization. Zein and Stroupe (2017) assert that Asian multilinguals do not think about "the Anglo-American cultural frame of reference" (p. 194) but take ownership of English in their ELF communication within their cultural contexts. They give Malay English as an example of this, referring to Kirkpatrick's (2016) examples of Malay English speakers' use of local terms such as *kampong* which means village, and *adat* which means mores in their ELF interactions while talking about their local culture. Fekete (2018) also mentions that ELF users "who

[recognize] in what ways they are using English successfully [are] aware of their ownership of the language, which [constitutes] their self-perception as multilingual speakers." (p. 228)

Within ELF interactions, successful communication can be seen as the goal, and communication strategies can aid in this. According to Mansfield and Poppi (2012), and Sung (2016), ELF speakers' purpose is to have successful or intelligible communication, and therefore, they seek intelligibility in their communication. Because of the diverse nature and variability of ELF communication, the most crucial matter for speakers in ELF interactions is to master the use of "strategies for the accomplishment of accommodation of diverse practices and modes of meaning" (Firth, 2009, p. 163) in order to have successful communication. According to Seidlhofer (2004), ELF speakers engage in the use of communication strategies such as *rephrasing* and *repetition* (p. 218) in their ELF interactions to understand each other, avoiding *misunderstanding* and *non-understanding* in their interactions.

2.3. English as an ASEAN lingua franca

The ASEAN region is extremely linguistically rich and diverse with a growing emphasis on English which is used as a lingua franca in the context with a multitude of L1 backgrounds and cultures, and bilingual and multilingual individuals. According to Kirkpatrick (2020), there are over 1000 languages spoken in the ASEAN region. Among the current ten ASEAN countries, Indonesia has the most living languages with 739 in total, and Brunei has the least living languages with 17 in total (Chitravelu, 2007). Chitravelu also states that the ASEAN societies are multilingual as are individuals who live in them. In the literature, bilingualism is defined as "the regular use of two or more languages (or dialects), and bilinguals are those people who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives" (Grosjean, 2008, p. 10). On the other hand, multilingualism simply refers to "the use of more than one language" or "competence in more than one language" (Clyne, 2017, p. 301) in the situation where the proficiency levels of the languages used may vary.

Given these definitions, and using myself as an example as a citizen of one of the ASEAN countries, I myself could be considered bilingual or multilingual. When I am in Hungary, I use English to communicate with my flatmates, international friends, participants in my research, and at my faculty. On the other hand, as Tavoyan is my mother tongue, I speak it with my family members, and former colleagues and students who are from the same ethnic group as me whenever I contact them. At the same time, when I contact my friends, colleagues and former students who are Burmese or non-Burmese whose mother tongue is

different from mine, I use Burmese or sometimes English with them. Whenever communicating with my Chinese teachers, we try to use as much Chinese as we can. Similarly, in the ASEAN region, many people are bilingual or multilingual, using perhaps a national or official language of a country and another language or dialect of the country. In the case of those who live in the border areas which share the country's border with another (or sometimes with more than one) country, it is common that people speak at least two languages in their daily life without (or with little) difficulty.

Despite the over 1000 languages spoken inside the ASEAN region, there is no one common language which is mutually understandable among all the speakers in the region. Having this level of diversity of regional languages makes people in the ASEAN region turn to the use of a lingua franca or several lingua francas to aid in communication. One of the lingua francas ASEAN people use is English. Kirkpatrick (2010) notes that multilinguals in the ASEAN region and Asia learn English as an additional language, and they use English as a lingua franca. Furthermore, according to Bautista and Gonzalez (2006), the status of English in the ASEAN member countries is growing: it is used in education, commerce, trade, and international relations with other countries.

Today, it has been the trend in the region to put English in the primary school curriculum as early as possible, often as a medium of instruction (Kirkpatrick, 2012a). However, whether English is taught as a foreign language or as a second language in Southeast Asian countries depends on the colonial past of the respective country (Bautista & Gonzalez, 2006; Hickey, 2005). According to Kachru's (1997) three circles model, among the ASEAN member countries, Brunei, Malaysia, Philippines, and Singapore are in the Outer Circle, where English is used as a second language. On the other hand, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, and Vietnam are in the Expanding Circle, where English is used as a foreign language (Wilang & Teo, 2012). Based on Kachru's model, Low (2020) also generally puts the ASEAN countries into two categories: the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle. ASEAN always mentions its member countries in alphabetical order, but in the following discussion about English in ASEAN, Low's two-level categorization will be used in the discussion of their linguistic situations.

Before discussing how the role of English in each ASEAN country changed over time in 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, the key terms, *English as a second language* (ESL), referring to English in the outer circle, and *English as a foreign language* (EFL), referring to English in the expanding circle, which will be seen frequently in the discussion, should be contrasted in terms of potential language proficiency. In Kachru and Nelson's (2006) view on the ESL vs.

EFL dichotomy, the possibilities for using English in daily life in the areas of education, government, and the law are potentially greater in ESL areas than in EFL areas. Thus, the different nature of English used in these two contexts possibly affects speakers' levels of English, which Kachru and Nelson claim are "higher overall in ESL than in EFL countries" (p. 26).

2.3.1. English in the Outer Circle countries of ASEAN

Among the four Outer Circle countries of ASEAN, Brunei, Malaysia, and Singapore were British colonies whereas The Philippines was an American colony, starting from the late 19th century till 1946 (Kirkpatrick, 2012b). The role of English in Singapore and The Philippines is as one of the official languages of the countries, whereas English is an official state language only in one state of Malaysia, Sarawak (Ruekeith, 2015).

Brunei

Brunei is a multilingual country like any other ASEAN country, but it is mainly *monocultural* (McLellan, 2020, p. 415). It has a coastline with the South China Sea in the north and the other three sides of Brunei are surrounded by Malaysia. McLellan (2020) states that the population of Brunei comprises Brunei Malays, Chinese and indigenous groups. Although Standardized Malay is the official language of the country, the majority of the Brunei population speaks Brunei Malay as the lingua franca among them. According to Haji-Othman and Najib (2016), there is a language shift taking place in the indigenous groups from their indigenous languages to Brunei Malay. Haji-Othman and McLellan (2014) mention that foreign languages used in Brunei include Arabic (used in Islamic religious and educational domains), and Mandarin and other Chinese languages (used among Chinese Bruneians, in business, and in education at Chinese schools).

In Brunei, English is used as a second language by many people, and "is one of the languages of the schools, government, business, and wider communication" (Haji-Othman & McLellan, 2014, p. 3). In education, after its independence in 1984, Malay was used as the medium of instruction in primary schools up to the third year. Then, after the third year, the medium of instruction became English for some subjects including mathematics and science, while Malay was still being used as the medium of instruction for subjects like Malay literature, Islamic knowledge, and the like. After the introduction of a new National Education System in 2009, the role of English in education changed in Brunei. Since 2011, English has been used as the medium of instruction for mathematics and science from the

first year of primary schools (Kirkpatrick, 2011; Low, 2020). Alongside debates on the use of English as a medium of instruction, this integrated bilingual Malay-English education system allows Bruneians to become bilingual in Malay and English after their secondary education. In the private education sector of Brunei, all subjects are taught in English from preschool. In this way, Bruneians use English as a second language, especially in their education system (McLellan, 2020).

The government also encourages Brunei to become an *English-rich environment* (McLellan, 2020, p. 415) in other ways. For example, Brunei is trying to become a study hub for learning English and other English-medium programs for people from other ASEAN countries and East Asian countries. One of the programs is under a project called "The Brunei-US English Language Enrichment Project for ASEAN". Non-Bruneians from other ASEAN countries whose jobs need good English skills are offered to participate in this program to promote their skills, staying in Brunei for seven weeks and in Hawai'i for four weeks. Moreover, Bruneians go to other Expanding Circle countries in the ASEAN region to teach English (McLellan, 2020). In this way, Brunei is promoting the English language in its own country as well as for other Expanding Circle countries of ASEAN.

Malaysia

The country which Brunei shares its border as well as a language among the ASEAN countries is Malaysia. The geography of Malaysia is separated into two parts by the South China Sea: East Malaysia (bordered with Indonesia in the south and Brunei in the north) and West Malaysia (bordered with Thailand in the north and Singapore in the south) (MyGovernment, 2021). According to Hashim (2020), the population of Malaysia consists of Malays, Chinese, Indians, and numerous ethnic and indigenous groups.

Malaysia is a multilingual country, having at least 80 languages. After independence from the British in 1957, the priority in the language use changed, making Malay the national and official language, and English as the most important foreign language (Hashim, 2020). However, English had still been holding the role of the official language until 1973 in Sabah, and until 1985 in Sarawak. In this way, the role of English changed "to the status of second language following The National Language Act of 1967" (p. 375).

Contrasting with Brunei and Singapore which adopted a bilingual education system including English as the medium of instruction, using English as the medium of instruction in the education system of Malaysia has changed over time. English had been the language of administration, and the language of education in urban schools in Malaysia until its

14

independence in 1957. Then, the pro-Malay language policy, using Malay as the language of instruction was initiated region by region. However, when the policy was cancelled in 2002, English was re-introduced as the medium of instruction for mathematics and science from the first year of primary schools (Chitravelu, 2007; Low, 2020). It was stopped again because of strong criticisms, and mathematics and science subjects have once again been taught in Malay again in 2012 (Kirkpatrick, 2011; Low, 2020). Despite the use of English as the medium of instruction changing over time, English has been taught as a major subject in schools continuously for economic and international reasons (Hashim, 2020; Low, 2020). In the higher education sector, although English is not used in all disciplines, it is the language of instruction for science and medicine. However, in private institutions, all programs are taught in English.

Malaysia also encourages student and staff mobility, sending students abroad for a semester and staff for research periods. There is also a collaboration between some Malaysian universities and those from other ASEAN countries such as Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam for research partnerships and mobility programs. Student and staff mobility programs are also with universities around the world. English as the language of education brings international students to Malaysia and also gives Malaysian students opportunities to go to universities abroad (Hashim, 2020).

The Philippines

The geography of the Philippines is different from other ASEAN countries. The Philippines is a geographically and linguistically diverse country, comprising 7,107 islands which are home to ethnic and indigenous communities (such as Tagalog, Visayans/Bisaya, Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Bikol, and Waray) who speak 186 individual languages (Bolton & Bautista, 2008; David, Cavallaro & Coluzzi, 2009; Hickey, 2005; Lewis, Simons & Fennig, 2015). Among these groups, the most significant population of the Philippines is Tagalog, and there is also a small population in the Philippines who are of mixed Filipino and foreign descent (Hickey, 2005).

Although the Philippines had been under the control of Spain, Spanish is not important anymore in the present-day Philippines. After the Spanish control, the Philippines was colonized by the United States until 1946, when the country gained its independence (Bolton & Bautista, 2008; Hickey, 2005; Low, 2020). Similar to Singapore, English is an official language in the Philippines, and nowadays, English is the language of not only the elite but also the people with low socioeconomic status because a large number of Filipinos

go abroad for job opportunities (Low, 2020). Moreover, English serves as a lingua franca for the native population because the languages of the Philippines are not mutually understandable (Hickey, 2005). Another official language of the Philippines is Filipino, but the country is well-known for having the third largest English-speaking population in the world (Bolton & Bautista, 2008). Bolton and Bacon-Shone (2020) state that according to the 2016 survey by the Social Weather Surveys organization, 81% of the Philippines' population can understand spoken English, 79% can read, 70% can write, and 62% can speak in English.

In the Philippines, English was used to teach maths and science from the first year of primary schools, and Filipino was used for other subjects from 1974. However, this bilingual education policy was substituted with a multilingual education policy, which uses a mother-tongue base, in 2009 but English is taught from the second year of primary schools (Kirkpatrick, 2011; Martin, 2020). Although the language policy in education was changed, the role of English is still vital in the legal domain and in that of business and trade (Martin, 2020).

Singapore

Singapore is a city state at the south of the Malay Peninsula. Singapore consists of the main island called Singapore Island and other smaller islands (The Commonwealth, 2021). The population of Singapore comprises Chinese, Malay and Indians whose home languages are Mandarin Chinese, Chinese vernaculars, Malay, Malay vernaculars, English, Tamil and other Indian languages. Singapore has had four official languages – Mandarin Chinese, Malay, Tamil and English – since the late 1950s during the colonial rule under the British. English as the official language, the language of administration and commerce, and the medium of education in Singapore has become more and more popular among Singaporeans, and it is used as a lingua franca among Singaporeans who have different ethnic backgrounds (Cavallaro et al., 2020).

Since its independence in 1965, science and mathematics were taught in English in all schools, and English was the mandatory second language in schools in which the medium of instruction was not English. Since 1987, English has become the primary language of education in Singapore, and English also became the language of instruction at the university level (Alsagoff, 2012; Hickey, 2005; Low, 2020). According to the Singaporean bilingual education system, all primary students must learn two languages: English and an ethnic language, making English the first language (the primary language, but not the student's ethnic language) and the ethnic language as the second language (Alsagoff, 2012, 2017).

Singapore's English-medium education encourages *English-dominant bilinguals* (p. 429) and people's good command of English is one of the contributing factors to the country's success in the economy. The dominance of English even takes the role of the other three languages in the home domain. A survey in 2015 shows that 36.9% of the Singaporean population uses "English as their dominant home language" (Cavallaro et al., 2020, p. 429).

2.3.2. English in the Expanding Circle countries of ASEAN

The role of English in the Expanding Circle countries of ASEAN is different from country to country. In these countries, English is adopted as a foreign language along with other foreign languages and their already existing local languages. Apart from Thailand which has never been colonized, other countries were colonized by different countries, leading them to different language policies and practices. For example, the role of French in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam was vital (Igawa, 2008) which had been French colonies in the past. However, the situation is different in the other three Expanding Circle countries which are Indonesia, Myanmar, and Thailand. No matter how different the role of English in the Expanding Circle countries is, each country has had to change their language policy after becoming members in ASEAN because "[i]n ASEAN, discussion and debate take place in English, with no official translation service. Furthermore, documents are prepared only in English" (Clayton, 2007, p. 101).

Cambodia

Cambodia is located on the Indochina Peninsula, sharing its border with Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. The population of Cambodia consists of mainly Khmer, and other ethnic groups including Vietnamese and Chinese (Igawa, 2008). According to Moore and Bounchan (2020), Khmer is the native language of 90% of the population in Cambodia.

In Cambodia, under French colonial rule from 1863 to its independence in 1953, during the three-year period of the revolutionary Khmer Rouge regime from 1975 to 1978, and under the Vietnamese occupation from 1979 to 1989, there was no or very little exposure to English. The foreign languages used in Cambodia during those time were French, Vietnamese, and Russian. However, the language policy was changed in Cambodia in 1989 after the Vietnamese occupation ended. The official languages in the Cambodian school curriculum changed from Vietnamese or Russian to French or English (Moore & Bounchan, 2020). Since that time, English has become one of the main foreign languages of Cambodia. According to Igawa (2008), Cambodia's admission into ASEAN in 1999 made Cambodia use

English in Cambodia's international relationships, and English is now taught from Grade 5 (Kirkpatrick, 2012a).

Similar to other Expanding Circle countries of the ASEAN member countries, English language proficiency is important for job opportunities in Cambodia (Low, 2020). Moore and Bounchan (2020) state that English is important in education, tourism, and international relations, and those who have a good command of English get good positions not only in business, and industry but also in the government sector. Another reason of the Cambodians' value for English is for technological advances. In mobile phones, only English fonts were available in the early days, and also in social media like Facebook and on the internet, Cambodian use English. Nowadays, English is preferred to French among students in schools. Moreover, some private schools in Cambodia use English as the medium from K-12. In this way, the role of English is growing rapidly in Cambodia (Moore & Bounchan, 2020).

Laos

Laos is located in the center of the Indochinese peninsular, in Southeast Asia, sharing its borders with China in the north, with Cambodia in the south, with Vietnam in the east, with Thailand in the west, and with Myanmar in the northwest (Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum, 2009). According to the 2005 census, there are 49 ethnic groups in Laos who speak languages of four main linguistic families: the Lao-Tai linguistic family, the Mon-Khmer linguistic family, the Hmong-Yao linguistic family, and the Tibeto-Burman linguistic family (Achren & Kittiphanh, 2020).

Laos was a French colony until 1946 and under French dominance till its full independence in 1954. That is why, like in Cambodia, the role of English is as a foreign language in competition with French, which is still commonly used in Laos. After the foundation of the Lao PDR in 1975, Laos received support from the Soviet bloc until the early 1990s. Thus, Russian was taught in schools. It was also taught in tertiary institutions as other foreign languages such as Bulgarian, Hungarian, and German. When the Soviet Union collapsed, the Lao government tried to get support from other Western countries in the early 1990s. In 1994, Laos became an observer country in ASEAN before its full membership status in 1997. All these factors had an impact on the language policy of Laos. Secondary and tertiary students were allowed to still choose Russian, or switch to French or English, a foreign language they had to learn in schools, but most students chose English. The problem, though, was teachers were not skilled English speakers yet. Thus, Australia helped Laos in its English language skills promotion in various ways by establishing the English Language

Resource Centre in the capital city of Laos and providing training programs for Laotian English teachers in Australia (Achren & Kittiphanh, 2020).

English has become increasingly studied in recent years in Laos. Phommanimith (2008, as cited in Low, 2020) states that the Ministry of Education made a decision to start teaching English from the third year of the primary level in schools. At present, only very few people in Laos are proficient in English, and it is still the language of the elite in Laos (Low, 2020).

Myanmar

Myanmar (also known as Burma) is an ethnically, linguistically and culturally diverse country in Southeast Asia, sharing its land border with China in the north and northeast, with India in the northwest, with Bangladesh in the west, with Laos in the east, and with Thailand in the southeast. It is also bordered by the Andaman Sea and the Bay of Bengal in the south and the southwest (Aung-Thwin, Aung & Steinberg, 2021). There are 135 ethnic groups, which represent eight major groups: Kachin, Kayah, Kayin, Chin, Bama, Mon, Rakhine, and Shan, officially recognized by the government (Aye, 2020). Ethnologue (2020) mentions that there are 121 languages used in Myanmar. Myanmar (also known as Burmese), "the language of the major ethnic group, is the sole national and official language of the country" (Aye, 2020, p. 356).

Myanmar was a British colony from 1886 till its independence in 1948. During the colonial period, English was obviously used as the language of government and administration. After independence, the official language of the country became Burmese, but English still held the role of the major foreign language (Low, 2020). The role of English in the education system twists and turns over time. After independence, Burmese became the medium of instruction in all schools from the primary level, and English was taught as a compulsory subject from the fifth standard, then from kindergarten in 1981 (Lwin, 2000; Myint, 2005; Myint & Poe, 2003; Tin, 1992). In 1986, English was started to be used as the language of the textbooks for mathematics, science (Chemistry, Physics, Biology) and Economics at the high school level (Tin, 1992).

Today, English is the main language used for international communication in Myanmar, and the study of English is in great demand among the general population in Myanmar (Myint, 2005; Myint & Poe, 2003; Nag, 2017). At present, English is taught as a subject from the first year of primary schools, it is the language of the textbooks for maths and science in upper secondary schools, and English is a compulsory subject in the

curriculum at the tertiary level (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017). According to Wong, Miller and Treadwell (2019), new textbooks are being developed for the primary and secondary levels, focused on more active learners' participation in class. At the time of this research, the new textbooks have already been finished for all the primary grades and for up to Grade 8 in the lower secondary, and then Grades 10 and 11 in the upper secondary. Teacher training programs on ELT methodology were conducted for all the new textbooks by the Ministry of Education with the support of international cooperation such as the Asian Development Bank (ADB), AusAID, and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) (Anonymous, personal communication[1], 2021). Since 2010, there has been international cooperation with ASEAN countries as well as non-ASEAN countries such as Brunei, Japan, the US, and Singapore, and also with some international institutions such as Australian Volunteer International, the British Council, Temasek Foundation, and SEAMEO Regional Language Center to promote English language teaching in Myanmar, providing short-term and long-term courses for English teachers in English speaking countries, as well as awarding scholarships to students (Paw, 2015).

Indonesia

Indonesia is the largest country among all other countries in ASEAN and consists of some 17,500 islands in the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. Indonesia shares its border with Malaysia on one of its islands, Borneo, and with Papua New Guinea on the island called New Guinea. Indonesia's population comprises more than 300 different ethnic groups, among which most are of Malay ancestry (Legge, Leinbach, Wolters, Adam, McDivitt & Mohamad, 2021). Lauder (2020) states that there are 707 living languages in Indonesia, and the national language is Indonesian (also known as Bahasa Indonesia) which is "based on colloquial Malay" (p. 606).

Indonesia was a Dutch colony till its independence in 1945 (Lauder, 2020). During the colonial period, Dutch was the main foreign language in Indonesia. However, English gained an important role after independence because of its international status, and teaching English was started as a foreign language, firstly at the university level in 1949, then in junior and senior high schools in 1967, and later in secondary schools in 1989, but students' command of English was poor at that time. With the hope that a better level of English would

---

[1] The citation is anonymous here as per request by the interviewees. The author conducted several interviews online in 2021 to know about new textbooks and teacher training programs for the new textbooks.

be achieved if English was introduced early, it was introduced in primary schools from the fourth grade in 1990 but as an optional local content subject, and there was no national curriculum for English in primary schools. The new Indonesian curriculum, in which English was treated as an extracurricular activity in primary schools, was implemented country-wide in 2014 but after one semester, it stopped. Thus, it is not clear what the status and relevance of English are at the primary level of education in Indonesian (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017). Among the ASEAN member countries, Indonesia is the only country where English is not included as a compulsory subject in the curriculum at the primary level (Kirkpatrick, 2011). Although English is taught as the main foreign language in Indonesia (Bautista & Gonzalez, 2006), there is no clear-cut and uniform language education policy.

Nowadays, the demand for English is high among Indonesians not only because of being an international language and a global lingua franca but also in business and commerce, and in academic and research publishing. English has become essential for those who want to join the workforce, and Indonesian researchers are encouraged and supported with funding by the government to publish their work in English and also in international journals (Lauder, 2020).

Thailand

Thailand is located in the center of mainland Southeast Asia, sharing its border with Myanmar in the west, with Laos in the north and east, and with Cambodia in the southeast. The Gulf of Thailand is in the south of the country (E. J. Keyes, C. F. Keyes & Hafner, 2021). The population of Thailand mainly consists of ethnic Thais and around 70 other ethnic and minority groups including Thai Chinese, ethnic Malay, Mon, Khmer, and highland indigenous groups. Those non-Thai ethnic groups have their own culture and languages but can communicate in Thai (Pechapan-Hammond, 2020).

Thailand, unlike other ASEAN countries, has never been colonized by any other country. The language of education had been Thai, and English was the sole foreign language (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017) throughout the history of Thailand. Thailand started including English in the curriculum in 1921 (Baker, 2012). Although Thailand wanted to include English in the school curriculum from Grade 1 in private schools, Grade 3 in university demonstration schools, and Grade 5 in government schools, the idea was postponed because there is a lack of teachers to teach English in Thailand, especially in the rural areas of the country (Bautista & Gonzalez, 2006). As Thailand is one of the five founding member countries of ASEAN in 1967, the role of English became vital in Thailand.

English became a compulsory subject at the primary level in 1996, and it is now taught as a subject in Grades 1 to 12 (Baker, 2012; Bautista & Gonzalez, 2006). Nowadays, English is important for Thailand for other reasons too. Thailand's tourism industry is a well-reputed one internationally, and English plays an important role in the tourism sector. In the higher education sector, programs in many universities are offered in the medium of English to get international students, especially from the ASEAN community (Pechapan-Hammond, 2020).

Recently, a new policy on English language education was initiated i.e., to recruit English-speaking teachers to teach English at all levels of government schools. This policy was not successful as the one in 2003, which promoted English learning by Thai children through English-medium instruction. These kinds of Thailand's initiatives related to English language teaching failed like other initiatives in the past. Darasawang and Todd (2012, as cited in Pechapan-Hammond, 2020) state that there is "a significant gap between the policies (whatever they are) and their implementation" (p. 214) which is a recurring problem in education in Thailand.

Vietnam

Vietnam is also an ethnically and linguistically diverse country in Southeast Asia, bordering with China in the north, and Cambodia and Laos in the west. The South China Sea is in the east and south of Vietnam, and the Gulf of Thailand is in its southwest (Hickey, Buttinger, Osborne, Jamieson, Turley & Duiker, 2021). The Vietnamese population is made up of 54 ethnic groups, and there are more than 100 different languages spoken in Vietnam. However, Vietnamese is the most dominant and widely used language, and it is also the language of education in Vietnam (Sundkvist & Nguyen, 2020).

The language policies in Vietnam have changed from time to time due to the political situation in the country. According to Sundkvist and Nguyen (2020), Vietnamese was not the medium of instruction until their independence from France in 1945. Before independence, "Chinese and French were used as the language of schooling with the aim to serve various social and political needs of the colonies" (p. 684). After independence, Vietnamese became the medium of instruction in schools and other languages were regarded as foreign languages. English was introduced by the Americans to Vietnam during the Vietnam War. However, after the end of the war, English was banned, being regarded as "the language of the enemy" (p. 686). Vietnam became closer to the Soviet Union, and it was clear that Russian became the most prominent foreign language in Vietnam. However, the economic reforms that started in 1986 encouraged Vietnamese people to learn English (Sundkvist & Nguyen, 2020).

English became the main foreign language to be learned from the 1990s and "English is now the predominant foreign language taught and is being introduced earlier and earlier in Vietnamese schools" (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017, p. 171). In 1996, English was taught from the third grade at the primary level but as an optional subject. By 1998, many primary schools started teaching English from Grade 1. In 2008, the government introduced a new language plan to start teaching English from Grade 3 as a compulsory foreign language in schools. According to the new language policy, students' English level must be A1 according to the CEFR when they finish primary school, and A2 when they finish secondary school (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017). According to Bautista and Gonzalez (2006), today all schools in Vietnam must offer English in Grades 10 to 12, and it is compulsory to pass the foreign language at Grade 12.

The demand for English has become higher after Vietnam's membership in ASEAN in 1995, in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) in 1998, and in the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2006 which all have a significant impact on the Vietnamese economy including manufacturing and tourism. However, Vietnam faces challenges in English language teaching and learning.

In summary, all the ASEAN countries have been affected by strong contact with English, but the role of English in each ASEAN country has been different till now. All the Outer Circle countries of ASEAN which are Brunei, Malaysia, Singapore, and The Philippines, and an Expanding Circle country, Myanmar, had been British or American colonies. Even after independence from colonial occupation, English has been widely used in such domains as government, education, law, and media. These days, English is also used in digital media along with their respective local or national languages. In other Expanding Circle countries of ASEAN which are Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, although English is not used in domains such as government, law, and administration as in the Outer Circle countries, English is widely taught as a foreign language in the education domain. No matter how different the historical background of each country regarding English is, there is an overall trend in all ASEAN countries that English is now in the education system as a result of the formation of ASEAN. Although language policies in education in the ASEAN countries are complicated, nowadays teaching English can be seen as starting from primary 1 in most ASEAN countries.

Not only in education, nowadays, there is also the increasing role of English across the ASEAN region because of other factors such as globalization, advanced technology,

tourism, and regional and/or international workplace. As a result, the demand for English is high. According to Bolton and Bacon-Shone's (2020) data, approximately 0.3 million people in Brunei, 0.9 million in Cambodia, 13.4 million in Indonesia, 0.4 million in Laos, 16.5 million in Malaysia, 8.1 million in Myanmar, 3.2 million in Singapore, 70.9 million in The Philippines, and 9.9 million in Vietnam are English speakers.

Regarding the future of English in the ASEAN region, Bautista and Gonzalez (2006) predict that "the status of English is growing, and its use as a language of education, especially at the tertiary level, and its spread as an international language of commerce, trade, and international relations, are expanding, not contracting" (p. 139). They go on to note that there will be changes in the region: "There will be forces of standardization in the interests of international communication and mutual intelligibility, aided by electronic means through the mass media, the internet, the mobile phone, and the educational system itself" (p. 139). However, as mentioned in section 2.1, there are also new Englishes such as Singapore English, Malaysian English, and so on which have already emerged in the ASEAN region which might result in misunderstanding and non-understanding when English speakers from ASEAN countries communicate with each other or with English speakers from non-ASEAN countries.

2.4. English in the ASEAN setting: misunderstanding and non-understanding

The different roles of English in each ASEAN country have been discussed above in 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. Because of this, the proficiency of English speakers from each ASEAN country is also different, which can be vividly seen in the data presented in this dissertation. Additionally, as mentioned earlier, English speakers from ASEAN countries use their own varieties of English. For these reasons, there is no doubt that English speakers from ASEAN countries encounter misunderstanding and non-understanding in their interactions in English.

The term *misunderstanding* generally means "any kind of trouble or difficulty in understanding" (Kaur, 2017, p. 28). Misunderstandings occur when "the listener arrives at an interpretation which makes sense to her or him – but it wasn't the one the speaker meant" (Bremer, 1996, p. 40). Similarly, Deterding (2013) states that misunderstandings occur when the listener does not arrive at the meaning the speaker intended but arrives at the unintended meaning. According to Cogo and Pitzl (2016), misunderstanding "cannot be indicated or negotiated immediately because no participant is aware of its existence when it happens" (p. 340).

On the other hand, *non-understanding* refers to the "instances in communication where one or more participants in a conversation realize(s) that there is a gap in understanding, i.e., someone notices that understanding is not shared by all participants" (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016, p. 340). Non-understandings occur "when the listener realizes that s/he cannot make sense of (part of) an utterance, either because too few elements in the utterance are accessible [...] or because the frame of reference in which they are to be viewed is not clear" (Bremer, 1996, p. 40). According to Kaur (2010), in non-understandings, the listener thinks that he or she does not understand or has not arrived at understanding for what the speaker has said.

In any communication including ELF interactions, both misunderstanding and non-understanding are possible to occur. In ELF settings, since an important feature of ELF is diversity, speakers having diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, speaking different Englishes, and having different proficiency levels, misunderstanding and non-understanding may occur greatly in ELF interactions (Kaur, 2010, 2011b). As discussed in 2.3, the ASEAN ELF setting has all these features thus misunderstanding and non-understanding are very likely to occur in ASEAN ELF speakers' ELF interactions.

In looking at the previous literature on ASEAN ELF, Deterding (2013) finds 147 instances of misunderstanding and non-understanding that occurred in ELF interactions in his research. A more interesting and fruitful finding in Deterding is how these misunderstandings and non-understandings are resolved by ELF speakers. In this dissertation, instances of misunderstanding and non-understanding will not be classified, instead, looked at together because the research is focused on the communications strategies ASEAN ELF speakers use to avoid misunderstanding or non-understanding in their ELF interactions. In my opinion, the fruits of the research on how to overcome problems of misunderstanding and non-understanding are more important and beneficial for English Language Teaching (ELT) in the ASEAN region, especially for the Expanding Circle countries, than classifying the instances of misunderstanding and non-understanding. That is why, in this dissertation, I paid attention to how both misunderstanding and non-understanding together were dealt with or avoided in ELF interactions to achieve shared understanding in the ASEAN context.

In the ELF literature, Mauranen (2006) and Kaur (2010) state that ELF speakers are good at avoiding misunderstandings and non-understanding, and when there are problems in understanding, ELF speakers use communication strategies to arrive at understanding in their interactions (Watterson, 2008). In my research, I investigated the communication strategies

employed by the ASEAN ELF speakers which facilitated arrival at shared understanding among them and the achievement of successful ELF communication.

2.5. English as a lingua franca in English language teaching

In the ELF literature, Seidlhofer (2001) makes a proposal that "the majority of uses of English occur in contexts where it serves as a lingua franca, far removed from its native speakers' linguacultural norms and identities" (pp. 133-134), and that there is 'a conceptual gap' in the English language teaching industry. Fekete (2018) points this out, quoting Jenkins (2009), as follows:

> When talking of ELF, it is inevitably compared to ENL [English as a native language]; however, differences from the native language are judged differently in an EFL and ELF context. In the former setting these differences are deemed errors, and EFL speakers are perceived as deficient users of the language who should aim at native-like proficiency, because EFL is traditionally taught for communication with NSs [native speakers]. On the other hand, differences from ENL are not viewed as errors in ELF settings; even though ELF communication may involve NSs, differences are not considered errors as long as successful communication is achieved, because the primary aim of ELF for NNESs [non-native English speakers] is to be able to interact with other NNESs (Jenkins, 2009). (pp. 53-54).

Fekete (2018) also reminds that since every ELF speaker is not a proficient English speaker, while communicating in English, ELF speakers have to try to understand their interlocutors and also to try to be understood by their interlocutors. In doing so, they may use code-switching, paraphrasing, repetition, and the like which might be considered as errors in the ENL and EFL settings.

Ke (2012) makes a similar argument, stating that in the EFL context, English learners are taught native speaker norms assuming that they communicate in English with native speakers in the future. However, English becoming a global language alters the use of English. In ELF contexts, speakers use English as a common language to communicate with speakers of other languages, and English does not represent its speakers. In this situation, ELF speakers have their own lingua-culture representation and use their own Englishes which are non-standard Englishes and will not be regarded as appropriate English. Thus, ELF and EFL communications are different from each other. As a result, Ke suggests adjusting

English language teaching in order to meet the emergence of ELF, focusing on native speaker based language forms.

Sifakis, Lopriore, Dewey, Bayyurt, Vettorel, Cavalheiro, Siqueira and Kordia (2018) also suggest a change in the field of ELT since it has been shown in research that "learners begin to acknowledge the role of ELF as a valid ingredient of their language learning experience" (p. 155). It is time for a critical reflection on ELF by English language teachers and to consider ELF's "effect as a catalyst for change in established ways of thinking" (Widdowson, 2012, p. 5).

However, Jenkins (2016) argues that it is not time yet "to talk about an 'ELF pedagogy' but an ELF pedagogy will need to be very different from traditional foreign language pedagogy". She also says in the interview that the idea of ELF and non-native English speaker teachers should be discussed during teacher training courses. Only when teachers understand ELF well, they will make a change in their teaching by preparing the learners to be able to communicate in English in the situation that learners will encounter in their future. Jenkins and Seidlhofer (2001) suggest teachers and learners change their attitudes towards ELF, and ELT should focus on the relevant contexts which the learners will use English in their future. Seidlhofer (2011) also suggests adjusting the conceptualization of ELT pedagogy by focusing less on NS-based learner proficiency, and NS–NS and NS–NNS interaction, but by focusing more on intercultural communication.

Jenkins (2012) points out that ELT practitioners should decide whether ELF is relevant to their learners or not. Dewey (2012, quoted in Jenkins) confirms that helping teachers to explore the possibilities of an ELF approach is fruitful. Jenkins also mentions that younger non-native English learners aware of the English they learn through instructions at school does not reflect the real-life situation in which they have to use English. Sifakis et al. (2018) suggest things to know if ELF is integrated into ELT, including the needs and wants of the learners, and their target of learning English.

Looking at the ELT literature, a new approach has been proposed since some years ago. Kirkpatrick (2006) declares that "It is time […] for applied linguists to provide a description of lingua franca English, for by so doing they can liberate the millions upon millions of people currently teaching and learning English from inappropriate linguistic and cultural models" (p. 81). This implies that data and ideas coming from the actual English language use of ELF speakers should be taken into account in English language teaching, when teaching English to speakers of other languages. Jenkins (2007), furthermore, argues that ELF is not a variety of English, but "a 'contact language' between persons who share

neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen *foreign* language of communication" (Firth, 1996, p. 240, original emphasis), again pointing to the importance of local conditions of English language use. According to Marr and English (2019), "English has a fairly clearly defined standard written form, but huge flexibility with regard to spoken form" (p. 57). They also point out that ELF is a communicative practice, and English is a resource to be used in real-world contexts. Thus, flexible forms (either standard or non-standard) of English will be encountered for ELF speakers in ELF settings whether they communicate with native speakers or non-native speakers, and thus the crucial point is to arrive at understanding each other. According to Kirkpatrick (2014), in the ELF approach in ELT, the desired result is not to get the English level of becoming like a native speaker, but to arrive at mutual or shared understanding among ELF speakers. This dissertation was inspired by this idea and can hopefully shed light on the ELT world, especially of the ASEAN region.

Looking at ELT materials, Jenkins (2012) and Seidlhofer (2011) assert that the English in ELT materials represent English as a native language. This may be a factor which makes English teachers not to be liberated from current ways of teaching English which Kirkpatrick (2006) names "inappropriate linguistic and cultural models" (p. 81). However, Seidlhofer (2011) states that although there is no teaching material for English as a lingua franca approach, and "what is crucial is not *what* teaching materials are used but *how* they are used" (p. 201, Seidlhofer's original emphasis). Thus, teachers should "reconsider their beliefs and practices and make informed decisions about the significance of ELF for their own individual teaching contexts" (Jenkins et al., 2011, p. 306).

2.6. Teaching communication strategies to English learners

Debates on the teachability of communication strategies can be found in the previous literature on English language teaching. Watterson (2008) states that the essence of ELT is "equipping [ELF users] with linguistic and cultural behaviour which will enable them to communicate effectively with others, and also [...] equipping them with an awareness of difference, and with strategies for coping with such difference" (Alptekin, 2002, as cited in Watterson, 2008, p. 402) which can be achieved by understanding communication strategies used in ELF settings and exposing and teaching these communication strategies to English learners who will be ELF users in the real world context.

Dornyei (1995) argues that English language learners can benefit from the direct teaching of communication strategies. In his investigation on Hungarian English learners'

experience, he finds that there is "some support to Tarone & Yule's (1989) claim concerning the direct teaching of CSs" (p. 80), and learners' attitudes towards the teaching of communication strategies is favorable. He also mentions that the effectiveness of the teaching of communication strategies does not relate to the learners' proficiency level.

A similar situation is also found in the Asian context. Sato, Yujobo, Okada and Ogane (2019) note that when Japanese first-year students in their study who did not have instruction in communication strategies misunderstood their instructors, and they did not use communication strategies which can help them carry out successful communication. It is also suggested in their study to discourage students from using ineffective communication strategies and to encourage them to practice effective communication strategies in order to avoid non-understanding and arrive at understanding in the interactions.

The possibility of teaching communication strategies is also found in the ASEAN context. Kongsom (2016) suggests raising awareness of communication strategies through explicit instruction to language learners and training them to use the strategies in their communication. Based on the results of her study with Thai undergraduate students, she claims that teaching communication strategies is beneficial for the students, and "the instruction of CSs is possible and desirable among second or foreign language learners" (p. 64).

Given the findings in Dornyei (1995), Kongsom (2016) and Sato et al. (2019), a new trend of teaching English to learners should be thought about in the ELT industry. Findings in this dissertation provide evidence of what communication strategies work well in ELF interactions to help ELF speakers arrive at shared understanding, and these communication strategies are hoped to shed light on the ELT industry.

Chapter summary

ELF is the use of English as a contact language among multilinguals who do not have a shared language of their communication. In the ASEAN region, although there are more than 1000 languages spoken, there is no one common language which is mutually understandable among all the speakers in the region. That is why, English has become an ASEAN lingua franca, and also is regarded as the official language of ASEAN. Having diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and also different proficiency levels of English, ASEAN ELF speakers will face problems in understanding in their ELF interactions and thus will use communication strategies to make their conversation flow smoothly and to avoid misunderstandings and non-understanding in their ELF interactions so that they arrive at

shared understanding. In the ELT literature, there are debates on ELF and the teachability of communication strategies. However, previous literature supports the idea that raising awareness of communication strategies through explicit instruction to English language learners and training them to use the strategies in their communication can be beneficial for ELF speakers.

Chapter 3
Communication strategies

In Chapter 3, previous literature on communication strategies in general and communication strategies in the ELF context will be briefly reviewed first. Then, previous studies on communication strategies in which ASEAN ELF speakers are included as participants will be introduced. After that, the related literature concerning each communication strategy which was found in the ASEAN ELF interactions of the research for this dissertation will be discussed in this chapter.

3.1. Communication strategies in general

Different authors use a variety of definitions for communication strategies and the use of communication strategies, and there has been a long history of research concerning communication strategies. Willems (1987) asserts that speakers use communication strategies when they face difficulty in their communication. Dörnyei and Scott (1997) define communication strategies as speakers' actions in interaction to accomplish the goal(s) of that interaction. According to Tarone (1980), communication strategies are "tools used in a joint negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal" (1980, p. 420). Bialystok (1990) states that speakers try to find appropriate linguistic sources when they have difficulty in their communication. For Doqaruni (2013), communication strategies are essential in situations such as "when a speaker doesn't know a particular word or misunderstands the other speaker" (p. 177).

No matter how communication strategies are differently viewed and defined by various scholars, there are critical points of communication strategies: firstly, there is a difficulty for a speaker to communicate concerning what he or she wants to say, or there is a difficulty for a listener in understanding what the other speaker says. Secondly, the speaker tries to resolve the problem, or the listener tries to help the speaker understand or not to misunderstand the other speaker.

3.2. Communication strategies in the ELF context

A significant number of previous studies on ELF communication can be found in the ELF literature. Empirical studies have been conducted in various ELF settings such as in academic settings by Björkman (2014) and Kaur (2012, 2018), in business settings by Cogo (2016), Firth (1996) and Marra (2014) and others. Among the previous studies on ELF

communication, many of them such as Björkman (2011), Bjørge (2010), Cogo (2009), Kaur (2012), and Vettorel (2019) are some examples of research on communication strategies by ELF speakers in their ELF communication. The use of communication strategies helps ELF speakers understand each other and leads to successful communication in various ELF settings (Sato et al., 2019).

Many previous studies on ELF communication strategies reveal that the use of communication strategies is vital in ELF communication to resolve the speakers' difficulties in understanding each other and finally arrive at understanding which leads to successful communication in ELF talk. These studies suggest that particular strategies are effective for successful ELF communication. For example, Cogo (2009), Kaur (2012), and Watterson (2008) assert that ELF speakers are good at using strategies such as *repetition* to understand each other in their interactions. House (2003) finds in her research that there are few misunderstandings in ELF interactions of participants with different L1 backgrounds, and participants use communication strategies like *represents* (*echoing* in Deterding, 2013, p. 162, which refers to the interlocutor's partial or whole repetition of what the speaker has said) (p. 568). House also finds that a large amount of *let it pass* is used by ELF speakers in her study.

Although ELF speakers use various communication strategies in their ELF communication, not all communication strategies enhance understanding among speakers. Some communication strategies help conversation flow smoothly but do not help speakers to arrive at shared understanding. Further communication strategies are needed for speakers to achieve understanding among them. For example, Firth (1996) notes that ELF speakers use *let it pass*, which means that "[t]he hearer […] lets an unknown or unclear action, word, or utterance 'pass' on the (common sense) assumption that it will either become clear or redundant as talk progresses" (p. 243, Firth's original emphasis) and *make it normal* which means that when the speaker uses "linguistically infelicitous form" (p. 245), the listener does not signal or uses a strategy like *repair*, only paying attention to the content in what the speaker is saying. Sometimes, after ELF speakers' use of *let it pass*, the non-understanding part is still unclear. Given this situation, speakers must use further communication strategies such as *clarification request* in order to arrive at understanding by asking their interlocutor an explicit question about the unclear part of the communication or in other ways.

Similar to *clarification requests*, *confirmation checks* (a speaker's confirmation with his/her interlocutor for what the interlocutor has said or the speaker's understanding of what the interlocutor has said) and *repetition* (partial or whole repetition of what the speaker has

said or what the interlocutor has said) are also communication strategies which help ELF speakers to arrive at understanding. Marra's (2014) empirical study on ELF in a business context reveals that business professionals use communication strategies to avoid misunderstanding and achieve successful communication. His study reveals that *clarification requests*, *confirmation checks* and *repetition* are used by participants to repair misunderstanding and non-understanding among them.

Communication strategies used by ELF speakers can be categorized into different groups. For example, Kirkpatrick (2007b) categorizes the communication strategies used by ASEAN ELF speakers into *speaker strategies* and *listener strategies*, whereas Björkman (2014) and Deterding (2013) categorize the strategies they find in their studies into *self-initiated* and *other-initiated* communication strategies. No matter how various studies categorize communication strategies, the main point is how communication strategies facilitate speakers in their ELF communication. Kaur (2010), Mauranen (2006), Watterson (2008), and Vettorel (2019) find in their data that ELF speakers widely use communication strategies such as *asking for confirmation*, *asking for clarification*, *paraphrasing* and *repetition* "to make communication as intelligible as possible to their interlocutors" (Cogo, 2009, p. 257).

Not only these given communication strategies but also non-linguistic forms are used by ELF speakers. In Pietikäinen's (2018) research about private ELF talk, it is found that ELF dyads use "innovative extralinguistic means such as pointing, showing, […] and onomatopoeia" (p. 188) which help ELF speakers for successful communication.

3.3. Previous studies on communication strategies in ASEAN ELF interactions

Regarding communication strategies in ELF interactions in the ASEAN context, there are mainly three authors whose research work includes ASEAN ELF speakers as participants. Deterding's (2013) work pays attention to sources of misunderstandings and non-understanding in the ASEAN ELF interactions and how the speakers repair to achieve mutual understanding among them. Kaur's (2010, 2011a, 2011b) work is very similar to that of Deterding, paying attention to sources of misunderstandings and how ASEAN ELF speakers achieve understanding among them. In contrast, Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study pays attention to the general communication strategies employed by the ASEAN ELF speakers whose main goal of the interaction is to have smooth and collaborative communication.

Not all the participants in Deterding's (2013) and in Kaur's (2010, 2011a, 2011b) research were from ASEAN countries. Among nine participants in Deterding's, four were

Asian ELF speakers (three Chinese and one Japanese), and there was one Nigerian as a participant in his study whereas among 22 participants in Kaur's, six were non-ASEAN ELF speakers (two Korean, and one Italian, one Nigerian, one Spanish, and one Sri Lankan respectively). However, all the 20 participants in Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study were ASEAN ELF speakers – two from each ASEAN country. Regarding the data in Deterding's, Kaur's and Kirkpatrick's, Deterding and Kaur collected the data and set up their own corpora whereas Kirkpatrick used the selected data from the Asian Corpus of English (ACE). To my knowledge, Kirkpatrick's study is the one and only study in which participants are ELF speakers from ASEAN countries only. Similar to Kirkpatrick's study, all the participants in this present dissertation were ASEAN ELF speakers, and there were no non-ASEAN ELF speakers in the study. In this way, it is hoped that this present study may fill a gap in ELF literature on ASEAN ELF.

Deterding (2013) finds that ELF speakers use *self-initiated repairs* such as *correcting oneself* (p. 131), *unprompted paraphrase* (p. 132), *asking for help* (p. 136) and *other-initiated repairs* such as *asking for clarification* (p. 139), and *correcting* (p. 144) to avoid misunderstandings[2]. His study also reveals that *silence*, *minimal backchannels* and *let it pass* are found as responses by ELF speakers in misunderstanding. To show the problem with understanding, the speakers also use *laughter* (p. 154), or *change the topic* (p. 152-153), or the speakers just focus on the part they understand. According to Deterding, *topic fronting* (p. 157), *lexical repetition* (p. 159), *echoing* (some or all of what a speaker has said) (p. 162), and *collaborative completions* (p. 164) are used by ELF speakers to avoid misunderstanding in their interactions.

In her studies, Kaur (2010) finds that ELF speakers use *repetition* which she refers to as "the restatement of all or part of an ongoing turn or a preceding turn" (p. 196), *paraphrase* (p. 198) which she refers to the re-phrasing the problematic part of an utterance, various forms of *request for confirmation of understanding* (p. 199) such as *repetition*, the use of *you mean* (p. 200) and *yeah* with a rising intonation (p. 201), and also *summary* of the content of prior talk using a question intonation (p. 201), and *request for clarification* (p. 202) with "wh-clarification question or alternative-type question" (p. 203) to arrive at understanding among speakers. Kaur's (2011b) research also shows that ELF speakers use *self-repairs* at any level

---

[2] In discussing the previous studies of Deterding (2013), Kaur (2010, 2011a, 2011b), and Kirkpatrick (2007b), many new terms will appear which are used by those three scholars in their studies. However, I leave most unexplained because the elaboration of these terms are not relevant to my research. The terminology of the communication strategies found in my research will be discussed in detail in 3.4.

of the utterance, including phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic levels, such as *self-correction* (p. 2707) for mispronunciation, incorrect word choice, insertion for the missing word, and the like, and also [*r*]*aising explicitness* (p. 2709) by "replacing a general term used in the preceding segment of an ongoing utterance with a more specific one" (p. 2709), *inserting a qualifying lexical item* where and when necessary (p. 2710) and the like to enhance understanding among speakers.

Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study indicates that ELF speakers cooperate for effective communication and use various communication strategies such as [*l*]*exical anticipation/suggestion/correction* (pp. 122-124), *don't give up* (p. 124), *signal a request for repetition/clarification* (p. 125), *let it pass* with backchannels (pp. 126-127), *spelling out the word* (p. 128), *repeating the phrase* (pp. 128-129), *signal topic change explicitly* (p. 130), *participant paraphrase* and *speaker paraphrase* (p. 131), and *avoid using local or idiomatic terms* which are obscure to interlocutors (p. 132) in their interactions. Kirkpatrick also notes that ASEAN ELF speakers frequently use *laughter*, and it plays different roles such as to signal relief and delight, to hide nervousness, and to hide a lack of understanding or to signal that a speaker did not understand what the other said at first, but he or she understands later. Kirkpatrick mentions that the use of these communicative strategies in his study makes the communication of the ASEAN ELF speakers smooth and successful.

As mentioned earlier, Deterding (2013), Kaur (2010, 2011a, 2011b), and Kirkpatrick (2007b) assume that communicative strategies make ELF interactions smooth and successful. However, not all the communication strategies in their studies help the speakers to arrive at mutual understanding. For example, Firth's (1996) *let it pass* is found as frequently used by the ELF speakers in Deterding's study as well as in Kirkpatrick's study, assuming by the speakers that non-understanding will be naturally worked out later. Although *let it pass* helps the communication be smooth, it does not enhance mutual understanding among the speakers.

Deterding (2013) states that participants in Smit's (2010) study are more direct. They use *clarification requests* more than participants in Deterding's study who use *let it pass* frequently. He claims that participants in Smit's study "were together for some time so they felt they could be direct with each other, while the participants in (his) study had only just met each other" (p. 167). That is why Deterding hypothesizes that the use of strategies depends on the familiarity between the speakers. The familiarity might be the reason why participants in Kaur's studies use various types of *confirmation and clarification requests* since ELF speakers in her studies are students and teaching staff (mainly visiting academics) from an international master's degree program at a university in Malaysia. Pietikäinen (2018)

also suggests that the closeness between speakers is an important factor to be considered in scrutinizing language in interaction and understanding. On the other hand, the participants in Kirkpatrick's study are trainees on a short course, and they have known each other only for a couple of days before the recording for the data collection. In Deterding's research, participants are complete strangers who did not know each other before the time of the recording. Therefore, communicative strategies used by speakers close to each other may differ from those already found in Deterding, Kaur, and Kirkpatrick's research. That is why this dissertation included the variable of the interlocutors' familiarity.

Although these three researchers do not mention anything about the use of *non-linguistic strategies* like *gestures* in order to reach understanding among each other, Breiteneder, Pitzl, Majewski and Klimpfinger (2006) state that "nonverbal behavior is an essential part of ELF interactions" (p. 176), "verbal behavior is clearly foregrounded over non-linguistic behavior in the transcripts" (p. 176) in the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) project. Therefore, it is worth a further investigation of non-linguistic behavior in the ASEAN ELF interactions, and this category is included in this dissertation.

In brief, there are relatively few studies on communication strategies in the ASEAN context. Deterding's (2013) study is mainly on sources of misunderstanding although how ELF speakers repair to achieve understanding is discussed later. Similarly, Kaur's (2011a) study is only about sources of misunderstanding in the ELF context, but her studies (2010, 2011b) are about how ELF speakers manage to arrive at understanding. In both Deterding's and Kaur's studies, participants include non-ASEAN people. On the other hand, Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study includes only ASEAN ELF speakers but focuses on general communication strategies. Also, none of the previous studies pay attention to the closeness between the speakers except Pietikäinen (2018). Again, the studies do not include the use of non-linguistic strategies like gestures found in the pilot study (See Chapter 4.) as a useful way to reach understanding among speakers. In addition, the previous studies do not categorize their participants as those from the ESL sub-group or those from the EFL sub-group. The participants in their studies are a mix of those from ESL and EFL groups.

For these reasons, there is a need for research on communication strategies, including non-linguistic strategies, which can be used to avoid misunderstanding and non-understanding among the speakers, taking the familiarity between the speakers as a variable and using only the ASEAN ELF speakers.

3.4. Previous studies on communication strategies which are found in the present research as the ones which aid understanding among ELF speakers

The following discussion of communication strategies which could be found in the research, was based on the communication strategies found in previous ELF studies by other researchers, primarily from Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study, which was conducted with ASEAN ELF speakers.

3.4.1. Code-switching

Code-switching is an important communication strategy in the present research. In Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study on the communication strategies of ASEAN ELF speakers, he finds that although the participants from Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore have knowledge of Malay, there is only one example of *code-switching* or the use of a local term in his data. That is why Kirkpatrick claims that ASEAN ELF speakers do not code-switch to their native languages and other languages to avoid their interlocutors' misunderstanding or non-understanding.

However, Deterding (2013) finds some instances of *code-switching* in his data. Deterding asserts that although *code-switching* can be less common among ELF speakers who do not share a common language, *code-switching* occurs among his participants when a speaker thinks that the interlocutor can understand the code-switched language. Deterding gives the following example of how two ELF speakers successfully build rapport between themselves with *code-switching* in their ELF communication.

Extract 3.1. FTw +MHk (from Deterding, 2013)
Context: They are talking about how one finds one's spouse.

1	FTw	but chinese we call it *yuán* {fate}
2	MHk	yeah
3	FTw	and (.) it's you maybe your past life
4	MHk	<1> yeah </1>
5	FTw	<1> we believe </1> in karma
6	MHk	yeah
7	FTw	and
8	MHk	yeah there is
9	FTw	maybe

10	MHk	something like that you know is kind of fate you know
11		you met somebody
12	FTw	@@@

(Deterding, 2013, p. 124, original emphasis)

In the above example, when the Chinese participant from Taiwan (FTw) and the Chinese participant from Hong Kong (MHk) were talking about how one finds one's spouse, FTw code-switched to a Mandarin Chinese word, *yuán* in Line 1 which means fate, assuming that MHk whose first language is Cantonese knows some Mandarin Chinese, too. Deterding also states that MHk understood what it means as MHk used the word *fate* in Line 10. However, as other instances of code-switching in his data show misunderstanding between speakers, Deterding concludes that although "*code-switching* generally achieves accommodation between the speakers […] it causes miscomprehension instead" (p. 130).

However, some instances of the participants' *code-switching* found in one of the pilot studies for this dissertation helped their interlocutors understand what they were talking about. In that pilot study, one of the participants was of Thai nationality, and the other two participants had been living in Thailand for more than one and a half years at the time of the pilot study. Thus, they said that some of the Thai words were familiar to them. That is why when they code-switched into the Thai language, they hoped that their code-switches would be understood by one of the interlocutors, and they could arrive at understanding among them. As they expected, there were some instances in their ELF conversation in which their code-switches enhanced understanding among them. (See Extract 4.1 in Chapter 4 where this is presented in more depth.)

This finding in the pilot study is in line with Cogo (2009), regarding *code-switching* as a type of strategy which makes communication successful in ELF talk. According to McLellan (2012), English speakers from the ASEAN region are those "who have access to other languages and for whom English is as add-on". He also states that Englishes in the ASEAN region are *code-mixed varieties* (p. 267).

To define *code-switching*, it is "the straightforward insertion of words from another language" (Tarone, 1977, as cited in Bialystok, 1990, p. 41). According to Grosjean (2010), *code-switching* is a speaker's alternative use of two languages, switching to another language for a word, phrase, or sentence, then switching back to the base language. Thus, *code-switching* can occur at the single word level, or at that of a phrase, clause, and sentence. Although there is a distinction between *code mixing*, *code switching* and *borrowing*

38

(Klimpfinger, 2007), the current research is not focused on the distinction between these terms but is focused on the use of non-English terms in ELF interactions as a communication strategy to enhance understanding between speakers. Thus, the term *code-switching* is used as a general term to cover all these three categories, as in Klimpfinger's (2007) study, whenever non-English words are used together with English in the participants' talk.

3.4.2. Asking for clarification

Asking for clarification is mentioned as a communication strategy used by the ASEAN ELF speakers in both Deterding's (2013) and Kirkpatrick's (2007b) studies. According to Dörnyei and Scott (1997), a speaker *asks for clarification* by requesting the interlocutor to explain it with questions like *What do you mean?*, or by *repeating* a word or a structure with a question intonation (in other words, *repetition* with a question intonation).

3.4.2.1. Direct questions to ask for clarification

In ELF settings, Pietikäinen (2018) finds that ELF dyads in her study on private ELF talk frequently use *direct clarification questions* with question words such as *what* and the like. In Mauranen's (2006) study on ELF in an academic context, ELF speakers *ask for clarification* with *direct clarification questions* when a lack of understanding occurs.

Extract 3.2. S1+S3+S6 (from Mauranen, 2006)
Context: S6 is talking about a problem of not being a Finn.

1	S1:	yeah well I tried to explain this by centre periphery
2	S1:	yeah you tried [yeah]
3	S6:	[but it's] I mean I'm not a Finn so I (xx) so much in-
4		sight that's the problem
5	S3:	but that's an asset
6	S1:	*hm*?
7	S3:	that's an asset that you're not a Finn in this in this topic I think
8	S1:	*what does an asset mean?*
9	S3:	it's an advantage
10	S1:	ok yeah (.) well (.)

(Mauranen, 2006, p. 132, original emphasis)

In the above example, Mauranen explains that when S3 said *asset* in Line 5 and Line 7, S1 asked a direct question as a clarification request in Line 8. Then, S3 provided the meaning of that word in Line 9 which made S1 arrive at understanding.

As in Mauranen's study, *direct questions* as *clarification requests* were also found in the pilot studies for this dissertation, as will be discussed in the following chapter.

3.4.2.2. Repetition to ask for clarification

Deterding (2013) and Kirkpatrick (2007b) find that ASEAN ELF speakers use *repetition* to signal their non-hearing or non-understanding and to avoid misunderstanding in their ELF interactions.

Extract 3.3. F2+L2+My2 (from Kirkpatrick, 2007b)
Context: My2 is talking about the importance of the English language and IT skills to get a job in Malaysia.

1   My2: there has been a concerted effort by the government in my country to
2   improve the standard of spoken written English because currently there are many
3   unemployed graduates people who have degrees from Malaysian universities
4   who can't find jobs basically because of their poor English and their lack if IT
5   skills and the government has had to spend a lot of money retraining these people
6   in a special training program to give them the basic proficiency the proficiency in
7   the English language and IT skills (L2: I see) maybe you have read about this in
8   your newspaper no
9   F2: IT?
10   L2: IT?
11   F2: did are you referring to the the information technology?
12   M2[3]: yeah they lack IT skills and they lack er certain level of proficiency in the
13   English language
(Kirkpatrick, 2007b, p. 129, original emphasis)

In the above extract from Kirkpatrick (2007b), when My2 talked about IT skills, the interlocutors F2 and L2 needed help understanding what IT means. Thus, both F2 and L2

---

[3] There may be a typo in Kirkpatrick (2007b). I think it is My2.

repeated the word *IT* with a question intonation in Line 9 and Line 10 respectively to get clarification. Then, their repetitions as a clarification request were followed by F2's confirmation question again in Line 11.

3.4.2.3. Asking for clarification with sorry/pardon

Another way of *asking for clarification* used by the ASEAN ELF speakers in the previous studies is the use of *sorry/pardon*. Deterding (2013) notices in his data that the participants used "the word *sorry*, usually with rising intonation" (p. 141), and he discusses it with the following extract.

Extract 3.4. FBr +FJp (from Deterding, 2013)
Context: They have been talking about movies they like to watch.

1	FBr	... so do you watch any chinese shows or chinese movies?
2	FJp	hm (.) yeah? (.) yeah yeah yeah. then three day before? i went to
3		labuan with my friends? <1> and </1>
4	FBr	<1> sorry? </1> (.) where?
5	FJp	we went to labuan?
6	FBr	oh labuan
7	FJp	yeah

(Deterding, 2013, p. 141, original emphasis)

Similarly, Kirkpatrick (2007b) states that ASEAN ELF speakers use *pardon* as a *request for clarification*. In Kirkpatrick's example in the following extract, when S1 asked a question in Line 1, Mn1 used *pardon* with a question intonation to ask for clarification in Line 2.

Extract 3.5. S1+Mn1 (from Kirkpatrick, 2007b)
Context: S1 is asking about learning English late.

1	S1: But how did you manage to cope when you were taught English at the very
2	later stage? (1.4 second pause)
3	Mn1: Pardon?
4	S1: How how are you all able to cope you know when in your during your time,

5   you were taught English only at secondary level?
(Kirkpatrick, 2007b, p. 126, original emphasis)

In the extract above, when FBr asked FJp about watching Chinese shows or movies, FBr did not understand the word FJp used in Line 3 (i.e., labuan). So, FBr used *sorry* in Line 4 as a clarification request, followed by a question word *where* in Line 4.

Looking at Deterding's (2013) and Kirkpatrick's (2007b) examples above, it can be assumed that the participants in the present research may also use *sorry/pardon* when they ask for clarification.

3.4.3. Lexical support

Regarding lexical items, Kirkpatrick (2007b) proposes three communication strategies, namely *lexical anticipation*, *lexical suggestion*, and *lexical correction* which are commonly found in ELF communication in the ASEAN context. In these lexical strategies i.e., *lexical replacement* in Kaur's (2020) term, a speaker provides a word or words to his/her interlocutor when the interlocutor seems to need that/those lexical item(s). Kaur claims that ELF speakers are skillful in cooperating with each other for lexical choice when one needs appropriate lexical items in his/her talk. According to Kaur, an ELF speaker supports lexical items when the interlocutor uses an inaccurate word or an approximation.

Extract 3.6. B1+F1+T1 (from Kirkpatrick, 2007b)

Context: They are talking about the education system in their countries.

1   F1: and the parents are well educated whereas {T1:eh hm} those coming from

2   the public er {B1: school} really come from lower er

3   B1: **income**

4   F1: **income families** {F+T1: ehm yeah} that's why er during our national exams

5   this (//) children coming from the private schools they get higher scores than

6   the ones who are {F+T ehm} in the government in the elementary {F+T1 ehm}

7   school except for some science high schools{B1:ehm} and the University of the

8   Philippines {B1: yes} system students [they get high grades

9   B1: for our high school] we get good results because we {F:ehm} we after

10   standard six or primary six they primary school they go to a secondary

11   {T1:correct}

12   school so our school is a government school and we get students from private

13   school {T: yes} and students from the government school{F:eh hm}so and ehm

14   er these people who've who are who are from the government er the private

15   school usually do better {T1:ehm} and they will continue doing

16   F1: **better**

17   B1: **better** until {T1: right} er ['O' levels {V1:yeah yeah}or or high school {Fx2

18   +T: yeah} at the end of the high school year

(Kirkpatrick, 2007b, pp. 122-123, original emphasis)

The example above is Kirkpatrick's (2007b) example of *lexical anticipation* in which B1 supplied the word *school* in Line 2, B1 also anticipated the word *income* in Line 3, and in return F1 supplied the word *better* in Line 16.

Kirkpatrick also finds in his data that ASEAN ELF speakers use *lexical suggestions* in their ELF communication.

Extract 3.7. B1+T1+F1 (from Kirkpatrick, 2007b)

Context: They are talking about teaching English.

1   T1: right but actually {F:ehm} we can share some some experiences right { F:

2   ehm} because teaching grammar is a continuation con[tinual process

3   B1: continuous process]

4   T1: right

(Kirkpatrick, 2007b, p. 123, original emphasis)

In Line 3 of the extract above, when T1 was facing difficulty in finding a correct word in Line 2, B1's lexical suggestion in Line 3 helped T1's talk become successfully accomplished.

Although the instances of *lexical anticipation* and *lexical suggestion* in the above extracts show there was mutual understanding between the two speakers which would lead to successful communication, the *lexical anticipations* and the lexical *suggestions* did not enhance understanding. Even without those *lexical anticipations* and *lexical suggestions*, the communication would keep flowing. However, *lexical correction* in the following extract really helped the interlocutor's talk to become accomplished successfully.

Extract 3.8. C1+I1+S2 (from Kirkpatrick, 2007b)

Context: They are talking about the education system in their countries.

1   I1: so how long do do they have to **sit** in the junior high school and senior high

2   school?

3   C1: ehm I've been teaching there for two years after my graduation er from er

4   I1: no I mean er er how many years do students have to **sit {S2: stay} to stay** in

5   the junior high school {C1: ehm} and the senior high school?

6   C1: er in in in Cambodia er junior high school starts from grade seven

(Kirkpatrick, 2007b, p. 124, original emphasis)

In the extract above, which is from Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study, a participant's lexical correction helped the interlocutor continue his/her talk without any problem which led to the other interlocutor's understanding. Kirkpatrick states that in this example, the reason for S2's lexical correction in Line 4 was to help C1 understand what I1 was asking. The lexical item *sit* in I1's question in Line 1 made C1 need help understanding what I1 was asking. That is why S2 provided a correct word i.e., *stay* in Line 4 which helped C1 understand what I1 was asking. Then, there was I1's uptake immediately after S2's correction in Line 4 which Kirkpatrick comments as "no evidence of irritation and unease on the part of I1 here" (p. 124).

Kirkpatrick also affirms that the multilingual ASEAN ELF speakers in his study are comfortable using these kinds of communication strategies between them to help each other, but if there is a native speaker among them and uses this kind of communication strategies, it might not be regarded as helping them but as correcting their errors which might make them feel less comfortable.

3.4.4. Asking for confirmation

Another communication strategy which ASEAN ELF speakers in the research may use to avoid misunderstanding and non-understanding is *asking for confirmation*. They may ask for confirmation from their interlocutors to confirm their understanding of their interlocutor's words.

3.4.4.1. Asking for confirmation with a direct question

One of the communication strategies ELF speakers use to *ask for confirmation* is using a *direct question*. According to Björkman (2014), Cogo (2010) and Marra (2014), ELF speakers *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors in order to check their understanding, or to signal their still lack of arriving at understanding and get confirmation from the speaker. In doing so, they use a *direct question* (*overt question* [p. 133] in Björkman's study). The following example is from Björkman's (2014) study in which a speaker used a *direct question* in *asking for confirmation* of his/her understanding of what the interlocutor had said.

Extract 3.9. S1+S2+S3 (from Björkman, 2014)
Context: They are talking about aircraft speed.

1 <S2>but it is the condition to have er a flutter speed er larger than divergence speed but I

2 think in in for aircraft it's er it's er, never have guessed that you have divergence speed great

3 er less than the flutter speed so erm I I **put very big mass** er which is half the mass of the

4 total wing but I think in a real real case you can't do that because you don't want to have

5 flutter speed er larger than the divergence speed but we we</S2>

6 <S3>mhm</S3>

7 <S2>that's why I find it from this reason</S2>

8 <S1>**with with putting a mass do you mean that you made the wing more stiff**</S1>

9 <S2>no you just put a mass without any stiffness</S2>

10 <S1>**without any stiffness**</S1>(question intonation)

11 <S2>yeah you just you know just just like a something you you glue on it or you you stick on

12 it or something</S2>

(Björkman, 2014, p. 133, original emphasis)

In the extract, when S2 said *I put very big mass* in Line 3, S1 first repeated what S2 previously said. S1 repeated it as *with putting a mass* in Line 8, then followed by a direct question i.e., *do you mean that you made the wing more stiff* to check for understanding. Then, when S2 provided an answer in Line 9, S1 raised a question again in Line 10, repeating what S2 had said in Line 9 by adding a question intonation. So, S2 confirmed in Line 11, adding a further explanation.

3.4.4.2. Asking for confirmation with repetition

Another form of *asking for confirmation* ELF speakers use is *repetition* in their interactions. According to Kaur (2012) and Mauranen (2006), *repetition* is found as a common communication strategy ELF speakers use. Kaur also states that *repetition* can be in an exact form or with some variation or in a reformulated form. In addition, Kaur states that *repetition* can be classified based on who uses the repetition: the speaker or the interlocutor, how repeated: exact repetition or repetition with some variation or reformulated repetition, and when repeated: immediate repetition or delayed repetition. Similar to Kaur, Deterding (2013) also finds that ELF speakers *repeat* some or all of what their interlocutors have said. Unlike others, Deterding uses the term *echoing* (p. 162) which he mentions it as similar to *lexical repetition* (p. 162).

The following example is from Mauranen's (2006) study in which a speaker used *repetition* in a reformulated form to *ask for confirmation* from the interlocutor.

Extract 3.10. S1+S2 (from Mauranen, 2006)

Context: They are talking about Estonia.

1	S1:	ok but what can we do if we say Estonian citizen citizenships who
2		studies in in Estonia at school but teaching in Russian? is it ok in
3		Russian? i know some
4	S2:	no ok they because they they have a law on minority you ki- you
5		you you have a right to to have your school and language but it's i
6		mean how i understand this problem it's it's kind of like the the
7		whole policy it's just like to to wait to somehow to put Russian on
8		the back and maybe it's fair i don't know but like for example then
9		have a school but they there is no fund from government so people
10		can't really eh
11	S1:	so there is another problem how to integrate such kind of people
12		who who who are Estonian but they don't speak [Estonian?]
13	S2:	*[oh you] mean*
14		*Estonian?*
15	S1:	yeah i mean [e- e-] Estonian citizenships they are they are Estonian
16	S2:	[oh]
17		but they study in school in Russian and teaching is in the Russian

18   /.../

(Mauranen, 2006, p. 143, original emphasis)

In the extract above, when S1 heard S2's answer for his/her question in Lines 1, 2 and 3, S1 asked for confirmation from S2 to check his/her understanding of what S2 had said. Here, S1 used a repetition in Lines 11 and 12 in a reformulated form of the question already asked in Lines 1, 2 and 3. Hearing this repetition, S2 confirmed S1 with a confirmation check question in Line 13. Then, S1 used another repetition in Line 15 to answer S2's confirmation check question in Lines 13 and 14. Here, among the two repetitions S1 used in this extract, the first repetition i.e., the one in Lines 11 and 12 is to confirm his/her understanding of S2.

3.4.4.3. Asking for confirmation with a minimal check

Another way of *asking for confirmation* is using a *minimal check*. According to Mauranen (2006), ELF speakers use *minimal confirmation checks* in their ELF communication. Mauranen provides the following example as "a typical case where a speaker inserts a confirmation check (yeah?) in his or her turn, and somebody responds to it, as S2 does here by a minimal acknowledgment (yeah)" (p. 136, original emphasis).

Extract 3.11. S1+S2 (from Mauranen, 2006)
Context: S1 is talking about writing a research paper.

1   S1:   /. . ./ eh (.) then there are how to convince your reader? And this is
2   also i- this is now kind of a (.) eh (.) i- is included in the first part of
3   the pap- of this (.) paper eh using authorities data data can be also
4   own experiences and observations, theories, concepts, methods, pre-
5   vious studies, also morals, values, and ethics (.) as I think we see in
6   Renata's paper (.) *yeah*? (.) one part
7   S2:   *yeah*

(Mauranen, 2006, p. 136, original emphasis)

3.4.5. Non-linguistic strategies

Communication strategies also include the use of *non-linguistic* or *non-verbal means* (The term *non-linguistic* will be used in this dissertation.) such as *mime*, *gesture*, *facial expression*, *gaze*, *touching*, and *sound imitation* (Dörnyei, 1995; Hoffer, 2002). Kimura and

Canagarajah (2018) also state that "[h]uman interactions are not restricted by linguistic boundaries", and they point out that "current ELF scholarship largely overlooks the place of non-verbal resources such as gestures" (p. 302). Vázquez, Luzón and Pérez-Llantada (2019) also mention that the use of *gestures* in communication can help speakers achieve understanding in ELF settings. However, none of Deterding (2013), Kaur (2010, 2011b) and Kirkpatrick (2007b) mention anything about the use of *non-linguistic means* like *gestures* as communication strategies when ASEAN ELF speakers try to arrive at shared understanding between each other in their ELF interactions. According to Goldin-Meadow (2007), bilinguals use more *gestures* when they use their less dominant language than when they use their more dominant language. In ELF interactions in the ASEAN context, speakers use English as their second or additional language thus they will most likely use more *gestures* when they speak in English than when they use their mother tongue.

Among previous literature on ELF interactions, Pietikäinen (2018) claims that ELF speakers use *extralinguistic means* (p. 204). Among four groups of *gestures* Laskowski (2001) categorizes, *descriptive gestures* are used "to indicate size, shape, location, and function of something, like choppy ocean waves, a huge mountain or a miniature creature" (p. 104).

Extract 3.12. C+K (from Pietikäinen, 2018)

Context: They are talking about icing sugar in the cookies.

1	K:	think this eh on- is sugar is in the cake is in the
2		cookies
3	C:	u-uh?
4		(0.7)
5	C:	[ba-]
6	K:	[on the:] (.) on the flo:r (flour) m- (0.3) s- was
7		in the flo:r (flour)
8		(0.9)
9	C:	uh?
10	K:	the-uh fff (sigh) (0.7) <u>this</u>
11		(0.8)

12 → C: *melis*. uh-↑huh

        icing sugar (Nor)

(Pietikäinen, 2018, p. 203, original emphasis)

In Extract 3.12 which is from Pietikäinen's study, K pointed to or showed the interlocutor, C, the box of icing sugar when K said *this* in Line 10 of the extract. As deictics require accompanying gestures, Pietikäinen assumes (because the study was done using the audio data only) that her participant used an accompanying gesture together with the utterance. As in Extract 3.12, since she finds her participants' use of deictics and *non-linguistic means* like *pointing* facilitate understanding in the ELF couples' communication, Pietikäinen asserts that ELF speakers use "innovative extralinguistic means such as pointing, showing, drawing, acting, deixis, and onomatopoeia" (2018, p. 188) in their ELF interactions to arrive at shared understanding among the speakers.

To summarize the communication strategies discussed in 3.4, the speakers' use of *direct questions*, *repetition* and *sorry/pardon* to get *clarification* from their interlocutors, their *lexical support* to their interlocutors, the speakers' use of *direct questions*, *repetition*, and *minimal checks* to ask for their interlocutors' *confirmation* for their understanding on what their interlocutors have said, and the speakers' use of *non-linguistic means* facilitate ELF speakers in their ELF interactions. Looking at these communication strategies, it can be assumed that the participants in the present research may also use them in their ELF interactions.

Chapter summary

Previous literature on communication strategies in general and communication strategies in ELF contexts are briefly introduced first in this chapter, and then followed by previous studies on communication strategies in the ASEAN ELF interactions. After that, communication strategies found in the present research which aid understanding among the speakers are discussed based on previous studies of communication strategies in ELF communication, primarily focused on Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study. All in all, communication strategies are presented and discussed in this chapter, specifically *code-switching* in 3.4.1, *asking for clarification* in 3.4.2 which is categorized into three sub-strategies such as *direct questions to ask for clarification* in 3.4.2.1, *repetition to ask for clarification* in 3.4.2.2, and *asking for clarification with sorry/pardon* in 3.4.2.3, *lexical support* in 3.4.3, *asking for*

confirmation in 3.4.4 which is categorized into three sub-strategies such as *asking for confirmation with a direct question* in 3.4.4.1, *asking for confirmation with repetition* in 3.4.4.2 and *asking for confirmation with a minimal check* in 3.4.4.3, and finally *non-linguistic strategies* in 3.4.5.

Chapter 4
Methodology

The research methodology used in this dissertation draws on the approach found in previous studies on ELF by other scholars. For example, in Mauranen's (2006) study, the data was collected in an academic setting, and a close and in-depth analysis was carried out on instances of misunderstanding. Then, communication strategies were investigated in the transcription of the data she collected. As in Mauranen's study, in the present research, after picking up on instances which seem to be examples of misunderstanding and non-understanding, there was an investigation of how the participants dealt with their misunderstanding and non-understanding. In doing so, the communication strategies from Deterding's (2013) study, Kaur's (2010, 2011b) studies, and Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study (and if necessary, those from other studies on ELF communication) were referred to since the ones in these studies are employed by the ASEAN ELF speakers and may be similar to the ones which would be found in the present research. Examples of these communication strategies were discussed in 3.4 in Chapter 3.

The research design of the present study was based on the lessons learned from the pilot studies, which were named the "Bangkok pilot study" and the "Hungary pilot study". In this chapter, these two pilot studies will be discussed first. In doing so, some of the empirical data from the two pilot studies were included in the discussion because they were directly related to the lessons learned from the two pilot studies, from which insights to change the research design of the main study were gained.

After the discussion of the two pilot studies, the detailed description of the methodology for the main study will follow. First, the sampling methods utilized for the participants, how the participants were contacted for data collection and then the descriptions of the participants will be presented. Secondly, how the data collection procedure was conducted will be presented in detail. After that, the presentation of different types of data collected in the main study will follow. Finally, how the collected data were analyzed to investigate the research questions will be discussed.

4.1. The pilot studies

The Bangkok pilot study was conducted in Bangkok, Thailand, with three participants from three different ASEAN countries. The task was a group discussion to talk about foods they like and dislike in Thailand. There was a lesson learned from that pilot study, and further

insights were also gained, which will be presented here. In the Bangkok pilot study, during the group discussion, as there were three speakers in the task, sometimes one of the speakers neglected an interlocutor's signal for non-understanding (or maybe the speaker did not notice it) and just paid attention to the other interlocutor. If there were only two participants in that pilot study, this kind of situation might not have occurred. Following this, another pilot study, with a revised methodology, was conducted in Hungary, named the Hungary pilot study, to examine if the number of participants in an ELF interaction has an impact on participants' responses or not. This second pilot study led to a further revision in the research methodology which resulted in the procedures outlined beginning in section 4.2. In this section, 4.1, the discussion will be about lessons learned from the two pilot studies together with communication strategies found in these pilot studies which validated that the data for the main study (i.e., communication strategies which help speakers arrive at sharded understanding) could indeed be captured.

4.1.1. The Bangkok pilot study

Before the main research began on the communication strategies which facilitate arriving at shared understanding in ASEAN ELF interactions, a pilot study was conducted with three ASEAN ELF speakers in December 2019. The data was collected at the Mahidol University in Thailand, where there are students from different ASEAN countries such as Indonesia, Myanmar, and the Philippines. English is the language of instruction at the university, and students need an IELTS score of 5 and above to join Mahidol University.

4.1.1.1. Data and participants in the Bangkok pilot study

As mentioned earlier in 4.1, the task used in the Bangkok pilot study was a group discussion to talk about foods they like and dislike in Thailand. That discussion was video-recorded as well as audio-recorded. During the recording of the participants' discussion, observation notes were also written by the researcher. Thus, the data from the Bangkok pilot study consists of a transcription of a video and an audio recordings of a conversation among the three ASEAN ELF speakers, and the researchers' observation notes. The data also includes the notes from the retrospection which were conducted immediately after the video and audio recordings. The profiles of each participant can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.1

The Profiles of Each Participant from the Bangkok Pilot Study

Participant	Gender	Age	Nationality	First language	Other languages known
B1	Female	24	Burmese/Myanmar	Burmese	English
I1	Female	23	Indonesian	Butonese	Bahasa Indonesia, English
T1	Male	24	Thai	Thai	English, some Khmer

For the Bangkok pilot study, "convenience sampling" (Patton, 2002, p. 241) was employed to obtain participants. Presenters and members of the audience during an international conference at Mahidol University, in which the researcher herself was one of the presenters, and members of the Mahidol University international student community were requested to participate in the pilot study. Two Thai participants from the former and three international students (two Indonesian and one Burmese) from the latter replied that they were available for a few days to participate in the pilot study. Thus, participants were from only three ASEAN countries in the pilot study. Although there were five participants in the pilot study, the data from only one conversation was included in this dissertation. All the three participants in that conversation were from the ASEAN countries where English is used as a foreign language. They all were complete strangers, as they had never met before the day of the recording, even though they all were studying at the same university. In the transcripts, the participants' names were coded as B1 for the Burmese participant, I1 for the Indonesian participant, and T1 for the Thai participant.

The video-recorded interaction lasted for about 22 minutes. The devices used in the recording were a Zoom H6 Audio Recorder, a Sony Digital 4K Video Camera Recorder, and a mobile phone, each device focusing on each participant in the activity. The topic of the conversation in the recording was Thai foods they like and Thai foods they don't like. According to Meierkord (2000), in ELF talk, speakers prefer talking about safe topics such as food at their hostel and their classes. That is why a topic related to food was chosen since this kind of topic was the one all the participants could participate in. After the recording, the participants watched the video files (and listened to the audio files if necessary), and stimulated recall was employed with the support of the prompts the researcher gave based on

the observation notes made during the recording. This was done individually first. After that, the audio files were listened to again by all the speakers who participated in the task to check whether the speakers achieved understanding with each other or not. In doing so, each participant also provided information on the moments they misheard what the other speakers said.

4.1.1.2. Lessons learned from the Bangkok pilot study

Since there were three participants in the assigned task to talk about Thai foods they like and Thai foods they don't like, unlike in pair work, all the participants in the conversation could not be equally engaged. Sometimes, during the task, it was noticed that a speaker neglected an interlocutor's signal for non-understanding (or maybe the speaker did not notice it) and just paid attention to the other interlocutor. In this way, one of the speakers in the group discussion could not arrive at understanding of what his/her interlocutor was saying, and that speaker's non-understanding was not resolved.

An example of this situation in which a participant neglected an interlocutor's signal for non-understanding in the Bangkok pilot study can be seen in Extract 4.1.

Extract 4.1. B1+I1+T1 (from the Bangkok pilot study)
Context: I1 is talking about an ingredient called /pʰatʃĩ/, which means coriander, which she does not like in Thai foods.

1	I1:	First, I- Yes I like it. But, then I asked her what is this? ah: leaves.
2	T1:	Aww.
3	I1:	We call it ผักชี /pʰatʃĩ/[1].
4	B1:	ผักชี /pʰatʃĩ/?
5	T1:	[/pʰa/- ah]=
6	I1:	[You know?]
7	T1:	=/tʃĩ/. Arr yes.
8	I1:	The leaves.
9	B1:	I don't know it.
10	I1:	I don't like it very much.
11	T1:	Hm:
12	B1:	That one also smell?

| 13 | I1: | Not-not smell but the taste is kind of ((makes a sound of |
| 14 | | disappointment)) different for me. I've never tasted before. |

¹ ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ means coriander.

In the extract above, when I1 was talking about ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/, B1 signaled her non-understanding by repeating ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ in Line 4. However, the other interlocutor, T1, understood what ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ is. When I1 asked T1 *You Know?* in Line 6, T1 said *yes* in Line 7. Even though B1 said *I don't know it* in Line 9 to signal again for her non-understanding, her signal was neglected. There was a lack of uptake on B's signal for non-understanding from any of her interlocutors.

In this extract, an interesting communication strategy which aided the participants to arrive at shared understanding was found, *code-switching*. In the Bangkok pilot study, it was found that all the participants used non-English terms in their conversation. For example, when I1 (in Extract 4.1) and B1 (in Extract 4.2 which will be discussed later) were talking about the ingredients they do not like in Thai foods, I1 code-switched with the word ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ in Line 3 of Extract 4.1. In the follow-up interviews with the participants in the Bangkok pilot study, I1 said that she did not know how to say that in English, and so she just used a local term ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ with a little hope that the term may be used the same or with a similar pronunciation in one of the interlocutors' languages, and that one of them would know and understand the word. When she code-switched, I1 first thought that ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ was an Indonesian word, and only at the time of the follow-up interview, she realized that ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ is not an Indonesian word, but that ผักชี /pʰaṭʃĭ/ is a Thai word which means coriander. That is why, when I1 asked for confirmation with the question *You know?* in Line 6, T1 said *yes* in Line 7. In this example, I1's code-switch made T1 achieve understanding, and so the example shows that code-switching can facilitate successful ELF communication. In this extract, there was also an interesting finding that at first, I1 did not actually know from which language the code-switch she did was. Only in the retrospection did she realize that the word was from the Thai language. This situation validated that the use of stimulated recall in methodology worked well for the research.

Another lesson learned from the Bangkok pilot study also related to having three participants in the conversation. There were some instances of Firth's (1996) *let it pass* strategy found in the pilot study possibly because all the participants were strangers to each

other, and that recording occasion was their first time meeting with each other. Deterding (2013) finds in his data set that there are many instances where the participants *let it pass*, keeping *silent* even though they do not understand their interlocutors, and later finds that this kind of *silence* leads to misunderstanding. In the Bangkok pilot study, participants sometimes *let it pass* and kept *silent* although they did not achieve understanding each other. This may be because they were strangers to each other. If they were not strangers, they might not have *let it pass* when they encountered non-understanding. Another possibility of their *let it pass* was that there were three speakers in that group discussion. If there were only two speakers, the use of *let it pass* and keeping *silent* might not have occurred.

The following extract (Extract 4.2) was an example of a speaker's *let it pass* and keeping *silent* even though she did not arrive at understanding.

Extract 4.2. B1+I1+T1 (from the Bangkok pilot study)
Context: B1 is talking about an ingredient called /kʰɒntʃãi/, which means Chinese celery, which she does not like in Thai foods.

1	B1:	That hot-pot has they gave us umm ah: the water glory, cabbage, that
2		that kind of vegetable.
3	T1:	Yes.
4	B1:	I don't know the name.
5	T1:	That's I think it's a kind of celery.
6	B1:	Maybe.
7	T1:	That is the I think is
8	I1:	Ah:
9	T1:	ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃãi/[1]. They call it ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃãi/.
10	B1:	Yes.
11	I1:	Not ผักชี /pʰạtʃĭ/? ((laughs))
12	B1:	((laughs))
13	T1:	Not ผักชี /pʰạtʃĭ/. Not ผักชี /pʰạtʃĭ/.
14	I1:	((laughs))
15	B1:	((laughs))
16	T1:	ผักชี /pʰạtʃĭ/- ผักชี /pʰạtʃĭ/ is the the green one.
17	I1:	Ah yes yes yes.

18	B1:	Yeah.
19	T1:	But, this one is light green.
20	B1:	Green, yes. It looks light green and yeah I'm not sure the name.
21	T1:	Hmm hmm.
22	B1:	But, I don't like the smell that that that plant. And they add it.
23	T1:	They put it on the hot-pot,
24	B1:	Yeah in the hot-
25	T1:	with the morning glory, pumpkin?
26	B1:	Yeah. The morning glory, pumpkin.
27	T1:	I think it's ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃāi/.
28	I1:	Ah:
29	B1:	Yeah. So when they add it, I don't want to eat. ((laughs))

[1] ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃāi/ means Chinese celery.

In the extract above, I1 did not understand but kept silent without interrupting her two interlocutors. In the extract, when B1 was talking about an ingredient she did not like in Thai hot-pot[4], I1 did not know what that ingredient was. After B1 gave the information that the ingredient she was saying was put in the hot-pot, together with other vegetables such as water glory and cabbage, T1 suggested that the ingredient B1 was talking about was celery in Line 5. Then T1 said that it was called ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃāi/ in Line 9. When T1 code-switched with the word ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃāi/ in Line 9, I1 asked him if it was ผักชี /pʰa̤tʃī/ or not. After T1 replied to her that it was not ผักชี /pʰa̤tʃī/, I1 let it pass and did not ask for any clarification anymore even though she did not understand what celery or ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃāi/ was. Although B1 and T1 kept talking about that ingredient, I1 kept silent till the end of their talk about ขึ้นฉ่าย /kʰɒntʃāi/. If there were only two speakers in their conversation, i.e., a dyad in which I1 and B1 were participants or a dyad of I1 and T1, I1 might not have used *let it pass* and kept *silent* in this situation and might have tried to arrive at understanding by using other communication strategies such as *asking for clarification* and *non-linguistic strategies*.

[4] Hot-pot is originally a Chinese food commonly found in mainland Southeast Asia. Mostly Chinese decedents eat it during celebrations and gatherings. Nowadays, localized versions of hot-pot can easily be found as street food in many Southeast Asian countries. It is a soup stock in a pot simmering on a burner, and a variety of meat, meatballs, seafood, and vegetables of one's choice are put into the pot and eaten immediately after being cooked.

After experiencing these kinds of situations, i.e., a participant's *neglect* to pay attention to his/her interlocutor's signal for non-understanding (neglect even after the second time signal) in Extract 4.1 and a participant's keeping *silent* despite her non-understanding in Extract 4.2, it became clear that if there were only two participants in that pilot study, *neglect* for the signals of a participant's non-understanding as in Extract 4.1, and keeping *silent* for lack of understanding as in Extract 4.2 might not have occurred. That is why, when the data collection was started in Hungary, the researcher decided not to collect the data with more than two participants.

Another lesson from the Bangkok pilot study was learnt in the retrospection with the participants. It was found that what a participant heard may have been different from what the interlocutor actually had said.

Extract 4.3. B1+I1 (from the Bangkok pilot study)
Context: They are talking about buying groceries in Bangkok.

1	B1:	And for the vegetables and meat, I bought I always buy at Makro[1].
2	I1:	Ah yeah yes yes.
3	B1:	Every month.
4	I1:	Yes yes. You stock it?
5	B1:	Yeah.

[1] Makro is a chain grocery store in Thailand.

In the retrospection concerning Line 4 of Extract 4.3 above, B1 said that she heard *store*. However, her interlocutor (I1) said that she did not say *store* but said *stock* in Line 4. That is why it was necessary in the data collection of the main study to make sure of what each participant heard and/or understood compared to what the interlocutor was saying. This finding also validated the idea that stimulated recall would need to be employed in the methodology for the main study.

In the Bangkok pilot study, it was also found that a participant used the same communication strategy for different functions. Extract 4.4 is an example of a participant's use of the same communication strategy for different purposes.

Extract 4.4. B1+I1+T1 (from the Bangkok pilot study)

Context: T1 is asking B1 and I if they eat raw food.

1	T1:	Do you eat the raw[1] food?
2	B1:	Law food? What is it?
3	T1:	Raw-raw[2].
4	I1:	Oh! [raw food.]
5	T1:	[R-A-W.]
6	I1:	Yes yes.
7	B1:	Aww raw food!

[1] T1 pronounced /lɔː/.

[2] T1 pronounced /lɔː/ again.

In the extract above, when T1 asked B1 and I1 whether they ate raw food or not, T1 pronounced *raw* as /lɔː/ in his question in Line 1. As a result, his interlocutors, B1 and I1, did not understand him. Thus, B1 first repeated the keywords from T1's question to signal her non-understanding in Line 2, and then B1 added a direct question to ask for clarification from T1 in Line 2. Then, T1 used a repetition with the keyword to make B1 understand his question, but he still pronounced *raw* as /lɔː/. After T1's repetition in Line 3, B1 still did not understand, but I1 arrived at understanding and thus signaled her understanding with a repetition in Line 4. Then, T1 spelled out the word in Line 5. In this example, T1's attempt to spell out the word made B1 finally understand what T1 was saying, thus, incidentally, demonstrating that *spelling out the word* can be regarded as a communication strategy which aids understanding among ELF speakers. This is in line with Kirkpatrick's (2007b) finding in his study, stating that ASEAN ELF speakers use *spelling out the word* as a communication strategy.

Looking at other communication strategies in the extract above, *repetition* was used by all the participants: in Lines 2 and 7 by B1, in Line 3 by T1, and in Line 4 by I1. Here, although B1 used *repetition* two times, the functions seemed to be obviously different. The first *repetition* in Line 2 was to signal her non-understanding and *ask for* further *clarification* whereas another *repetition* in Line 4 was to signal T1 that she arrived at understanding of what T1 was saying. This example shows that the same strategy was used by the same speaker for different functions in ASEAN ELF interactions.

The lessons learned from the Bangkok pilot study were incorporated into the next data collection(s). As discussed earlier, there were three ELF speakers in the task, and the task type was a group discussion in the Bangkok pilot study. Having three speakers in a conversation sometimes caused one of the speakers to be neglected by the other two speakers. Thus, shared understanding by all the three participants was not possible in the group discussion task. Another lesson learned from the Bangkok pilot study was that participants sometimes *let it pass* and kept *silent* although they did not arrive at understanding. This may be because participants in the Bangkok pilot study were strangers to each other. Another possibility of their use of *let it pass* was that there were three speakers in their group discussion, and if there were only two speakers, any speaker might not have used the *let it pass* and kept *silent* when non-understanding occurred. Another lesson from the Bangkok pilot study was that what a participant heard may have been different from what the interlocutor actually had said. Thus, retrospection was necessary for data collection of the main study to make sure of what each participant heard and/or understood compared to what the interlocutor had said.

4.1.2. The Hungary pilot study

Based on the experience from the Bangkok pilot study, a recording with two ELF speakers was conducted in Hungary to collect data for the main study. In the Bangkok pilot study, as there was no physical task to accomplish in that recording, sometimes participants continued their speaking without resolving non-understandings which had occurred in their communication, and without arriving at shared understanding. Because of the nature of the task they were accomplishing, the participants in the Bangkok pilot study changed topics without every participant arriving at shared understanding as their task was to talk about Thai foods they like and Thai foods they don't like. That is why, to avoid this kind of situation, the two participants in the Hungary pilot study were originally assigned to cook a recipe for a regional dish provided by the other speaker. However, although the intention was to make a video recording and an audio-recording of the two ELF speakers' actual cooking, due to the Covid restrictions, it was not possible, and the task for the recordings turned out to be a discussion on how to cook each participant's traditional cuisine, and the actual cooking activities were postponed. Thus, the data from the recording with these two participants was used as another pilot study, with the name the Hungary pilot study, instead of including it in the main study. Nevertheless, quite useful data was collected, and experience was gained in this second pilot study.

4.1.2.1. Data and participants in the Hungary pilot study

        The two participants in the Hungary pilot study were an Indonesian (I2) and a Thai (T2) who were international students at a Hungarian university. They were living in the same dormitory by the time the data was collected, and they had known each other for a certain period of time. The profile of each speaker from the Hungary pilot study can be seen in Table 4.2 below. For the Hungary pilot study, convenience sampling was employed to obtain the participants by contacting the international students from ASEAN countries whom the researcher knew, and the data collection was conducted with those who replied that they were available to participate in the research project. The video-recorded interaction of the participants in the Hungary pilot study lasted for about 16 minutes. The devices used in the recording were two mobile phones, with each phone camera focusing on each participant in the activity in order to catch all the interactions of each participant.

Table 4.2

The Profiles of Each Speaker from the Hungary Pilot Study

Participant	Gender	Age	Nationality	First language	Other languages known
I2	Female	24	Indonesian	Sundanese	Bahasa Indonesia, English, Russian
T2	Female	37	Thai	Thai	English, some Chinese

        In the Bangkok pilot study, all the three participants were familiar with Thai foods and the ingredients in Thai foods as they all were living in Bangkok for a certain time. However, in the Hungary pilot study, the Indonesian participant (I2) and the Thai participant (T2) were not much familiar with each other's traditional food and the ingredients used in each other's traditional food. That is why both participants had some difficulties explaining their recipes, and when a participant talked about her recipe, it was a bit difficult for the other to imagine what kind of ingredients the interlocutor was talking about. Also, it was a bit difficult for each participant to explain her food without any resources around them. Then, both I2 and T2 used their mobile phones to show each other pictures of the food and the ingredients on the internet, which is in itself an interesting, new communication strategy.

Extract 4.5 is an example of the ELF speakers' *use of the internet* as a communication strategy to arrive at shared understanding in their ELF interactions.

Extract 4.5. I2+T2 (from the Hungary pilot study)
Context: They are talking about ingredients in Thai ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup.

1	T2:	Ah yeah. It's good. It's like ต้มยำ /tôm jām/[1]. You can put the
2		lemongrass, ah: tomatoes, and the hmm pepper, yes pepper maybe
3		green or red, whatever you want. And the, for me, when I cook, eh
4		I will use the instant powder, if I have the fresh lemongrass, I will
5		put it as well. And the I'm not sure it may be perfect if the if you
6		have this kind of ((gesture to show the size of the leaf)) the maybe
7		you don't know maybe this eh this kind of the leaf.
8	I2:	What leaf?
9	T2:	Leaf of::
10	I2:	((gesture of the smell coming out from the food)) Is this the leaf
11		that will give some [aroma]=
12	T2:	[Smell.]
13	I2:	=smell.
14	T2:	Yeah. Yeah. You know about this?
15	I2:	I think so. They have it in Lidl. And you see, they put it for rice:
16		I don't know. Let's check. Is it this one? ((looking up on the internet))
17		It's called like *daun salam*[2]. Well, we call it like *daun salam*.
18	T2:	Actually, I don't know the name of this leaf?
19	I2:	((shows photos of the leaf to T2)) This one. This one. Right?
20		((pointing at the photo of the leaf)) Bay leaf.
21	T2:	((looks at I2's phone)) Ah: No. Not not not this one. But it's
22		I think you cannot we cannot we cannot find here.

[1] ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ is a Thai soup which tastes hot and sour.

[2] *daun salam* means bay leaf.

In the extract above, while I2 and T2 were talking about the ingredients, I2 used the internet to confirm the leaf she knew and the leaf T2 talked about as an ingredient in her recipe. At the beginning of the extract, T2 was talking about the ingredients in a traditional Thai soup, ต้มยำ /tôm jām/. At that time, she had difficulty saying kaffir lime leaf in English. So, she used a gesture in Line 6 to show the size of the leaf. However, her gesture was not supportive for I2 to get the idea which leaf it was. That is why I2 asked a question to ask for clarification in Line 8. Moreover, I2 used a gesture in Line 10 to help T2 get the idea of whether the leaf has an aromatic smell or not. Then, T2 thought that I2 knew the leaf, and I2 also thought that the leaf T2 was talking about was bay leaf which they could buy at a local store. I2 also provided additional information that the leaf was put in cooking rice in Line 15, but she did not know how to say it in English. So, she used the internet to look up the name she knew in her first language and then showed pictures of the leaf she found on the internet to T2. I2 said in the follow-up interview that using the internet was the best way to know about which leaf to put in the ต้มยำ /tôm jām/. I2's use of the internet also helped T2 respond that the leaf I2 showed T2 on the internet was not the leaf for the ต้มยำ /tôm jām/. T2 also added that they could not buy the leaf she was talking about in Hungary in Line 22.

As in the above example, there were some other instances of the participants' uses of the internet in the Hungary pilot study, and in the retrospection, both participants said that *using the internet* was the best way for them to explain the recipe and the ingredients needed as neither of them was familiar with each other's recipe, and as there were no ingredients around them and also it was not possible to buy the ingredients in the Hungarian setting. I2 also used the internet when she talked about her Indonesian recipe.

Extract 4.6. I2+T2 (from the Hungary pilot study)
Context: They are talking about *bala-bala*.

1	I2:	((laughs)) So, this is how *bala-bala*[1] so looks like.
2	T2:	Hmm.
3	I2:	This one. ((pointing at the photo))
4	T2:	*bala=* ((typing *bala-bala* in her phone))
5	I2:	=[*bala.*] ((looking at T2's typing))
6	T2:	=[*bala.*] Right?
7	I2:	Yeah. ((looking at the pictures T2 found)) Not that one.

8		*bala-bala*. Maybe *bala-bala* food.
9	T2:	Ah: OK. ((scrolling down and looking at the information she has found))
10		((laughs)) What is it?
11	I2:	((laughs)) I don't know what is that.
12	T2:	Ah: Hmm. OK. ((found something))
13	I2:	((looks at the T2's screen)) Yeah. Like that and ((shows the pictures
14		in her phone to T2) this is the consistency of=
15	T2:	OK. OK.
16	I2:	=the flour.
17	T2:	OK. OK.

[1] *bala-bala* is a kind of deep-fried vegetable fritter.

After looking up *bala-bala* on the internet, I2 showed the pictures of *bala-bala* to T2 in Line 3 of Extract 4.6 above. Then, I2 also showed pictures of the consistency of the batter in cooking her Indonesian recipe. Before using the internet, I2 had difficulty explaining to T2 the consistency of the batter. In the retrospection, T2 said that the pictures I2 showed her on the internet made her fully understand what the food looked like. She also confirmed that without the internet, she could not have clearly understood what I2 had talked about the recipe.

Although there is no literature on the *use of the internet* as a communication strategy in ELF literature, the *use of the internet* by I2 and T2 in the Hungary pilot study shows that the *use of the internet* can be a communication strategy which helps speakers to arrive at shared understanding in ELF interactions.

4.1.2.2. Lessons learned from the Hungary pilot study

As in the Bangkok pilot study, there were also some lessons learned in the Hungary pilot study. Since the participants in this pilot study were not familiar with their interlocutor's foods, and also there were no ingredients around them, or they could easily have seen or bought the ingredients they were talking about in their environment, the participants in this pilot study relied a lot on the internet for the recipe and ingredients as they talked to each other. If there were the ingredients around them, they might not have needed the internet as they did in the examples above. In addition, if they were doing the actual cooking together in

a kitchen, it might not have been that difficult to arrive at understanding of, for example, the consistency of the batter for *bala-bala*.

For these reasons, in the main study, the data were collected in the form of the video recordings of two ASEAN ELF speakers' actual cooking activities. Thus the research design for the main study, presented in the following section, was strongly influenced by the experience gained from the two pilot studies.

4.2. Research design

Based on the lessons learned from the two pilot studies discussed in 4.1, the research design was revised again for the main study to answer the research questions, which were previously mentioned in Chapter 1. As there were mainly two parts in the research questions, the exploration of which communication strategies aided the ASEAN ELF speakers to achieve shared understanding and the investigation of the frequencies of each communication strategy, a mixed-method design was adopted, consisting mainly of qualitative research which was backed up by quantitative measures. The video-recorded data was analyzed qualitatively first, especially through retrospective interviews, and later quantitative analysis for frequencies of each communication strategy was conducted.

To answer the research questions, data for the main study were collected in Hungary with the ASEAN ELF speakers who were international students at different Hungarian universities. These participants in the main study did the actual cooking activities for their ELF interactions. Before moving to the discussion about these participants, the sampling methods utilized for getting participants will be discussed first.

4.2.1. Sampling methods

The participants for the main study were selected following convenience sampling and "snowball or chain sampling" (Patton, 2002, p. 237), based on the availability of ASEAN English speakers in Hungary. First, the data collection started with a few international students from ASEAN countries whom the researcher knew and who were willing to participate in the research project. Then, those participants referred others who might become participants in the research. They were contacted, and those who became participants in the research again referred others they knew, and the new potential participants were followed up. This was done till at least two dyads for each sub-group of the participants (e.g., the ESL sub-group) in the main study could be included. All the potential participants were initially contacted online or in person.

4.2.2. Online or in person meeting with potential participants

During the online or in person meetings with potential participants, they were first explained the research purposes and ethics. There was an emphasis in the explanation that their English level would not be assessed and would not be compared with their interlocutors' or any other participants' language level. It was also confirmed that their participation in the research could be withdrawn at any time if they wished. They were also informed that the data collection would be in the form of a video recording. To ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of the data, the researcher gave the participants verbal assurance that each participant would be anonymous, that codes would be used for each of them in the data analysis in the dissertation, and that the data would be used only for the dissertation and publications for academic purposes. At this stage, some ASEAN ELF speakers declined to participate in the research. This may be either because of the video recording format of the data collection or because speakers were not confident in their English proficiency. Surprisingly, those who rejected the researcher's request for their participation in the research were all from EFL countries. Moreover, one said that she could participate in the research, but that she did not want her interlocutor to be an English speaker from an ESL country.

On the acceptance of their participation in the research, participants were fully informed of the ownership of the data i.e., the recordings and the transcriptions of the recordings since participants' mobile phones were also used in the data collection process and also transcriptions were shared with them. Then, participants gave verbal consent to the researcher to use the transcribed data of the video recordings of their cooking activities. To anonymize the participants' identities, each of them was given a code, such as V1, F1, and the like, and these codes were applied whenever each participant was mentioned in the dissertation.

4.2.3. Participants and setting

As mentioned in 4.2. above, participants in the main study were international students at Hungarian universities who were from nine ASEAN countries[5].

---

[5] As the data collection site, it was planned to collect the data at RELC (The Regional Language Centre), an educational institution of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education (SEAMEO), whose headquarter is in Singapore. As SEAMEO RELC is the regional hub for English language teaching and learning in the ASEAN region, it is the most suitable place to get participants from different ASEAN countries so that data from different ASEAN ELF speakers can be collected. However, due to the Covid-19 restrictions, all the recordings for the data collection were done in Hungary.

In the main study, there were in total 20 (10 male and 10 female) ELF speakers from nine ASEAN countries. The EFL sub-group consisted of 10 participants, six male, and four female participants. The ESL sub-group consisted of four participants, two male, and two female participants. The mixed group of EFL and ESL consisted of six participants, two male, and four female participants. All of them were students from Hungarian universities located in five different cities in Hungary.

The participants' self-report profiles, including their linguistic background, were listed, as seen in Table 4.3. As seen in the table, participants were aged between 19 to 39 at the time of the data collection. They speak different L1(s), and most participants are multilingual. In terms of their English skills, participants reported various proficiency levels, which were not included in the table according to the assurance the researcher gave to them, ranging from competent speakers to less competent speakers. As all of them were university students in Hungary, their language proficiency level was assumed to be at least at a B2 level of English, but some of the participants' (from the ASEAN countries where English is used as a foreign language) spoken English was noticed as lower than B2 (which can be seen in the extracts in Chapters 5 and 6). Concerning the other languages they speak, participants reported on this themselves.

Based on the experiences from the pilot studies, participants in the actual research were paired. Because of the unavailability of other participants on the days of the recordings, a Burmese (B1) and a Laotian (L2) participated in two recordings each. That is why there are altogether 11 pairs in the study.

When looking at the communication strategies used by the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study, it will be investigated whether the communication strategies used by those who are from the ASEAN countries where English is used as a foreign language (EFL), by those from the ASEAN countries where English is used as a second language (ESL), and by those who are from the mixed group of EFL and ESL are the same or not.

One reason why communication strategies used by each sub-group were compared came from the researcher's personal experience as an ASEAN ELF speaker who used to travel frequently in the ASEAN region and had had a long stay in Singapore to do a master's degree together with eight classmates from seven ASEAN countries. At that time, it was noticed that ESL speakers more easily arrived at shared understanding in their interactions among themselves than in their interactions with EFL speakers. On the other hand, it appeared that EFL speakers needed to use more communication strategies to arrive at shared understanding in their interactions among them than if their interlocutors were ESL speakers.

For these reasons, when this research began, it was included in the research questions to compare the communication strategies used in each sub-group.

Another reason for this was the experience gained during the online or in person meetings with the potential participants. As mentioned in 4.2.2, some ASEAN ELF speakers from EFL countries refused to participate in the research, one mentioning that she did not want an interlocutor from an ESL country. All these experiences made the researcher think that a comparison between the uses of communication strategies in each sub-group i.e., the EFL sub-group, the ESL sub-group, and the mixed group of EFL and ESL, should be investigated in the main study.

According to the research questions mentioned in Chapter 1, the communication strategies used by strangers and by the speakers who knew each other well will also be compared in the main study. Thus, when the two ELF speakers were matched for a dyad, these two variables – from which group (EFL or ESL countries) the ELF speakers are and whether they knew each other – were considered. Therefore, the participants were first categorized into three sub-groups as in Table 4.3: an EFL sub-group, an ESL sub-group, and a mixed group of EFL and ESL. Later, in Chapter 6, when the research questions of the main study are answered and discussed, the participants will be categorized into two different groups again as the ASEAN ELF speakers who did not know each other (strangers) before the day of the video recording for the data collection and those who already knew each other well.

As mentioned earlier, participants in the main study were international students from different Hungarian universities which are located in different cities. Thus, the researcher needed to travel to these cities for the recordings with the participants. If both participants were from Szeged, where the researcher lived, no one needed to travel, and usually, the researcher's kitchen or sometimes a participant's kitchen was chosen as the data collection site. However, there were also some cases in which participants needed to accompany the researcher to another city for the recording with their interlocutors who lived in that city. Therefore, data collection sites were different Hungarian cities, and different kitchens in these cities, such as the researcher's kitchen, participants' kitchens or kitchens in the apartments the researcher rented in other cities rather than Szeged.

Table 4.3

The Profiles of Each Participant in the Study

Group	Dyad	Code	Gender	Age	Nationality	First language	Second language(s) they use in daily life apart from English	Additional language(s) they have some knowledge of apart from English
EFL	1	B2	M	35	Burmese	Burmese	-	some Hungarian
		V1	F	27	Vietnamese	Vietnamese	-	French, some Russian
	2	B3	F	33	Burmese	Burmese	-	-
		L1	F	20	Laotian	Laotian	-	some Chinese
	3	B2	M	35	Burmese	Burmese	-	some Hungarian
		V2	M	29	Vietnamese	Vietnamese	-	-
	4	I3	F	39	Indonesian	Manado Melayu	Bahasa Indonesia	German, Spanish, Italian, some Hungarian
		L2	M	26	Laotian	Laotian	-	Thai, some Hungarian
	5	C1	M	20	Cambodian	Khmer	-	some French, some Hungarian
		L2	M	26	Laotian	Laotian	-	Thai, some Hungarian
	6	L3	M	31	Laotian	Laotian	-	Thai, some Vietnamese, some French
		T3	M	26	Thai	Thai, English	-	Portuguese, some Spanish, some French, some Hungarian
ESL	7	F1	F	34	Filipino	Filipino	-	Tagalog, Ilocano, some Hungarian
		M1	M	19	Malaysian	English	Malay	Tamil, Malayalam
	8	F2	F	22	Filipino	Cebuano	Filipino	some Hungarian, some Japanese, some Korean, some Spanish
		S1	M	25	Singaporean	Mandarin Chinese	-	-
Mixed	9	I4	F	31	Indonesian	Javanese	Bahasa Indonesia	some Hungarian
		M2	M	32	Malaysian	Malay	-	some Arabic, some Thai
	10	I5	F	28	Indonesian	Javanese	Bahasa Indonesia	some Arabic, some German, some Japanese, some Hungarian
		M3	F	27	Malaysian	Malay	-	some Arabic, some Hungarian, some German
	11	C2	M	20	Cambodian	Khmer	-	some Chinese, some Thai
		F3	F	23	Filipino	Tagalog	-	Ilocano

4.2.4. Data collection procedure

The procedure comprises four different parts, which will be explained below: choosing a task to collect data; video recordings of ELF interactions and observation notes while implementing the task chosen by participants; initial analysis of original video recordings with the support of video-assisted retrospective interviews with participants (the first retrospection); and initial transcription of original video recordings and retrospection with participants (the second retrospection). If necessary, further retrospections were conducted for additional clarifications and confirmations with participants.

4.2.4.1. Choosing a task to collect data

Based on the pilot study data, to collect the data for the main study, each dyad with two participants from two different ASEAN countries was given a task which involved cooking together. Topics related to food are the kinds of safe topics which ELF speakers were comfortable talking about with others, as mentioned in 4.1.1.1. What was added to the topic related to food in the data collection of the main study was the actual cooking of the food by participants. When choosing the dish to be cooked, a dish based on one of the participants' recipes was chosen, depending on the available time and the participants' cooking knowledge (or skills). Although all the other dyads cooked only one dish in their cooking activities, the participants in Dyad 2 (B3 and L1) cooked two dishes. While cooking, participants in all 11 dyads naturally used English with each other in order to carry out the task.

4.2.4.2. Video recordings of ELF interactions and observation notes while implementing the task by participants

The data were collected in the form of both audio and video recordings. Spencer-Oatey (2000) notes that video recording can help the researcher form a "more comprehensive analysis of interaction" (p. 286) for non-linguistic forms which audio recording cannot provide. Also, in both the Bangkok and Hungary pilot studies, it was found that *gestures* were used as communication strategies. Therefore, the interactions of each dyad in the main study were video recorded in order to include the gestures of the participants during their ELF interactions. The main data for the research were from these video recordings of the participants' cooking activities.

During the video recording of the participants' cooking activity, observation notes (See 4.2.5.1 for details) were prepared by the researcher which would be used in the retrospective interviews with the participants after the video recording.

Audio recordings of the cooking activities were also made to be used as backup data in case the video recordings were lost in some ways and in order to "listen repeatedly and make accurate transcriptions what was said" by the researcher and "check and verify the transcription and interpretation" (Allan, Bradshaw, Finch, Burridge & Heydon, 2010, p. 272) by the participants who were the original speakers in the recordings. The verification with the original speakers of what they had said was important in the research because what a participant heard may have been different from what the interlocutor actually said. (See Extract 4.3 in 4.1.1.2.)

For all the recordings of the data collection for the main study, the researcher's and participants' mobile phones were used; at least two mobile phones at each cooking activity, mostly three mobile phones, and sometimes up to four mobile phones were used. Sometimes, unexpected problems were encountered, such as one of the phones running out of battery power or memory during the recording, but neither the phone owner nor the researcher did not notice it. There were also cases where the phone owner forgot to touch the phone screen to start the recording or the researcher forgot to touch the participant's phone screen, or the touch was not accurate to start the recording. However, in each case, it was just for a couple of minutes in the beginning, and it was noticed by someone, mostly the researcher, that the counter for the video recording mode had not changed. Then, the problem was fixed. None of the cooking activities were restarted from scratch because of these technical problems. Thus, all the ELF interactions through cooking together by each dyad recorded for the data collection of the main study can be regarded as naturally occurring ELF interactions.

Regarding the participants' reaction towards having the researcher present during the recordings, most participants appeared comfortable with the researcher's presence, and it appeared to have no impact on their behavior or English use. However, there were some participants who included the researcher in their conversation with their interlocutor. For example, during the cooking activity of Dyad 7, while the Filipino participant (F1) was talking to her interlocutor, the Malaysian participant (M1), F1 included the researcher in the conversation as in Extract 4.7.

Extract 4.7. F1+M1

Context: They are washing chicken.

1	M1:	How do I (.) wash the chicken? ((laughs))
2	F1:	Ah OK. ((goes to the basin)) Just put everything in here. ((transfers
3		chicken into a plastic bowl already been in the basin)) Oh: this is a lot.
4		How many kilos are this? ((asks the researcher)) ((turns on the tap))

In the extract above, M1 asked a question to F1 regarding how to wash chicken properly in Line 1. In the retrospection, F1 said that she noticed M1 was not familiar with housework, and F1 thought using a demonstration to explain to M1 how to wash chicken would be better for M1 to understand her. Thus, F1 transferred chicken pieces from the container to the plastic bowl she had already put in the basin. While transferring chicken into the plastic bowl, F1 saw the amount of chicken the researcher bought for their cooking activity and made a remark in Line 3. Then, in Line 4, F1 asked the researcher how many kilos of chicken it was while she was putting water into the plastic bowl.

Another type of participants' reaction to the researcher's presence during their cooking activities was that some participants looked at the researcher as if they were asking for lexical support from the researcher when they had difficulties finding a word or were unsure about their word choice while talking to their interlocutors. As B2 from Dyad 1 and B3 from Dyad 2 were the researcher's countrymates, they engaged in this kind of reaction more than other participants from other ASEAN countries.

In both cases mentioned above, when the researcher did not respond in any way to the participants, they just continued their interactions. In F1's case, she continued her demonstration of washing chicken to her interlocutor, M1. In B2 and B3's cases, they tried to resolve their difficulties by themselves. Thus, it can be assumed that there was no special impact on the participants' behavior or English use in the data collection process regarding the researcher's presence during their cooking activities.

4.2.4.3. Initial analysis of original video recordings with the support of video-assisted retrospective interviews with participants

As in Deterding (2013), each participant in the main study was invited for the retrospective interviews immediately after the cooking activity while listening or mostly watching the recording(s) to provide information on what they had said and what they did not

understand in their interlocutor's saying. This research project concerns how the ELF speakers from ASEAN countries try to arrive at understanding when non-understanding arises, and to avoid misunderstanding in their interactions. Therefore, the moments the participants did not understand each other and the moments they arrived at shared understanding needed to be confirmed by the participants themselves. That is why, as in House (2003) and Kennedy (2017), stimulated recall (video-assisted recall) was employed after the recording of the cooking activity, with the support of the prompts the researcher gave, which were based on the observation notes during the recording of the cooking activity. The discussion with each participant (retrospection) was conducted together with the interlocutor to check for understanding, misunderstanding, and non-understanding while watching the video recording. If one of the participants in a dyad did not want to do so, the discussion with that participant was conducted individually.

This kind of retrospection was important in the research because even for one communication strategy, a participant might use it for different functions. For example, in the Bangkok pilot study, B1's uses of *repetition* of the same word in the same extract (See Extract 4.4 in 4.1.1.2.) were different. As discussed in Extract 4.4, B1's first *repetition* was to *ask for clarification* from T1 while the second *repetition* was to signal her interlocutor (T1) that she arrived at understanding of what T1 was saying. Although it was easily noticeable for B1's uses of the same communication strategy for different functions in this example, it may not be possible to know this kind of situation all the time in the main study. The only way was to investigate it through retrospections with each speaker after the recordings and confirm with each speaker which strategies were employed for which purposes. If a retrospection was not long, the participants' answers were noted down. For the long retrospections after the cooking activities, they were audio recorded to be used later for data analysis.

4.2.4.4. Initial transcription of original video recordings and retrospection with participants

After the video recordings and the retrospective interviews with participants in the video recordings, the videos were transcribed as soon as possible, usually within a week after the recording. Then, for the accuracy of the transcription and interpretation, another retrospection was conducted with participants to confirm whether the transcriptions were the same as what the original speakers had said. After that, transcribed data were analyzed in

detail to find out the communication strategies which aided in understanding among speakers in their ELF interactions. (More detail can be seen in 4.2.6.)

4.2.5. Data

The focus of the present research project mainly concerns the communication strategies employed by the ASEAN ELF speakers in resolving their misunderstanding and non-understanding in their ELF interactions. As mentioned in 4.2.4, the data for the study were collected by video recording the ELF interactions in the ASEAN context while the participants in each dyad were doing a cooking activity together. Then, based on the observation notes by the researcher during the participants' cooking activity in each dyad, retrospections were conducted after the video recording. Thus, there were three parts of the data for the main study: the observation notes during the recordings, the transcriptions of the recorded videos, and the notes from the retrospective interviews. These three, together with each participant's self-reported profile, including his/her linguistic background, were used as instruments in the main study.

4.2.5.1. Observation notes with coding for data analysis

While video recording the participants' cooking activity in each dyad, observation notes were made for the moments one of the participants' utterances were unclear for later use in transcribing the video recordings. The moments the participants used communication strategies were also noted to know for the purposes of the strategy use and to confirm with participants for their understanding, misunderstanding, and non-understanding of their interlocutors' utterances.

In the observation notes made during the recording, coding was used for the convenience of the researcher in making these observation notes. Before the actual recording for data collection started, it was important to become used to the communication strategies which might be found in the data collection. For this reason, multiple readings of the communication strategies in previous studies, such as Deterding (2013), Kaur (2010, 2011b), and Kirkpatrick (2007b), were necessary. Then, based on the previous literature, to identify different communication strategies participants in each dyad used in their ELF interactions during their cooking activity, the communication strategies were coded into different types such as (1) code switching (coded as CS in the observation notes), (2) direction question (coded as Q), (3) repetition (coded as R), (4) lexical support (coded as LS), (5) non-linguistics strategies (coded as P for pointing, G for gesture, D for demonstration, etc.) and

the like. This typology was developed by the researcher based on the communication strategies from the previous literature.

The observation notes were made manually in the researcher's handwriting, and the participants' real names were used at the time the data was collected. Thus, a sample of an observation note was computerized (See Figure 2 below.), and the participants' real names were substituted with the codes given later to each participant in the transcription of the recording.

Figure 2

A Sample of Observation Notes

05:25	F3	P onion	(? C2)
05:27		G è knife	
05:28	C2	Q, D	
05:32	F3	G è knife	(? C2)
05:33		Sound è knife	(? C2)
05:34	C2:	LS	(? F3)
05:35	F3:	Uptake LS	

4.2.5.2. Video-recorded data

Findings in the main study were primarily based on video recordings of each dyad's cooking activity. Thus, video recordings were transcribed, as noted above and using an adjusted version of the transcription conventions by Atkinson and Heritage (1984). In the transcriptions, the language of the participants was not corrected, and standard conventions of punctuation were not used too. Data comprised 11 video recordings which were around 8 hours and 42 minutes long in total.

4.2.5.3. Interview data

As mentioned in 4.2.4, retrospective interviews were conducted immediately after the video recordings for triangulation of the video-recorded data. The video-assisted retrospections (video-assisted recall in Sillars, Roberts, Leonard & Dun, 2000) were conducted with participants in each dyad while watching the recorded video together with the

researcher to comment on the participants' interactions in the recorded video. If one of the participants in the dyad did not want, retrospections were conducted individually. If both participants in each dyad agreed, retrospection was done together.

During the retrospections, while watching the recorded videos, at the moments when misunderstanding or non-understanding seemed to occur, and when participants' utterances were unclear, the videos were paused, and participants were asked questions since the research was about the communication strategies which enhanced shared understanding between participants in each dyad. Participants were mostly asked the questions such as when they arrived at understanding, what helped them arrive at understanding, and why they said this or that at specific moments. For code-switched parts, the meanings of each participant's code-switches and also why they code-switched were asked.

4.2.6. Data analysis

When analyzing data in this research, the mixed method approach was applied, with two research strands, the qualitative and the quantitative strands. Since using *multiple methods* or *data sources* (Patton, 1999, p. 1192-1193) allows researchers "cross-data validity checks" (Patton, 1999, p. 1192), *triangulation* was thus utilized in the main study. According to Noble and Heale (2019), and Patton (1999), triangulation can be defined as the use of multiple methods or data sources in research to avoid errors which might result from using only one method or data source, and to increase the reliability and validity of the research. In data analysis, triangulating data sources include data from observation notes compared with interview data. This means validating the communication strategies noticed and marked in observation notes by checking information obtained through retrospections.

Investigating the answer to research question 1, to analyze the data on communication strategies which the ASEAN ELF speakers in the research employed to achieve shared understanding between them, qualitative data analysis was utilized, first exploring communication strategies which seemed to be instances of how speakers solved their misunderstanding and non-understanding to arrive at shared understanding, referring to the communication strategies in the previous studies discussed in 3.3 and 3.4. Then the communication strategies were confirmed with the actual speakers with the support of the retrospective interviews. In this way, the retrospective interviews allowed the triangulation (Bans-Akutey & Tiimub, 2021) of the data to validate the findings of communication strategies which aided understanding between speakers in each dyad by using the multiple data sources discussed in 4.2.5.

To answer research question 2, the frequencies of each communication strategy were calculated to investigate which communication strategy was employed by ASEAN ELF speakers in their interactions. In the discussion, descriptive statistics were employed, comparing the frequencies of each communication strategy.

After collecting the data and carrying out the retrospections, as mentioned in 4.2.4.4, recordings were transcribed as soon as possible. For the accuracy of the transcription and interpretation, if there was a doubt, it was confirmed with the original speaker of that part while listening to/watching the recordings together with the researcher for the retrospective interviews. If the participant could, he/she was requested to proofread the transcription to confirm if the transcription accurately reflected what he/she had said in the recordings. The participants' confirmation of the transcriptions was conducted until a consensus was reached. In this way, true and credible data sets were compiled for the research. Following their confirmation, transcripts were analyzed together with the notes made during the recordings, and the notes from the follow-up retrospections with each participant. Video recordings were repeatedly watched, and if necessary, audio recordings were also listened to for detailed analysis.

During data analysis, the emphasis of the research was the use of communication strategies which enhanced shared understanding between the participants in each dyad when non-understanding occurred and to avoid misunderstanding between them. Thus, the extracts related to this research focus were selected for transcription for conversation analysis, as in Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

According to Atkinson and Heritage, "speakers understand an utterance by reference to its turn-within-sequence character provides a central resource for both the participants and the overhearing analyst to make sense of the talk" (p. 7). They also state that "talk analyzably proceeds on a turn-by-turn basis and that 'generally, a turn's talk will be heard as directed to a prior turn's talk' […] (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974: 728)" (p. 7, Atkinson and Heritage's original emphasis) and furthermore "each next turn at talk is heard as directed to the prior, its producer will generally be heard to display an analysis, understanding, or appreciation of the prior turn's talk that is exhibited in his or her responsive treatment of it (see Schegloff, Chapter 3)" (p. 7, Atkinson and Heritage's original emphasis). That is why, while analyzing data, extracts with communication strategies were carefully read and analyzed within this conversation analysis framework to identify how the two speakers in a dyad tried to arrive at shared understanding. Then, the data were further analyzed for occasions of communication strategies which enhanced shared understanding between the

two speakers, and each speaker's non-linguistic communication and code-switches were identified if these helped the interlocutor understand what the speaker wanted to say. For sequences where other languages (non-English) were used, their meaning equivalent to English, and some cultural notes (e.g., What ผักชี /pʰạtʃĩ/ is in Extract 4.1 in 4.1.1.2.) were provided immediately under the extract. An adjusted version of the transcription conventions by Atkinson and Heritage was also employed in the transcriptions.

For further analysis, as the researcher needed to confirm at which moments each speaker arrived at shared understanding, their use of non-linguistic means, and the meaning of their code-switches, retrospective interviews with each speaker, which can be regarded as the main data analysis method of the research, were employed with the support of video-assisted stimulated recall as mentioned in 4.2.4.3. To finish data analysis for the ELF interaction of a dyad, depending on the participants' agreement, retrospections were conducted again and again, with sometimes up to five to six retrospections with the participants.

During the data analysis process, it was found that participants frequently used *asking for clarification*, *asking for confirmation*, and *non-linguistic means*. However, as mentioned above, the emphasis of the research was the communication strategies which enhanced shared understanding between the participants in each dyad when non-understanding occurred and to avoid misunderstanding between them. That is why, although a participant used a communication strategy to avoid misunderstanding or non-understanding, if his/her attempt was not successful, that occasion was not included in the main study. For example, in Extract 4.1 in 4.1.1.2, B1 signaled her non-understanding in Line 4 by *repeating* what her interlocutor (I1) had said. However, her attempt to signal her non-understanding was not successful. B1 signaled her non-understanding again in Line 9, saying *I don't know it*. This time again, her signal was neglected, and there was no uptake from any of her interlocutors. For these kinds of occasions, they would be included in the discussion about the extracts but would not be counted as the communication strategy which aided understanding in the main study since the interlocutor did not provide any action which could make the participant understand what the interlocutor was saying.

In the transcripts, the participants' names were coded with the initials of their respective nationalities (such as 'F' for Filipinos and 'L' for Laotians) and a number (used to distinguish the participants of the same nationality). Then, transcripts were analyzed together

with the notes made during the video recordings, and the notes from the follow-up retrospections with each participant. (See Table 4.3 in 4.2.3.)

To answer the research questions, examples of communication strategies which aided understanding in each sub-group of the ASEAN ELF speakers: the EFL sub-group, the ESL sub-group, and the mixed group of EFL and ESL would be discussed first in Chapter 5. Then, the findings and discussion of the research questions will be in Chapter 6. For example, to answer research question 1, the communication strategies which aided understanding found in each sub-group would be examined to know whether they were the same/similar or different. Also, the communication strategies used among the speakers who knew each other well and the strategies used by the speakers who did not know each other before were compared. For research question 2, the frequency of the communication strategies, including non-linguistic means and code-switching, used by the speakers which enhanced understanding among them, were counted and compared to each other to investigate which strategy was most used and which was the least used in the research.

Chapter summary

The research design presented in this chapter was based on the experiences from the two pilot studies and the previous studies on ELF interactions. The participants in the main study were 11 dyads, with each dyad having two ELF speakers from two ASEAN countries. There were altogether 20 ELF speakers in the main study who were from nine ASEAN countries. They were international students at Hungarian universities at the time of the data collection. The data were collected in the form of audio and video recordings of each dyad cooking a recipe together, and retrospective interviews with each participant. The retrospective interviews were based on the researcher's observation notes during the video recording. During the interviews, each recorded video was watched together with the researcher and the participants, and at each moment when there was a question for each participant, the video was paused. If one of the participants in a dyad did not want the interlocutor to be with them during the interview, the interview with that participant was conducted individually. The data used in the research comprises the observation notes during the recordings, the transcriptions of the recorded videos, the notes from the retrospective interviews, and also each participant's self-reported profile, including his/her linguistic background. The recordings were transcribed, and the participants' names were coded with the initials of their respective nationalities and a number like F1 and L1 in the transcripts. A close and in-depth analysis was carried out on instances of the communication strategies

which enhanced shared understanding between the participants in each dyad. In doing so, the communication strategies, especially from Deterding's (2013) study and Kirkpatrick's (2007b) study (if necessary, those from other studies on ELF communication), were looked up in the data collected. As the emphasis of the research was the communication strategies which enhanced understanding between the ASEAN ELF speakers, the instances of these communication strategies were selected. Then, conversation analysis along the lines of Atkinson and Heritage (1984) was employed, also using an adjusted version of their transcription conventions.

Chapter 5
Results: Communication strategies which enhance understanding
among ASEAN English speakers

Communication strategies found in previous literature as well as those in the two pilot studies show that ASEAN ELF speakers employ a variety of communication strategies in their ELF interactions such as *repetition*, *spelling out the word*, *asking for clarification/confirmation*, *let it pass*, *laughter*, and so on. However, not all communication strategies are related to understanding, misunderstanding, and non-understanding. As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, communication strategies such as *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, and *asking for confirmation* facilitate ELF speakers arriving at shared understanding, although each communication strategy is not always supportive for achieving shared understanding among ELF speakers. In addition, as discussed in 3.4.5, communication strategies include not only the use of *linguistic forms* but also the use of *non-linguistic means* such as *gesture*, *facial expression*, *touching*, *showing*, *sound imitation*, and the like. Although Kirkpatrick (2007b) and Deterding (2013) do not include the use of *non-linguistic forms* as communication strategies ELF speakers from ASEAN countries use to understand each other in their ELF interactions, in the pilot studies, it was found that participants did use *non-linguistic forms*. In this chapter, the communication strategies which facilitated understanding between the participants in each dyad in the main study will be discussed.

In doing so, the communication strategies which were not supportive for the ASEAN ELF speakers to arrive at shared understanding will not include in the discussion. For example, not all the communication strategies participants used in the following extract (which is from the Bangkok pilot study, already discussed in 4.1.1.2) were related to participants' achieving understanding among them.

Extract 4.4. B1+I1+T1 (from the Bangkok pilot study, already mentioned in Chapter 4)
Context: T1 is asking B1 and I if they eat raw food.

1	T1:	Do you eat the raw[1] food?
2	B1:	Law food? What is it?
3	T1:	Raw-raw[2].
4	I1:	Oh! [raw food.]

5	T1:	[R-A-W.]
6	I1:	Yes yes.
7	B1:	Aww raw food!

[1] T1 pronounced /lɔː/.

[2] T1 pronounced /lɔː/ again.

In the extract above, because of T1's use of *repetition* in Line 3, I1 arrived at understanding of what T1 was asking about, and this *repetition* was the communication strategy which enhanced understanding between T1 and I1. However, I1's *repetition* in Line 4 was to signal T1 that she arrived at understanding, and this *repetition* was not the communication strategy which enhanced understanding between T1 and I1. Similarly, B1's *repetition* in Line 7 was also not the communication strategy which enhanced understanding between T1 and B1. These *repetitions* in Lines 4 and 7 seemed to be the communication strategy the speakers used to make their communication flow smoothly and lively, but not to enhance understanding among speakers. Thus, the communication strategies in this kind of situations were not included in the discussion in this chapter.

Another example of the communication strategy which will not be included in this chapter is the participants' use of *let it pass*. Myintzu (2021b) has found that *let it pass* is used by ASEAN ELF speakers in their ELF interactions "as a communication strategy to make their conversation flow smoothly while maintaining their politeness as long as their non-understanding of what their interlocutor has said [does] not affect accomplishing the shared goal" (p. 103) but when they want to resolve their non-understanding and to arrive at shared understanding, they have to use other communication strategies. *Let it pass* alone cannot make the ELF speakers achieve mutual understanding. Thus, in this chapter, this kind of communication strategy which does not enhance understanding among the speakers will not be included in the discussion. Participants' use of other strategies, after *let it pass*, which help speakers arrive at shared understanding will be discussed.

As mentioned earlier, even among the communication strategies which facilitate speakers arriving at shared understanding, each communication strategy cannot always help to achieve shared understanding among speakers. However, to some extent, these communication strategies can help speakers arrive at understanding. In this chapter, these communication strategies will be discussed, emphasizing on how they helped the ASEAN ELF speakers in each dyad in the study arrive at shared understanding.

In doing so, firstly, how a speaker's *code-switching* helped his/her interlocutor to arrive at understanding will be discussed in 5.1. Next, ASEAN ELF speakers' uses of different strategies such as *direct questions*, *repetition*, and *using sorry/pardon* to *ask for clarification* will be discussed in 5.2. Then, the discussion will be moved on to how a speaker's *lexical support* helped to arrive at shared understanding between the two speakers in each dyad. The next discussion will be about how an ASEAN ELF speaker skillfully employed *direct questions*, *repetition* and *minimal checks* when they wanted *confirmation* from his/her interlocutor to enhance mutual understanding between them. Finally, ASEAN ELF speakers' uses of *non-linguistic forms* which helped their interlocutors arrive at shared understanding will be presented.

Generally, there are five categories of communication strategies which enhanced understanding among ASEAN ELF speakers in their interactions found in the main study, namely *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, *asking for confirmation*, and *non-linguistic strategies*. The frequency of these communication strategies used by each ASEAN ELF speaker can be seen in Table 5.1. As can be seen in the table, the frequency of the communication strategies which enhanced understanding between speakers in each dyad is not even. Among the 693 communication strategies which enhanced understanding found in the main study, *non-linguistic strategies* were found to be the most used communication strategies which facilitated the speakers' understanding whereas *code-switching* was found to be the least frequent communication strategy for the ELF speakers in their interactions. A detailed discussion of each communication strategy will be presented in the following sections of this chapter.

As mentioned in Chapter 4, there are three sub-groups of ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study: EFL sub-group, ESL sub-group and the mixed group of EFL and ESL. Thus, when each communication strategy which enhanced ASEAN ELF speakers to arrive at shared understanding is discussed in this chapter, an example from each sub-group will be used. In this way, sub-groups will be identified in the examples, but the details concerning the research questions on sub-groups will be discussed in Chapter 6.

In the discussion, for the participants' naturally occurring language, as mentioned in 4.2.6, an adjusted version of the transcription conventions by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) was employed to transcribe the ELF interactions of participants in the research. In doing so, for the participants' use of non-English words, if the non-English language a speaker used does not have a standardized romanization system, the non-English words were transcribed in that language's scripts followed by the pronunciation in IPA whereas for other non-English

languages with standardized romanization system, the code-switched utterance was mentioned in italics. Then, the meaning equivalent to English, and also some cultural notes were provided immediately under the extract.

Table 5.1

Number of Instances of Each Communication Strategy Which Made the Participants Achieve Understanding Each Other

Participants		Code-switching	Asking for clarification	Lexical support	Asking for confirmation	Non-linguistic strategies	Total	Communication strategy use per minute
Dyad	Code							
1	B2	-	-	-	-	8	8	0.35
	V1	-	8	-	43	10	61	2.65
2	B3	-	5	-	18	10	33	0.87
	L1	-	8	-	6	7	21	0.55
3	B2	-	11	6	28	12	57	1.24
	V2	-	-	-	1	39	40	0.87
4	I3	-	-	-	-	4	4	0.07
	L2	1	12	-	15	9	37	0.62
5	C1	-	1	-	1	12	14	0.56
	L2	-	2	4	11	6	23	0.92
6	L3	1	4	-	14	15	34	0.97
	T3	2	-	2	-	12	16	0.46
7	F1	-	-	-	4	45	49	0.58
	M1	2	14	2	16	9	43	0.51
8	F2	2	1	-	-	20	23	0.48
	S1	-	15	2	30	16	63	1.31
9	I4	1	2	-	1	8	12	0.29
	M2	2	4	1	26	12	45	1.10
10	I5	3	5	1	22	9	40	0.61
	M3	1	4	-	3	18	26	0.39
11	C2	-	12	-	10	5	27	0.49
	F3	-	-	-	3	14	17	0.31
		15	108	18	252	300	=693	

5.1. Code-switching

One of the communication strategies which enhanced understanding among the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study was *code-switching*. In the previous studies on the communication strategies of the ASEAN ELF speakers, Kirkpatrick (2007b) found that the ASEAN ELF speakers "avoid using local or idiomatic terms" (p. 132) of their native languages as these terms can create other speakers' non-understanding. In his study, Kirkpatrick also states that although Bruneians, Indonesians, Malays and Singaporeans have the knowledge of Malay, he finds only one example of codeswitching or the use of a local term in his data.

As mentioned in 3.5.1, Deterding (2013) found some instances of code-switching in his study. He stated that although ELF speakers who do not have a mutually understandable language between them may code-switch less, among his participants who had a shared language, code-switching occurs. He also stated that "code-switching generally achieves accommodation between the speakers, but once in a while it causes miscomprehension instead" (p. 130), and he supported his statement with some instances he had found in his study. However, as discussed in Chapter 4, all the participants in the Bangkok pilot study and in the Hungary pilot study used non-English terms in their ELF communication, mostly Thai words, and some of their use of non-English words helped their interlocutors understand what they wanted to say. Similarly, in the main study for this dissertation, it was found that most of the participants used non-English terms in their ELF interactions with their interlocutors. Among their code-switches, some of the code-switches helped their interlocutors understand what they wanted to say.

Myintzu (2021a) has found that ASEAN ELF speakers code-switch mainly to signal culture, by using their mother tongue or the official language of their country to show the cultural identity of the speaker. However, there are other reasons for speakers' code-switches, such as to assist in their understanding of each other, for lack of linguistic resources, and so on. No matter with which reason ASEAN ELF speakers code-switch, their code-switches do not necessarily hinder their interlocutors' understanding. Instead, some code-switch even enhance the interlocutors' understanding. In addition, when they code-switch, ASEAN ELF speakers code-switch to different languages such as their local language(s), their interlocutors' language(s) as well as other languages they have some knowledge of. No matter which language they code-switch to, their code-switch does not necessarily lead their interlocutors to misunderstanding. Instead, their code-switch even enhances their interlocutors' understanding.

An example of the participants' *code-switch* in the EFL sub-group which enhanced their interlocutors' understanding found in the study is presented in Extract 5.1. This extract was from the cooking activity of Dyad 6 in which participants were a Laotian (L3) and a Thai (T3). They cooked a Thai soup which was T3's recipe.

Extract 5.1. L3 +T3
Context: L3 is asking T3 if they will put pepper into the soup or not.

1   L3:   ((finished cutting the green Iion)) OK. ((gives T3 the chopping
2   board on which the green onion pieces are)) You can put this.
3   T3:   ((takes over the chopping board)) ((whispers some music))
4   Thank you. I think we've to just put it when we serve it.
5   I3:   Ah. OK. So, when we serve it, you you need to put like the kind
6   of ah pepper. ((gesture of adding pepper into the soup)) We call
7   pepper. Like ah ((gesture)) พริกไท[1] /pʰrík tʰāj/, [hot pepper.]
8   T3:   [Oh black pe]pper. No.
9   L3:   No. Ah.

[1] พริกไท /pʰrík tʰāj/ means pepper.

In the extract above, when L3 asked T3 if they would put pepper into the soup as in Lines 5 and 6, T3 was confused which pepper L3 meant. Although L3 used the gesture of adding pepper to the soup, T3 did not understand what L3 was talking about. Then, L3 code-switched to Thai in Line 7, saying พริกไท /pʰrík tʰāj/ which means pepper. Here, L3's code-switch to Thai, which is the interlocutor's language, made his interlocutor, T3, understand what L3 was asking about. Then, T3 answered with a *no* in Line 8.

Another example of *code-switching* which was supportive for understanding between the ELF speakers in the study was in Extract 5.2. This example was from the ESL sub-group, and the extract was from the cooking activity of Dyad 7 in which a Filipino (F1) and a Malaysian (M1) were participants who cooked a Filipino dish.

Extract 5.2. F1+M1

Context: They are talking about Southeast Asian foods.

| 1 | M1: | In Malaysia, we make ah *sambal*[1]. |

1   M1:   In Malaysia, we make ah *sambal*[1].

2   F1:   Yeah yeah yeah. I   [think]

3   M1:   [It's   ] very famous.

4   F1:   Malaysian and Indonesian food I bet for me also good because they

5   combine a lot of things and mash.

6   M1:   Yes, true.

7   F1:   You mash the ingredients?

8   M1:   Yes.

[1] *sambal* is a red chili paste which is usually a condiment to Indonesian and Malaysian dishes.

While cooking together, F1 and M2 were talking about the common foods in their countries in the extract above. M2 said *sambal* is a common food in his country. *sambal* is a chili paste which is commonly eaten with rice in Indonesia and Malaysia. Here, M2 did not use an English word for *sambal*. Instead, he just code-switched here into Malay. In the retrospection, M2 said that before he code-switched, he hesitated a bit, thinking to code-switch or not to code-switch because the interlocutor might not understand. However, when F1 heard the term *sambal*, she knew it and talked about the way of cooking it in Lines 4, 5 and 7. Later, she also talked about the ingredients in *sambal* while they were talking about a Malaysian food, *nasi lemak*[6]. This example clearly shows that a speaker's code-switch to his/her local language can make the interlocutor arrive at shared understanding.

Another example of *code-switching* which enhanced understanding between the speakers which will be discussed in this section is a code-switch found in Dyad 10's cooking activity which was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL. Participants were an Indonesian (I5) and a Malaysian (M3) who were flatmates, and they cooked the famous Malaysian food, *nasi lemak*. In the retrospection, I5 said that there were four students living in their flat: her interlocutor (M3), the other two Malaysian students, and herself (I5). Thus, the three

[6] *nasi lemak* is a Malay cuisine which consists of rice cooked with coconut milk instead of water, commonly served with sambal, fried crispy anchovies, peanuts, cucumber, and boiled egg.

Malaysians in the flat just used their Malay language at home. I5 said that at the beginning, it was difficult for her to understand what they were saying. Later, she became used to it and could quite understand her three flatmates. In the retrospection, both I5 and M3 said that Bahasa Indonesia (also called Indonesian) and Malay are similar and mutually understandable. Both of them said that they never used Indonesian and Malay, but just used English when they texted each other although they used a lot of Indonesian and Malay when they talked to each other. If there was an outsider at home (e.g., a friend of one of the flat mates who was a non-Malay or a non-Indonesian visited the flat), they used English to make the guest inclusive. The video recording of their cooking activity was in their kitchen, and they used English throughout their cooking time. They said that they counted the researcher as their guest, and as the researcher was physically with them in the kitchen throughout their cooking activity, they said it was natural for them, using English to communicate with each other. However, there were a lot of moments when they used Indonesian and Malay during their cooking activity, altogether 115 code-switches to their Indonesian and Malay languages. Among those code-switches, an example of M3's code-switch which enhanced understanding for I5 was in Extract 5.3.

Extract 5.3. I5+M3
Context: M3 is explaining I5 how to use finger for the ratio of rice and water.

1	M3:	Wait wait we put it inside. ((puts her finger in downward position
2		into the rice in the rice pot))
3	I5:	Yes.
4	M3:	And then we ah actually you can see it if there is no coconut milk.
5	I5:	Hm hm.
6	M3:	And then we can, you know here ((takes her finger out of the rice pot,
7		and shows her finger to I5)) is the rice. ((puts her finger into the rice
8		pot)) Here is the: ((takes her finger out of the rice pot))
9	I5:	And then, we have to put more:
10	M3:	wa[ter.] ((takes her finger out of the rice pot, and shows her finger to I5))
11	I5:	[wa]ter, (.) [like half of] ((shows her finger))
12	M3:	[Yeah. We have.]
13	I5:	[like] this part. ((shows her finger))
14	M3:	[Yeah.]

15		*macam ni kan, kita masukkan dalam ni*.[1] ((puts her finger into the rice
16		pot again))
17	I5:	Hm.
18	M3:	*dekat dalam beras, targen kita betul-betul dalam beras tu*.[2]
19	I5:	Hm.
20	M3:	And then, *kita put atas beras tu*[3].
21	I5:	Hm.
22	M3:	And *sekarang kita tambah sikit lagi air kosong*[4].
23	I5:	OK.

[1] Translation: OK like this, we put it in the rice.

[2] Translation: Our finger should be inside the rice.

[3] Translation: And then, we put it on top of the rice.

[4] Translation: And now we add a little bit plain water.

In Extract 5.3, I5 and M3 were preparing to cook coconut rice, I5 wanted to know the ratio of rice, water, and coconut milk to put into the rice cooker. Thus, M3 said the *finger technique* was used for the ratio of rice and liquid (with or without coconut milk) in her house back in Malaysia. Then, she explained what the *finger technique* was. While explaining her *finger technique* for rice cooking to I5, first M3 used English together with a demonstration of how to measure rice and water in rice cooking. However, they were not cooking normal rice but coconut rice at that time, thus, instead of water, they put coconut milk in the rice cooker. Therefore, I5 could not see M3's finger under the coconut milk. Then, M3 code-switched to Malay language to explain that *finger technique* to I5 in Lines 15, 18, 20 and 22. In the follow-up interview, I5 said that she understood what M3 wanted to say from M3's demonstration, but M3's code-switching made her understand what M3 wanted to say more clearly. At the same time, M3 said that it was easier for her to explain that *finger technique* to I5 in her Malay language.

5.2. Asking for clarification

Another communication strategy which enhanced understanding among the ASEAN ELF speakers found in the main study was *asking for clarification*. As in previous literature on communication strategies in the ASEAN context, participants in the main study *asked for clarification* from their interlocutors to overcome their non-understanding and to avoid

misunderstanding. In doing so, participants used different ways such as *direct questions*, *repetition with a question intonation*, and *using sorry/pardon*. In this section, how these three communication strategies helped the ELF speakers in the main study arrive at shared understanding will be discussed.

5.2.1. Direct questions to ask for clarification

One of the sub-strategies the ASEAN English speakers in the main study used in *asking for clarification* from their interlocutors was *direct questions*. In this section, the questions (with or without question words) which were used by the participants to *ask for clarification* from their interlocutors to explain about something their interlocutors had said but they did not understand will be discussed.

An example of using *direct questions to ask for clarification* from the interlocutors found in the study was in Dyad 2's interaction. Dyad 2 was from the EFL sub-group, and its participants were a Burmese (B3) and a Laotian (L1). They cooked a Burmese curry by using canned fish.

Extract 5.4. B3+L1

Context: They are preparing ingredients for their cooking.

1	L1:	Where d' you bought it?
2	B3:	From the Forum market.
3	L1:	Hm [hm.]
4	B3:	[Yeah.]
5	L1:	The Spar: (.) or?
6	B3:	No. Forum, in the morning market.
7	L1:	Onn onn onn.
8	B3:	Yeah. And there was a: little woman. Yeah she: selling the onion,=
9	L1:	Onn:
10	B3:	=yeah I found the small one.
11	L1:	Ah:

In Extract 5.4, B3 and L1 were preparing ingredients for their cooking. While L1 was peeling onions, she asked B3 where B3 bought the small onions she was peeling. Thus, B3 replied L1 that she bought them from the Forum market in Line 2. Then, L1 asked B3 another

91

question about the place B3 had bought those small onions in Line 5, using a specific place at Forum from which B3 might have bought those small onions in her question. After L1's clarification request question, B3 said that the place she bought the small onions was the Forum morning market in Line 6. Then, B3 gave L1 additional information in Line 8 for the clarification request question L1 asked her in Line 5.

In the retrospection, L1 said that B3's answer in Line 2 was not enough for her to know where to buy those small onions. She said:

"I extremely know Forum because I always go there. I asked her again because there are many shops in Forum such as Forum market, Spar."

Thus, L1 asked for clarification from B3 to get more information on where exactly B3 had bought those small onions, by using a direct question in Line 5 which made her get more information from B3 and arrive at understanding.

Another example of using *direct questions to ask for clarification* from interlocutors which helped the ELF speakers in the main study to arrive at understanding was in Dyad 8's cooking activity which was from the ESL sub-group. In their cooking activity, a Filipino (F2) and a Singaporean (S1) cooked a Filipino dish, *adobo*.

Extract 5.5. F2+S1

Context: S1 was looking for rice.

1	F2:	It's really good when you eat it with rice.
2	S1:	Alright. But we don't have rice. ((looking around the kitchen for rice))
3		That's a bit unfor-. ((found a pot next to the basin)) Wait, that'd be
4		that rice. ((found nothing in the pot))
5	F2:	((points at the rice cooker on a shelf in front of the stove)) Yeah, we still
6		have some rice. Some rice in the rice cooker. ((points at the rice cooker))
7	S1:	But is it cooking right now?
8	F2:	No no no.
9	S1:	OK.
10	F2:	((points at the rice cooker)) But we still have some left.

In the extract above, when the *adobo* was about to be ready, F2 said that *adobo* is good to eat with rice. Hearing that, in Extract 5.5, S1 was looking around the kitchen for rice. First, he saw a pot next to the basin but when he looked into the pot, there was nothing in it.

At that time, F2 pointed at an electric rice cooker on a shelf in front of the stove, and she said there was some rice in that rice cooker. Then, S1 saw the rice cooker and asked for clarification from F2 if rice was cooking in that rice cooker at that time. Thus, F2 explained S1 that rice was not cooking in it, but there was some cooked rice left in that rice cooker.

In the retrospection, S1 said that what F2 had said in Lines 5 and 6 was clear enough to understand that there was some rice in the electric rice cooker, but it was not clear enough for him to understand whether the rice in that rice cooker was either the cooked rice or the rice still being cooking in the rice cooker. Here, S1's clarification request, with a direct question in Line 7, helped him to get more information he wanted from F2 and finally arrive at shared understanding.

Some more examples of using *direct questions to ask for clarification* which helped the ELF speakers arrive at understanding found in the main study were in Dyad 11's cooking activity which was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL. Participants were a Cambodian (C2) and a Filipino (F3). Similar to other dyads with a Filipino participant, Dyad 11 also cooked an *adobo*. However, F3's recipe for her *adobo* was in her own style. In F3's recipe, F3 boiled chicken first before cooking *adobo*. Some examples of direct questions used by C2 in their cooking activity to ask for clarification from F3 when he had not arrived at understanding were in Extract 5.6.

Extract 5.6. C2+F3

Context: F3 was explaining the *adobo* cooking process.

1	F3:	And then, we will (.) remove the chicken (.) and cook ((points at
2		the onion)) the onion and the-
3	C2:	Which can- like fry it ((gesture of frying in a wok))?
4	F3:	Yes.
5	C2:	And what and when we can put the potatoes? ((points at the potato bowl))
6	F3:	Ah: we can separate ((points at the potato bowl)) actually the (.)
7		cooking of the potato (.) because we just add ((gesture of adding))
8		it (.) in the (.) prepare (.)
9	C2:	Hm hm.
10	F3:	dish.
11	C2:	So, separate ((gesture of separate)) (.)
12	F3:	[Yes.]

13	C2:	[these.]
14	F3:	It's a separate- yes we: we prepare it separate [these.]
15	C2:	[Hm hm.]
16	F3:	So we need to prepare ((points at the chicken pot on the stove))
17		the *adobo* first. Then we add this ((points at the potato bowl))
18		potato in the end. ((gesture of putting potato))
19	C2:	Hm hm. OK I see. ((gesture of thumbs up))
20	F3:	So, we will cook this ((points at chopped garlic)) after this one
21		((points at the chicken pot)) we will cook the (.) garlic ((points at
22		chopped garlic)) and the onion ((points at onion container)).
23	C2:	Into the chickens? ((gesture of adding))
24	F3:	Yes into the chicken. ((points at the chicken pot))
25	C2:	And ((points at the soy sauce bowl)) what about the sauce?
26	F3:	We add ((points at the soy sauce bowl)) it.
27	C2:	Into ((points at the chicken pot)) that (.) [too.]
28	F3:	[Into] that ((points at
29		the chicken pot)).
30	C2:	What about the potatoes like how can we cook it?
31	F3:	Fry. So maybe it's possible to fry it now?

In the extract above, when F3 was explaining how to cook the *adobo*, C2 asked for clarification from F3 at some points. In the extract, there were three direct questions C2 used to ask for clarification from F3. The first one was in Line 5 when C2 wanted to know when they would put in the potato. In her explanation, F3 said when chicken was cooked, they would add onion in Lines 1 and 2 of Extract 5.6. After F3's confirmation that they would fry onion in Line 4, C2 asked for clarification when they would put potato in Line 5. Thus, F3 explained that they would not need to cook potato together with chicken.

The second direct question C2 used to ask for clarification in Extract 5.6 was in Line 25. After F3 said that they would put chopped garlic and onion into the chicken pot, C2 asked about the sauce in Line 25. In the retrospection, C2 said that F3 told him they would prepare potato and chicken separately. Thus, he wanted to know how they would use the sauce: with the chicken or with the potato. Then, F3 explained him that they would put the sauce into the chicken pot.

After C2 had realized that they would cook the sauce with the chicken, C2 wanted to know how they would cook potato. In the retrospection, C2 said that when F3 explained to him about potato for his first direct question in Line 5, F3 did not mention how they would cook potato. Thus, C2 asked a direct question to F3 in Line 30 to know how they would cook potato. Then, F3 answered him that they would fry it in Line 31.

All the three direct questions C2 used in Extract 5.6. to ask for clarification from F3 facilitated C2's achieving understanding of the way their *adobo* could be prepared.

5.2.2. Repetition to ask for clarification

In the study, it was found that participants used not only *direct questions* but also *repetition* to *ask for clarification* from their interlocutors. In this section, the use of participants' *repetition* (i.e., participants' partially or fully repeating their interlocutor's utterance) which helped them get an additional explanation and/or support from their interlocutors and arrive at understanding will be discussed.

An example of a participant's *repetition* used to *ask for clarification* from the interlocutor which enhanced understanding for the participant was in Dyad 1's cooking activity. Dyad 1 was from the EFL sub-group, and its participants were a Burmese participant (B2) and a Vietnamese participant (V1). During their cooking activity, they cooked a Burmese dish, an egg curry. According to B2's recipe, the ingredients were garlic, onion, potato, fresh chili, oil, chili powder, seasoning powder, salt, ginger powder, masala, egg, and ketchup (to substitute fresh tomato).

Extract 5.7. B2+V1
Context: They are talking about oil.

1	B2:	And a little bit oil, oil.
2	V1:	Oil?
3	B2:	Oil oil is over there. ((points at the oil bottle)) Here.
4	V1:	[That's oil?]
5	B2:	[Yes.]
6	V1:	OK. ((takes the oil bottle))

In Extract 5.7, when B2 told V1 to put oil into the pan in Line 1, V1 used repetition as a clarification request from B2 in Line 2. B2 pronounced oil as /əwʌɪ/ and in the

retrospection, V1 said that B2's pronunciation was not understandable for her. Thus, V1 repeated the word with a rising intonation in Line 2. After her repetition, B2 also repeated the same word twice in Line 3 and at the same time, B2 pointed at the oil bottle which was on the table behind them. Then, V1 turned around and looked at the oil bottle, repeating the word again in Line 4. In the retrospection, V1 said that when B2 talked about oil in Line 1, she did not understand his pronunciation. Thus, she asked for clarification with a repetition in Line 2. B2 also said in the retrospection that V1's repetition in Line 2 signaled him that she did not understand him and needed clarification from him. Thus, in this extract, although B2's pointing at the oil bottle in Line 3 made V1 clear that B2 was talking about oil, the first communication strategy which led them to arrive at shared understanding in the extract was V1's repetition to ask for clarification in Line 2.

Another example of the use of *repetition* to *ask for clarification* from the interlocutor which helped the participant in the study to arrive at understanding was from Dyad 8's cooking activity which was from the ESL sub-group.

Extract 5.8. F2+S1

Context: They were preparing for their cooking.

1	F2:	And that pineapples and also (.) this one ((shows the laurel leaf pack))
2		laurel leaves.
3	S1:	OK. ((nods)) ((finished putting the onion into the pot))
4	F2:	°And° ((takes the measuring cup)) °ah° I usually don't really use the
5		measuring cup for this but-
6	S1:	Well, by feel>°ing°< then.
7	F2:	What?
8	S1:	Go by go by your feel>°ing°< then.
9	F2:	Go?
10	S1:	Go by your own feelings then.
11	F2:	Ah OK. ((laughs))

While cooking a Filipino dish, *adobo*, in Extract 5.8, the Filipino participant (F2) told the Singaporean participant (S1) that she usually did not use the measuring cup to measure the liquid ingredients such as soy sauce and vinegar when she cooked in Lines 4 and 5. Thus, S1 told F2 to cook by feeling in Line 6. Then, when F2 asked for clarification in Line 7, S1

repeated what he had said in Line 6 by adding the verb *go* in Line 8. However, F2's asking for clarification and S1's repetition here were not successful to arrive at shared understanding. Thus, F2 made another attempt to ask for clarification from S1. This time, F2 used a repetition to signal S1 that she still did not understand what S1 had said and to get clarification for her non-understanding from S1 in Line 9. Then, when S1 repeated what he had said by adding the word *own* this time in Line 10, F2 signaled S1 for her arriving at understanding in Line 11. That is why, the communication strategy which led F2 to arrive at understanding in this extract was her use of repetition in Line 9.

Another example of *repetition* which was used to *ask for clarification* from the interlocutor and enhanced the participant's understanding in the study was in Dyad 10's cooking activity. Dyad 10 was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL, and its participants were an Indonesian (I5) and a Malaysian (M3) who cooked *nasi lemak*.

Extract 5.9. I5+M3

Context: They are preparing a serving of *nasi lemak*.

1	M3:	Do we have like small ((takes out a glass)) oh no ((puts back the glass))
2		we can use like a shape?
3	I5:	For what?
4	M3:	For the (.) coconut rice. Ah: or maybe that one. ((sees a mug)) That one
5		is OK.
6	I5:	For the coconut rice?
7	M3:	So like shaping thing, ((shows I5 the way she wants to prepare a serving
8		of *nasi lemak* by putting the mug in the downward position on the plate))
9	I5:	[Oh my!]
10	M3:	[like the] shape. ((laughs))

When the *nasi lemak* they cooked in their cooking activity was ready to eat, I5 and M3 prepared a serving of *nasi lemak*. In Extract 5.9, M3 was looking for a small container to be used to prepare the serving. In Lines 1 and 2, M3 asked I5 if they had something like a small container to make a shape. At that time, M3 took out a glass from a cabinet, but she realized that it was not something she wanted and so, she put the glass back into the cabinet. I5 did not understand what M3 was looking for. Thus, I5 asked for clarification with a direct question in Line 3. M3 answered I5's question in Line 4, but M3's clarification did not help

I5 understand what M3 was doing. Thus, I5 signaled M3 for her non-understanding and for further clarification from M3 in Line 6. This time, instead of using a direct question, I5 used a repetition. I5 repeated what I5 had said in a rising intonation in Line 6. Then, M3 explained I5 with the support of a gesture to demonstrate how she would decorate the serving of *nasi lemak* she was about to make in Lines 7 and 8.

Here, in this extract, it was I5's repetition to signal for her non-understanding in Line 6 which made M3 give I5 an explanation with a demonstration for what M3 would do, and this explanation with the demonstration made I5 arrive at understanding. In the retrospection, M3 said that it was I5's request for clarification in Line 3 which made her know that I5 did not understand what she was doing. Thus, I5's asking for clarification from M3 in Line 3 was the initial step which made I5 get M3's explanation to help her arrive at understanding. However, the communication strategy which helped I5 arrive at actual understanding in this extract was I5's repetition in Line 6 which helped her get further explanation from M3.

5.2.3. Asking for clarification with sorry/pardon

Another type of strategy the ASEAN ELF speakers used to *ask for clarification* from their interlocutors found in the main study was the use of *sorry/pardon* and other similar terms. Participants in the study used *sorry/pardon* to *ask for clarification* from their interlocutors when they did not understand something their interlocutors had said. In this section, the use of *sorry/pardon* and other similar terms (if any) by the participants which made them get clarification from their interlocutors and led them to arrive at understanding will be discussed.

The first example of the ELF speakers' use of *sorry/pardon* to *ask for clarification* from their interlocutors which enhanced the speakers to arrive at understanding was in Extract 5.10. This extract was from the cooking activity of Dyad 5 which was from the EFL sub-group. Participants were a Cambodian (C1) and a Laotian (L2), and they cooked C1's recipe, a beef dish served on lettuce leaves.

Extract 5.10. C1+L2
Context: They are preparing lettuce leaves.

1   L2:   ((has tears in her eyes because of the onion))
2   C1:   Sorry like ((laugh))
3   L2:   The onion.

4	C1:	Yeah the onion so. ((laugh))
5	L2:	((taking out the lettuce from the plastic bag)) Shall we wash it first?
6	C1:	Sorry?
7	L2:	((taking out the lettuce)) Shall we wa- wash [it first?]
8	C1:	[Yes.] (0.2) But
9		I think before you wa:sh, just ah ((points at the lettuce)) getting one
10		or two layers of salad,
11	L2:	((peels the lettuce leaves))
12	C1:	and then we can wash only that and the rest of it, we can put it in-
13	L2:	((puts some lettuce leaves in a bowl))
14	C1:	Yeah. (0.1) Use the good one to wash.
15	L2:	((puts more lettuce leaves into the bowl))

In the extract, C1 and L2 were preparing lettuce leaves. When L2 took out the whole lettuce from a plastic bag, L2 asked C1 whether they should wash the lettuce first or not before cutting it in Line 5. However, C1 did not seem to understand well what L2 wanted to know, and then he signaled his non-understanding, using *sorry* in Line 6. Then, L2 repeated his question again in Line 7, and L2's repetition here helped C1 understand what L2 had asked. Then, C1 said *yes* and then, suggested L2 remove the outermost layers of the lettuce before washing it in Lines 8, 9, 10, 12, and 14. Here, although L2's repetition was the communication strategy which really made C1 arrive at understanding of what L2 had said, C1's use of *sorry* was the communication strategy which led L2 to repeat what he had said.

Another example of the use of *sorry/pardon* to *ask for clarification* from the interlocutor which helped the participant in the study to arrive at understanding was in Dyad 7's cooking activity which was from the ESL sub-group. In their cooking activity, a Filipino (F1) and a Malaysian (M1) cooked the Filipino dish, *adobo*. In the following extract, while frying potatoes, they were talking about M1's religion.

Extract 5.11. F1+M1

Context: They are frying potatoes.

1	F1:	Ohh! I have some Indian friends who are Hindu as well.
2	M1:	Ah I see.
3	F1:	Hm:

4	M1:	Like here in Szeged?
5	F1:	Yeah. Some some Indians that I went to the lab I mean: but not here
6		also like fresh. I mean in the last year so I haven't.
7	M1:	OK.
8	F1:	I'm not seeing them often, as before in the laboratory. ((stopped
9		flipping the potato pieces and puts the tong aside)) Maybe two Hindus,
10		I know, Indians.
11	M1:	Ah, sorry?
12	F1:	Indian. Two [Indian: ah] students who are Hindus.
13	M1:	[Ah: yes.]
14	F1:	(0.2) So, you can eat everything except beef.

In Extract 5.11, when F1 realized that M1 is a Hindu, she said she had some Hindu friends in Line 1 of the extract. Then, M1 asked for clarification from F1 with a direct question in Line 4. In the retrospection, M1 said that it was not clear to him whether F1's Hindu friends were in her country or in Szeged. That is why, he asked for clarification in Line 4. Then, F1 explained M1 that they were her lab mates in Szeged in Lines 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10. At that time, M1 asked for another clarification from F1, signaling his non-understanding with *sorry* in Line 11. Then, in the next turn in Line 12, F1 repeated what she had already said in Lines 9 and 10, but in this repetition, F1 did not use the exact words she had used, she used a reformulation. Then, M1 showed his arriving at understanding in Line 13. In the retrospection, M1 said that in this extract, what F1 said in Lines 9 and 10 was all mixed up and was not understandable to him. Thus, he said *sorry* for his non-understanding and to ask for clarification from F1.

Another example of the use of *sorry/pardon* which helped the participants in the main study arrive at shared understanding was in Dyad 10's cooking activity in which participants were I5 (an Indonesian) and M3 (a Malaysian). Dyad 10 was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL.

Extract 5.12. I5+M3 (Token ??)
Context: M3 is talking about using the oil they fried anchovies in to cook chili.

1	M3:	((finished transferring fried anchovies from the pan onto a plate)) OK.
2		We can use: thi:s oil to cook the chilies, it has the better taste=

| 3 | I5: | [Sorry. |]= ((carrying eggs in her hands from the table to the stove)) |

3   I5:   [Sorry.   ]= ((carrying eggs in her hands from the table to the stove))

4   M3:   =[because   ]   [of the-]

5   I5:   =[Sorry.]

6   M3:   an- anchovies. We have ((points at the pan)) we can use this oil for the:

7   I5:   Hm hm.

8   M3:   (0.1) to cook the *sambal*[1].

9   I5:   OK.

[1] *sambal* is a red chili paste which is usually a condiment to Indonesian and Malaysian dishes.

In Extract 5.12, after frying anchovies, M3 took out fried anchovies from the pan onto a plate. At that time, I5 was carrying eggs from the table to the stove in order to boil them. When M3 finished transferring fried anchovies onto the plate, she said that they could use the oil in the pan when they cooked chili in Line 2. First, I5 did not understand what M3 meant, thus she signaled M3 for her non-understanding with *sorry* in Lines 3 and 5 to get clarification from M3. Then, after M3's explanation and her repetition of what she had said in Lines 4 and 6, I5 arrived at understanding of what M3 meant.

5.3. Lexical support

Another communication strategy which helped participants in the main study arrive at shared understanding was related to lexical items. Kirkpatrick (2007b) categorized lexical-related communication strategies as *lexical anticipation*, *lexical suggestion*, and *lexical correction* and Kaur (2020) used the term, *lexical replacement*. In this study, a general term, *lexical support*, will be used for all the lexical-related communication strategies which enhanced understanding among the ELF speakers in the main study.

The first example of *lexical support* which helped participants arrive at shared understanding in the main study was from Dyad 3's cooking activity in which participants were a Burmese (B2) and a Vietnamese (V2). Dyad 3 was from the EFL sub-group, and participants cooked the Vietnamese chicken rice together according to V2's recipe. Extract 5.13 was at the very beginning of Dyad 3's cooking activity while participants were talking about ingredients.

Extract 5.13. B2+V2

Context: They are preparing ingredients for their cooking.

1	V2:	Frist of all, you need to prepare: for the gro- /grəʊsi/[1],
2	B2:	Yeah.
3	V2:	like about I have the chicken. ((shows chicken in a plastic container))
4	B2:	I will do it. OK.
5	V2:	Yeah. And about:: ((grabs ginger in a plastic bag))
6	B2:	Ginger?
7	V2:	Ginger? And ((takes a bowl with some onions)) ah:
8	B2:	This is onion.
9	V2:	Yeah, onion. It's onion. After that, I will now you need to cut ((takes a
10		plastic bag with a piece of ginger)) the ginger.
11	B2:	OK.
12	V2:	((opens a drawer))
13	B2:	Is there a cutting board?
14	V2:	Yeah here. ((shows the chopping boards he has)) You can use it.
15	B2:	((takes a bigger chopping board)) This one.
16	V2:	Yeah. And this is a:: ((shows some knives in the drawer))
17	B2:	Knife.
18	V2:	Knife. Hmm. ((looks at the table to know if there is another knife or not))
19		Yeah. Maybe you can use it.

[1] V2 had intended to say *grocery* as was reported in the retrospection.

In the extract, V2 was explaining to B2 what they needed for their cooking. In doing so, when V2 grabbed ginger and seemed to be facing difficulty uttering the word in Line 5, B2 provided lexical support to V2 in Line 6, then V2 took up B2's lexical support. Another lexical support by B2 was in Line 8. When V2 showed B2 some onion and wanted to say *onion* in Line 7, V2 was hesitant again. So, B2 provided lexical support again to V2 in Line 8, and there was V2's uptake for the word *onion* in Line 9. There was another lexical support by B2 in the extract. After telling B2 to cut ginger, V2 opened a drawer to show B2 the chopping boards and the knives he had. There were two chopping boards in the drawer, and B2 took the bigger one. Then, when V2 wanted to talk about the knives in the drawer, V2

was hesitant again. So, B2 provided lexical support for V2 again in Line 17, and V2's uptake for that lexical item was in Line 18.

In the retrospection, V2 said that he went back to his country for a few months and arrived back to Hungary just a few days before the recording for the research. His current flatmates were Vietnamese. Thus, he had not spoken in English for quite a long time, and the recording activity for the research was his first time again to speak in English for a long conversation. That is why he said he needed to think about how to say things in English and was having some difficulties speaking in English. Thus, B2's lexical supports were supportive for him to continue what he was talking. In return, V2's uptake of B2's lexical supports and explanation about cooking made B2 understand what he should do in their cooking activity. Thus, *lexical support* as a communication strategy in this extract facilitated having a successful communication between the two participants in Dyad 3.

Another example of *lexical support* which helped participants arrive at shared understanding found in the study was in Dyad 7's cooking activity in which participants were F1 and M1 from the ESL sub-group. As mentioned before, F1 and M1 cooked F1's recipe, *adobo*.

Extract 5.14. F1+M1

Context: They are washing chicken.

1	M1:	How do I (.) wash the chicken? ((laughs))
2	F1:	Ah OK. ((goes to the basin)) Just put everything in here. ((transfers
3		chicken into a plastic bowl already been in the basin)) Oh: this is a lot.
4		((turns on the tap)) ((mixes chicken and water)) Like this. ((takes a
5		piece of chicken, and washes it properly)) Yeah. So, you can just wash
6		it ((turns off the tap)) regularly with water, massage it with your hand
7		when I get the coliander[1]. ((opens the cabinet below the basin to take a
8		colander))
9	M1:	Ah no problem. ((starts washing the chicken))
10	F1:	((holding the colander and looks at M1's washing chicken)) Ah I think
11		it's OK. And then, you can ah [sip it] here.
12	M1:	[Drain] it.
13	F1:	Yes, drain.

14   M1:   ((transfers all chicken and water into the colander F1 is holding))

[1] F1 said she wanted to say *colander*.

When F1 and M1 started their cooking activity, M1 asked a question to F1 regarding how to wash chicken properly in Line 1 of Extract 5.14. In the retrospection, F1 said that he looked a bit shy when he asked that question, and she could notice that M1 was not familiar with housework. Thus, she explained him with the support of demonstration as in Lines 2 to 7, thinking that demonstration could make M1 understand her more clearly. In the retrospection, M1 also confirmed that the demonstrations of F1 throughout their cooking activity enhanced his understanding.

While M1 was washing chicken pieces, F1 was looking at the way M1 was washing them. Then, in Lines 10 and 11, F1 thought that chicken pieces were clean enough and F1 told M1 to remove the water. At that time, F1 used the word *sip*, then M1 suggested the word *drain*, referring to *putting all the water and chicken into the colander to let all the water go down through the holes of the colander*. Then, F1 adopted M1's lexical suggestion in the following line. In the retrospection, M1 said that when F1 said *sip* in Line 11, he could guess what F1 wanted to say, based on the context they were talking about, thus he used the word *drain* in Line 12. In the retrospection, F1 said that when she speaks English, she does not pay that much attention to grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary and so on, and she just uses whatever comes into her mind. In the extract, when M1 did lexical suggestion, it helped her, and she did not feel any irritation in that kind of situation, and it was fine with her to accept that kind of lexical suggestion from the interlocutor. This is in line with Kirkpatrick's (2007b) finding that the multilingual ASEAN ELF speakers in his study were comfortable using this kind of communication strategy among them to help each other. Here, in the extract, M1's lexical support enhanced arriving at shared understanding between him and F1.

Another example of *lexical support* which helped participants arrive at shared understanding in the study was in the cooking activity of Dyad 9 which was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL. Dyad 9's participants were I4 and M2.

Extract 5.15. I4+M2
Context: They are chatting about their social lives in Hungary.

1   M2:   Is it easy (.) to get (.) the visa for your husband?

2	I4:	Not so easy. ((laughs))
3	M2:	Right?
4	I4:	Because ah: we should have deposit [y' know.]
5	M2:	[Yeah.]
6	I4:	And: it is not (.) so easy to have deposit.
7	M2:	Yeah.
8	I4:	Million. ((laughs))
9	M2:	((gazes at I4's face)) How much?
10	I4:	Ah. No no no, million in Rupiah.
11	M2:	[Ah.]
12	I4:	[Hm] hm. But: (.) in Euro (0.1) I don't remember (.) in Euro, but in
13		Rupiah it's like (0.1) nineteen (.) thousand: (.) million [ah]
14	M2:	[Hm?]
15	I4:	billion billion billion.
16	M2:	Oh billion!
17	I4:	No no not billion. Billion or million? ((laughs))
18	M2:	Million?
19	I4:	Million. Yeah. Million (.) million.

While cooking, I4 and M2 were chatting about their academic and social lives in Hungary. In Extract 5.15, when M2 asked I4 how much money was needed to be deposited in the bank account for her husband's visa application so that he could come and stay in Hungary, I4 was confused between *million* and *billion* in Lines 13 and 15. When I4 uttered *billion* in Line 15, M2 was shocked, thinking that it must be in *millions*. Then, I4 said the amount of money she was talking was not in billions in Line 17, but she was still confused the two words. M2 suggested *million* in Line 18 as lexical correction and finally, I4 confirmed that the amount of the deposit was in *millions* in Line 19. In this example, I4 tried to correct herself first, then, she received her interlocutor's support for the correct lexicon and finally arrived at what the speaker wanted to say. Here, a participant's *lexical support* facilitated arriving at shared understanding between the two speakers of Dyad 9.

5.4. Asking for confirmation

Another communication strategy which ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study used to avoid misunderstanding and/or non-understanding was *asking for confirmation*. In the

retrospections, participants said that on some occasions in their cooking activities, they could guess what their interlocutors were saying or wanted to say, based on their previous cooking experience, the interlocutors' gestures, and the like. In that kind of occasions, they *asked for confirmation* from their interlocutors so that they could arrive at shared understanding. However, there were also occasions when participants did not want to agree with what their interlocutors had said or they were confused about what their interlocutors were saying. On those occasions as well, they *asked for confirmation* from their interlocutors to avoid misunderstanding or non-understanding. This section is about three communication strategies participants used to *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors which helped them arrive at shared understanding, particularly the use of *direct questions*, *repetition* and a *minimal check* to ask for confirmation.

5.4.1. Asking for confirmation with direct questions

The first communication strategy participants in the main study used to *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors which enhanced understanding between speakers in each dyad was the use of *direct questions*. An example of participants' use of *direct questions* to *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors can be seen in Extract 5.16, which was from the cooking activity of Dyad 1 in which participants were B2 and V1 from the EFL sub-group.

Extract 5.16. B2+V1

Context: They are preparing chilli for their cooking.

1	V1:	Oh. So strange. OK? And next?
2	B2:	And a little bit ((points at the plastic bag with chili))
3	V1:	Chili?
4	B2:	Chili. Yes. OK.
5	V1:	((opening the plastic pack to take out chili)) How many?
6	B2:	Half. Just half.
7	V1:	Just one? ((shows B2 a chili))
8	B2:	One. One. One.

In Extract 5.16, B2 and V1 were preparing chili for their cooking. When they had finished cutting the potato, V1 wanted to know what they would do next. At that time, B2

used a pointing gesture in Line 2. In the retrospection, when B2 was asked why he used a pointing gesture here, B2 said that he forgot how to say chili in English, thus he used a gesture, pointing his finger at the plastic bag with chili inside. Here, B2's use of gesture made V1 able to guess what B2 wanted to say, thus V1 made lexical suggestion to B2 with a rising intonation in Line 3. Then, B2 had an uptake V1's lexical suggestion, by repeating the word V1 provided in Line 4.

When V1 asked B2 how many chilies they needed for their cooking in Line 5, B2 answered *Half. Just half.* in Line 6. In the retrospection, V1 said that B2's answer was confusing. It might mean *half of all the chilies in the plastic pack* or *half of a chili*. Thus, V1 used a direct question as a confirmation check together with the action of showing a chili to B2 in Line 7 to confirm whether B2 was sure to use half of that chili. Then, B2 said *One* repeatedly in the next turn in Line 8, and thus, V1 took that chili and went to the sink to wash it. Here, V1's asking for confirmation made her get what she wanted to know.

Another example of the use of a *direct question* to *ask for confirmation* which enhanced the participants to arrive at shared understanding in the study was in Dyad 8's cooking activity of *adobo* by F2 and S1 who were from the ESL sub-group.

Extract 5.17. F2+S1
Context: The food is cooked and they are preparing servings.

1	F2:	Ah I think it's good now. ((opens the lid)) We can transfer in a bowl.
2		Want it? ((points at a bowl)) Right?
3	S1:	((takes the bowl F2 pointed at and a big spoon)) So, ((starts preparing
4		a serving)) Ah, it looks really good.
5	F2:	Just taste it. ((laughs))
6	S1:	Is it enough sauce or should ((gesture of adding more sauce into the
7		bowl)) more sauce?
8	F2:	Yeah yeah sure you can get more ((gesture of putting more sauce and
9		chicken into the bowl)) chicken also.

In Extract 5.17, when *adobo* was well cooked, F2 pointed at a bowl and told S1 that they could prepare servings in Lines 1 and 2. Thus, S1 took the bowl F2 had pointed at and started preparing servings. When he thought that the first serving he was preparing had enough food for one person, he asked F2 for confirmation in Lines 6 and 7, using a direct

question. Then, in the next turn, F2 told him that he could add more sauce and more chicken as well. In this extract, S1's direct question to ask for confirmation helped him to know what he wanted to confirm with his interlocutor, F2.

The use of a *direct question to ask for confirmation* was also found in the mixed group of EFL and ESL. In Dyad 9, participants were I4 and M2, and they cooked *nasi goreng*, Indonesian or Malaysian style fried rice.

Extract 5.18. I4+M2
Context: They are cooking *nasi goreng*.

1	M2:	((closes the lid of the oil bottle and puts it back to where he took it from))
2	I4:	Then, just wait until
3	M2:	[It's very hot here.]
4	I4:	[the oil] is hot. (0.2) Yeah yeah yeah.
5	M2:	((goes to the sink and washes his hands)) ((goes back near the stove))
6		(0.4) You put all together? ((points red chili, garlic and onion in a plate))
7	I4:	Yes. (0.3) With the: (0.1) ah maybe be:fore the ingredients [, we]
8	M2:	[Hm hm.]
9	I4:	can [add ah] ((points at the chicken pieces M2 had cut))
10	M2:	[Fry chicken?]
11	I4:	the chicken. Yeah fry the chicken, then-
12	M2:	So, normally, you fry it first? And then you take it out? Or you just lay
13		it [in?]
14	I4:	[Yeah.]
15		Ah actually (0.1) it's better ((points at chicken)) to, fry the chicken first.
16	M2:	Hm hm.

As there are different ways people cook *nasi goreng* in Indonesia and Malaysia, and by the time of the video recording, I4 and M2 were cooking *nasi goreng* according to I4's recipe, M2 wanted to know whether I4 usually fries red chili, garlic and onion together or separately when she cooks her *nasi goreng*. Thus, M2 asked I4 about that in Line 6 while they were waiting for the oil to become ready to start their cooking. However, M2 did not mention red chili, garlic, and onion in his question, but he pointed at those ingredients. Together with his pointing gesture use, M2's asking for confirmation was to avoid his non-

understanding of what to fry first in their cooking *nasi goreng*. Then, I4 said it was better if they fried chicken first in Lines 7 and 9. Here, I4 did not utter chicken but just pointed at the chicken plate. Then, M2 asked for I4's confirmation whether she meant to fry chicken first or not with a very short direct question in Line 10. Then, I4 confirmed it by repeating what M1 had said in Line 11. In the retrospection, M2 said he wanted to avoid misunderstanding because he usually puts chili, garlic and onion first before he puts chicken in his version of cooking *nasi goreng*. That's why M2 wanted to confirm with I4 about putting chicken first, and he asked for confirmation from I4 one more time in Lines 12 and 13. Then, I4 confirmed M2 in Lines 14 and 15. This example shows that M2's use of a direct question to ask for confirmation from I4 help him arrive at understanding what he wanted to know.

5.4.2. Repetition to ask for confirmation

Similar to *direct questions*, participants in the study also used *repetition* to *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors to check their understanding and/or to signal their non-understanding and misunderstanding, and to get confirmation from the interlocutors. Participants in the study employed *direct questions* and *repetition* not only to *ask for clarification* from their interlocutors but also to *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors. In the study, it was found that when participants used *repetition*, sometimes they used the exact form of what their interlocutors had said, sometimes they used some variation or a reformulated form.

An example of the use of *repetition* which helped participants arrive at shared understanding found in the main study was in Dyad 4's cooking activity which was from the EFL sub-group. Participants in Dyad 4 were I3 and L2 who cooked a mixed vegetable dish. According to I3's recipe, vegetable ingredients were boiled first. After chicken pieces were fried, boiled vegetables were added together with glass noodles, and then, mixed them all.

Extract 5.19. I3+L2

Context: They are about to start frying.

1	I3:	We can use this one I think, ((choosing spatulas one after another))
2	L2:	((puts some oil into the wok))
3	I3:	if you like the wooden,
4	L2:	((takes a wooden spatula))
5	I3:	or this. ((shows another spatula)) It's up to you.

6	L2:	((looks into the drawer and looks the spatulas))
7	I3:	It can be washed.
8	L2:	((takes a plastic spatula))
9	I3:	This one, yeah this one.
10	L2:	((tries using the spatula in the wok))
11	I3:	((looks at the oil in the wok)) Maybe add a bit more-
12	L2:	A bit [more?]
13	I3:	[oil.] Yes. A bit too: too little.
14	L2:	((takes the oil bottle and adds some more oil into the wok))

In Extract 5.19., while L2 was putting oil into the wok, I3 was choosing a spatula in the drawer near the stove. After agreeing on which spatula they would use in their cooking, when I3 came to the stove and saw the amount of oil in the wok, she told L2 to add some more oil in Line 11. L2 seemed to think that the amount of oil he had put in the wok was enough for their cooking. In the retrospection, L2 said that they would add some butter later. That is why, when I3 told him to add more oil, L2 wanted to confirm it. Here, L2 used a repetition to ask for confirmation from I3 and in the next turn, I3 confirmed him, saying that the amount of oil in the wok was a bit too little in Line 13. Thus, L2 took the oil bottle again and added some more oil into the wok.

Another example of the use of *repetition* to *ask for confirmation* which enhanced the participants to arrive at shared understanding in the study was in Dyad 7's cooking activity of *adobo* by F1 and M1 who were from the ESL sub-group.

Extract 5.20. F1+M1

Context: They are tasting the food they are cooking.

1	F1:	Yeah. And then ah: maybe if you want, you can try it. ((takes a spoon
2		and gives it to M1)) Then (.) give me a verdict. (.) just I will try to put
3		sugar afterwards later on.
4	M1:	((takes some juice from the pot))
5	F1:	Tell me what's the taste, ah it's OK.
6	M1:	((tastes the juice))
7	F1:	So, how do you find it?
8	M1:	Ah, I think it's nice. [It's ve:ry nice, yeah.]

9	F1:	[How d'you find- you find] the combination
10		of taste? You find something like sourness? Or:-
11	M1:	Yeah just sourness and a bit (.) a bit sweet also I think.
12	F1:	[REALly] still sweet for you? ((smiles))
13	M1:	[Yeah.]
14	F1:	Can ((takes a spoon)) [can I] try?
15	M1:	[Yeah.] But it's nice. ((chuckles))
16	F1:	((takes some juice and tastes it)) Hmm it's already sweet for you. Well,
17		I don't need to put sugar any more?
18	M1:	Hm hm, ah do you taste the sweetness?
19	F1:	NO actually.
20	M1:	Oh. ((laughs))
21	F1:	But you find it sweet already?
22	M1:	A little bit sweet yes.
23	F1:	OK, ((takes the spatula and stirs the pot)) [so] I don't=
24	M1:	[But-]
25	F1:	=I don't need to put any more because-
26	M1:	But we can put also.

When the food was almost ready to eat, F1 asked M1 to taste the food in Lines 1 and 2 of Extract 5.20, and to tell her about the taste in Lines 5 and 7. Then, when M1 told her the taste was nice in Line 8, F1 asked M1 about the taste specifically in Lines 9 and 10. Thus, M1 gave her his opinion on the taste of the dish in Line 11. When she heard about the taste from M1 in Line 11, F1 did not seem to be happy to accept M1's opinion. In the retrospection, F1 said she did not think that the food would be sweet because they did not put sugar into the pot. Thus, she wanted to confirm about the taste and asked for confirmation from M1 in Line 12. Here, F1 repeated the word *sweet* which was used by M1 in Line 11. Then F1 took a spoon to taste the food, and after tasting, F1 showed her disagreement with M1's opinion in Line 16. On hearing that, M1 asked for confirmation from F1 about the sweetness of the food in Line 18, using a partial repetition with the word *sweetness*. Then, when F1 said *no* in Line 19, M1 laughed a bit uncomfortably. Then, F1 asked for confirmation about the sweetness from M1 again in Line 21, by using a partial repetition with the word *sweet*. Thus, M1 confirmed that in Line 22. It seemed like they had different

sweetness level. When F1 said she did not need to put any sugar in Line 25 since M1 thought the food was sweet, M1 told her that they could put sugar.

In this extract, both F1 and M1 used repetitions in their asking for confirmation from each other which made them arrive at shared understanding.

Another example of *repetition* which helped participants arrive at understanding in the main study was in Dyad 11's cooking activity which was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL. In Dyad 11, participants were C2 and F3, and they cooked a Filipino dish. While cooking, they chatted about their social life in Hungary and in their countries.

Extract 5.21. C2+F3
Context: They are talking about the place they live in their countries.

1	C2:	I live near to the capital city as well. It's just like (.) how can- you know
2		Gödöllő?
3	F3:	Gödöllő?
4	C2:	Yes.
5	F3:	[Here?]
6	C2:	[No] yeah yeah ((points his finger to the floor)) in in
7	F3:	((laughs))
8	C2:	in Hungary. ((smiles))

In Extract 5.21, C2 was talking about the place he lived in his country in Line 1. When C2 wanted to say he lived in a suburb, he asked F2 whether she knew Gödöllő or not in Line 1. At that time, F2 repeated the word *Gödöllő* with a rising intonation and added a minimal check in Line 4 to ask for confirmation from C2. In the retrospection, F2 said that she was not familiar with the place names of C2's country. Thus, when she heard the word *Gödöllő* from C2, she wanted to confirm whether the *Gödöllő* C2 had said was the place in Hungary she knew or a place in C2's country. Then, C2 gave F2 confirmation in Lines 6 and 8.

5.4.3. Asking for confirmation with a minimal check

Another communication strategy participants in the main study used which enhanced their understanding is *asking for confirmation* with *minimal checks*. This is in line with Mauranen (2006) finds that ELF speakers use *confirmation checks* (p. 136), often with

minimal checks (p. 136), to avoid misunderstanding in their ELF talks. In the study, when a speaker in an ELF dyad requested confirmation from his/her interlocutor by using a *minimal* (either a word with a meaning such as *OK* or *backchannels*) followed by a rising intonation in the data, these kinds of *minimal signals* were classified as *asking for confirmation* with *minimal checks* in the analysis.

The first example of participants' uses of *minimal checks* to *ask for confirmation* in the main study was in Dyad 1's cooking activity in which participants were B2 and V1 who were from the EFL sub-group.

Extract 5.22. B2+V1
Context: They are tasting the food they are cooking.

1	B2:	But please taste. Just the taste, taste taste	[sorry	]=
2	V1:		[Taste it?	]
3	B2:	=try taste it.		
4	V1:	What should it- ((tastes the curry))		
5	B2:	Maybe a little bit sour. (0.1) Please taste it. Sweet or sour?		
6	V1:	[Can you try it?]		
7	B2:	[Please let me let] me taste it. Let me let me taste it.		
8	V1:	Ah: a little bit ah sweet. A little bit sour. But I'm not sure if the taste is (.)		
9	B2:	((tastes the curry))		
10	V1:	good or not.		
11	B2:	Yes good.		
12	V1:	Good? ((smiles))		
13	B2:	Yes. I want to put a little bit more ketchup.		
14	V1:	((takes the ketchup bottle and opens it)) OK.		
15	B2:	The ketchup maybe empty because we have-		
16	V1:	((holds the wooden spoon)) One more spoon?		
17	B2:	Yeah yeah because we we don't have potato[1] (.) we use this one.		
18	V1:	((squeezes the ketchup bottle to get the ketchup into the wooden spoon))		
19		OK. Oh. ((squeezing the ketchup bottle))		

((Ketchup is stuck in the bottle and not coming down easily, and there are some noises of air coming out of the ketchup bottle.))

20		((laughs)) Sorry. ((smiles and laughs)) OK?

21   B2:   Yes OK. Enough enough. Yes. OK.

¹ B2 mistakenly said *potato* instead of *tomato*.

In Extract 5.22, B2 told V1 to taste the curry they were cooking in Line 1. Then, V1 asked for clarification from B2 on what kind of taste the curry should be in Line 4. In the retrospection, V1 said that she had never had or never heard about the dish they were cooking. Thus, she did not know what kind of taste she should expect when she tasted it. Even before V had finished her question to get clarification from B2, B2 started giving V1 the information on what kind of taste the curry should have in Line 5. Later, B2 tasted the curry by himself.

After tasting the curry, B2 suggested adding some more ketchup into the pan in Line 13. Thus, V1 took the ketchup bottle, and opened the bottle. Then, she held the wooden spoon and asked for confirmation from B2 for how much ketchup she should add into the pan in Line 16. In the retrospection, B2 said that although he said *yeah* in Line 17, he was not sure how much ketchup in one spoon would be, and he just would look at the amount when V1 put the ketchup into the spoon. Then, when V1 squeezed the ketchup bottle to get the ketchup into the wooden spoon, V1 used another confirmation check with B2 by the time she thought that the amount of the ketchup she had squeezed into the wooden spoon was enough. In this confirmation check, V1 used a minimal check in Line 20. After that, B2 confirmed her in the next turn in Line 21. Here, V1's asking for confirmation with a minimal check in Line 20 was the communication strategy which helped her know what she wanted to know.

Another example of the use of a *minimal check* for confirmation which enhanced understanding among participants in the study was in Dyad 8's cooking activity of *adobo* by F2 and S1 who were from the ESL sub-group.

Extract 5.23. F2+S1
Context: They are adding ingredients into the pot.

1   F2:   So: I think right now we can add these laurel leaves. ((takes a pack))
2   ((takes a laurel leaf out of the pack)) This gives a different smell.
3   S1:   Hm.
4   F2:   ((puts laurel leaves into the pot)) And then we can also add ((points
5   at pineapples)) the pineapples.

6	S1:	Now? ((points at the pineapples pieces))
7	F2:	Yeah. ((nods))
8	S1:	Alright. ((takes pineapple with a big spoon and puts into the pot))
9	F2:	((continues putting laurel leaves into the pot))
10	S1:	Yeah. ((finished putting pineapple pieces))

When F2 thought that chicken in the pot was cooked, she said she thought it was time to add laurel leaves into the pot in Line 1 of Extract 5.23. While she was adding laurel leaves into the pot on the stove, F2 said they could also add pineapple pieces. Then, S1 asked for confirmation from F2 with a minimal check to know when they should add pineapple in Line 6, accompanied by a pointing gesture at the pineapple pieces they had prepared. After F2 confirmed in Line 7, S1 took pineapple pieces with a big spoon and added them into the pot.

Another example of the use of a *minimal check* for confirmation which enhanced arriving shared understanding among participants in the study was in Dyad 9's cooking activity in which participants were I4 and M2 who were from the mixed group of EFL and ESL.

Extract 5.24. I4+M2

Context: They are adding soy sauce into the wok.

1	M2:	((opens the soy sauce bottle)) OK, can you tell me how much?
2	I4:	Yeah yeah. Hm: Can you (0.1) just spread it?
3	M2:	((puts some soy sauce into the wok))
4	I4:	((looks at the amount of soy sauce M2 is adding)) OK. That's enough.
5		((gesture to stop M2's action))
6	M2:	Enough?
7	I4:	Ah: add a little bit.
8	M2:	A little bit. ((adds some more soy sauce))
9	I4:	((looks at the amount of soy sauce M2 is adding)) Ah! OK.
10	M2:	Is it OK?
11	I4:	It's OK. [It's] OK.
12	M2:	[OK.]

In Extract 5.24, when I4 told M2 to add soy sauce into the wok, I4 did not say how much soy sauce M2 should add. So, M2 asked I4 how much soy sauce he should add. Then, I4 told M2 to spread the soy sauce on the rice while adding it into the wok. While M2 was adding soy sauce, I4 looked at how much soy sauce was in. And, when I4 thought the right amount, I4 signaled M2 to stop. However, M2 thought that they should add more soy sauce and so, he signaled I4 to confirm whether he should stop adding soy sauce or not. In doing so, M2 used a minimal check with a rising intonation in Line 6. Here, M2's minimal check to ask for confirmation made I4 to confirm not to stop but to add more soy sauce into the wok. M2 used Ir asking for confirmItion in LIne 10 in this extract. While M2 was adding more soy sauce into the wok, I4 used an exclamation in Line 9, thinking that M2 overly added soy sauce into the wok. Noticing I4's exclamation, M2 asked for confirmation from I4 again to make sure the amount he had added was OK. Then, I4 comforted M2 in Line 11. In this extract, although M2 used asking for confirmations twice, the forms M2 used were different. For the first time, M2 used a minimal check with a rising intonation but in his second asking for confirmation, M2 used a question. In the retrospective interview, I4 said that both the first time and the second time of M2's asking for confirmation alarmed her to rethink whether the amount of soy sauce M2 had added was OK or not. In this way, M2's asking for confirmations at both times could help the two speakers arrive at mutual understanding.

5.5. Non-linguistic strategies

In the main study, it was found that participants used different types of *non-linguistic means* such as *gesture*, *facial expression, touching*, *showing*, *gaze*, and so on as communication strategies which enhanced understanding between each other.

An example of a *non-linguistic strategy* which enhanced participants arriving at shared understanding found in the main study was in Extract 5.25 which was from Dyad 3's cooking activity. Participants were a Burmese (B2) and a Vietnamese (V2) who were from the EFL sub-group. As mentioned earlier, B2 and V2 cooked V2's recipe in their cooking activity.

Extract 5.25. B2+V2

Context: They are preparing to cook rice.

| 1 | V2: | No wait, after that you need to put ginger- |
| 2 | B2: | ((about to close the rice cooker)) |

3	V2:	WAIT WAIT.
4	B2:	Oh. Sure?
5	V2:	Yeah.
6	B2:	I don't know.
7	V2:	Ginger. ((points at the ginger and kaffir lime leaves bowl))
8	B2:	Oh. OK ((takes the bowl)) OK OK OK. ((puts ginger and kaffir
9		lime leaves into the rice pot)) This is your culture, good. (.) We
10		don't normally cook like that. That's why. (.) Good. Good
11		experience. I will try (.) again.
12	V2:	Yeah.

In their cooking activity, V2's recipe was to cook rice with chicken broth, adding some ginger and kaffir lime leaves. After putting chicken broth into the rice pot, the inner pot of an electric rice cooker, B2 was about to put the rice pot into the outer pot of the electric rice cooker. At that time, V2 told B2 to wait as V2 wanted to put ginger and kaffir lime leaves into the rice pot. But, B2 did not notice it and continued doing his action. When B2 was about to close the lid of the electric rice cooker, V2 told B2 again to wait in Line 3 of the extract above. This time, V2's voice was louder, and thus, B2 obviously noticed that V2 was trying to stop him. Then, V2 pointed at the small bowl they put some ginger pieces and kaffir lime leaves in Line 7. Thus, B2 took the bowl, and put ginger and kaffir lime leaves into the rice pot. In the extract, V2 pronounced *ginger* as /gingə/. In the retrospection, B2 said that when V2 said *ginger*, he did not understand what V2 was saying. However, V2's use of a pointing gesture in Line 7 made B2 understand what to do next.

Another example of a *non-linguistic strategy* which helped participants arrive at shared understanding found in the main study was in Dyad 4's cooking activity of which participants were an Indonesian (I3) and a Laotian (L2) from the EFL sub-group.

Extract 5.26. I3+L2
Context: They are talking about the electric stove they are using.

1	L2:	But I- we use one ((points at another cooking unit next to the one
2		he is using)) at a time, [not (.) both.]
3	I3:	[Hm hm, two.] Aw: Not two. Maybe that's
4		why because we're using two.

5	L2:	Yes.
6	I3:	So: that's why the the power is like ((gesture)) departing because
7		°you that's why that-°
8	L2:	Yeah. Eh ((points at the cooking unit he is using)) this part is like
9		(0.1) the heat is (0.2) ah no not (.) hotter than this part. ((points at
10		the other cooking unit))
11	I3:	[Ah:]
12	L2:	[This] part is the main. ((points at the other cooking unit))
13	I3:	Ah:: the back.
14	L2:	Yeah the back. ((puts his hand over the cooking unit he is using)) This
15		part is, for small cooking like, egg in the morning.
16	I3:	[Oh::]
17	L2:	[Some]thing like those like-
18	I3:	Alright, °I really XXXXX° because at my flat, we use the gas stove.
19	L2:	Yeah:
20	I3:	And for the gas stove, we just fix the small size, the medium size, or
21		the big size. ((gesture)) If you want to cook something like bigger
22		like this ((points at the wok)), we can use the biggest one. Hm: I think
23		hm: we already smell (.) some (0.2) some-
24	L2:	((lowers his head near the wok)) ((takes garlic and onion pieces with
25		the spatula and looks at them)) ((shakes his head))
26	I3:	Not yet?
27	L2:	Not yet.

In the cooking activity of Dyad 4, while L2 was frying garlic and onion in the pan, I3 complained about the heat level of the stove they were using. In Extract 5.26, L2 was explaining I3 about the kind of electric stove they were using which had two cooking units in Lines 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 15. While explaining about the two cooking units they were using, L2 pointed at each cooking unit when he talked about each cooking unit. In the retrospection, I3 said that L2's pointing gestures here were supportive for her understanding.

In the extract above, L2 used another type of *non-linguistic form* which made I3 understand what he wanted to say. It was L2's head shake in Line 25. When I3 signaled to say garlic and onion were getting cooked in Lines 22 and 23, L2 bent down to make his head near the wok and checked the garlic and onion he was frying. Then, he took some garlic and

onion with the spatula in his hand and looked at garlic and onion pieces. Then, he shook his head. Seeing L2's head shaking, I3 asked him if garlic and onion were not cooked yet in Line 26. Then, L2 repeated her in Line 27 to answer I3's question. Here, it was obvious that L2's head shaking made I3 understand what L2 wanted to say.

More *non-linguistic forms* which facilitated participants' understanding each other were found in Dyad 6's cooking activity. Dyad 6's participants were a Laotian (L3) and a Thai (T3) who were from the EFL sub-group.

Extract 5.27. L3+T3

Context: They are talking about how to cut a tomato into eight pieces.

1	L3:	((takes three tomatoes))
2	T3:	((tastes the /tôm jām/ broth and is satisfied with the taste)) So, right
3		now, it doesn't need anything.
4	L3:	Hm. ((finished washing the tomatoes)) OK.
5	T3:	Ah cut them into ((gesture of cutting)) eight pieces please.
6	L3:	Eight pieces? ((thinking)) Eight pieces. [How to cut?]
7	T3:	[Like one,] ((gesture of
8		cutting the tomato vertically into two halves))
9	L3:	Ah ha.
10	T3:	and then four, ((gesture of cutting the tomato halves horizontally
11		into quarters)) and then ((gesture of cutting each tomato quarter
12		vertically again into smaller halves)).
13	L3:	Ah: I see. ((cuts a tomato into two pieces)) Like this?
14	T3:	Hm hm. That's two. And then, four.
15	L3:	Oh. ((cuts the two halves of the tomato into quarters))
16	T3:	Be careful.
17	L3:	[And then,]
18	T3:	[And then,] cut it individually.
19	L3:	Hm hm.

In Extract 5.27, when T3 told L3 to cut tomatoes into eight pieces, L3 repeated *eight pieces* in Line 6 with a rising intonation and he was thinking how to cut tomatoes into eight pieces. L3 even repeated *eight pieces* one more time without a rising intonation. Then, L3

119

asked a direct question. L3's repetition accompanied by a direct question made L3 get the further clarification he wanted from T3. T3 explained L3 how to cut a tomato into eight pieces with the support of gestures in Lines 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12. Later in the follow-up interview, L3 said T3's use of gestures here was very helpful for him to understand what to do. Then, when L3 started cutting a tomato, he asked for confirmation from T3 in Line 13 to know if his cutting was as T3 wanted or not. In the follow-up interview, L3 said that he was calculating the number of tomato pieces in his mind while cutting like:

"Four pieces. Then, cut individually, it will be 4 x 2 = 8 pieces. Oh, it can be eight."

While L3 was cutting the tomato, T3 was looking at the way L3 was cutting and provided the information L3 might need to do the task in Lines 14 and 18. Here, L3's demonstration made T3 which information he should provide L3 at different stages of L3's cutting a tomato.

The ELF speaker's use of *demonstration* as a communication strategy which enhanced understanding for the interlocutor was also found in Dyad 7's cooking activity. Dyad 7 was from the ESL sub-group.

Extract 5.28. F1+M1

Context: They are preparing ingredients for their cooking.

1	M1:	((peels a garlic clove with a knife))
2	F1:	First, so, what you can do, ((puts the knife on a garlic clove and presses
3		the garlic clove so that it's broken and becomes easy to peel)) maybe
4		you can do like this.
5	M1:	OK.
6	F1:	So, for easy to get removed it like this. ((shows M1 how to cut out the
7		edge of the garlic clove)) First, crush it first so that we'll easily.
8	M1:	((peels the garlic clove which F1 has crushed, and cuts the edge with
9		his hands))
10	F1:	Yeah. ((continues breaking garlic cloves)) Hm, like, crushing like that.
11		Yeah. So, it's easy to open this. ((removes garlic skin)) Hm hm.
12	M1:	Crush it. ((M1 puts the knife on a garlic clove and presses the knife
13		with his palm to crush the garlic clove to become open))
14	F1:	Put some force. ((looking at the way M1 is pressing the knife with his
15		palm)) Yeah like that. Yeah yeah OK.

16	M1:	((removes garlic skin with his hands))
17	F1:	Is it easier?
18	M1:	Yeah, much easier.
19	F1:	Yeah. I'll help you cut others. ((takes the knife and starts crushing
20		the other garlic cloves))

In Extract 5.28, a Filipino (F1) and a Malaysian (M1) were preparing ingredients for their cooking. When M1 was peeling garlic cloves, F1 took a garlic clove, and crushed it with a knife. Thus, the garlic clove had broken and became easy to peel. While demonstrating M1 how to break garlic cloves, F1 explained him as well in Line 2, 3 and 4. After that, F1 showed M1 how to cut out the edge of the garlic clove in Line 6 and 7. Then, M1 took the knife and put it on a garlic clove, then pressed the knife with his palm to crush the garlic clove to become open. Looking at the way M1 was pressing the knife with his palm, F1 gave further suggestions to M1 in Lines 14 and 15.

In the retrospection, F1 said that from the beginning, she noticed M1 did not have much experience in cooking, thus she thought a demonstration would be better for M1 to understand than just saying how to do something. That is why, she used demonstrations during their cooking activity. M1 also said that he was happy with F1's demonstrations which helped him a lot to understand how to do things in cooking.

More examples of *non-linguistic strategies* which helped participants arrive at shared understanding found in the main study were in Dyad 8's cooking activity. Dyad 8 was also from the ESL sub-group of which participants were a Filipino (F2) and a Singaporean (S1).

Extract 5.29. F2+S1
Context: They are preparing for their cooking.

1	S1:	((shows the onion)) It looks ugly but at least (.)	[done.]
2	F2:		[Yeah] ((laughs))
3	S1:	So, are we supposed to dice it? or-	
4	F2:	Ah: yeah you can dice it.	
5	S1:	Dice it?	
6	F2:	Yeah.	
7	S1:	OK then. How do you dice it? I can't remember really. Hm:	
8	F2:	Hm:	

9	S1:	How do you dice it?
10	F2:	I usually cut into the half ((gesture of cutting)).
11	S1:	Hm hm so, ((puts the knife on the onion)) this way?
12	F2:	Ah. ((points at the tip of the onion)) I also remove this part (.) you
13		don't remove.
14	S1:	The part? ((points at a part of the onion with the knife))
15	F2:	((touches a part on the onion)) This part like, only that. ((points at
16		the part again)) Just cut this here.
17	S1:	Cut this way? ((holds the top part of the onion, and shows F2))
18		You mean you see?

((S1 was about to get rid of the onion's tip by hand.))

19	F2:	No no no. This ((gesture of cutting)) ah: use the knife.
20	S1:	Knife, this way? ((puts the knife to show a line on the onion))
21	F2:	((laughs))
22	S1:	This way? ((changes the direction of the onion)) ((puts the knife on
23		the onion to show a line))
24	F2:	Yeah yeah yeah [yeah that one ((points at the onion)) just to remove-]
25	S1:	[Ah that way sure?]

In Extract 5.29, F2 and S1 were preparing ingredients for their cooking activity. After peeling the skin of an onion, S1 asked for confirmation from F2 whether they would dice that onion or not in Line 3. In the retrospection, S1 said that he seldom cooked. Thus, when F2 said they would dice the peeled onion, S1 used self-repetition in Line 5 to recall his memory of how to dice an onion. Then, S1 asked for clarification from F2 to tell him how to dice an onion in Lines 7 and 9. Thus, F2 told him how she usually cuts an onion with an accompanied gesture in Line 10. Then, S1 asked for confirmation from F2 by putting the knife on the onion to show F2 the direction of the onion he should cut in Line 11. Here, S1's showing made F2 know how S1 would cut the onion first.

Another *non-linguistic strategy* in this extract which helped the interlocutor understand what the speaker wanted to say was in Line 12. Here, F2 pointed at the tip of the onion to let S1 know that he also should cut out that part of the onion. In the retrospection, S1 said that F2's pointing here helped him know which part he should remove from that onion. Then, S1 pointed at that onion part with the knife he was holding in his hand to ask for confirmation from F2 in Line 14. In the retrospection, F2 said that she was worried for S1

might cut out a big part from the onion. Thus, F2 touched the tip of the onion, and told him to cut out only that tip. F2 used a repetition here also to confirm S1 that he just needed to cut only the tip of the onion, accompanied by a pointing gesture at the onion tip in Lines 15 and 16. In the retrospection, F2 said that all these uses of *non-linguistic strategies* by S1 in Lines 12, 15, and 16 helped her understand clearly what S1 meant.

After F2's pointing and touching in Lines 15 and 16, S1 asked for confirmation again for the onion part he should cut out in Line 17, and S1 was about to get rid of the onion's tip by hand. Thus, F2 told him to use the knife to cut out the onion tip in Line 19. Then, S1 asked for confirmation again in Lines 20 and 22. First, S1 put the knife to show a line on the onion in the form of cutting the onion into two halves. Then, he changed the direction of the onion and put the knife on the onion again to show a line on the onion in the form of cutting out the bottom part of the onion. Then, F2 confirmed to him the direction he should cut the onion in Line 24.

In this extract, there were altogether six occurrences of participants' *non-linguistic strategies* which helped each other to arrive at shared understanding between them. First, S1's showing in Line 11 enhanced understanding of F2. Secondly, F2's pointing in Line 12, and also F2's touching and pointing in Lines 15 and 16 helped S1 understand what F2 meant. Finally, S1's showing in Line 20 as well as his showing in Lines 22 and 23 enhanced understanding of F2.

The speaker's use of *demonstration* as a *non-linguistic strategy* which enhanced understanding for the interlocutor was also found in Dyad 10's cooking activity in which participants were an Indonesian (I5) and a Malaysian (M3), and they were from the mixed group of EFL and ESL. As mentioned earlier, I5 and M3 cooked *nasi lemak*, M3's recipe.

Extract 5.30. I5+M3

Context: They are cooking.

1:	I5:	Atchoo! Oh my god! It's because of-
2	M3:	I will add some salt. ((puts some salt into the rice pot))
3	I5:	chili. ((choking))
4	M3:	((laughs))
5	I5:	((goes away from the table)) Oh my god! ((goes back to the table and
6		continues stirring the rice and other ingredients in the rice pot))
7	M3:	I need to open the window.

8	I5:	Yes, please.
9	M3:	((opens the window))
10	M3:	((laugh)) So spicy. ((takes a spatula and stirs the chili she is boiling in
11		a pot on the stove))
12	I5:	M3, how do you know that ((choking))
13	M3:	((choking)) Right now in the ((choking)) on the
14	I5:	it will not too spicy[1]? How do you know?
15	M3:	Hm. ((looks into the rice pot)) I will try to use
16	I5:	How much ((points at the salt container)) you put salt?
17	M3:	((holds the salt container and demonstrates the way she puts salt
18		into the rice pot)) *agak-agak*[2]. I just this *agak-agak*.

[1] I5 said she wanted to say *salty*.

[2] *agak-agak* means a little.

In Extract 5.30, I5 and M3 were preparing to cook rice for their *nasi lemak*. After M3 had added some salt into the rice pot, I5 asked M3 how M3 knew if the food would be salty or not when M3 added salt into the rice they were preparing to cook as in Lines 12 and 14. In the retrospection, I5 said that she mistakenly uttered *spicy* in Line 14 although she wanted to utter salty here. Then, I5 reformulated her question in Line 16 to ask M3 how much salt M3 added. When M3 answered I5's question, M3 took the salt container and demonstrated the way she put salt into the food she cooked in Line 17.

While demonstrating, M3 code-switched into Malay in her answer in Line 18 with *agak-agak*. In the follow-up interview, M3 said that *agak-agak* is a slang word, and here, she wanted to say she just estimated the amount. In the retrospection with I5, I5 said that *agak* does not mean a little or estimate in Indonesian language, but I5 said she understood what M3 wanted to say. I5 said that M3's demonstration while saying *agak-agak* helped her arrive at understanding on what M3 wanted to say. I5 also said that although the meaning of *agak-agak* is different in her language, M3's code-switch with *agak-agak* did not make I5 misunderstand or non-understand here. I5 also added that as M3 and she were flatmates, she had been familiar with M3's way of speaking and also familiar with some Malay usage.

The use of *gesture* and *pointing* which aided understanding between participants was also found in the cooking activity of Dyad 11 of which participants were C2 and F3 from the mixed group of EFL and ESL. As mentioned earlier, C2 and F3 cooked *adobo*, F3's recipe,

in their cooking activity. In this extract, each participant's use of pointing or gesture facilitated understanding of each other.

Extract 5.31. C2+F3

Context: They are preparing vegetables.

1	F3:	It's OK. I can- from now you can slice this one in ((points at the
2		potato with the knife)) maybe eight pieces.
3	C2:	O:K. I see.
4	F3:	Any slice I think. ((gives the knife and the chopping board to C2)) Eight
5		[pieces.]
6	C2:	[Hm hm.]
7	F3:	Like- ((gesture of drawing a line on the table))
8	C2:	((takes the potato and lays it on the chopping board)) ((puts the knife on
9		the potato))
10	F3:	OK do it first.
11	C2:	(.)
12	F3:	Can you halve it first? like- ((touches the potato with her finger and
13		uses gesture of cutting the potato into halves)) this.
14	C2:	((cuts the potato into halves))
15	F3:	OK. And then,
16	C2:	((changes the direction of the potato and shows the lines on the potato
17		with the knife))
18	F3:	yeah that's it.

In Extract 5.31, C2 and F3 were preparing ingredients for their cooking. After washing the potato, F3 pointed at the potato and told C2 to cut it into eight pieces in Lines 1 and 2. In the retrospection, C2 said that F3's pointing here aided in his understanding of what F3 wanted him to cut because there was an onion as well as a potato in the bowl, and F3 did not utter potato when she told C2 to cut it into eight pieces, instead, she just pointed at the potato. Then, F3 showed how to cut the potato by using the gesture of drawing a line on the table in Line 7. After that, C2 took the potato and put it on the chopping board, then put the knife on the potato in Lines 8 and 9. In the retrospection, F3 said that seeing C2's gesture of putting the knife on the potato, she understood that C2 wanted to confirm with her for the

125

direction he should cut the potato into two halves. Thus, she confirmed it in Line 10. However, C2 did not do any action. Thus, F3 touched the potato with her finger and used the gesture of cutting the potato into halves, at the same time telling C2 to cut the potato into two halves in Lines 12 and 13. Then, C2 cut the potato into halves. After that, C2 changed the direction of the potato and showed the lines on the potato with the knife, letting F3 know the way he would cut the potato. This time again, seeing C2's gestures in Lines 16 and 17, F3 confirmed C2 for the way the potato should be cut. In the retrospection, F3 said that C2's uses of gestures in this extract made her understand how C2 would cut the potato.

5.6 Summary of the strategies found in the data

In brief, as found in the two pilot studies, participants in the main study, who are multilingual, speaking at least two languages in their daily lives, code-switched to their other languages when they talked to each other in English during their cooking activities, and their code-switches could help their interlocutors arrive at understanding as in Extracts 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3.

Another communication strategy which enhanced understanding among participants was the speakers' use of *asking for clarification* from their interlocutors. In the main study, it was found that most participants used *direct questions*, and *repetition with a question intonation* as in Extracts 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9. Some participants used *sorry/pardon* to signal their interlocutors for their non-understanding, and their use of *sorry/pardon* made them get the clarifications they wanted from their interlocutors, and arrive at understanding as in Extracts 5.10, 5.11, and 5.12. The use of different types of *asking for clarification* found in the main study support Kaur (2010), stating that ELF speakers *request clarification* with "wh-clarification question or alternative-type question" (p. 203) to arrive at understanding among them.

Another type of communication strategy which enhanced understanding among participants in the main study was participants' *lexical support* to their interlocutors. During the cooking activities, when participants were hesitant to speak something or when they used English words which were obviously not appropriate for what they wanted to say, their interlocutors provided the words they might need to use as in Extracts 5.13, 5.14, and 5.15. Hearing *lexical support* from the interlocutors, the participants picked up their interlocutors' *lexical support* and continued what they were talking. Among participants' *lexical support*, some facilitated participants' achieving shared understanding and had successful communication between them.

In the main study, participants also *asked for confirmation* from their interlocutors to avoid misunderstanding and/or non-understanding in their ELF interactions. When participants wanted to confirm something, they used *direct questions*, *repetition*, or *minimal checks*, and their use of *direct questions*, *repetition* or *minimal checks* facilitated them avoiding misunderstanding or to arrive at understanding between them as in Extracts 5.16, 5.17, 5.18, 5.19, 5.20, 5.21, 5.22, 5.23, and 5.24.

In addition, in the main study, the use of *non-linguistic forms* was found in all dyad's cooking activities as would be expected due to the nature of the task i.e., the ELF interactions while performing actual cooking activities. This is in line with Kimura and Canagarajah (2018), asserting that "[h]uman interactions are not restricted by linguistic boundaries" (p. 302). Among those *non-linguistic forms* found in the main study, some served as communication strategies which enhanced participants' understanding of what their interlocutors wanted to say. As discussed above, the participants' use of *pointing* in Extracts 5.25, 5.26, 5.29 and 5.31, the use of *head shaking* in Extract 5.26, the use of *showing* and *touching* in Extract 5.29, and the use of *gestures* in Extracts 5.27 and 5.31 enhanced understanding between the speakers in each dyad. In addition, participants' *demonstrations* to their interlocutors in Extract 5.27, 5.28 and 5.30 were also a communication strategy supportive for interlocutors' understanding.

Finally, it should be noted that in ASEAN ELF interactions, speakers used multiple communication strategies at a single time while trying to arrive at mutual understanding between them. If a speaker's use of a communication strategy was not enough to arrive at shared understanding between them, he/she employed multiple communication strategies. As a result, at one point in the ELF interaction, speakers in a dyad arrived at shared understanding. The speakers' use of multiple communication strategies can be either using a single strategy for multiple times or using a combination of different strategies. For example, in Extract 5.6, C2 used a series of *direct questions* to *ask for clarifications* from his interlocutor, F3, till his arrival of understanding. On the contrary, in Extract 5.24, M2 used a *minimal check* with a rising intonation to *ask for confirmation* from I4, then also used a *direct question* to *ask for* another *confirmation* from his interlocutor to arrive at mutual understanding. Another example of M2's use of different communication strategies was in Extract 5.18. In that extract, M2's use of a *pointing gesture* and his use of *direct questions* to *ask for confirmation* from I4 till he finally arrived at understanding for what he wanted to know. In Extract 5.27 as well, when his interlocutor, T3, told him to cut tomatoes into eight pieces, first L3 used a *repetition* accompanied by a *direct question* to get T3's further

clarification and then, he *asked for confirmation* with a question while cutting a tomato. These examples obviously show that ASEAN ELF speakers use multiple communication strategies in their interactions.

Chapter summary

In the main study, it was found that ASEAN ELF speakers used different types of communication strategies such as *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, and *asking for confirmation*. In previous literature, Kirkpatrick (2007b) and Deterding (2013) stated that *code-switching* is not common among ELF speakers in the ASEAN context, but the instances of *code-switching* found in the pilot studies as well as in the main study facilitated ASEAN ELF speakers' arriving at shared understanding. Regarding other communication strategies which were *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, and *asking for confirmation*, the data in the pilot studies and also in the main study showed that these communication strategies enhanced ASEAN ELF speakers' arrival at shared understanding in their ELF interactions. In the main study, it was also found that ASEAN ELF speakers used different types of *non-linguistic communication strategies* which include body language such as *gesture*, *head shaking*, *pointing*, *showing*, and *touching*, and *demonstrations* of how to do things, and the like. Looking at the instances of communication strategies found in the pilot studies as well as in the main study, the data shows that not only the communication strategies which are in linguistic forms but also those in non-linguistic forms help ASEAN ELF speakers understand each other.

Chapter 6
Discussion

The main study was focused on the research questions presented in Chapter 1. As seen in Chapter 1, there are two main research questions, and in research question 1, there are three sub-questions. In this chapter, these research questions will be answered accordingly first. Then, further significant findings which are not directly related to these research questions will be presented and discussed. In doing so, findings of research question 1 on communication strategies which aided in the achievement of understanding among ASEAN ELF speakers in their interactions will be discussed in 6.1, followed by the discussion about the three sub-questions of the research question 1 in sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2. After that, research question 2, which is about the frequency of each communication strategy which aided ASEAN ELF speakers in their arrival of shared understanding, will be answered in 6.2. Other significant findings which are not directly related to the research questions will be presented in 6.3. While presenting the discussion concerning findings of the research in this chapter, examples from the main study as well as from the pilot studies will be used wherever necessary.

6.1. Discussion concerning research question 1 on communication strategies which aid in the achievement of understanding

ASEAN ELF speakers in the two pilot studies as well as in the main study used communication strategies in their ELF talk to avoid misunderstanding and non-understanding, and their use of communication strategies helped them arrive at shared understanding. As presented in Chapter 5, among these communication strategies, some were linguistic whereas others were non-linguistic.

To answer research question 1, as seen in Chapter 5, *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, and *asking for confirmation* were communication strategies which have linguistic forms the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study used, and facilitated arriving at shared understanding among the speakers in each dyad. To *ask for clarification* from their interlocutors, the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study employed *direct questions*, *repetition* and *sorry/pardon*. They also employed *direct questions* and *repetition* when they wanted to *confirm* something with their interlocutors. *Minimal checks* were also found in the main study as a communication strategy the ASEAN ELF speakers used to *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors. The ASEAN ELF speakers' use of different ways to

ask for clarification and *confirmation* found in the main study supports Kaur's (2010) finding that ELF speakers use "different confirmation and clarification practices to address and resolve problems of understanding when they occur" (p. 204). In the main study, the ASEAN ELF speakers' use of *non-linguistic strategies* also enhanced understanding between speakers in each dyad. As in *asking for clarification* and *asking for confirmation*, the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study employed different types of *non-linguistic strategies* such as *gesture*, *head shaking*, *pointing*, *showing*, and *touching*, and also *demonstration*. Findings regarding these communication strategies are in line with previous literature on communication strategies in the ELF context such as Björkman (2014), Deterding (2013), Kaur (2010, 2012, 2020), Kirkpatrick (2007b), Mauranen (2006) and Pietikäinen (2018).

One finding which was noted among the findings of the main study was about *code-switching*. In previous literature on communication strategies in the ASEAN context, Deterding (2013) argued that *code-switching* can create misunderstandings among ELF speakers. However, *code-switching* of the ELF speakers in the main study was found as a communication strategy which facilitated understanding among speakers rather than making misunderstandings among them. Among all the code-switches the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study used in their ELF interactions, there were only three instances of code-switching which led to misunderstanding and/or non-understanding for the interlocutors. (One of those examples will be discussed later in this chapter in 6.3.5.) However, even with those misunderstandings and/or non-understanding, the communication between speakers in each dyad did not break down.

Apart from those three code-switches, other uses of communication strategies enhanced understanding between participants in each dyad in the main study although the use of each communication strategy was not always successful to arrive at shared understanding. As discussed in Chapter 5, if one of these communication strategies was not enough to arrive at shared understanding between them, the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study employed more than one communication strategy in their ELF interactions. As a result, at one point in their ELF interactions, they arrived at shared understanding.

6.1.1. Discussion concerning research questions 1.1 and 1.2 on EFL, ESL and mixed subgroups

To answer research questions 1.1 and 1.2, specific sub-groups of the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study i.e., the EFL sub-group, the ESL sub-group and the mixed group of EFL and ESL will be looked at. Table 6.1 shows the distribution of the communication

strategies the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study employed in their ELF talk. In the table, the extracts' numbers discussed in Chapter 5 for each communication strategy were included.

In Table 6.1, it is obvious that the ASEAN ELF speakers in each specific sub-group employed the same communication strategies in their ELF talk to help them arrive at shared understanding. For example, *asking for clarification* was found as a communication strategy which participants in each sub-group employed to help them arrive at shared understanding. (The extracts listed in Table 6.1 were presented in the previous chapter.)

Table 6.1

Distribution of Communication Strategies across Different Sub-groups (EFL Sub-group, ESL Sub-group and the Mixed Group of EFL and ESL), Listed by Extract Numbers

Communication strategies	EFL	ESL	Mixed
Code-switching	Extract 5.1	Extract 5.2	Extract 5.3
Asking for clarification	Extracts 5.4, 5.5, 5.6	Extracts 5.7, 5.8, 5.9	Extracts 5.10, 5.11, 5.12
Lexical support	Extracts 5.13	Extracts 5.14	Extracts 5.15
Asking for confirmation	Extracts 5.16, 5.17, 5.18	Extracts 5.19, 5.20, 5.21	Extracts 5.22, 5.23, 5.24
Non-linguistic strategies	Extracts 5.25, 5.26, 5.27	Extracts 5.28, 5.29	Extracts 5.30, 5.31

In brief, to answer research questions 1.1 and 1.2, it was found in the main study that among the ASEAN ELF speakers, the communication strategies used by the EFL sub-group, those used by the ESL sub-group, and those used by the mixed group of EFL and ESL were the same. This finding reveals that type of the sub-groups, whether it includes EFL or ESL speakers or both EFL and ESL speakers, did not influence types of the communication strategies the ASEAN ELF speakers used in their interactions.

However, looking at individual ELF speaker in each dyad, it was noted that the strategies found in one dyad underlined the variation in strategy use across individuals. (See detail in Table 5.1 and Table 6.4, and the discussion in 6.3.)

6.1.2. Discussion concerning research question 1.3 on social connections between participants

To answer research question 1.3 on the effect of social relationships between the speakers in the dyads, all the dyads who participated in the main study will be grouped into two sub-groups: the ASEAN ELF speakers who did not know each other before, and the ASEAN ELF speakers who knew each other well. In the former, dyads in which participants did not know each other (i.e., those who had been strangers) before the day of their cooking activities for the video recordings will include whereas the latter will include dyads in which participants were those who already knew each other well before.

Among the 11 dyads in the main study, participants in Dyads 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11 did not know their interlocutors until the day of the video recording for data collection, thus participants in these dyads were complete strangers before the day of the video recordings. However, participants in Dyads 1, 2, 3 and 10 knew each other very well. The two participants in Dyad 1 were close friends, those in Dyads 2 and 4 were flatmates, and those in Dyad 3 were close friends (also former roommates at a dorm in their first year in Hungary). (See Table 6.2.)

Table 6.2

Two Sub-groups of Participants and the Relationship between Speakers in Each Dyad

Participants		Relationship between participants in each dyad
Group	**Dyad**	
	4	Strangers
	5	Strangers
	6	Strangers
Participants who did not know	7	Strangers
each other before (Strangers)	8	Strangers
	9	Strangers
	11	Strangers
	1	Close friends
Participants who were close to	2	Flatmates
each other	3	Close friends (also former roommates)
	10	Flatmates

Looking at the communication strategies participants in each sub-group, i.e., the sub-group in which participants were those who did not know each other before and the sub-group in which participants were those who were close to each other, employed and achieved understanding among the two ELF speakers in each dyad, it was found that each sub-group employed the same communication strategies and these communication strategies facilitated participants' understanding of each other. In Table 6.3, it was found that not only strangers but also those who were close to each other used the same strategies (namely *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, *asking for confirmation* and *non-linguistic strategies*) to help them arrive at shared understanding in their communication. Thus, to answer research question 1.3, the communication strategies used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who do not know each other before are generally the same as those used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who know each other well. In Table 6.3, there are more examples for stranger dyads compared to the number of examples for those who were close to each other. However, it does not mean that stranger dyads in the main study used a higher frequency of each communication strategy because it should be noted that there were more stranger dyads participated in the study than dyads with participants who were close to each other, as clearly seen in Table 6.2.

Table 6.3

Distribution of Communication Strategies across Different Sub-groups (the Group in which Participants were Strangers and the Group in which Participants were Close with Each Other), Listed by Extract Numbers

Communication strategies	Strangers (Dyads 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11)	Those who were close to each other (Dyads 1, 2, 3 and 10)
Code-switching	Extracts 5.1, 5.2	Extract 5.3
Asking for clarification	Extracts 5.5, 5.6, 5.8, 5.10, 5.11	Extracts 5.4, 5.7, 5.9, 5.12
Lexical support	Extracts 5.14, 5.15	Extract 5.13
Asking for confirmation	Extracts 5.17, 5.18, 5.19, 5.20, 5.21, 5.23, 5.24	Extract 5.16, 5.22
Non-linguistic strategies	Extracts 5.26, 5.27, 5.28, 5.29, 5.31	Extract 5.25, 5.30

In previous studies on ELF interactions, Deterding (2013) hypothesized that the use of strategies depends on the familiarity between the speakers. Deterding claims that participants

in Smit's (2010) study who had known each other for some time used communication strategies which are more direct such as *clarification requests* whereas participants in his study who had just met each other used *let it pass* frequently. Findings for research question 1.3 in the main study do not support Deterding's hypothesis since the communication strategies used by the participants who did not know each other before are generally the same as those used by the participants who have known each other well.

6.2. Discussion concerning research question 2 on the frequency of communication strategies

The frequency of each communication strategy used by each ASEAN ELF speaker in the main study which enhanced understanding of their interlocutors can be seen in detail in Table 5.1. Among the communication strategies which made the participants in the main study achieve understanding each other, *non-linguistic strategies* were found as the communication strategies which facilitated the participants' understanding most with 300 instances in total, followed by *asking for confirmation* as the second most used communication strategy with 252 instances in total and *asking for clarification* as the third most used communication strategy with 108 instances in total. Among the instances of *lexical support* found in the study, only 18 occurrences facilitated the participants' arrival at shared understanding. For *code-switching*, only 15 *code-switches* of the participants enhanced understanding of their interlocutors.

Looking at the individual level, those who employed most communication strategies were V1 in Dyad 1 with the use of 2.65 communication strategies per minute, S1 in Dyad 8 with the use of 1.31 communication strategies per minute, B2 in Dyad 3 with the use of 1.24 communication strategies per minute, and M2 in Dyad 9 with the use of 1.10 communication strategies per minute. Here, V1 in Dyad 1 and B2 in Dyad 3 were from the EFL sub-group whereas S1 in Dyad 8 was from the ESL sub-group and M2 in Dyad 9 was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL. Individually, V1 and B2 were from EFL countries whereas S1 and M2 were from ESL countries. These findings reveal that the frequency of the communication strategy use does not depend on which sub-groups the ELF speakers were in or which countries they come from.

Comparing the frequency of the communication strategies used by each ASEAN ELF speaker in each dyad, it was found that in all dyads apart from Dyad 2 and Dyad 7, the ASEAN ELF speakers who used fewer communication strategies than their interlocuters in the dyads were those who talked about the recipes in their cooking activities. For example,

134

B2 in Dyad 1 employed only eight communication strategies whereas his interlocutor, V1, employed 61 communication strategies in their cooking activity. However, the same ELF speaker, B2, employed 57 communication strategies when he was in Dyad 3 while his interlocutor in Dyad 3, V2, employed 40 communication strategies during their cooking activity. (See Table 5.1.) The reason was that the role of B2 in Dyad 1 was the speaker who talked about the recipe of the dish Dyad 1 cooked whereas in Dyad 3, B2 was the listener of the recipe Dyad 3 cooked. Thus, it might be possible to conclude that the listeners of the recipes employed more communication strategies than the speakers of the recipes to arrive at shared understanding in each dyad. In brief, the role of the ASEAN ELF speakers in each dyad, i.e., the speaker or the listener in their ELF interactions, influences the frequency of the communication strategy use in arriving shared understanding in their ELF interactions.

The role of the ASEAN ELF speakers in each dyad also seems to influence the choice of the communication strategy each ASEAN ELF speaker used to arrive at shared understanding in their ELF interactions in the main study. As mentioned earlier, *non-linguistic strategies* were found the most used communication strategy in the main study. Looking at the most used communication strategy by each individual ASEAN ELF speaker, those who used *non-linguistic strategies* most in their cooking activities were mostly (10 out of 11 ELF speakers who used *non-linguistic strategies* most) the ones who talked about the recipe they cooked in each dyad (e.g., C1 in Dyad 5 and F1 in Dyad 7 were those who spoke the recipe they cooked in their dyads). On the other hand, looking at the use of *asking for confirmation* which was the second most used communication strategy in the main study, it was found that 8 out of 9 ELF speakers who used *asking for confirmation* most during their cooking activities were listeners of the recipe they cooked in each dyad (e.g., S1 in Dyad 8 and M2 in Dyad 9 were those who listened to their interlocutors' talking about the recipe they cooked in their dyads). Thus, it can be concluded that the role of the ELF speaker in each ELF interaction determines the type of communication strategies he/she used. (The most used communication strategy of individual ELF speakers in the main study can be seen in Table 5.1.)

Among the five types of communication strategies which the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study used, and facilitated their arrival at shared understanding, i.e., *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, *asking for confirmation*, and *non-linguistic strategies*, it can be obviously seen in Table 5.1 that not every ELF speaker in the main study naturally used every type of communication strategies. For example, B2 in Dyad 1 used only *non-linguistic strategies*. As mentioned earlier, B2 was the one who talked about

the recipe of the dish he cooked together with his interlocuter, V1, in their cooking activity. Thus, naturally he did not need to *ask for clarification* or *confirmation* from V1 in talking about his own recipe. Regarding *code-switching* and *lexical support*, B2 did not use any *lexical support* but he used *code-switching* in that cooking activity. However, his code-switch was not related to arriving at shared understanding between speakers. In the retrospection, he also said that he code-switched to signal his individual national identity by using his mother tongue. Thus, among all the communication strategies B2 used during the cooking activity with V1, those found as the communication strategies which enhanced understanding between them were only *non-linguistic strategies* he used in talking about his recipe to V1 and in their cooking of that recipe. Similar situations were found in other dyads, too and thus can be concluded that one of the factors influencing the choice of the communication strategy to be used by ELF speakers in the ASEAN context is the role of the speakers in their ELF interactions: whether they are speakers or listeners by the time they use each communication strategy.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, *non-linguistic strategies* were found as the most used communication strategies by the participants in the main study which facilitated their understanding most. These *non-linguistic strategies* can be categorized into specific *non-linguistic strategies* such as *gesture* (in which the body parts especially hands, arms, and head are used to express what the speaker wants to say), *pointing at an object* (with a finger or by using something e.g., with the knife holding in a speaker's hand by the time he/she used pointing), *showing an object* (e.g., taking out an ingredient from the bag and showing it to the interlocutor, picking up an ingredient and showing it to the interlocutor, etc.), *touching an object* (with a finger or a hand), *demonstration* (which refers to showing the interlocutor how to do things), *action* (which refers to the process of the speaker's doing something such as adding water into a pot) and *miscellaneous* for non-linguistic means such as facial expression, the use of sounds, and the like as can be seen in Table 6.4. Among the 300 instances of *non-linguistic strategies* used by the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study which enhanced arriving at shared understanding between speakers in each dyad, *pointing at an object* was found as the most used *non-linguistic communication strategy*. The number of instances for the participants' use of *gesture*, that of *showing an object*, and that of *demonstration* were almost the same.

One factor to be noted which influenced the use of a large number of *non-linguistic strategies* in the main study was that the participants in each dyad did the actual cooking activity so that if an interlocutor did not arrive at understanding of what a speaker had said,

the speaker could make it clear by using non-linguistic means such as pointing at objects and showing objects to his/her interlocutor. Also, the ingredients they might have wanted to use in their cooking activities were available in the kitchen. Thus, these might be the reasons why participants used a large number of non-linguistic strategies in their ELF interactions in the main study. It might be possible to conclude that the task type in ELF interactions influences the communication strategy choice of the ELF speakers in the ASEAN context.

However, another factor to be noted was that even in the ASEAN ELF interactions which were only in the verbal form in the two pilot studies, some participants used *non-linguistic strategies*. One of the examples can be seen in Extract 6.1 which was from the Bangkok pilot study. The participants were a Burmese (B1), an Indonesian (I1), and a Thai (T1) who were talking about Thai foods.

Extract 6.1. B1+I1+T1
Context: They are talking about an ingredient in Thai traditional ต้มยำ /tôm jām/[1] soup.

1	I1:	But this is kind of ((smacks)) different for me. I've never taste it before.
2		That's why-
3	B1:	Aw:.
4	I1:	I don't like it. And then I eat a lot so I think I feel like unwell.
5	T1:	Hnn: ผักชี /pʰạtʃǐ/[2]? Did you mean this is the small one ((gesture)) or
6		the big one?
7	I1:	I don't know because they put it in ((laughs)) °XXXXX°
8	B1:	((laughs))
9	I1:	((laughs)) It's in the bowl.
10	T1:	Because I think I think that this is this is ((gesture)) the really bad taste
11		is a kind of the the lime leaf.
12	B1:	Lime leaf?
13	I1:	Lime? Oh: you have=
14	T1:	[We call it makrut.]
15	I1:	=[two different ผักชี /pʰạtʃǐ/.]
16	T1:	No no. But it's put in ต้มยำ /tôm jām/?
17	I1:	Yes.
18	T1:	So, I guess it's kind of lime leaf.

19	B1:	Lime leave?
20	T1:	Yes.
21	B1:	[Hm:.]
22	I1:	[Aw:.]
23	T1:	But I don't remember the exact name of the- but we call it makrut.
24		Buy makrut.
25	I1:	Makrut.
26	B1:	Hm:.
27	T1:	Hm: it's quite rotten. Umm. And very smelly.
28	I1:	Not really smelly. But the taste is different.
29	T1:	Onn onn onn.
30	I1:	But my my senior said we have it in Indonesia but the taste is different.
31	T1:	((laughs))
32	B1:	((laughs)) Aw aw.
33	I1:	((laughs)) That's why I eat a lot. But the taste is different since that
34		I had it. I had ผักชี /pʰ ̣atʃĩ/.

¹ ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ is a Thai soup of which taste is hot and sour.

² ผักชี /pʰ ̣atʃĩ/ means coriander.

In the extract, B1, I1 and T1 were talking about an ingredient used in Thai ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup. At that time, I1 was telling B1 and T1 that she liked the Thai ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup, but the taste of a leaf ingredient in the soup was unusual for her⁷. Her Indonesian friend said that the leaf is also available in their country, thus she ate the leaf she found in the Thai ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup. Unfortunately, she became unwell later. When I1 wanted to talk about that leaf, she thought that it was called ผักชี /pʰ ̣atʃĩ/ which means coriander. T1 thought that it was not ผักชี /pʰ ̣atʃĩ/ and it might be makrut also known as kaffir lime leaf. Thus, T1 asked a clarification request question about the size of the leaf in Lines 5 and 6. In his clarification request question, T1 used a descriptive gesture to know the size of the leaf so that he could guess whether the leaf I1 was talking about was ผักชี /pʰ ̣atʃĩ/ or makrut. Here, T1 used a

⁷ The leaf I1 wanted to talk about was makrut or kaffir lime leaf which is one of the ingredients in Thai ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup. Although it is put in cooking, it is usually not to be eaten. It is used for the aromatic purpose, and people do not usually eat because of its bitterness.

descriptive gesture by using his fingers to show I1 the size of ผักชี /pʰạtʃǐ/ leaf. In Lines 7 and 9, I1 answered T1's clarification request question that she did not know the size of the leaf because it was chopped and put in the soup. T1 thought that it could not be ผักชี /pʰạtʃǐ/ because ผักชี /pʰạtʃǐ/ did not have any bad flavor, but makrut has a bad flavor. Thus, T1 used a gesture again, with his finger on the table, to draw the size and shape of a makrut or kaffir lime leaf.

In this example, when I1 and B1 did not know makrut, T1 used gestures to make his interlocutors aware of makrut, while saying that it is a kind of lime leaf. His use of gestures could arrive at mutual understanding and be successful if I1 saw the actual size and shape of a whole makrut or kaffir lime leaf in the ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup she had had. Unfortunately, as the makrut or kaffir lime leaves were chopped to put in the ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup, I1 could not compare the leaf in the ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup with the one T1 was talking, using gestures to show the size and shape of the leaf.

Although T1's uses of gestures in this example did not help in arriving at shared understanding among the three ELF speakers, this example shows that the ASEAN ELF speakers use *gestures* as *non-linguistic strategies* even in completely verbal tasks.

Table 6.4

Number of Instances of Each Non-linguistic Strategy Which Made the Participants Achieve Understanding Each Other

Participants		Non-linguistic strategies						
Dyad	Code	Gesture	Pointing at an object	Showing an object	Touching an object	Demonstration	Action	Miscellaneous
1	B2	2	6	-	-	-	-	-
	V1	-	3	-	-	7	-	-
2	B3	-	3	4	-	2	1	-
	L1	3	4	-	-	-	-	-
3	B2	-	6	2	-	-	4	-
	V2	5	19	4	3	4	4	-
4	I3	1	3	-	-	-	-	-
	L2	-	6	2	-	-	-	1
5	C1	2	6	3	-	1	-	-
	L2	2	-	1	2	1	-	-
6	L3	1	4	3	-	7	-	-
	T3	5	6	-	-	1	-	-
7	F1	6	14	7	7	8	3	-
	M1	2	6	-	1	-	-	-
8	F2	-	14	1	2	3	-	-
	S1	2	6	5	-	3	-	-
9	I4	1	6	-	1	-	-	-
	M2	-	5	5	-	-	1	1
10	I5	1	5	2	-	1	-	-
	M3	4	9	1	1	2	1	-
11	C2	2	3	-	-	-	-	-
	F3	3	7	1	-	1	1	1
		42	141	41	17	41	15	3
Total						=300		

Looking back to research question 2, the frequency of the use of each communication strategy which made the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study achieve understanding each other, *non-linguistic strategies* were found as the most used communication strategies (300 instances), *asking for confirmation* as the second most used (252 instances) and *asking for clarification* as the third most used communication strategy (108 instances). Compared with these three groups of communication strategies, the use of *lexical support* (18 instances) and that of *code switching* (15 instances) were found very few that they seemed to be underused strategies in the ELF interactions in the ASEAN context. (See detail in Table 5.1.) Apart from *non-linguistic strategies*, *asking for confirmation* was found as the highest in use among communication strategies which have linguistic forms.

Having answered that research question, it should be noted that a communication strategy cannot always be successful in enhancing understanding among speakers. In Extract 6.2, which was extracted from the cooking activity of Dyad 3 from the EFL sub-group, when B2 used *asking for clarification* from V2, his first attempt was not successful. Then, he used his second *asking for clarification* which made him arrive at understanding. Later, he also used *asking for confirmation* to confirm his understanding of what V2 meant. (See detail in Extract 6.2 in 6.3.1.) This finding shows that although a communication strategy can facilitate speakers' arrival at shared understanding at one time, it might not be successful at other times. This kind of situation was found in the main study not only in Dyad 3 but also in other dyads.

6.3. Other findings and discussion

In addition to the findings discussed above in 6.1 and 6.2 which answered the research questions of the main study, there were also some notable findings which are not directly related to the research questions, yet which contribute to the description of the use of ELF communication strategies. These findings will be discussed in this section.

6.3.1. The use of multiple strategies

The first finding which will be discussed here is the ASEAN ELF speakers' use of multiple strategies in their ELF interactions. As mentioned earlier in 6.2, the communication strategies found in the main study as those which enhanced the ASEAN ELF speakers' arrival of shared understanding were not always successful. This situation was found both in the pilot studies and in the main study.

Looking back Extract 6.1 above again, in the Bangkok pilot study, when T1 asked for clarification from I1 in Lines 5 and 6 about the size of the leaf I1 did not like in the ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup, T1 used a direct question and a gesture. However, neither of these was successful for the information T1 wanted to know because I1 did not know about the size of the leaf. Then, T1 proposed his assumption that it must be a kind of lime leaf, and in Line 14, T1 used lexical support with the word, *makrut*. T1 used another direct question in Line 16 to ask for confirmation from I1 that I1 found the leaf in the ต้มยำ /tôm jām/ soup. Then, when I1 said *yes* in Line 17, T1 became surer that the leaf I1 meant could be makrut, and T1 provided lexical support again in Lines 23 and 24. However, I1 did not take up T1's lexical support, and she still thought that the leaf was ผักชี /pʰàtʃī/ till Line 34. After that, they stopped talking about the leaf and changed the topic.

In Extract 6.1, T1 tried to know which leaf I1 meant by using multiple communication strategies, particularly a *direct question* to *ask for clarification* and a *gesture* in Lines 5 and 6, *lexical support* in Lines 14, 23 and 24, and also a *direct question* to *ask for confirmation* in Line 16. However, the use of any of these communication strategies did not make the speakers arrive at shared understanding as I1 did not have enough information about the leaf she meant to provide T1 for confirming what leaf it was. If I1 could tell T1 the size and/or shape of the leaf she meant, they could have arrived at shared understanding. Although the speakers did not arrive at shared understanding in this example, it was noted that T1 used multiple communication strategies in his attempt to know what I1 was talking about. This kind of using multiple communication strategies was also found in the main study.

An example of the ASEAN ELF speakers' use of multiple communication strategies in the main study can be seen in Extract 6.2. This extract was from the cooking activity of B2 and V2 who were participants of Dyad 3 from the EFL sub-group. In the extract, they were preparing to cook rice. V2's plan was to cook rice with chicken broth, not with normal water. Thus, V2 boiled chicken first, and while waiting for chicken broth, B2 and V2 prepared other ingredients.

Extract 6.2. B2+V2
Context: They are checking the chicken being boiled on the stove.

1   V2:   OK now I think we can try ((points at the chicken pot)) to use ah ah

2		water ((takes a ladle) and cook the rice. ((takes the rice pot))
3	B2:	((takes the rice pot from V2)) For what?
4	V2:	I think you can use: ((returns the ladle)) like about- ((takes another ladle))
5	B2:	I can't understand. What do you mean?
6	V2:	I mean about this- ((puts the ladle into the chicken pot and
7		demonstrates to take out the chicken soup))
8	B2:	The water?
9	V2:	Yeah water. ((demonstrates to put the chicken soup into the rice pot))
10	B2:	((takes the ladle from V2)) Oh more delicious. ((puts the ladle into
11		the chicken pot)) OK. OK. OK.

In the extract, when V2 thought that the chicken broth was ready to use for the rice cooking, he took a ladle to put some chicken broth into the rice pot. Although V2 had already told B2 that they would use chicken broth in their rice cooking, B2 did not get the point. That is why, when V2 took the ladle and the rice pot, B2 asked for clarification in Line 3. However, V2 did not give B2 any answer. Then, B2 explicitly said he could not understand and asked for another clarification in Line 5. Then, V2 demonstrated transferring chicken broth from the chicken pot into the rice pot in Lines 6 and 7. At that time, B2 got the idea that V2 would cook rice with chicken broth. However, B2 was not sure yet, and thus, B2 checked his understanding with a confirmation question in Line 8. Then, V2 confirmed him, and continued his demonstration of transferring chicken broth from the chicken pot into the rice pot. Here, V2's demonstration made B2 arrive at understanding, and thus B2 took the ladle from V2 to put the chicken broth into the rice pot.

In this example, when B2's use of a *direct question* to *ask for clarification* from V2 in Line 3 was not successful, B2 explicitly said he did not understand, and then he used another *direct question* to *ask for clarification* in Line 5. When V2 provided the clarification B2 wanted from him by using demonstration, B2 thought that he understood V2, but B2 seemed still not sure yet. Thus, B2 *asked for confirmation* from V2 to check his understanding with a question in Line 8. This example reveals that an ASEAN ELF speaker in the main study used multiple strategies till he/she arrived at understanding for what his/her interlocutor meant. This kind of using multiple strategies were found in the main study not only in Dyad 3 but also in other dyads. Thus, a point should be emphasized that when a communication strategy is not successful to arrive at understanding in an ELF interaction, ASEAN ELF speakers use multiple strategies to lead them to shared understanding with their interlocutors.

6.3.2. Communication strategies found only in one dyad

In the main study, some communication strategies which enhanced understanding between the ASEAN ELF speakers were found only in one dyad. Most of these communication strategies were found in *non-linguistic strategies* which were included under Miscellaneous in Table 6.4 above. These *non-linguistic strategies* include the participants' *head shake*, *gaze*, and *onomatopoeia*, and how helpful these communication strategies were for the interlocutors to arrive at shared understanding will be discussed in this section.

Firstly, a participant's *head shake* which made the interlocutor understand had been discussed in Extract 5.26 of Chapter 5 in the cooking activity of Dyad 4 in which participants were an Indonesian (I3) and a Laotian (L2). In the extract, I3 and L2 were talking about stoves while frying garlic and onion in a pan. While I3 was talking about the type of stove she used, she changed the topic and started talking about the smell from the pan in Lines 6 and 7. Then, L2 lowered his head to become closer to the pan and smelt the garlic and onion he was frying. After that, L2 shook his head. In the retrospection, I3 said that from L2's posture of slightly bending his body and lowering his head, she did not know whether L2 smelt the garlic and onion or looked at them. However, from L2's head shake, she could know that L2 thought the garlic and onion he was frying were not ready yet. Here, according to what I3 said, L2's head shake made her understand what L2 was doing. Then, I3 asked L2 for confirmation in Line 10, and in the next turn in Line 11, L2 confirmed her. (See Extract 5.26 in Chapter 5.)

Another non-linguistic means which facilitated the arrival at understanding was *gaze* in Extract 6.3. The extract was from the cooking activity of Dyad 9 with an Indonesian participant (I4) and a Malaysian participant (M2). In the extract, they were cooking an Indonesian fried rice.

Extract 6.3. I4+M1
Context: They are cooking.

1	I4:	You can use the ((points at the spatula) wood spoon.
2	M2:	((takes the wooden spatula)) ((collects all the pieces of red chili, garlic,
3		and onion in the plate)) ((puts them into the pan)) ((stirs them in the pan))
4	I4:	Could you also put the ((points at the half-fried chicken)) chicken also
5		in here ((points at the pan)) in there? ((points at the pan))
6	M2:	Now?

7	I4:	Yeah.
8	M2:	((takes the chicken plate)) ((gazes at I4))
9	I4:	It's OK because-
10	M2:	Ah I want to ah-
11	I4:	What do you think? What do you think?

In the extract above, when the oil in the pan was ready to cook, M2 put red chili, garlic and onion and then started stirring them. At that time, I4 told M2 to add half-fried chicken pieces as well in Lines 4 and 5. M2 thought that it was not time yet to put chicken, thus he tried to make it clear by asking I4 for confirmation in Line 6. Although I4 confirmed M2 to add chicken, M2 did not want to add chicken at that time. Therefore, M2 gazed at I4 in Line 8. In the retrospection, I4 said that M2's gaze at her made her understand that M2 did not agree with her to put the chicken into the pan at that time. This example shows that even the participants' *gaze* could be used as a communication strategy to arrive at understanding. This example supports the argument of Donrnyei (1995) and Hoffer (2002) that communication strategies also include the use of *non-linguistic means* such as *mime*, *gesture*, *facial expression*, *gaze*, *touching*, and *sound imitation*.

Another example found in the main study which supports Donrnyei (1995) and Hoffer (2002) is a participant's use of *sound imitation* (*onomatopoeia* in Pietikäinen's [2018] term) in her talk. Pietikäinen claims that "ELF speakers use innovative extralinguistic means such as […] onomatopoeia" (p. 188) which facilitate understanding among speakers. In Extract 6.4, the Filipino participant (F3) used an onomatopoeia in her talk, and her use of *onomatopoeia* made her interlocutor (C2) understand what she wanted to say.

Extract 6.4 was from the cooking activity of C2 and F3 in which participants cooked a Filipino dish, *adobo*.

Extract 6.4. C2+F3

Context: They are preparing vegetables.

1	F3:	Ah ((points at the onion in the bowl)) this one.
2	C2:	((takes the onion and puts it on the chopping board))
3	F3:	Just the normal s-
4	C2:	Ah normal one like this this. ((gesture of cutting onion)) ((smiles))
5	F3:	OK you have to cut it ((gesture of cutting the onion into two halves))

6		and then ((gesture of cutting onion into small pieces)) ((sound imitation
7		of the knife touching the chopping board))
8	C2:	Aw chop it.
9	F3:	Chop yes, you need to chop it.

In the extract, C2 and F3 were preparing vegetable ingredients for their cooking. After cutting potatoes, F3 pointed at an onion and told C2 that it was time to prepare the onion for their cooking. When F3 wanted to say to chop the onion into small pieces, F3 used gestures in Lines 5 and 6. At that time, she also added an onomatopoeia which is the sound of a knife touching a chopping board when chopping something. Hearing that sound, C2 signaled his understanding with a lexical suggestion in Line 8, and F3 made an uptake of C2's lexical suggestion in the next turn in Line 9. After that, C2 started slicing an onion half to chop it. In the retrospection, C2 said that F3's gestures of cutting the onion into small pieces were understandable. However, F3's use of the onomatopoeia was more helpful for him to arrive at understanding. This example shows that the participants' use of innovative means in their ELF communication can facilitate understanding of their interlocutors.

Another communication strategy which facilitated creating understanding between the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study but was found only in one dyad was in Extract 6.5 which was from the cooking activity of Dyad 1. This communication strategy had a linguistic form. In the extract, a Burmese participant (B2) and a Vietnamese participant (V1) were cooking a Burmese dish.

Extract 6.5. B2+V1

Context: They are talking about masala.

1	B2:	((takes the masala bottle)) This is another powder, called- I don't know
2		the name. (.) [Maybe good smell.]
3	V1:	[I think it's a- no no] I think ah-
4	B2:	(.) Eh: This is a kind of Indian food.
5	V1:	Hm hm.
6	B2:	Good smell, for the curry.
7	V1:	((takes the masala bottle from B1)) Oh, it's new. Should I open it?

((The masala bottle has not been opened yet. It's a new bottle.))

In the extract above, when B2 and V1 were about to put masala into the pan, B2 had a lack of linguistic resource for the word masala. In the retrospection, B2 said:

"First, I was about to say masala. Then, I remembered that it's an Indian word." Thus, in Line 1, B2 did not utter the word and just said he did not know how to call that powder in English. Instead of saying the word *masala*, B2 used an explanation of what kind of powder masala is. First, he told V1 an attribute of masala i.e., good smell in Line 2, the origin of masala in Line 4, and in what kind of food masala is used i.e., curry as in Line 6. In this way, B2 used an explanation as a substitute for the word he did not know how to say in English. In the retrospection, V1 said that she did not know masala, but from B2's explanation, she understood the powder they were going to use was a kind of Indian spice which has a good smell and usually used in cooking curries. This example shows that a participant's *explanation* about a thing instead of using a word could help the interlocutor get the gist of what the speaker was saying.

In previous literature on ELF communication strategies such as Deterding (2013), Kaur (2010) and Kirkpatrick (2007b), ELF speakers use *speaker paraphrase* or *listener paraphrase* for a word or term to avoid communication breakdown and to assist them in understanding each other, however, the example in Extract 6.5 from the main study was not a *paraphrase*. Instead, it was an *explanation* about a thing to substitute for a word to talk about that thing. Here, in Extract 6.5, the speaker's use of *explanation* was found as a communication strategy which enhanced understanding of the interlocutor.

In the main study, the non-linguistic means which are *head shaking*, *gaze* and *onomatopoeia* discussed in Extracts 5.26, 6.2, and 6.3, and the use of *explanation* in Extract 6.5 were found as communication strategies which facilitated understanding between the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study. However, these communication strategies were not found in other dyads or in all the sub-groups of the ASEAN ELF speakers who participated in the main study. *Head shaking* was found only in Dyad 4 whereas *gaze* was in Dyad 9 and *onomatopoeia* in Dyad 11. Similarly, *explanation* was found only in Dyad 1. The examples in this section reveal that the strategies found in one dyad underline the variation in the strategy use across individuals.

6.3.3. Non-linguistic strategies as complementary or accompanying communication strategies

Another finding in the main study which was not related to the research questions of the study was the use of *non-linguistic strategies*. As discussed in 6.3.1, the ASEAN ELF

speakers in the main study as well as in the pilot studies used multiple strategies in their ELF interactions. Similar to these multiple strategies, if speakers used a *non-linguistic strategy*, they used it as a complementary or accompanying strategy to the other strategy which was in a linguistic form.

An example of this type of complementary to another communication strategy can be seen in Extract 6.6. This extract was from the cooking activity of Dyad 2. In the extract, a Burmese participant (B3) and a Laotian participant (L1) were cooking fried noodles.

Extract 6.6. B3+L1
Context: They are adding seasonings into the pan.
(B3's confirmation request with question together with showing, L1's gesture)

1	L1:	((goes to a shelf and brings the sugar pack)) Here.
2	B3:	((takes the sugar pack from L1))
3	L1:	And:
4	B3:	((takes some sugar with a spoon and shows to L1)) [It's enough?]
5	L1:	[Yeah. Enough.]
6	B3:	((adds sugar into the pan))
7	L1:	And salt. ((points at salt))
8	B3:	((takes some salt and puts it into the pan))
9	L1:	((gesture of stirring))
10	B3:	And I will mix it.

In the extract above, B3 and L1 were adding seasonings into the pan. When L1 gave the sugar pack to B3, B3 took out the amount of sugar she thought she should add with a spoon. Then, B3 showed the spoon with sugar to L1, and asked for confirmation from L1 in Line 4. Here, B3 used a non-linguistic strategy which was showing as a complementary communication strategy together with her confirmation check question. In this example, it was obvious that B3's *It's enough?* alone in Line 4 was not enough for L1 to understand what B3 was asking. A complementary communication strategy seemed to include here to make L1 arrive at understanding, and B3 employed *showing* as a complementary communication strategy here.

These kinds of *non-linguistic strategies* which were used as together with other communication strategies were also found in other dyads. An example was in Extract 5.23 of

Chapter 5 which was from the cooking activity of a Filipino participant (F2) and a Singaporean participant (S1). While F2 was adding laurel leaves into the pot on the stove, she said they could also add pineapple pieces. Then, S1 asked for confirmation from her to know when they should add pineapple, accompanied by a pointing gesture at the pineapple pieces they had prepared. In that example, when S1 *asked for confirmation*, he used a *non-linguistic means* as well.

In the main study, it was also found that some instances of participants' *non-linguistic strategies* were used as accompanying, together with *deictics*. For example, in Extract 6.7 which was from the cooking activity of a Cambodian participant (C1) and a Laotian participant (L2) from Dyad 5, there was a non-linguistic strategy, which was *touching* an object here, L2 used which was accompanied by the deictic *this* in his questions to C1 in Lines 9 and 10.

Extract 6.7. C1+L2

Context: C1 is talking about how to cook the dish before they prepare the ingredients.

1	C1:	And after that (0.1) ah: after you mix an everything, you can put the onion
2		ah: after the meat and I mean like after you put all the in[gredients.]
3	L2:	[The onion?]
4	C1:	Yes and then, ah hm like (0.1) ((gesture of stirring)) for all is around
5		(0.1) XXXXX for like three minutes, and then you can get it out to
6		a plate into the salads. That is the-
7	L2:	Hmm hmm.
8	C1:	the main point.
9	L2:	So, this one? ((touches the green onion pack)) this one? ((touches garlic
10		cloves))
11	C1:	This one. ((points at garlic cloves)) We can cut which one either. Both
12		of them.

In the extract, C1 said they could add onion after meat in Lines 1 and 2. At that time, C1 self-corrected in Line 2 that they could add onion after they put all the other ingredients. In the retrospection, L2 said that due to C1's self-correction in Line 2, L2 became a bit confused whether C1 meant onion or green onion. Thus, L2 asked for confirmation in Line 3. After giving confirmation to L2, C1 said that they would cook the ingredients for about three

minutes, and then transfer the food onto the lettuce leaves they put on a plate. Then, to start the preparation for the ingredients, L2 asked C1 which ingredient he should cut first: green onion or garlic in Line 9. At that time, L2 did not utter garlic and green onion. Instead, L2 said *this one* in Line 9, accompanied by touching at the onion and again another *this one* accompanied by another touching at the garlic cloves. In the retrospection, C1 said that L2's touching here were supportive for him to understand what L2 was asking him. Here, this finding of L2's uses of *deictics* and *touching* is in line with Pietikäinen's (2018) finding of her participants' uses of *deictics* and *non-linguistic means* like *pointing*, *showing*, *drawing*, *acting* and the like to facilitate understanding in the ELF communication.

Thus, it was found in the main study that the ASEAN ELF speakers employed non-linguistic strategies also as complementary or accompanying communication strategies to other communication strategies.

6.3.4. Communication strategies found in the pilot studies but not in the main study

It should be noted here that there were communication strategies, which aided understanding among ELF speakers, found only in the pilot studies but not in the main study. This suggests that the nature of the communication task that the participants were engaged in influences their communication strategy use.

The first example was in Extract 4.4, which was discussed in Chapter 4. This extract was presented again in the following.

Extract 4.4. B1+I1+T1 (from the Bangkok pilot study)
Context: T1 is asking B1 and I if they eat raw food.

1	T1:	Do you eat the raw[1] food?
2	B1:	Law food? What is it?
3	T1:	Raw-raw[2].
4	I1:	Oh! [raw food.]
5	T1:	[R-A-W.]
6	I1:	Yes yes.
7	B1:	Aww raw food!

[1] T1 pronounced /lɔː/.

[2] T1 pronounced /lɔː/ again.

In the extract, when T1 asked B1 and I1 whether they ate raw food or not in Line 1, neither B1 nor I1 understood T1. Thus, B1 used a repetition to signal for her non-understanding and also asked for further clarification with a direct question in Line 2. Although T1 repeated the word *raw* in Line 3, B1 still did not arrive at understanding as T1 pronounced *raw* as /lɔː/. Thus, T1 spelt out the word in Line 5 and his spelling out the word here made B1 arrive at understanding.

In the above example, *spelling out the word* served as a communication strategy which aided understanding among the ASEAN ELF speakers. This finding is in line with Kirkpatrick (2007b) in which *spelling out the word* is regarded as a communication strategy which enhanced understanding among ASEAN ELF speakers. Although *spelling out the word* was found as a communication strategy in the Bangkok pilot study, it was not found in the main study.

Another communication strategy which aided understanding among the ASEAN ELF speakers found in a pilot study but not in the main study was the *use of the internet*. In 4.1.2.1 of Chapter 4 about the Hungary pilot study, the two ASEAN ELF speakers (I2 and T2) used the internet from their mobile phones whenever they had difficulty explaining each other's traditional foods. (See Extracts 4.5 and 4.6 in Chapter 4.) In the retrospection, both I2 and T2 said that from the speaker's point of view, it was easier for them to use the internet and show pictures of the food to the interlocutor such as an ingredient in Extract 4.5 and the consistency of the batter in Extract 4.6 to in explaining about the food. Also, from the interlocutor's point of view, I2 and T2 said that it was easier for them to understand what the speaker was saying through the pictures the speaker found on the internet and showed them.

Although there is no literature on the *use of the internet* as a communication strategy in ELF literature, the *use of the internet* by I2 and T2 in the Hungary pilot study shows that the *use of the internet* can be a communication strategy which helps speakers to arrive at shared understanding in ELF interactions. Although the *use of the internet* was found in a pilot study, there was no such kind of strategy found in the main study. This might have been due to the nature of the task they were engaged in: a talk in the Hungary pilot study whereas an actual cooking activity in the main study.

6.3.5. Significance of the use of code-switching

When findings for research question 1 were discussed in 6.1, it was mentioned that there were mainly five types of communication strategies, namely *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, *asking for confirmation* and *non-linguistic strategies*, which

facilitated arriving at shared understanding among the ASEAN ELF speakers in their ELF interactions. Among these communication strategies, one finding noted in the main study is about *code-switching*. Although *code-switching* of the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study was found as a facilitating communication strategy for understanding among speakers, there were some code-switches of the ELF speakers found in the main study which led their interlocutors to misunderstanding or non-understanding. However, the number was very few. Among all the code-switches the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study used in their ELF interactions, there are only three instances of code-switches which led to misunderstanding or non-understanding for their interlocutors. (One of those examples will be discussed later in Extract 6.8.) This finding supports Deterding's (2013) argument that *code-switching* can create misunderstanding among ELF speakers. However, even with those instances of misunderstanding and non-understanding, the communication between speakers in each dyad did not break down.

It was also found in the main study that although *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, and *asking for confirmation* were constructed in the same way by the ASEAN ELF speakers in the study, how they constructed *code-switching* was different. Some code-switched only in single words (See Extracts 5.1 and 6.1.) whereas others code-switched not only in single words but also in short phrases and long strings of words (See Extract 5.3.). This finding supports Grosjean (2010), stating that a speaker may *code-switch* to another language for a word or for a phrase or for a sentence, then use the base language again. Another difference was in the use of the code-switched language. Some ELF speakers in the main study code-switched to their local language(s) (See Extracts 5.2, 5.3 and 6.1.), their interlocutors' language(s) (See Extract 5.1.) as well as other languages they have some knowledge of (See Extract 5.1.). Since the ELF speakers in the main study were from nine different ASEAN countries and they were multilingual, there were many different languages found in their code-switches (For example, Thai in Extract 5.1, Malay in Extract 5.2 and 5.3, Filipino in Extract 6.8.). The issue of which languages were chosen for code-switching was addressed in retrospections.

Another point noted in the main study concerns the reasons for *code-switching*. In the use of other communication strategies, there was simply only one reason for each communication strategy. (For example, a speaker's use of *asking for clarification* was to get further clarification from his/her interlocutor.) However, behind the use of *code-switching*, there were other reasons rather than merely as a communication strategy to arrive at shared understanding. This is in line with Myintzu (2021a), stating that there are different reasons

for ASEAN ELF speakers' *code-switching*, especially to signal culture, and also so as to accommodate the interlocutor by creating an atmosphere between each other in their social interaction, and so on. This kind of having other reasons for the use of code-switching could be the reason why there were only very few code-switches (15 code-switches) which enhanced understanding between speakers in each dyad although there were many code-switches (115 code-switches in total) found in the main study. (See detail in Table 6.5.)

An example of the ELF speakers' code-switches which were not related to understanding, misunderstanding, and non-understanding each other between speakers in each dyad was the Filipino participants' use of *adobo*. All the Filipino participants in the main study cooked the same dish, *adobo*, in their cooking activities, and all of them code-switched to the Filipino word *adobo* to talk about the dish, but their reasons behind their code-switching seemed to be different based on what they said in the retrospections. F1 said that she explained what type of food *adobo* is right after she code-switched during the cooking activity. Another Filipino participant, F2, said she did not know why she just used the word *adobo*. F1 and F2's code-switches here seem to be in line with Myintzu (2021a) and Pölzl's (2003) claims, stating that ELF speakers code-switch to their first languages in their ELF interactions to signal their cultural identity. In the retrospection with F3, she gave a more detailed and specific explanation of her code-switching. She said that she is used to using the word *adobo* and that she did not know if there is an English equivalent for *adobo*. She also said:

> "I also thought the term *adobo* is a familiar term to other Southeast Asians. I even forgot that it's a Filipino term."

Moreover, she said:

> "Actually, I used it to introduce the Filipino cuisine."

She also said:

> "There's also no other way to introduce the *adobo* except for saying it's an *adobo* or by mentioning the ingredients or how it is cooked."

F3's explanation here clearly reveals that she code-switched because of a lack of linguistic resource. Moreover, it seems that she wanted to signal her Filipino identity by code-switching with the word *adobo*. The three Filipino participants' code-switch with the word, *adobo*, found in the main study is in line with Fekete (2018), Ke (2012), and Zein and Stroupe (2017), with regard to ELF speakers' awareness of being multilingual and the ownership of English.

No matter for which reasons the ELF speakers in the main study code-switched, there were some code-switches they used in their ELF interactions in the main study which enhanced understanding of their interlocutors. No matter how they constructed their code-switches, and no matter why they code-switched, their code-switches did not appear to hinder their interlocutors' understanding. As mentioned earlier, there were three instances of code-switches which led to misunderstanding or non-understanding for their interlocutors among the 115 instances of code-switch found in the main study (see Table 6.5, below). These three instances of code-switches were non-understandings which occurred in Dyad 8's cooking activity and misunderstanding in Dyad 10's cooking activity. Although misunderstanding and non-understanding occurred in these three code-switches, communication did not break down in each dyad. (For example, see Extract 6.8.)

Table 6.5

Frequency of Code-switching (in Terms of Types[8]) in Each Dyad and the Frequency of Code-switching Which Enhanced Understanding

Participants			Duration of the cooking activity	Frequency of code-switch	Frequency of code-switch which facilitated understanding	Code-switch per minute which facilitated understanding
Group	Dyad	Code				
EFL	1	B2	23 min	4	-	-
		V1		-	-	-
	2	B3	38 min	1	-	-
		L1		2	-	-
	3	B2	46 min	1	-	-
		V2		3	-	-
	4	I3	1 hr	1	-	-
		L2		1	1	0.016
	5	C1	25 min	-	-	-
		L2		-	-	-
	6	L3	35 min	4	1	0.028
		T3		5	2	0.057
ESL	7	F1	1 hr 25 min	7	-	-
		M1		5	2	0.023
	8	F2	48 min	8	2	0.041
		S1		2	-	-
Mixed	9	I4	41 min	6	1	0.024
		M2		9	2	0.048
	10	I5	1 hr 6 min	23	3	0.045
		M3		30	1	0.015
	11	C2	55 min	2	-	-
		F3		1	-	-
Total				115	15	

---

[8] Frequency of code-switches were counted in terms of types, not in terms of tokens. Tokens here refer to the number of individual code-switches each participant in the study used whereas types refer to the number of unique types of code-switches each participant used.

Extract 6.8 was from the cooking activity of Dyad 8 in which participants were a Filipino (F2) and a Singaporean (S1). While they were cooking a Filipino dish, *adobo*, they talked about the difficulty of getting ingredients for Southeast Asian foods in Debrecen, a city in Hungary.

Extract 6.8. F2+S1

Context: F1 is talking about Filipino seasonings.

1   S1:   ((sees a pack, and is interested in it)) Ah *sisig*[1], it's tamarind soup

2   based, so it's sour?

3   F2:   Yeah.

4   S1:   ((takes out the pack, and looks at it carefully))

5   F2:   We usually make it with *sinigang*[2].

6   S1:   OK.

7   F2:   It can be pork, it can be chicken.

8   S1:   Thai, Thai food, Thai, produced in Thai. ((puts the *sisig* pack back

9   in the container))

((S1 and F2 go back to the stove. F2 opens the cover of the pot they are cooking.))

[1] *sisig* is a Filipino dish. *sisig* refers to sizzling *sisig* which is a Filipino dish of sizzling pork head, pork belly, and chicken liver.

[2] *sinigang* means stew or soup.

In the extract, F2 showed S1 the Filipino seasonings she had bought from Budapest. At that time, F2 code-switched to mention the seasonings for Filipino foods such as *bihon*, *sisig*, and so on. When S1 saw the *sisig* seasoning pack, he was interested and thought that it was a food of Thai origin. In the retrospection, S1 said that he did not know *sisig* was a Filipino food, and thought that it was a Thai sour soup. When he described *sisig*'s taste as *sour* and its type of food as *soup* in Line 1, F2 confirmed him in Line 2. In the retrospection, F2 said that she did not notice here that S1 thought *sisig* was a soup. Then, in Line 5, F2 said the Filipinos usually make *sisig* together with *sinigang*. Then, she talked about with which meat the Filipinos cook *sinigang*. In Line 8, S1 spoke out his inner thought of *sisig* as a Thai food. However, F2 did not notice it as she was paying attention to their *adobo* pot on the stove. As F2 thought it was time to flip chicken in the pot on the stove, she moved to the

156

stove, and S1 followed her. S1's misunderstanding and non-understanding here support Cogo and Pitzl's (2016) view that misunderstanding "cannot be indicated or negotiated immediately because no participant is aware of its existence when it happens" (p. 340).

In the extract, F2 code-switched into Filipino for *sisig* and *sinigang* which made S1 misunderstand and non-understand them. When S1 mentioned *sisig* as a soup in Line 1, F2 did not explain S1 that *sisig* is not a soup, but a sizzling dish. Then, after Line 9 in the extract, their attention moved to their *adobo* cooking, and they did not continue talking about the seasonings. Throughout their cooking activity, F2 made eight types of code-switch whereas S1 made two types, thus altogether 10 types of code-switch in Dyad 8 (See Table 6.5.). Among these 10 types of code-switch, misunderstanding and non-understanding occurred only for the words *sisig* and *sinigang*. F2 and S1 even did not notice that misunderstanding and non-understanding occurred in Extract 6.8. However, none of these two code-switches made their communication breakdown. Therefore, the code-switches of each participant in Dyad 8 cannot be assumed that they made misunderstanding and/or non-understanding occur between the speakers. Instead, among the other eight types of code-switch during their cooking activity, there were two instances found as the code-switches which facilitated their understanding between them.

As mentioned above, apart from these two *code-switches* found in Dyad 8's ELF interaction which were discussed in Extract 6.8, and a *code-switch* in Dyad 10's ELF interaction, among other *code-switches* found in the main study, there was no *code-switch* which made any misunderstanding between the speakers in each dyad. Instead, there were some *code-switches* (15 *code-switches* in total) which enhanced understanding among the participants in each dyad. (See Table 6.5.) Among them, *code-switches* in Extracts 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 discussed in Chapter 5 are some examples.

In Table 6.5, it is also noticeable that almost all participants in the main study code-switched in their ELF interactions. Among them, the frequency of the code-switch of F1, F2, M2, M3, and I5 were quite high. It shows that non-English forms were not used only once, but seemed to become a part of the repertoire of these speakers. An example of this repertoire can be seen in Extract 5.30 in Chapter 5 which was from the cooking activity of Dyad 10 in which participants were a Malaysian participant (M3) and an Indonesian participant (I5). In that extract, when M3 was demonstrating how she put salt into the rice pot, she used a non-English term *agak-agak* in her utterance in English, saying:

"I just this *agak-agak*."

Here, although M3 used a Malay word of which meaning is different in I5's language, I5 understood what M3 wanted to say. In the retrospection, I5 said that since they were flatmates, she had been familiar with M3's way of speaking, and also familiar with some Malay usage. This shows that code-switching is a part of the ELF speakers' repertoire.

In brief, *code-switching* is a strategy which should be highly sensitive to the language repertoires of the interlocutors. Before the data analysis, it was expected that ELF speakers in the ESL sub-group would not code-switch as much as those in the EFL sub-group would do because of their lack of linguistic resources. However, it was found in the study that although there were some ELF speakers in the EFL sub-group who did not code-switch, every ELF speaker in the ESL sub-group and in the mixed group code-switched, and also their *code-switches* were found as a communication strategy which could facilitate understanding among them and their interlocutors. (See detail in Table 6.5.)

Chapter summary

In this chapter, findings for the research questions of the main study were discussed. In the study, it was found that when non-understanding and misunderstanding occurred in their ELF interactions, ASEAN ELF speakers employed communication strategies such as *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, and *asking for confirmation* to arrive at shared understanding. They also used different types of *non-linguistic strategies* such as *gesture*, *pointing*, *showing*, and *touching*, and also *demonstration* to enhance understanding between them. It was also found that the communication strategies used by the ESL sub-group and those used by the EFL sub-group found in the main study were generally the same. Also, the communication strategies used in the mixed group of ESL and EFL found in the main study were the same as those used in the ESL and EFL sub-groups found in the main study. In addition, it was also found in the main study that the communication strategies used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who did not know each other before and those used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who knew each other well were also generally the same.

In investigating the frequency of each communication strategy which made the ASEAN ELF speakers in the main study achieve understanding each other, *non-linguistic strategies* were found as the most used communication strategies which facilitated the speakers' understanding, followed by *asking for confirmation* as the second most used communication strategy and *asking for clarification* as the third most used communication strategy. Among the *non-linguistic strategies* found in the main study which enhanced

arriving at shared understanding between speakers, *pointing at an object* was found as the most used *non-linguistic strategy*.

In the main study, the *non-linguistic strategies* such as the ELF speakers' facial expressions like *gaze*, body language such as *head shaking*, and sound-related strategy like *onomatopoeia* were also found as communication strategies which enhanced understanding between speakers in their ELF interactions. It was also found in the main study that when *non-linguistic strategies* were used, the ASEAN ELF speakers used them as complementary to another communication strategy or used them accompanied by *deictics*.

In the study, it was also found that communication strategies which were found as those which facilitate the ASEAN ELF speakers' achieving understanding cannot be successful all the time. One communication strategy can facilitate arriving at understanding at one time but it may not work at other times.

Chapter 7
Pedagogical implications and conclusions

Previous chapters, particularly Chapters 5 and 6, revealed what communication strategies are used among English speakers from ASEAN countries in their ELF interactions, and how these communication strategies facilitate the ASEAN ELF speakers in achieving understanding of each other. The next step is to think about the teachability of these communication strategies in English language teaching (ELT). In this chapter, firstly, how the results of this dissertation might inform teaching communication strategies in the ASEAN context will be discussed. Then, the conclusion of the dissertation will come.

7.1. Pedagogical implications of communication strategies in ELT in ASEAN

In the ASEAN context, English is used as a lingua franca among multilinguals who have different linguistic backgrounds and different proficiency levels of English. Thus, English learners and teachers in ASEAN should realize how ELF works in the ASEAN context. Teachers should also consider that they should find ways of integrating ELF into their own teaching contexts as Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011) and Sifakis and Bayyurt (2018) argue in order to lead to the more effective and practical English language teaching and learning situation. One possible way is to raise awareness of communication strategies through explicit instruction to English language learners in the ASEAN context and train them to use these strategies in their ELF interactions as Kongsom (2016) suggests. Thus, this research provides evidence of what communication strategies work well in ELF interactions to help ELF speakers arrive at shared understanding.

This research was based on naturally occurring spoken English of ELF speakers from ASEAN countries. Looking back at the participants' English in this study, especially in the extracts in Chapters 5 and 6, a large number of non-standard forms of English can be found. However, participants' use of non-standard forms did not hinder their interlocutors' understanding. The data in the study provides evidence of ASEAN ELF speakers' effective and skillful use of communication strategies whenever they seem to encounter misunderstanding or non-understanding in their ELF interactions. This information will be useful in the teaching of English in ASEAN countries as a demonstration that the use of communication strategies should receive appropriate emphasis in the ELT curriculum.

In the retrospections with participants in the study, although not related to the research questions of the study, there were conversations about sharing their previous experience of

learning English in their home countries and personal experience on the use of English with English speakers from other countries in the real world situation. Some examples are shown in the following comments and excerpts from those conversations.

One of the participants from the EFL sub-group in the study said:

"I only listen to some words. I don't listen to everything."

That participant explained that when communicating in English, he usually only pays attention to the words which he thinks are key words in the interlocutor's utterance to understand what the interlocutor says. He also added that he could not understand everything the interlocutor said. Thus, he said he usually just listens to the important message in the interlocutor's utterances. He said he does not think he needs to listen to and understand everything in the interlocutor's utterance.

A participant from the ESL sub-group in the study said that she never cares about grammar or pronunciation when she speaks in English. As long as the interlocutor(s) can understand her English, she feels it is fine with her. However, she said she feels a bit uncomfortable speaking in English if the interlocutor's English is very good, native-like English.

Another participant who was from the mixed group of EFL and ESL in the study said that whenever she speaks in English, she usually hesitates to utter English words, thinking in her inner mind if her utterance would be correct or not. From her previous experience of learning English in her home country, teachers were strict and thus, she was not comfortable speaking in English, worrying about making mistakes in her English. That anxiety has been fossilized and she thought that it always hinders her for oral communication in English. She said she wishes English teachers would not be strict, paying attention to students' mistakes, instead, they would emphasize on students' fluency rather than accuracy, neglecting some mistakes students make and encouraging students to speak English without anxiety.

These three participants' opinions on the use of English reveal that they think that comprehensibility or arriving at shared understanding among speakers is more important in communication than being highly competent speakers of English, and their opinions are the voices of experienced users of English. Examples of communication strategies in this dissertation were naturally occurring English of experienced English users who were placed in situations where they needed to use communication strategies, and these communication strategies were evidence of how to achieve understanding between speakers in the ELF contexts. This is in line with Hülmbauer, Böhringer, and Seidlhofer (2008), stating that in ELF interactions, "the main consideration is not formal correctness but functional

effectiveness" (p. 28). Cogo (2010) also finds similar ELF perceptions in her study that her participants seem to have priority on "effective communicative skills, rather than English NS correctness, and ELF speakers were seen as *fluent and confident*" (p. 309, original emphasis).

From the extracts which were discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, it is obviously seen that some ELF speakers in the study are less competent speakers, but they themselves or their interlocutors have the linguistic creativity to resolve non-understanding and misunderstanding in their ELF interactions, by using a variety of communication strategies which facilitate their arrival at shared understanding among them. These ELF speakers in the study are good examples for future ELF learners or speakers to explore how to resolve non-understanding and misunderstanding when they occur in their ELF interactions and trust their own creativity in using communication strategies to arrive at understanding in their ELF communication.

Regarding pedagogy, Canagarajah (2007) states that language learners should "understand communication as performative" and suggests that "[a]lthough enabling students to join a new speech community was the objective of traditional pedagogy, we now have to train students to shuttle between communities by negotiating the relevant codes. To this end, we have to focus more on communicative strategies, rather than on forms of communication" (p. 936). Canagarajah also suggests that not only teaching but also assessment should be changed. He claims that "[a]ssessment would focus on one's strategies of negotiation, situated performance, communicative repertoire, and language awareness. To this end, we must develop new instruments with imagination and creativity (p. 936)".

In private conversations with some English language teachers from ASEAN countries, some teachers have said that they do not teach communication strategies to their students. Also, in a small-scale survey which the researcher carried out on teaching communication strategies to English language learners with English teachers from ASEAN countries, a bit more than half of the participants mentioned that they teach communication strategies to their students. However, in terms of frequency, it was not that significant. Among those who said they teach communication strategies, more than one-third of them mentioned that they often teach the strategies, and another one-third of them mentioned that they only sometimes teach the strategies (Myintzu, 2019). Thus, teaching communication strategies to English language learners is still very little in the ASEAN context.

As mentioned above, communication strategies which facilitate arriving understanding between speakers found in this dissertation are employed by ELF speakers when they encounter situations in which they have to employ these communication strategies,

but English learners do not need to wait till they encounter the real world to have this experience. Even in their English class, learners will definitely experience difficulty in communicating in English with their fellow learners, and they need to use communication strategies in that situation to overcome the difficulty and achieve successful communication. In addition, learners may not be using the *correct* language at that time. Here, the teachers' role becomes important to help learners achieve successful communication. To raise awareness on the use of communication strategies which can help speakers to achieve understanding of each other is the best way to help learners to have "effective communicative skills" (Cogo, 2010, p. 309) in order to become fluent ELF speakers.

In doing so, the communication strategies found in this dissertation are good examples for the learners to use in class as well as when they are in the real world facing the situations which the ASEAN ELF speakers in this dissertation encountered in their ELF interactions. For example, learners should know that even the examples of *minimal* like *yeah*, *OK*, *backchannels* and the like, followed by a rising intonation, can be used as a communication strategy to *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors when they want to get confirmation in order to arrive at shared understanding between them. Without teachers' instruction, learners who are not yet experienced language users may not know this kind of subtle strategy.

As discussed in Chapter 6, non-linguistic strategies were found as the communication strategies which helped the ASEAN ELF speakers understand each other most. Apart from non-linguistic strategies, asking for clarification and confirmation were found as the highest linguistic strategies which helped the ASEAN ELF speakers in the study arrive at shared understanding. These findings have pedagogical implications from which teachers can give instructions to their learners on the use of these communication strategies when they are in a situation that they have to use them in their communication to arrive at shared understanding among them.

One point which should not be forgotten is that although these communication strategies can facilitate arrival at understanding at one time, they might not be successful at other times. Learners should be provided instruction on how to use multiple communication strategies when one communication strategy is not successful in order to achieve understanding in their communication. The success of using multiple strategies in the study's ELF interactions is evidence of the usefulness of using multiple communication strategies.

The creative use of *onomatopoeia* by a participant found in the study is also a good example to let learners know that their creativity in communication can help them arrive at shared understanding in their communication.

One activity inspired by this current research which should be done in class is the use of retrospections in speaking activities from which learners can know how and when and with which communication strategy(ies) use their interlocutors can arrive at shared understanding with them. In this way, learners can become ready to be able to communicate effectively in the real world and become successful ELF users. This readiness should be started in their language class with the support of their teachers' appropriate instructions in class.

As Dornyei (1995) and Kongsom (2016) suggest, if English language learners get explicit instruction on communication strategies, their communication will be more effective and successful. With explicit knowledge of the communication strategies and their use in their communication with others, English speakers in ASEAN countries can better understand each other and avoid misunderstanding and non-understanding in their ELF interactions.

7.2. Conclusions

As mentioned in Chapter 1, this research focused on communication strategies that help ASEAN ELF speakers arrive at shared understanding in their ELF interactions. Among the communication strategies used in their ELF interactions, the study reveals that ASEAN ELF speakers employ *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, and *asking for confirmation* as communication strategies to arrive at shared understanding when they think they encounter misunderstanding and/or non-understanding. In previous literature, Kirkpatrick (2007b) and Deterding (2013) state that *code-switching* is not common among the ELF speakers in the ASEAN context but *code-switches* found in the study facilitate the ASEAN ELF speakers' arrival at shared understanding. Regarding *asking for clarification*, the ASEAN ELF speakers use *direct questions*, *repetition with a question intonation*, and *sorry/pardon* when they want to get clarification from their interlocutors. Similarly, there are three ways the ASEAN ELF speakers *ask for confirmation* from their interlocutors to avoid misunderstanding and/or non-understanding in their ELF interactions. As in *asking for clarification*, *direct questions* and *repetition* are used by the ASEAN ELF speakers as communication strategies in *asking for confirmation*. They also use *minimal checks* when they want to confirm something and to avoid misunderstanding or to arrive at understanding.

Not surprisingly, the ASEAN ELF speakers also employ *non-linguistic strategies* in their interactions among which *pointing gesture* was found as the most used and most helpful

164

non-linguistic strategy for the ASEAN ELF speakers to arrive at understanding. Other *non-linguistic strategies* which enhance arriving at understanding include body language such as *gesture*, *pointing*, *showing*, and *touching*, and *demonstrations* of how to do things. Despite very few instances, *non-linguistic strategies* such as the ELF speakers' facial expressions like *gaze*, body language such as *head shaking*, and sound related strategy like *onomatopoeia* also enhance understanding between speakers in their ELF interactions. When using these *non-linguistic strategies*, sometimes the ASEAN ELF speakers use them alone, but sometimes they use these *non-linguistic strategies* as complementary to another communication strategy or use them accompanied by *deictics*.

When comparing the communication strategies use of the ASEAN ELF speakers in the EFL sub-group, in the ESL sub-group and in the mixed group of EFL and ESL, the communication strategies employed by the ELF speakers in these groups are generally the same. In addition, the communication strategies used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who did not know each other before and those used by the ASEAN ELF speakers who knew each other well are also generally the same.

Regarding the frequency of each communication strategy which helps the ASEAN ELF speakers achieve understanding each other, *non-linguistic strategies* were found in the study as the most used communication strategies which facilitate the speakers' understanding, followed by *asking for confirmation* as the second most used communication strategy and *asking for clarification* as the third most used communication strategy. Among the *non-linguistic strategies* found in the study which enhance arriving at shared understanding between speakers, *pointing* is the most used.

The data also shows that although the communication strategies mentioned above can facilitate the arrival of understanding among speakers, they are not always successful. If an unsuccessful situation occurs, a combination of multiple communication strategies can help speakers arrive at shared understanding among speakers in ELF interactions. Moreover, the ELF speakers in the study use these strategies simultaneously.

In previous literature on ELT, Cogo and Pitzl (2016) affirm that naturally occurring ELF conversations are useful for English learners, especially the strategies ELF speakers use to resolve their non-understanding to achieve successful communication. They also state that although some strategies are context-dependent, awareness raising of these strategies has a vital role in English language teaching. Thus, the data in the study might be helpful for those who want to be aware of the naturally occurring ELF interactions among English speakers from ASEAN countries.

Until now, there has been not much literature on English spoken by ELF speakers from ASEAN countries, particularly little research on using non-linguistic forms as a communication strategy. The findings in this dissertation are hoped to fill a gap in current ELF research and to be able to contribute some help for the ELF learners and users as well as for the ELT industry especially in the ASEAN context. However, the findings in this dissertation were limited as the data was from the ASEAN ELF speakers' interactions only in an informal and social context, international students in Hungary interacting with each other in English while cooking together. In addition, the study did not have many participants, with only five participants in the pilot studies and 20 participants in the main study. Finally, there was no Bruneian participant and only one Singaporean participant among the ASEAN ELF speakers in the study. If further data is collected in other settings like business, diplomatic, tourism, scientific or academic settings, and also if there are participants from all ASEAN countries with an equal number of participants from each ASEAN country, the results may come out differently from the current findings. In addition, future research could be conducted on the teaching of communication strategies, and the attitudes of teachers as well as learners on the use of communication strategies and also their inclusion in the curriculum.

Chapter summary

There are debates on the teachability of communication strategies in previous literature on English language teaching (ELT). However, there are also positive opinions on a new trend of teaching English to learners in the ELT industry in literature. Findings in this dissertation provide evidence of what communication strategies work well in ELF interactions to help ELF speakers arrive at shared understanding. In addition, experienced ELF speakers in the study reveal that they have a clear opinion on the use of English, prioritizing comprehensibility or arriving shared understanding among speakers over having high competence in English. However, private conversations with some English language teachers from ASEAN countries reveal that teaching practices of English teachers in the ASEAN context do not reflect the opinion of the ELF speakers in the study on the use of English in their real world situations. To reflect real world situations, English language learners should get explicit instruction on communication strategies which they can use in their ELF interactions with other English speakers to avoid misunderstanding and non-understanding in their ELF interactions, and to arrive at understanding each other. To conclude, the study shows that ASEAN ELF speakers use a variety of communication strategies, including *code-switching*, *asking for clarification*, *lexical support*, *ask for*

confirmations, and *non-linguistic strategies*. These main communication strategies help ELF speakers arrive at shared understanding in their ELF interactions. These findings are hoped to fill a gap in current ELF research and to contribute some help for the ELF learners and users as well as for the ELT industry, especially in the ASEAN context.

References

Achren, L., & Kittiphanh, D. (2020). English in Laos. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 667–682). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Allan, K., Bradshaw, J., Finch, G., Burridge, K., & Heydon, G. (2010). *The English language and linguistics companion.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56*(1), 57–64. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.57

Alsagoff, L. (2012). The development of English in Singapore language policy and planning in nation building. In E. L. Low, & A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language in use* (pp. 137–154). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Alsagoff, L. (2017). English in Singapore and Malaysia: Common roots, different fruits. In L. H. Guan (Ed.), *Education and globalization in Southeast Asia: Issues and challenges* (pp. 14–35). Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.

ASEAN. (2020). *The ASEAN Charter*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat. https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/November-2020-The-ASEAN-Charter-28th-Reprint.pdf

Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum. (2009). *17th Annual Meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF)*. Vientiane Capital, Lao PDR, 11-15 January 2009.

Atkinson J., & Heritage J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aung-Thwin, M. A., Aung, M. H., & Steinberg, D. I. (2021, March 10). *Myanmar*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/place/Myanmar

Aye, K. K. (2020). Myanmar English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 355–372). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Baker, W. (2012). English as a lingua franca in Thailand: Characterisations and implications. *Englishes in Practice: Working Papers of the Centre for Global Englishes*, *1*(1), 18–27.

Bans-Akutey, A. & Tiimub, B.M. (2021). Triangulation in research. *Academia Letters*, *Article 3392*. https://doi.org/10.20935/AL3392

Bautista, M. L. S., & Gonzalez, A. (2006). Southeast Asian Englishes. In B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 130–144). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second language use.* London: Backwell.

Bjørge, A. K. (2010). Conflict or cooperation: The use of backchannelling in ELF negotiations. *English for Specific Purposes*, *29*. 191–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.04.002

Björkman, B. (2014). An analysis of polyadic English as a lingua franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *66*, 122–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.03.001

Bolton, K. (2006). *World Englishes: Critical concepts in Linguistics.* London: London Routledge.

Bolton, K., & Bacon-Shone, J. (2020). The statistics of English across Asia. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 49–80). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bolton, K., & Bautista, M. L. S. (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Breiteneder, A., Pitzl, M-L., Majewski, S., & Klimpfinger, T. (2006). VOICE recording - Methodological challenges in the compilation of a corpus of spoken ELF. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *5*(2), 161–187. http://doi.org/10.35360/njes.16

Bremer, K. (1996). Causes of understanding problems. In K. Bremer (Ed.), *Achieving understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters* (pp. 37–64). London: Longman.

Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 923–939. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00678.x

Cavallaro, F., Ng, B. C., & Tan, Y-Y. (2020). Singapore English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 419–447). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Chitravelu, N. (2007). Multilingualism in Southeast Asia: A tentative research agenda. In A. Hashim, I. Martin, D. Prescott, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, literacies and literatures* (pp. 224–245). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Clayton, T. (2007). Transition, culture, and language in Cambodia. In A. B. M. Tsui, & J. W. Tollefson (Eds.), *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts* (pp. 95–117). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Clyne, M. (1997). Multilingualism. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 301–314). Malden/Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

Cogo, A. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen, & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 254–273). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Cogo, A. (2010). Strategic use and perceptions of English as a lingua franca. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, *46*(3), 295–312. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10010-010-0013-7

Cogo, A. (2016). "They all take the risk and make the effort": Intercultural accommodation and multilingualism in a BELF community of practice. In L. Lopriore, & E. Grazzi (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: New perspectives from ELF* (pp. 365-383). Roma: Roma TrE-Press.

Cogo, A., & Pitzl, M-L. (2016). Pre-empting and signalling non-understanding in ELF. *ELT Journal*, *70*(3), 339–345. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw015

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

David, M. K., Cavallaro, F., & Coluzzi, P. (2009). Language policies – Impact on language maintenance and the teaching: Focus on Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei and the Philippines. *The Linguistics Journal*, 155–199.

Deterding, D. (2013). *Misunderstandings in English as a lingua franca: An analysis of ELF interactions in South-East Asia.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Deterding, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Emerging South-East Asian Englishes and intelligibility. *World Englishes, 25*(3/4), 391–409. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2006.00478.x

Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca 1*(1), 141–70.

Doqaruni, V. R. (2013). The relationship between communication strategies and noticing function of output hypothesis in teacher talk. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *9*(1), 176–205.

Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 55–85. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587805

Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, *47*(1), 173–210.

Ethnologue. (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (23rd ed.). Dallas: SIL
    International. Retrieved from www.ethnologue.com

Fekete, A. (2018). *Exploring advanced English learners' multilingual identity construction
    from multiple perspectives* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Pécs,
    Pécs.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On "Lingua Franca" English
    and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 237–259.
    https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8

Firth, A. (2009). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *6*(2), 147–170.
    https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.009

Gnutzmann, C. (2013). Lingua franca. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopeadia of
    language teaching and learning* (pp. 413–416). London: Routledge.

Goldin-Meadow, S. (2007). Nonverbal communication: The hand's role in talking and
    thinking. In W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology:
    Cognition, perception, and language* (pp. 336–369). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons,
    Inc.

Grosjean, F. (2008). *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual life and reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Haji-Othman, N. A., & McLellan, J. (2014). English in Brunei. *World Englishes*, *33*(4), 486–
    497. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12109

Haji-Othman, N. A., & Najib, S. A. (2016). The state of indigenous languages in Brunei. In
    N. A. Haji-Othman, J. McLellan, & D. Deterding (Eds.), *The use and status of
    language in Brunei Darussalam: A kingdom of unexpected linguistic diversity* (pp.
    17–28). Singapore: Springer.

Hashim, A. (2020). Malaysian English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The
    handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 373–397). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hickey, R. (2005). Southeast Asian Englishes. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *Legacies of colonial
    English: Studies in transported dialects* (pp. 559–585). Cambridge: Cambridge
    University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486920.023

Hickey, G. C., Buttinger, J., Osborne, M. E., Jamieson, N. L., Turley, W. S., & Duiker, W. J.
    (2021, April 5). *Vietnam. Encyclopedia Britannica*.
    https://www.britannica.com/place/Vietnam

Hoffer, B. L. (2002). Language borrowing and language diffusion:* An overview.
    Intercultural Communication Studies, *XI*(4), p. 1–37.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language: Native and non-native perspectives* (pp. 73–89). Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verlag.

House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*(4), 556–578. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00242.x

Htet, W. Z. (2020). Reviews of policy, practice and research: Basic education curriculum reforms in Myanmar and the role of social studies. *The Journal of Social Studies Education in Asia*, *9*, 37-45.

Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H., & Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication. *Synergies Europe*, *3*, 25–36.

Igawa, K. (2008). English language and its education in Cambodia, a country in transition. *Shitennoji University Bulletin*, *46*, 343–369. https://www.shitennoji.ac.jp/ibu/images/toshokan/kiyo46-20.pdf

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

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28(2),* 200-207.

Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, *66*(4), 486–494. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs040

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, *2*(3), 49–85. DOI 10.1515/eip-2015-0003

Jenkins, J. (2016, February 3). English as a lingua franca - Interview with Jenifer Jenkins. (TEA, Interviewer) Retrieved from TEFL Equity Advocates and Academy: http://teflequityadvocates.com/2016/02/03/english-as-a-lingua-franca-interview-with-jennifer-jenkins/

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of development in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, *44*(3), 281-315. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115

Jenkins, J., & Seidlhofer, B. (2001, April 19). Bringing Europe's lingua franca into the classroom. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2001/apr/19/languages.highereducation

Kachru, B. B. (1984). The alchemy of English: Social and functional power of non-native varieties. In C. Karamarae, M. Schulz, & W.M. O'Barr (Eds.) *Language and power* (pp. 176–193). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kachru, B. B. (1988). Teaching world Englishes. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*, *12*(1), 1, 3, 4, 8.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *17*, 66–87. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500003287

Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian context*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kaur, J. (2010). Achieving mutual understanding in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, *29*(2), 192–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2010.01638.x

Kaur, J. (2011a). Intercultural communication in English as a lingua franca: Some sources of misunderstanding. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *8*(1), 93–116. https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2011.004

Kaur, J. (2011b). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 2704–2715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.012

Kaur, J. (2012). Saying it again: Enhancing clarity in English as a lingua franca (ELF) talk through self-repetition. *Text & Talk*, *32*(5), 593–613. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2012-0028

Kaur, J. (2017). Ambiguity related misunderstanding and clarity enhancing practices in ELF communication. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *14*(1), 25–47. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2017-0002

Kaur, J. (2018). ELF in spoken genres in the international university: Of contextual factors and non-linguistic resources. *JELF*, *7*(2), 403–410. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2018-0020

Kaur, J. (2020). Other-correction in next position: The case of lexical replacement in ELF interactions in an academic setting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *169*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.013

Ke, I-C. (2012). English as a lingua franca (ELF) in intercultural communication: Findings from ELF online projects and implications for Taiwan's ELT. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL, 9*(2), 63–93.

Kennedy, S. (2017). Using stimulated recall to explore the use of communication strategies in English lingua franca interactions. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *6*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2017-0004

Keyes, E. J., Keyes, C. F., & Hafner, J. A. (2021, July 11). *Thailand. Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/place/Thailand

Khodorkovsky, M. (2013, August 19). How is English used as a lingua franca today? ALTA. https://www.altalang.com/beyond-words/how-is-english-used-as-a-lingua-franca-today/

Kimura, D., & Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice and ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 295–308). London & New York: Routledge.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Which model of English: Native-speaker, nativized or lingua franca? In R. Ruddy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world* (pp. 71–82). Sydney: Bloomsbury Publishing.

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

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007b). The communicative strategies of ASEAN speakers of English as a lingua franca. In D. Prescott (Ed.), *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, literacies and literatures* (pp. 118–137). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). English as the official working language of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN): Features and strategies. *English Today*, *24*(2), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078408000175

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). Learning English in ASEAN: Myths and principles. *Language Education in Asia*, *1*(1), 1–7. https://leia.org/LEiA/LEiA%20VOLUMES/Download/LEiA_V1_2010/LEiA_V1_02_Kirkpatrick_Learning_English_in_ASEAN_Myths_and_Principles.pdf

Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching*, *44*(2), 212–224. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000145

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012a). English as an Asian lingua franca: The 'Lingua Franca Approach' and implications for language education policy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *1*(1), 121–140. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0006

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012b). English in ASEAN: Implications for regional multilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *33*(4), 331–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661433

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). Teaching English in Asia in non-Anglo cultural contexts: Principles of the 'Lingua franca approach'. In R. Marlina, & R. A. Giri (Eds.) *The pedagogy of*

English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students (pp. 23–34). Cham: Springer.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2016). English as a lingua franca and its educational impact in Asia. In G. Leitner, A. Hashim, & H.-G. Wolf (Eds.), *Communicating with Asia: The future of English as a global language* (pp. 282–295). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107477186.019

Kirkpatrick, A. (2020). English as an ASEAN lingua franca. In K. Bolton, W. Botha & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 725–740). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat A. (2017). Language education policy and practice in East and Southeast Asia. *Language Teaching*, *50*(2), 155–188. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000027

Klimpfinger, T. (2007). 'Mind you, sometimes you have to mix' – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca. *Views*, *16*(2), 36–61.

Kongsom, T. (2016). The impact of teaching communication strategies on English speaking of Engineering undergraduates. *PASAA*, *51*, 39–69.

Krasnick, H. (1995). The role of linguaculture and intercultural communication in ASEAN in the year 2020: Prospects and predictions. In M. Tickoo (Ed.), *Language and culture in multilingual societies* (pp. 81–93). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Laskowski, L. (2001). *10 Days to more confident public speaking.* New York: Warner Books.

Lauder, A. F. (2020). English in Indonesia. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 605–627). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Legge, J. D., Leinbach, T. R., Wolters, O. W., Adam, A. W., McDivitt, J. F., & Mohamad, G. S. (2021, July 21). *Indonesia. Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/place/Indonesia

Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2015). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.

Low, E. L. (2020). English in Southeast Asia. In C. Nelson, Z. Proshina, & D. Davis (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 135–158). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lwin, T. (2000). *Education in Burma (1945-2000).* Chiang Mai: Thinking Classroom Foundation.

http://www.thinkingclassroom.org/uploads/4/3/9/0/43900311/lwin_t._2000._educatio
n_in_burma_1945-2000.pdf

Mansfield, G., & Poppi, F. (2012). The English as a foreign language/lingua franca debate: Sensitising teachers of English as a foreign language towards teaching English as a lingua franca. *Profile*, *14*(1), 159–172.

Marr, T., & English, F. (2019). *Rethinking TESOL in diverse global settings: The language and the teacher in a time of change*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Marra, A. (2014). *Communicative strategies in BELF negotiations: A qualitative study on misunderstandings and communicative strategies in BELF telephone negotiations* [Unpublished undergraduate thesis]. Stockholms Universitet.

Martin, I. P. (2020). Philippine English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 479–500). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mauranen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *177*, 123–150. https://doi.org/10.1515/IJSL.2006.008

Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, A. (2018). Second language acquisition, world Englishes, and English as a lingua franca (ELF). *World Englishes*, *37*, 106–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12306

McArthur, T. (1992). *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McLellan, J. (2012). The view from below: Code-switching and the influence of "substrate" languages in the development of Southeast Asian Englishes. In E-L. Low, & A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language in use* (pp. 267–288). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McLellan, J. (2020). Brunei English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 398–418). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Meierkord, C. (2000). Interpreting successful lingua-franca interaction. An analysis of non-native-/non-native small talk conversation in English. *Linguistik Online*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.5.1013

Moore, S. H., & Bounchan, S. (2020). English in Cambodia. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 649–666). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

MyGovernment. (2021, July 21). *Malaysia Information.* Retrieved from
   https://www.malaysia.gov.my/portal/content/142

Myint, M. (2005). *English language teaching in Myanmar: A century and a half of experience and experimentation.* Yangon: Universities' Historical Research Commission.

Myint, M., & Poe, P. (2003). English language teching in Myanmar: A century and half of experience and experiments. In H. W. Kam, & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in east Asia today: Changing policies and practices.* Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Myintzu, W. (2019, June 5-6). *The current role of ELF in English language teaching & learning in Myanmar context* [Conference presentation]. 14th Faculty Doctoral Students' Conference of the Doctoral School in Linguistics, Univesity of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary.

Myintzu, W. (2021a). Code-switching in English as a lingua franca in the ASEAN context. In L. Kajos, C. Bali, Z. Preisz, & R. Szabó (Eds.). *10th Jubilee Interdisciplinary Doctoral Conference 2021 Conference Book* (pp. 830-842). Pécs: Doctoral Student Association of the Univesity of Pécs.
   https://dok.pte.hu/sites/dok.pte.hu/files/files/Kiadvanyok/IDK2021_Conference_Book
   _Final_20220203.pdf

Myintzu, W. (2021b). Use of the let it pass strategy among ASEAN English speakers. *EduLingua*, *7*(1), 89-108. https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2021.1.5

Nag, O. S. (2017, August 1). "*What languages are spoken in Myanmar (Burma)?*": *Worldatlas*. https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/what-languages-are-spoken-in-myanmar-burma.html

Noble, N., & Heale, R. (2019). Triangulation in research, with examples. *Evidence-Based Nursing, 22*(3), 67–68. https://doi.org/10.1136/ebnurs-2019-103145

Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Sciences Research, 34*, 1189–1208.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Paw, J. (2015). Current English language teaching in Myanmar. In T. W. Bigalke, & S. Sharbawi (Eds.), *English for ASEAN integration: Policies and practices in the region* (pp. 103-109). Bandar Seri Begawan: Universiti Brunei Darussalam.

Pechapan-Hammond, S. (2020). English in Thailand. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 629–648). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Pietikäinen, K. S. (2018). Misunderstanding and ensuring understanding in private ELF talk. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(2), 188–212. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw005

Pölzl, U. (2003). Signalling cultural identity: The use of L1/Ln in ELF. *Vienna English Working Papers*, *12*(2), 3–23.

Ruekeith, G. O. (2015, November 18). *Sarawak to recognize English as official language besides Bahasa Malaysia*. Retrieved from Borneo Post Online: https://web.archive.org/web/20160305082141/http://www.theborneopost.com/2015/11/18/sarawak-t

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). *Lectures on conversation, Volume I & II*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Sato, T., Yujobo, Y. J., Okada, T., & Ogane, E. (2019). Communication strategies employed by low-proficiency users: Possibilities for ELF-informed pedagogy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *8*(1), 9–35. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2019-2003

Schneider, E. (2014). Asian Englishes – into the future: A bird's eye view. *Asian Englishes*, *16*(3), 249–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/21639159.2014.949439

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/10.1111/1473-4192.00011

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*(1), 209–239. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000145

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

Sifakis, N. C., & Bayyurt, Y. (2018). ELF-aware teacher education and development. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook on English as a lingua franca* (pp. 456–467). London: Routledge.

Sifakis, N. S., Lopriore, L., Dewey, M., Bayyurt, Y., Vettorel, P., Cavalheiro, L., Siqueira, S. & Kordia, K. (2018). ELF-awareness in ELT: Bringing together theory and practice. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 7(1)*, 155–209.

Sillars, A., Roberts, L. J., Leonard, K. E., & Dun, T. (2000). Cognition during marital conflict: The relationship of thought and talk. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *17*(4–5), 479–502. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407500174002

Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of class-room discourse. Vol. 2*. Boston/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Soe, M. Z., Swe, A. M., Aye, N. K. M., & Mon, N. H. (2017). *Reform of the education system: Case study of Myanmar*. Phnom Penh: Parliamentary Institute of Cambodia. http://afeo.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Reform-of-the-Education-System-in-Myanmar-Case-Study.pdf

Soe, T. (2015, July 24-26). *A study of contemporary trends and challenges of English language teaching in Myanmar* [Paper presentation]. International Conference on Burma/Myanmar Studies 2015, Chiang Mai, Thailand. https://www.burmalibrary.org/docs21/Language/Thandar-Soe-2015-A_Study_of_Contemporary_Trends_and_Challenges_of_English_Language_Teaching_in_Myanmar-en.pdf

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory.* London & New York: Continuum.

Sundkvist, P., & Nguyen, X. N. C. M. (2020). English in Vietnam. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 683–703). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sung, C. C. M. (2016). Does accent matter? Investigating the relationship between accent and identity in English as a lingua franca communication. *System*, *60*, 55–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.06.002

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio, & R. C. Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL Quarterly '77. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, *30*(2), 417–431.

Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Commonwealth. (2021, July 23). *Singapore*. Retrieved from https://thecommonwealth.org/our-member-countries/singapore

Tin, H. (1992). *English language teaching issues in the Union of Myanmar.* Yangon: Ministry of Education/UNDP/UNESCO. Education Sector Study Project. Myanmar Education Research Bureau.

Vázquez, I., Luzón, M. J., & Pérez-Llantada, C. (2019). Linguistic diversity in a traditionally monolingual university: A multi-analytical approach. In J. Jenkins, & A. Mauranen (Eds.), *Linguistic diversity on the international campus* (pp. 74–95). London: Routledge.

Vettorel, P. (2019). Communication strategies and co-construction of meaning in ELF: Drawing on multilingual resource pools. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *8*(2), 179–210. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2019-2019

Watterson, M. (2008). Repair of non-understanding in English in international communication. *World Englishes*, *27*(3/4), 378–406. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2008.00574.x

Widdowson, H. G. (2012). ELF and the inconvenience of established concepts. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca,* 1(1), 5–26. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0002

Wilang, J. D., & Teo, A. (2012). Measuring the comprehensibility of Englishes within ASEAN among ASEANS. *International Journal of English and Literature (IJEL)*, *2*(3), 22–42.

Willems, G. M. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching. *System*, *15*(3), 351–364. https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(87)90009-1

Wong, M. S., Miller, J., & Treadwell, B. (2019). English language teacher preparation in Myanmar: Challenges and recommendations for Myanmar and the ASEAN region. In S. Zein, & R. Stroupe (Ed.), *English language teacher preparation in Asia: Policy, research and practice* (pp. 244–260). London: Routledge.

Zein, S., & Stroupe, R. (2017). English and language-in-education policy in the ASEAN Plus Three Forum. *Asian Englishes, 19*(3), 193–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1389061

Appendix

Transcription conventions

The video-recorded materials were transcribed according to the following notation system which was an adapted version of Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

=	a continuous flow of speech, a continuing intonation
,	a continuing intonation
.	a stopping fall in tone
:	an extension of the sound or syllable it follows, more colons prolong the stretch
?	a rising inflection
!	an animated tone, not necessarily an exclamation
(.)	a short pause which lasts less than a second
(0.1)	an interval within an utterance or between utterances timed a second
wor-	a halt or cutoff, a word or clause not produced in its entirety
-word-	syllables of a word or strings of words to show stammering
WORD	a part of an utterance which is delivered louder than the surrounding talk
W-O-R-D	spelling out the word
°word°	a passage of talk quieter than the surrounding talk
>word<	a part of an utterance which is delivered at a pace quicker than the surrounding talk
((word))	a non-vocal action, description of conversational scene
[	overlapping (start)
]	overlapping (end)
/word/	a transcription in IPA
italic	a code-switch into a non-English language
XXXXX	an inaudible sound or utterance

Publications

Publications in the field of ELF and multilingualism

Myintzu, W. (2019). English as a lingua franca (ELF) in ASEAN countries. In C. Nguyễn & L. Ngô (Eds.), *Tuyển tập Hội nghị Khoa học thường niên năm 2019 (Proceedings of the Annual Conference of Thuyloi University)* (pp. 682–684). Hanoi: FECON & Construction Publishing House.

Myintzu, W. (2021a). Pointing gesture use of English speakers from ASEAN countries. In Antalné, S., et al. (Eds.) *XXIV. Tavaszi Szél Konferencia 2021 Conference Volume (Volume 2)* (pp. 339–350). Budapest: Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége.

Myintzu, W. (2021b). Code-switching in English as a lingua franca in the ASEAN context. In Kajos, L., Bali, C., Preisz, Z. & Szabó, R. (Eds.). *10th Jubilee Interdisciplinary Doctoral Conference 2021 Conference Book* (pp. 830–842). Pécs: Doctoral Student Association of the Univesity of Pécs. https://dok.pte.hu/sites/dok.pte.hu/files/files/Kiadvanyok/IDK2021_Conference_Book_Final_20220203.pdf

Myintzu, W. (2021c). Use of the let it pass strategy among ASEAN English speakers. *EduLingua*, *7*(1), 89–108. https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2021.1.5

Myintzu, W. (2022a). Humor and teasing among ASEAN ELF speakers. *Argumentum*, *18*, 421–438. https://doi.org/10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/24

Myintzu, W. (2022b). Third or additional language learning: A case study of Hungarian Chinese learners. In Brdar-Szabó, R. & Tóthné, L. (Eds.). *XIV. Nemzetközi Tudományos Konferenciája – 2022 Tanulmányikötet (XIV. International Scientific Conference – 2022 Conference Book)*. Scientific Committee, Selye János University. (Accepted for publication).

Other publications

Myintzu, W. (2019). Compliment behaviour: A case study of Burmese from lower Myanmar. In Maeda, K. et al. (Eds.). *Pattaya-Thailand Int'l Conference Proceedings PAET-19, PAEBS-19 & LHBSS-19* (pp. 11–17).

Myintzu, W., Thainkha, S., & Moore, E. (2019). Traditional design in an ancient village of Tanintharyi. *Nakhara: Journal of Environmental Design and Planning*, *17*. 1–24.

Fan, L. & Myintzu, W. (2022). A study on Hungarian Chinese learners' pronunciation for Chinese consonant initials. In Brdar-Szabó, R. & Tóthné, L. (Eds.). *XIV. Nemzetközi Tudományos Konferenciája – 2022 Tanulmányikötet (XIV. International Scientific*

Conference – 2022 Conference Book). Scientific Committee, Selye János University. (Accepted for publication).