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Abstract

This paper examines explicitness in English as lingua franca (ELF) spoken interactions. Using a conversation analysis procedure, about 11h of audio-recorded naturally occurring ELF interactions of 79 incoming Erasmus students were analyzed for this purpose. The corpus was compiled by means of 54 speech events, 29 interviews and 25 focus group meetings and the participants represented 24 mother tongues. Research into ELF reveals that ELF speakers tend to use various "explicitness strategies" (Mauranen, 2007) in order to enhance intelligibility. The findings of this study show that there are indeed variations from standard ENL forms with respect to the degree of explicitness in spoken interactions. There is a tendency among ELF speakers to make the meaning more explicit for the listeners. Repetitions of same expressions in subsequent sentences, use of over-explicit forms, use of an extra subject following a relative clause and use of emphatic reference are the emerging patterns observed in this study.
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1. Introduction

English as lingua franca (ELF) have been defined 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” (Firth, 1996: 240); as “a repertoire of different communicative instruments an individual has at his/her disposal, a useful and versatile tool, a ‘language for communication’” (House, 2003: 559); as “a medium of communication by people who do not speak the same first language” (Kirkpatrick, 2007a: 155); and as “a contact language used only among nonmother tongue speakers” (Jenkins, 2006a: 160). The one common point among these definitions of ELF is that English is perceived as the medium of communication among people coming from diverse mother tongues. Another point, which is open to discussion, is that ELF interactions exclude native speakers. As Seidlhofer (2011: 7) puts forward, this is not a very accurate definition as ELF interactions include native speakers. As Seidlhofer (2011: 7) puts forward, this is not a very accurate definition as ELF interactions include Inner and Outer Circle English speakers as well, e.g. in an academic conference held in Seattle or at a touristic journey to India. She defines 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” (Seidlhofer, 2011: 7).

1.1 Research into ELF

The increase in global communication has been an important factor in the spread of English. English is a global lingua franca like no other. The number of its non-native speakers outweighs its native speakers. As Crystal (2003) puts forward ESL and EFL speakers will gain prestige and shape the future of English by creating their own standard varieties. Likewise, ELF speakers who come from diverse ethnic, linguistic, cultural and social backgrounds and use English as a medium of communication are expected to shape the future of English. These observations have greatly impacted the interest in ELF research. The studies in ELF can be broadly categorized as those describing the linguistic features of written and spoken ELF discourse; those investigating the attitudes and perceptions towards ELF; corpora studies; and those focusing on how to bring ELF into the classroom. The lexico-grammar of ELF has been investigated by Seidlhofer (2001, 2004); Dewey (2007a); Cogo and Dewey (2012); and Breiteneder (2009). The phonological characteristics of ELF have been examined by Jenkins (2000) and Walker (2010). The pragmatic features of ELF have been investigated by Björkman (2011a); Firth (1996); Firth and Wagner (1997); House (1999, 2002); Kaur (2011); Meierkord (2000); and Mauranen (2006a, 2006b). As for the attitudes towards ELF, Murray
Jenkins (2005a); Llurda (2005); Young and Walsh (2010) identified teachers’ -pre-service and in-service- perceptions of ELF and Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenboeck and Smit (1997); Timmis (2002) and Groom (2012) examined students' perceptions of ELF. With respect to the corpus studies, VOICE (Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English); ELFA (the Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings); WrELFA (the Corpus of Written English as Lingua Franca in Academic Settings); ACE (the Asian Corpus of English) are among the large-scale ELF corpora which have been used as a source of data in ELF research. On the other hand, Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (2019); Kaçar and Bayyurt (2018); Sifakis, Lopriore, Dewey, Bayyurt, Vettorel, Cavalheiro, Siqueira, and Kordia (2018); and Sifakis and Bayyurt (2016) have been carrying out studies on ELF-aware pedagogy and teacher education which can be used as a guide by English teachers who wish to bring ELF into their classrooms.

1.2 Explicitness as an Emerging Pattern in ELF Interactions

In a cooperative discourse the responsibility of participants is to ascertain the meaning. Meaning can be either speaker-oriented or hearer-oriented. The requirements of a speaker-oriented discourse are explicitness and clarity. In a speaker-oriented culture, if something is not comprehended in a specific speech event, the speaker is accused of not being clear and precise enough (Lakoff, 1984). However, in a hearer-oriented culture, imprecision is valued. When speakers are over-explicit, they are perceived negatively. Being very clear and straightforward is seen as contemptuous. Thus, while in a speaker-oriented culture, ‘imprecision’ is marked; in a hearer-oriented culture ‘explicitness’ is marked (Lakoff, 1984). This shows that different cultures have different norms in the expression of meaning.

In English as Lingua interactions, the participants come from diverse cultural backgrounds. When a speaker’s native language is based on a different strategy from the language of other speakers this might create a problem. Therefore, it is important to understand how meaning is negotiated in ELF discourse. Previous pragmatic studies in ELF (Seidlhofer, 2004; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Mauranen, 2006b; Kaur, 2011) show that speakers use some negotiation strategies. Mauranen (2006b) in her ELFA-based study investigated the occurrence and prevention of misunderstandings among ELF speakers. The findings revealed that ELF speakers were successful in managing to prevent linguistic misunderstandings by means of explicitation strategies, repetitions, and collaborative tactics. Similarly, Kaur (2011) examining the self-repair practices of ELF speakers, reveals that correcting and using a variety of self-repair practices to make the meaning explicit and clear are among the emerging patterns in ELF interactions.

This paper primarily examines over-explicitness, e.g. “black color rather than just black”, in spoken ELF interactions, which is revealed as a characteristic of ELF communication in previous ELF studies (Seidlhofer, 2004: 220) and addresses the following research question:

RQ: Does English as a lingua franca reveal any variations from standard ENL forms with respect to the degree of explicitness?

2. Method

This study is a part of a corpus study based on English as lingua franca interactions. The corpus, Corpus IST-Erasmus (Önen, 2014), is composed of 10 hours 47 minutes of audio-recorded naturally occurring ELF interactions and 93,913 words of transcribed data. One of the first papers (Önen, 2015) reporting the findings of Corpus IST-Erasmus was concerned with the use of prepositions in ELF discourse. Previous pragmatic studies in ELF (Seidlhofer, 2004: Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Mauranen, 2006b; Kaur, 2011) show that speakers use some negotiation strategies. Mauranen (2006b) in her ELFA-based study investigated the occurrence and prevention of misunderstandings among ELF speakers. The findings revealed that ELF speakers were successful in managing to prevent linguistic misunderstandings by means of explicitation strategies, repetitions, and collaborative tactics. Similarly, Kaur (2011) examining the self-repair practices of ELF speakers, reveals that correcting and using a variety of self-repair practices to make the meaning explicit and clear are among the emerging patterns in ELF interactions.

This paper primarily examines over-explicitness, e.g. “black color rather than just black”, in spoken ELF interactions, which is revealed as a characteristic of ELF communication in previous ELF studies (Seidlhofer, 2004: 220) and addresses the following research question:

RQ: Does English as a lingua franca reveal any variations from standard ENL forms with respect to the degree of explicitness?

2.1 Research Design

This is a corpus study which investigates lexico-grammar of spoken ELF interactions. The main stages of compiling a spoken corpus are recording, transcribing, coding and mark up, and management and analysis (Adolphs & Knight, 2010: 3). The data collection phase of this study started with the recording of the naturally occurring ELF interactions and lasted for three months. Then, the 10 hours 47 minutes of recorded data were transcribed verbatim
following the transcription conventions of VOICE. One of the limitations during this process was that the existing software programs were not able to recognize non-native speakers’ accents and convert voice into text accurately. Therefore, the transcriptions were performed manually. As the third stage, the raw transcriptions were marked and coded manually using the adapted form of VOICE mark-up conventions. The pronunciation variations, onomatopoeic noises and breath were not coded as they were not related to the scope of this study. As for the data analysis, the corpus was examined in two ways: manually and by means of corpus analysis software (WordSmith Tools 6.0).

2.2 Participants and Setting

The corpus was compiled with the participation of 79 exchange students, primarily Erasmus students, enrolled in state and foundation universities in Istanbul. Convenient and snowball samplings were employed and participation in the study was completely voluntary. However, the restrictive criterion was to be an incoming exchange student and to use English as a medium of communication with other students. As can be seen in Table 1, the 79 participants were of 24 different lingua-cultural backgrounds. Moreover, 6 of the participants were bilinguals.

Table 1. The Distribution of the Participants by Mother Tongues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Tongues</th>
<th>No. of Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arabic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Azerbaijan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basque</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bulgarian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cantonese</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Czech</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dutch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. French</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Galician</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. German</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Greek</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Italian</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Korean</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lithuanian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Polish</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Slovak</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Suriname</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Turkish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ukranian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age range of the participants was 19-27 years. They were exchange students enrolled in various undergraduate or graduate programs in Istanbul. In total, the participants represented 10 universities, 4 state and 6 foundation universities. The majority of the participants were from Istanbul University. However, students from Yeditepe University and Bahçeşehir University also showed high participation in the study.

The setting for data collection was primarily Istanbul University but some of the speech events were conducted at Bilgi University, Yeditepe University, and Bahçeşehir University. Particularly, the international day organizations that took place at these foundation universities contributed immensely to the data collection process.

2.3 Data Collection Instruments

The corpus was compiled by means of 54 speech events, 29 interviews and 25 focus group meetings. The primary objective of these speech events was to encourage the participants to talk as much as possible. Each speech event was piloted before the actual study and necessary revisions were applied.
The interviews were conducted on a face-to-face basis with one participant. The participants were asked to answer 15 open-ended questions impromptu. The questions were primarily based on participants’ Erasmus experiences. The focus group meetings were also conducted on a face-to-face basis but with two participants. The participants chose a topic among the previously arranged list and discussed the topic impromptu. In order to avoid the use of native language, the pairs that would participate in the meetings were selected from different L1s. Prior to each speech event, the participants were given a participant information sheet and consent from and a participant information questionnaire. All the speech events were recorded using a digital voice recorder. By means of these speech events naturally occurring ELF interactions were audio-recorded.

2.4 Data Analysis

The corpus was analyzed both manually and electronically. First of all, the transcriptions of 54 speech events were transferred into a single file. Thereby, a 93,913 words corpus of spoken ELF was compiled. The next step was to create a word list of the corpus using the WordSmith Tools 6.0, a lexical analysis software. The software provides a word list of the corpus which displays the words in the corpus according to their frequency orders, gives the percentages of their occurrences, and shows the distribution of the words in each speech event. Besides, the software enables to make concordance analyses, identify the collocations and clusters, and compare the corpus with other related corpora. However, the analysis of the explicitness in ELF interactions had to be performed manually because the software cannot detect explicit language uses in the corpus.

3. Results

The results reveal that over-explicitness is an emerging pattern in spoken ELF discourse as proposed in previous ELF studies. ELF speakers in this study do also attempt to make the meaning more explicit in the speech events. As in Cogo and Dewey (2012: 110) the speakers are “exceptionally listener-oriented in talk”. The following extracts illustrate the over-explicitness observed in the interactions.

Extract 1 (S11: German)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>S11: mhm (.) erm: i live in a: erm (. ) flat share? a: little apartment i share it with turkish girl and it's in nisantasi? (.) erm it's a nice area i like it but erm i found it over a friend because a fellow student went to istanbul in two thousand nine and nine and she heard that i need a apartment and she told me &lt;imitating&gt;yeah&lt;/imitating&gt; i know (.) a nice girl and maybe she is searching for a flatmate (.) and so: erm she have had a free room and then we erm wrote at facebook and so we LIKED each other and she said &lt;imitating&gt;yeah you can move&lt;/imitating&gt; (.) into my flat and so we share this flat (.) and erm it's nice living with her and it's so (. ) good that she's a turkish girl and she can help me in everything: and she: (.) she went to me with er to the mobile shops and things like this so and we go out and she show me istanbul and (.) that's nice to live with her&lt;/12&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this extract, an Erasmus student is talking about the process of finding a housemate. Although in line 157, the student states that she shares the flat with a ‘Turkish girl’, in 164 she uses the same expression again, though it would be appropriate to just say ‘it’s so good that she’s Turkish’. As can be understood, the speaker’s main concern is that her housemate is Turkish, not that she is a girl. Thus, the use of the word ‘girl’ following the word ‘Turkish’ shows the tendency for over-explicitness. Also, the use of ‘meat’ following ‘pork’ in line 41 in Extract 2, the use of ‘school’ preceding ‘children’ in line 2 in Extract 3, the use of ‘language’ following ‘English’ in line 39 in Extract 4, the use of ‘country’ following ‘the other one’ in line 36 in Extract 5, the use of ‘language’ following ‘azerbaijani’ in lines 171 and 175 in Extract 6, are just a few of the over-explicit forms attested in the corpus.

Extract 2 (S21: Italian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S21: yeah i don't like meat here so much ( . ) because i like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S22: why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S21: i like you know pork meat so: you cannot find here &lt;6&gt;easily&lt;/6&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>S22: &lt;6&gt;@@@@&lt;/6&gt;@@&lt;6&gt;@@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>S21: actually when i: came back italy for for a while i: come here again with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>some ( . ) you know sausage real sausage @</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>S22: yes but &lt;slow&gt;this is er ( . ) for their re&lt;7&gt;ligion&lt;/7&gt;&lt;/slow&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Extract 3 (S23: Bulgarian)
1 R: interview eleven (1) okay at what age do children start in your school
2 S23: back in bulgaria er children our school children start school at seven six
3 or seven years it depends on which part of the year they are born some parents
4 prefer to send them erm: (. ) a bit: late: than usual

Extract 4 (S25: German)
33 R: <4>mhm yeah i</4> understood so maths courses history they are all in
34 german
35 S25: yes
36 R: <5>okay</5>
37 S25: <5>everything is in german i think it should be offered to be in english
38 (. ) for knowing the parents decide okay maybe my children (. ) should be learning
39 the english language=
40 R: =mhm=
41 S25: =much more (1) so but (1) it depends on the school and then the education
42 system

Extract 5 (S50: Lithuanian)
33 in the street where is: some place (. ) maybe five people would stop and they will
34 try to help you so (. ) what i'm trying to say: that (. ) this is the most important
35 thing for me when you're going to different country because you can see
36 differences between your own country and other one country (. ) so: it's nice i like

Extract 6 (S71: Azerbaijani)
169 S71: mhm (1) my (. ) they are five (1) in my family father mother me (. ) my sister
170 and brother and i'm the (1) older than them and erm we are speaking in
171 azerbaijani language but (1) sometimes i say to my mother to speak with me in
172 russian because her russian is (1) like russian or russian yes that's why i don't
173 want (. ) to: have accent (1) and that's why i speak with her russian (. ) or for (1)
174 not to be in accent (1) in my speaking russian but (1) exactly we speak in (. )
175 azerbaijani language and (1) now i <@>miss them so much</@>

Besides this, there is another emerging pattern of explicitness in the corpus, which does not appear in ENL varieties. That is, ELF speakers tend to use an additional subject following a relative clause. As can be seen in lines 7 and 9 in Extract 7, and in line 16 in Extract 8, the relative clauses 'some children who are little bit slow at learning', 'the students who are at the age of seven and five', and 'people who study economics' are followed by the subject pronoun 'they', which is not permitted in ENL.

Extract 7 (S6: German, R: Turkish)
5 S6: but there are some cases for example i was (. ) really <fast>interested in
6 going to school so there are possibilities to go there</fast> with (. ) at the age
7 of five or (. ) for some children <fast>who are little bit slow at learning they
8 can also start at</fast> s:even but i think six is still the usual (. ) age
9 R: mhm but er the students who are at the age of seven and five they are not
10 included in the same class
11 S6: yes they are they are

Extract 8 (S15: German)
14 R: mhm (1) what are the criteria to be accepted to the erasmus program in your
15 country
16 S15: that differs a lot so people who study economics they have to really have
17 to have good grades and then to apply to it formally but for me it was pretty easy
The same pattern is also observed in reduced relative clauses, as presented below. In line 126 in Extract 9 and in line 67 in Extract 10 respectively, ‘some of the girls I met here’ and ‘my neighbor in harbiye’ are followed by subject pronouns.

**Extract 9 (S15: German)**
125 S15: erm: yeah there are a few but less than i would expect so: erm (1) i think it really depends: so some of the girls i met here they stay at home all the time .)

**Extract 10 (S27: German)**
66 S27: =experience yeah (.) erm (1) ye:s i know then it's weird cos (.) my neighbor in harbiye he said that he always checks who likes his pictures and who doesn't

As can be seen, though not permitted in ENL varieties, ELF speakers combine relative clauses with subject pronouns for the sake of explicitness. Moreover, unlike ENL, there is high degree of explicitness in ELF interactions attained through the repetition of same words or phrases in subsequent clauses. For example, in line 288 in Extract 12, the speaker uses the word ‘urology’ in succeeding clauses, where an ENL speaker would most probably use the subject pronoun ‘it’.

**Extract 11 (S10: German)**
145 S10: <15>hm</15> i sp- i: spea:k french? i had (.) i learned french in school (.) and i think i was quite good at it but i forgot a lot now and i also had italian but italian just a little bit not very good er of course now i learn turkish (.) and that's:

**Extract 12 (S24: Greek)**
209 S24: and: (.) also the (.) i know it's a poor neighborhood but i also like the neighborhood because (.) it's there's life in it and some power for example
287 S24: erm yeah as i told we take circles of internships let's say like er (.) i just for example i just finished my urology and i had the exam for urology=

**Extract 13 (S42: Dutch)**
103 R: mhm (.) of all the courses you are taking this term which one interest you the most (1) which course
105 S42: erm: (.) i think ecommerce (1) because ecommerce is: (1) a course (.) that's really e:r (1) contemporary it's talks about nowadays issues (.) about the internet

**Extract 14 (S79: Czech)**
104 S79: yes: it's especially about religion (1) because for example here i'm ( .) i really miss the pork (1) because (.) muslims people (.) not eating the pork and (1)
106 and i'm now (1) three months before erm (.) three months erm (1) without pork

On the other hand, explicitness is also attained through the use of *fronting structures*. In fact, these structures are also widespread in ENL. As Carter et al. (2000: 159) put forward “[p]reposing or fronting identifies for a listener that a place, person, or event is important. It is common in spoken English in the form of heads, but some forms of fronting are also used in written English”. The following sentences illustrate the use of *heads* in ENL.

*John*, he’s nice.
*The man from Leeds we met on holiday*, his sister…
*The results*, they are interesting.
*My friend, Janet*, her sister has just emigrated to Brazil.
*That leather coat*, it looks really nice on you.

(Cartel et al., 2000: 156,169)

However, as Cogo and Dewey (2012: 110) state “[t]he degree to which speakers in ELF put this to use, though, does appear to be a distinctive interactional feature”. The following extracts illustrate the same situation in Corpus IST-Erasmus.
In each of these extracts, the subjects are followed by subject pronouns. For example, in line 184 in Extract 18, the subject pronoun 'she' is used subsequent to the subject, as in 'my sister she is: erm nineteen...'. There are also several cases in the corpus where the reverse occurs; that is, pronouns are followed by subjects. As presented in the extracts below, in order to ensure comprehension, speakers use overt subjects, 'the topic', 'christians', 'İstanbul', 'little children', 'people', after the pronouns. It is obvious that speakers attempt to make the meaning more explicit for the listener.

In each of these extracts, the subjects are followed by subject pronouns. For example, in line 184 in Extract 18, the subject pronoun 'she' is used subsequent to the subject, as in 'my sister she is: erm nineteen...'. There are also several cases in the corpus where the reverse occurs; that is, pronouns are followed by subjects. As presented in the extracts below, in order to ensure comprehension, speakers use overt subjects, 'the topic', 'christians', 'İstanbul', 'little children', 'people', after the pronouns. It is obvious that speakers attempt to make the meaning more explicit for the listener.
Furthermore, *repetitions* are also very frequent in the corpus. ELF speakers, as illustrated with the following extracts, tend to repeat their utterances either to make sure that the listener understands or to emphasize the arguments made in the discourse.

**Repetitions**

**Extract 26 (S3: Spanish)**
150 don't like e:r <fast>i don't like too much from istanbul university that you don't
151 have</fast> e:r (1) **too much space** for **too much space** for **practice sport** (1) for
152 **practice sport** yeah (.) you know you don't ha:ve a football fie:Id you don't have
153 the **space** you don't have <fast>**too much space** for **practice sport** that i think is
154 important also for the students</fast> and for example in my hometown

**Extract 26 (S31: Polish)**
72 S31: <loud><3>children</3></loud> yes and (.) national (.) **national holiday** and
73 they are children and we think hm: like in poland (1) it could be (.) like if there is
74 **national holiday** (.) about (.) it was about making the (.) **national holiday** is like
75 **national holiday** (.) it's really pathetic

**Extract 27 (S33: Arabic)**
89 S33: yes is it the first time (.) i: i chosed also turkey because (.) i knew that there
90 was good weather @@@ <@@>so it's really good</@@> to live in turkey (1) as today
91 is a really good day (.) and: (1) i also wanted (.) to: to discover this (1) cultural
92 **turkish culture** (1) **turkish culture**

Finally, as in Cogo and Dewey (2012: 110), “emphatic reference through frequent use of phrases” is also observed in Corpus IST-Erasmus. In particular, the extensive use of *‘right now’* is salient, as presented in Table 2. Consequently, in line with the previous studies (Dewey, 2007a; Cogo & Dewey, 2012), the tendency for over-explicitness is an emerging pattern in Corpus IST-Erasmus. The use of over-explicit forms, e.g. *‘pork meat’*; the use of additional subjects in relative clauses, e.g. *‘people who study economics they’*; the high degree of explicitness attained through repetitions, e.g. *‘i think ecommerce because ecommerce is’*; the use of fronting structures, e.g. *‘my brother he studies’*; and repetitions are the primary means for ensuring explicitness in the corpus.

**Table 2. The Concordance of ‘Right Now’**
4. Discussion

The primary focus of this study was to investigate the degree of explicitness in ELF interactions. The findings suggest that there are variations from standard ENL forms with respect to the degree of explicitness in ELF interactions. As proposed by Seidlhofer (2004: 220) “[o]verdoing explicitness (e.g. black color rather than just black) is typical of spoken ELF interactions. First of all, speakers tend to make the meaning more explicit for the listeners. They repeat the same expressions in subsequent sentences, as in “i share it with a turkish girl … it's so good that she's a turkish girl …”. Besides, as suggested in ELF literature, they use over-explicit forms, such as 'pork meat' rather than just ‘pork’. Moreover, unlike ENL, there is a tendency in ELF interactions to add an extra subject following a relative clause, e.g. “people who study economics they have to …”. Furthermore, the use of fronting structures, which also appear in ENL, is widespread in the corpus, e.g. “my brother he studies physics …”. Finally, explicitness is also attained through repetitions, as in ‘too much space for too much space for practice sport for practice sport yeah …’, and through emphatic reference, e.g. 'right now'.

In summary, the study reveals that there are some emerging patterns in English as lingua franca interactions and over-explicitness is one of them. The results of this and other ELF corpora can be beneficial for the field of ELT and teacher education. First of all, one of the most important benefits of corpora studies is that they reflect real language use. They do not display prefabricated patterns or inauthentic language uses but the naturally occurring patterns and authentic language uses. Therefore, the findings of corpora studies should be applied to material development in language learning and teaching. On the other hand, as the mobility of students and teachers is promoted in the last decade universities have become multicultural environments. English is used as the medium of instruction not only in the classroom but also on the campuses. Thus, it is vital that an instructor lecturing in multicultural classes is aware of the emerging patterns in ELF interactions and design the course content, materials, and type of assessment accordingly.

In relation to limitations, this study is only based on lexico-grammar of spoken ELF interactions. Therefore, generalizations cannot be made regarding the written ELF interactions. Future research could investigate lexico-grammar of ELF in written interactions and digital media. Besides, in order to fully identify the features of ELF lexico-grammar, further studies investigating other lexico-grammatical units, such as tenses, modals, passives or if-constructions should be conducted.
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