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Introduction

This article was written as a result of our master’s degree subject entitled “English in the Community” where we had to read English Next by David Graddol (2006). What we learnt from that work gave us a new horizon to analyse and reflect on the process of English language teaching and learning perspectives. Consequently, we decided that, based on his work, we would explore English and its globalisation within the metaphorical background of a ‘dance’. We have done so because, just as a dance “is a type of art that generally involves movement of the body, often rhythmic and to music [it] is performed in many cultures as a form of emotional expression, social interaction, or exercise, in a spiritual or performance setting, and is sometimes used to express ideas or tell a story” (Dance, 2001:1st paragraph). And in this way, so too can the English language, especially in its international version, be seen in a similar fashion. In exploring Graddol’s 2006 work entitled English Next, published by the British Council, we hope to explore Graddol’s treatment of (i) – the effect of English on globalisation and vice versa, (ii) – the role of culture within the world of English Language Education (ELE) / Lingua Franca, and (iii) – the current ‘native’ versus ‘international’ debate within the world of English language teaching/learning. Having outlined our intention, all that we can say is – Let’s dance!

(i) The ‘English-Globalisation’ International Dance

Interestingly, as noted by Philip Ball, “English is a rather strange beast. It is a hybrid language, based originally on a dialect of West Germanic spoken somewhere around the area of Holland that we now call Frisia” (n.d.: 5), and since then it has been continually adapting and evolving. However, according to Graddol, our modern/postmodern understanding of what constitutes a ‘foreign language’ did not exist prior to the 18th century and he notes that it was only with the dawning of the “Enlightenment and the industrial and urban age of the 19th century [that the subsequent] rise of modern languages brought with it modern concepts of the ‘native speaker’ and its counterpart: the notion of a ‘foreign language’” (2006:18).

“The notion of ‘English as the Global Language’ reflects a completely new phenomenon” (Alekseyenkob, Petrovac & Smokotin, 2014) and as we are now well and truly into the 21st century, Graddol puts forward the theory for a new ‘paradigm shift’ being required due to the effects of ‘globalisation’ on different aspects. In order to understand what this means it is necessary to highlight that throughout human history the demographic movements of people around the world “has been the main reason for language spread. It still has important linguistic consequences today”. Hence, we agree with
Graddol when he qualifies this claim by noting that “three-quarters of all travel is between non-English speaking countries [which...] suggests a large demand for either foreign language learning or the increasing use of English as a lingua franca” (2006:30).

Graddol also notes in terms of the economy that nowhere are the effects of ‘Globalisation’ more visible than in the changing face of how national and international economies function and compete in a rapidly changing world market, especially in terms of service industries such as ‘business process outsourcing’ (BPO), ‘information technology outsourcing’ (ITO) and knowledge process outsourcing’ (KPO), and in how more and more transnational corporations (TNCs) are emerging to manipulate the international economy, areas where both India and China, and to a lesser extent Brazil and Russia (BRICs), have made/are making their presence felt. This has led Graddol to comment that “[i]n a globalised world, English is much more widely distributed, as is access to education [but this phenomenon...] has brought with it the danger that English has become one of the main mechanisms for structuring inequality in developing economies” (2006:38).

Turning to the area of technology it can be seen, that “[f]rom the 1970s, internationalisation and globalisation have become powerful forces in shaping the economic and political policies of individual nation states [...] The rapid development of information technology has accelerated this process” (Parmenter, 2004, in Byram, 2004, Internationalisation:309). However, as noted by Graddol, while “the proportion of English material on the internet is declining [...] there remains more English than is proportionate to the first languages of users” (2006:44), albeit that, as noted by analysis carried out by Byte Level Research (2005), “the next Internet revolution will not be in English. While English isn’t becoming any less important on the Internet, other languages, such as Chinese, Russian, Spanish, and Portuguese, are becoming comparatively more important” (as cited in Graddol, 2006:44). Although we agree
with Graddol when he states that “the proportion of English material on the internet is declining” we cannot fully agree with the Byte Level Research analysis, since we believe that even though there has been a rise in other languages’ usage on the internet, English is still the most used language thereon, a claim reinforced by Internet World Stats (2013), see chart in image 1, wherein English is the most used language in the world, followed by Chinese and Spanish.

Likewise, in terms of globalisation and society, Graddol notes that the “world is rapidly becoming more urban and more middle class – both of which are encouraging the adoption of English” (2006:50). While this may serve in helping some “escape from traditional values and expected relationships [it could also impact upon family relationships as…] children within the same family may have quite different linguistic allegiances and proficiencies” (Graddol, 2006:55), which may lead to ‘community institutions and resources’ increasing in importance in terms of “linguistic and ethnic identity” (Graddol, 2006:55).

Consequently, globalisation has not only seen the world become a smaller place in terms of the demographic movements of people, the economy, technology, society, and indeed languages, but globalisation is also witnessing a world emerging from its ‘modern’ beginnings in terms of ‘English as a foreign language’, towards a world in which the sociolinguist Braj Kachru’s 1985 ‘tri-circular model of English’ has somehow metamorphosed so that the ‘inner circle’, which was traditionally inhabited by native English speakers, has now swallowed up the inhabitants of all three circles via pro/anti – linguistic imperialistic/genocidal globalized tentacles, and has begun to give birth to a new linguistic “world”, wherein what seems more and more to matter is an English speaker’s “functional nativeness” regardless of how they learned or use the language” (Graddol, 2006:110). ‘Functional nativeness’ is defined by Kachru (1997:4) as being a bi-variable range and depth parameter of indicators, which are viewed in terms of a given language’s functional domains, and how the language has penetrated a given society. Such indicators include:

1. the sociolinguistic status of a variety in its transplanted context;
2. the functional domains in which the language is used;
3. the creative processes used at various levels to articulate local identities;

---

4. the linguistic exponents of acculturation and nativization;

5. the types of crossover contributing to a new canon; and

6. the attitude-specifying labels used for the variety.

(Kachru. 1997:4)

In other words, Kachru now proposes “that the inner circle is now better conceived of as the group of highly proficient speakers of English” (Graddol, 2006:110), with the level of proficiency decreasing as one leaves the inner circle and journeys towards the outer expanding circle. This emerging phenomenon causes us to favour those analytical interpretations which favour talking of the current 21st century era as being one of “‘late modernity’ rather than ‘postmodernity’ – emphasising the continuity with the past rather than the novelty of the present” (Graddol, 2006:18).

Having said the above, the successful ‘birthing’ of a new international model of English cannot be taken for granted, since traditionally “the notion of a language is so closely and automatically tied up with its native speakers” (Seidlhofer, 2003:14), or as noted by Coulmas (1981:5), “nativeness is the only universally accepted criterion for authenticity” (as cited in Seidlhofer, 2003:14). However, the ‘birthing’ process has begun and cannot be undone, indeed, the above ‘paradigm shift/birthing process’ has been developing since the concept was introduced by Graddol in 2006, and we are in agreement with Graddol that: “the world has changed and will never be the same again” (2006:19).

One important reason/catalyst for the above irreversibility mentioned is Kachru’s observation in the past that there were “at least four non-native speakers of English for every native speaker” (1996:24,1 as cited in Seidlhofer, 2003:7). Nowadays, the statistic (2015), of one of the leading statistic companies on the internet (see Figure 2), “shows the most spoken languages worldwide” where we can notice that English is the most spoken language in the world since “1,500 million people worldwide speak English”. Nevertheless, only 375 million of them are native speakers. Consequently, Kachru’s observation on the amount of native speakers per non-native speakers of English, as previously noted, still holds true.

Figure 2. Includes information about the most spoken languages worldwide2

---

The above thus gives rise to the new reality “that it is the non-native speakers of English who will be the main agents in the ways English is used, is maintained, and changes, and who will shape the ideologies and beliefs associated with it” (Seidlhofer, 2003:7). Alekseyenkb, Petrovac & Smokotin, (2014:510) also note that at present the English language has acquired the status of a language of global communication, and as such it presents a unique global phenomenon that has no parallel in the history of the world languages, a point which we see as reinforcing Graddol’s claim to the emergence of a paradigm shift (2006:15) since this new paradigm has been developing for years but it is not yet fulfilled.

The above birthing process has recently been reinforced by a questionnaire-based investigation carried out by Block and Pan (2011) in China. The researchers affirmed that “the questionnaire results point to a prevalent view that English is a global language” finding out that “over 60% of teachers and students acknowledge that they agree with the proposition that English is the current dominant global language”. Furthermore, teachers and students answered a multiple choice questionnaire about their feeling on why English is popular in China and the three top answers were: “C: English is more ‘international’ and ‘global’ than the other languages”; “G: as the language for international business, English is necessary for China’s economic development”; and “H: English is a handy tool for China’s rise as a superpower”. They also discovered that “over 70% of both teachers and students indicate that they agree or strongly agree that with the popularization of English, China will be more globalized and internationalized.” (Block & Pan, 2011). Consequently, one can say that our perception of the prominence of English as a lingua franca has been reinforced by these Chinese teachers and students’ view of the language, since they
understand the importance of English in order to be able to communicate with the rest of the world, as well as being more competent and international individuals.

Given that, as noted by Lopes (2008:312)\textsuperscript{3}, English is an extremely hybridized language, i.e. formed from so many other languages (Scandinavian languages, Celtic, Latin, French, Greek, Urdu, etc.), and is now internationally recognized as a lingua franca, which hybridizes (and continues to hybridize) other languages, enabling communication throughout the globe in areas such as language knowledge, media, the Internet, the market and politics. Therefore, we feel justified in moving our focus more directly to the impact of globalisation on the international influences on the English language, both in terms of English as a second language where English is the mother tongue and in terms of English as a foreign language wherein there is another L1 in place. It is in this context that we have been looking at the birthing of a new model of International English through Graddol’s eyes, both in terms of how “the availability of English as a global language is accelerating globalisation [and how such] globalisation is accelerating the use of English” (Graddol, 2006:22). Before we explore which model of ‘International English’ Graddol predicts to be potentially emerging, we would like to look at the role of culture in this new paradigm of English.

(ii) - The Culture – ELE/Lingua Franca Dance

Being in a globalized world it is essential to understand the meaning of English as lingua franca (ELF) wherein English Language Education (ELE) is so popular. For Firth (1996:240) English as lingua franca means that of “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”. In other words, Kaur & Raman (2014:254) explained that “ELF interactions involve members from different lingua cultures for whom English is not a first language (L1)”.

Accordingly, the above mentioned approach, which Graddol highlights comprehensively tackles some of the issues raised by Global English, such as ‘intelligibility’ versus ‘native-like accuracy’, and in its updated post-traditional format whereby English as a lingua franca “focuses also on pragmatic strategies required in intercultural communication” (2006:87), leads us to wonder how language should be taught in this “post-modernity world”.

One view that may be helpful with respect to this question is that of Alekseyenkob, Petrovac and Smokotin (2014:511), who note that English lingua franca (ELF) “may be regarded as a variety of English simplified to some degree, but not primitive or defective since ELF speakers are able to express their thoughts (starting with the simplest utterances and ending with complicated arguments), effectively using the available language forms and functions”. Nonetheless, it is relevant to mention that even if there is a ‘general level’ of intelligibility this may vary according to the contextualization. Then, “what is contextually intelligible or unintelligible depends significantly on the participants’ ability (and willingness) to negotiate meaning” (Motschenbacher, 2013:24). Consequently, one can say that ELF users are efficient as soon as they start learning “the pronunciation, grammar and lexicon of English but additionally of familiarizing them with central strategies of collaborative meaning negotiation (independently of notions of grammatical correctness)” (Motschenbacher, 2013:24). However, we would like to note that this strategy should be used for all language teachers and not only for ELF users. We consider that it is essential for teachers to know that while teaching English (ELF or any other kind) we should lead students in learning “meaning negotiation” as a meaningful resource, so that the communication does not get

\textsuperscript{3} Translated from its original version (Portuguese).
interrupted when speaking to other English speakers (native or non-native speakers).

Many teachers of foreign languages have traditionally taught language through the “four skills” leaving the cultural factor as an extra activity to manage within the class. Some teachers have even avoided introducing cultural aspects in their classes, since they find it “Anglo-cultural imperialism”. As noted by Graddol (2006:84), this “imperial strategy typically involved the identification of an existing social elite who would be offered a curriculum designed to cultivate not just language skills but also a taste for British-and generally western –culture and values”. Taking this latter point on board it is probably more descriptively correct to talk of “American-Anglo cultural imperialism” in order to incorporate developments within the second half of the 20th century, as well as those of the 18th– early 20th century.

However, it is our view that such a traditional approach is mistaken, as what teachers utilising such an approach choose to ignore/do not realise, is that culture is part of the language itself. As Byram states “culture without language is fundamentally flawed” (as cited in Buttjes & Byram, 1991:18). An example of which is to be found in ‘Esperanto’, a language that was created to be a commonly accessible second international lingua franca, whose success has been limited, according to critics, due to its “alleged lack of a cultural base, its European lexicon and phrase structure, and its perceived association with naïve utopianism or a rootless cosmopolitanism” (Byram, 2004, Critique:202). Consequently, it is visible that this lack of culture has lead ‘Esperanto’ into its own failure as an ILF since its origin. As a reinforcement of this point we note Tang’s (1999) observation that,“(l)anguage and culture are inextricably linked, and as such we might think about moving away from questions about the inclusion or exclusion of culture in foreign language curriculum, to issues of deliberate immersion versus non-deliberate exposure to it” (as cited in Cakir, 2006:155).

Based on the fact that language and culture are intertwined; “culture teaching is to imply that a foreign language can be treated in the early learning stages as if it were self-contained and independent of other social cultural phenomena” (Buttjes & Byram, 1991:18). Likewise, there are several socio-cultural factors that will determine and influence how a teacher will introduce this topic. We have two ways of teaching cultural aspects. On the one hand, we can explain cultural aspects from the native English countries’ (i.e. United Kingdom, United States, Ireland, Australia…) perspective as part of the teaching-learning process. Teachers might find this fascinating and so, transmit it simultaneously to their students, but others might be afraid of the bigger concept of “Anglo-Culture”, where they fear they may become lost since they might not be aware of all its aspects. Even though it must be acknowledged that native English-speaking teachers would more likely be comfortable teaching these aspects, we can say that, nowadays, English has become a global language and so has the culture intertwined with it.

On the other hand, there is another possibility of teaching culture. This could be approached by means of teaching the students’ own culture. For example, ‘Chinese English’ (CE), understood as a variety of a Standard English (SE), influenced by traditional characteristics of Chinese’s linguistics. As He and Li (2009:83) defined it: “a performance variety of English which has the standard Englishes as its core but is colored with characteristic features of Chinese phonology, lexis, syntax and discourse pragmatics”. According to Wang’s research (2015) the majority of University teachers and students do not accept CE (96% of them understand it but only 30% accept it). However, this minority “value the capability of CE in fulfilling communication purposes and the role of CE for identity making more than following native speaker English correctness.
and avoiding any Chinglish overtone while speaking English” (Wang, 2015:68).

Continuing with the above, Hyde (1998:8) stated that “English today and tomorrow will perhaps be a language that the world's people use in accordance with their own cultural norms and pragmatic aims” (as cited in English In The Community, Reading 6.1:4). This would probably result in teachers feeling more comfortable about teaching culture, but it would also likely omit many aspects of the language inherited through centuries from native speakers.

Nevertheless, Reid (2015) suggested that it is necessary for teachers to incorporate “cultural activities right from the beginning of foreign language education for all age groups” so that “learners' awareness, attitudes, knowledge and skills” can be developed in the target culture, their own culture and, also, other cultures. Moreover, we agree with her vision of Intercultural Communicative Competences (ICC) in English Language lessons:

Socio-cultural knowledge (everyday living, living conditions, interpersonal relations, history, values, beliefs, taboos, social conventions, ritual behaviour), sociolinguistic competences (greetings, addressing, dialect, accent, register, positive and negative politeness, idioms, etc.), pragmatic competences (advising, persuading, urging, socialising, interaction patterns) and non-verbal communication (body language, gestures, eye contact, proxemics, etc.) are the most fundamental components necessary for development of ICC (Reid, 2015:940).

It is no exaggeration to state that the question of culture is critically important to the rapidly changing international English language scene, a point reinforced by Hyde who notes that what he considers “to be more of a threat to communicative competence for global English than the issue of the linguistic model taught/
learnt is the fact that inevitably the use of English will vary from one cultural group to another” (Hyde, 1998:9, as cited in English In The Community, Reading 6.1:5). The rapidity of this international scene-changing is noted by Graddol in the European context, wherein “English has become the ‘first foreign’ language in educational systems…[and indeed]…is also being introduced to ever lower ages in primary schools” (2006, pp. 92-93), a downward trend which, in terms of English language students’ age, is also predicted to affect secondary English foreign language education, wherein “teaching English…will fall away and become the preserve of the remedial teacher” (Graddol, 2006:101). A likely reality despite the fact that the European project has declared its aim as being “to foster large-scale multilingualism in Europe (or ‘plurilingualism’ as the council of Europe prefers to call it)” (Graddol, 2006:92).

However, looking further afield, Graddol notes an emerging ‘World English Project’, wherein the European experience of English being introduced at an ever lower age is also being witnessed to such an extent that if “this project succeeds, it could generate over 2 billion new speakers of English within a decade” (Graddol, 2006:96). A figure which Graddol, 2006:101 observes, “contrasts with the British Council global estimate for the year 2,000, in which between 750 million and 1 billion people were learning English”. The above situation is reinforced by the three-fold competition facing ‘major English-speaking destination countries’ (MES-DCs): 1 – The rapid expansion and educational reform in terms of quality improvements taking place in many key source countries; 2 – The subsequent repositioning of such countries “as net exporters of higher education” (Graddol, 2006:77) and 3 – The increase in universities throughout Europe and Asia offering “courses taught through the medium of English” (ibid.).
These projects, and the countries therein, are increasingly moving from the first option previously discussed of following a native English-speaking cultural model, and are moving towards the second option, for reasons previously referred to by Hyde in this article, and “do not look to the UK, or to the USA as a model but to Singapore, Finland or the Netherlands… [and]…are increasingly likely to look to English teachers from bilingual countries to help them in their task” (Graddol, 2006:89). This emerging reality leads us to speculate that, in the future, those teachers who have upskilled and have experience of working within bilingual environments such as CLIL⁴, wherein “assessment of English proficiency is made partly through subject assessment” (Graddol, 2006:86), will likely be the most employable/sought after. That is to say, that we absolutely agree with Hyde’s view, teachers should use CLIL in order to teach a foreign language subject itself since sometimes students do not value its importance.

The above point brings us into the third part of this reflection on Graddol’s (2006) work entitled English Next, that of the traditional native English-speaking model versus that of its newly emerging offspring referred to in the first part of our article as a new model of ‘International English’.

(iii) The ‘Native English’ versus the ‘International English’ Dance

As highlighted previously in this article, Graddol notes that the “world is rapidly becoming more urban and more middle class – both of which are encouraging the adoption of English” (2006:50). This trend, coupled with Kachru’s observation referred to earlier that there “are now at least four non-native speakers of English for every native speaker” (1996:241, as cited in Seidlofer, 2003:7), and international projects such as the European “Bologna process, which has been embraced by a number of European governments” (Truchot, 2002:9, as cited in English In The Community, Required Reading 1:9) has influenced/speeded up/strengthened Graddol’s claim that a new ‘paradigm shift’ is required due to globalisation. A shift that is now visibly “being birthed” in the linguistic-cultural dance of “intelligibility versus native-like accuracy”, referred to earlier in this article. Consequently, one can say that “the study of English as an International Language (ELL) or ELF had gained validation with the growth of NNSs (Non-Native Speakers) of English and the shift of roles and functions of English worldwide” (Kaura & Ramana, 2014:254).

However, whereas qualified researchers think that the world is changing and so is the perception of English, English learners have contradicting opinions. For example, Ke & Cayhani (2014:32) discovered that Taiwanese students conception of English was based on “learning English as an Anglo-American language while perceiving it as an international language used by the world”. That is to say that even if “most Taiwanese students had a positive attitude toward including different cultures in English teaching and developing the ability to understand different accents” they still want to sound as native as they can “and be taught by NS (Native Speaker) teachers”. This conception of language is not too far from our reality. We have recently been teaching in Latin-American countries and have realised that a lot of our students feel the same way as Taiwanese students do. For instance, in Colombia some students have expressed the view that they would like to speak certain kinds of accents such as ‘British’ or ‘American’, giving importance to NS teachers, and inadvertently discrediting their NNS teachers.

Additionally, regarding the type of teacher learners are willing to be taught by, we have found different researches that show a variety of opinions. On the one hand, Diaz concluded in her study, applied to French students of Applied Foreign Language Programs (LEA), that students preferred native English speaking teachers (NEST) in subjects that have to deal with
oral production whereas in subjects related to “grammar, culture, strategies and vocabulary learning, they are inclined towards NNEST\textsuperscript{5} or both types of teachers” (2015:96). On the other hand, research carried out by Walkinshaw & Duong (2012) showed that Vietnamese students' give preference to NNEST since they have “an understanding of the local culture and pedagogy, as well as first-hand experience of second language learning”. Consequently, it can be tangibly argued that Graddol’s ‘paradigm shift’ is just developing nowadays and that there is still a long road to travel.

Furthermore, it is important to note Graddol’s prediction that “even if the ‘World English Project’ were successfully implemented… [it is not expected that]…more than 40% of the global population would ever become functional users of English” (Graddol, 2006: 107), irrespective of their entry point. Indeed, Graddol notes that we “are entering a phase of global English which is less glamorous, less news-worthy, and further from the leading edge of exciting ideas” (Graddol, 2006:109). Nonetheless, we don’t agree with Graddol here, as the so-called ‘native speaker problem’, touched on earlier by Seidlhofer’s observation in relation to imperialistic tensions within the historical spreading of the English language, and Seidlhofer’s (2003:7) observation that “it is the non-native speakers of English who will be the main agents in the ways English is used, is maintained, and changes, and who will shape the ideologies and beliefs associated with it”, lead us to believe that this ‘native speaker problem’ is giving birth to a potential shift in the whole debate on ‘intelligibility versus native-like accuracy’, an approach which is likely to be more acceptable internationally as “it will become expected that speakers will signal their nationality, and other aspects of their identity, through English” (Graddol, 2006:117).

According to Teodorescu (2014:1535) “the international business environment is presently governed by the use of English”. So, we agree with Louhiala-SÁIminen & Kankaanrata when they explain that “internationally operating business professionals are able to accomplish their work by using BELF (English as Business Lingua Franca)”. In addition, they highlighted that “BELF performs its task as an enabler of communication” but that it “does not have any strict rules governing its grammatical form, structures, or ‘correctness’” (2012: 267), leads some teachers to be concerned “about how we teach and learn business English” (Teodorescu, 2014:1535).

Although we do acknowledge that there is some truth worth taking into consideration in Graddol’s observation that in “organisations where English has become the corporate language, meetings sometimes go more smoothly when no native speakers are present [and that throughout the world…] the same kind of thing may be happening, on a larger scale”(2006:115), we do feel it might be a slight over-exaggeration of the issue to state, as Graddol does, that the presence of native English speakers at such meetings “hinders communication” (ibid.), we especially feel this to be the case if, as reported by Philippe Van Parijs, (2004), one of the consequences of “the universal spread of the lingua franca would…be that Anglophones will face competition on their home labour markets with everyone else in the world, while having no real access to those labour markets in which another language remains required” (as cited in Graddol, 2006:122).

That is, we feel that as the whole concept of ‘intelligibility’ gains momentum, its supporters, perhaps more motivated by reasons of economic gain/survival rather than linguistic ideals, will not only continue to emerge from the non-native English speaking world, but also from the native English speaking one. The veracity of this point is seen in the example of the “decision by a private school in the UK in January 2006 to make Mandarin a compulsory subject [reflec-
Thus if a global model of English based on intelligibility or another language such as Mandarin, emerges as the new lingua franca, then native speakers of English are going to have to adapt, at least when doing business on the international scene. Indeed we should not forget that English “only accounts for around 30% of the world Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and is likely to account for less in the future. Neglecting other languages means ignoring quite significant potential markets” (Graddol, 2006:62), something that, for example, transnational companies are highly unlikely to do. That innovative solutions to this pending challenge are emerging is seen in Louhiala-Salminen & Kankaanrata’s suggestion that:

“For example, simultaneous use of multiple languages could be promoted in the organizational context when appropriate. Such policy would mean that an employee’s expertise would not be weakened by his/her language competency but rather each employee would be able to show and share the expertise in the language he/she feels most comfortable with” (2012:267).

Indeed, a recent article by Matt Pickles reinforces the above point by noting growing concern within international academic circles that the overriding requirement of academic publishers for articles to be published in English (a trend within the world of scientific publications using English, which Pickle observes German linguist Ranier Enrique Hamel notes has increased from 36% in 1880 to 96% in 2000) is leading to non-English research becoming marginalised, and has led to a “campaign among German academics [which] says science benefits from being approached through different languages” (BBC News:Business 14/01/16).
Having stated the above, Graddol is correct to note that as ‘English Language Teaching (ELT)’ “becomes a ‘mission-critical’ undertaking […] it requires energy, resources and patience to ensure that ELT does not become an even more effective gatekeeping mechanism for elite groups in society” (2006:120). A very real danger if global English becomes a basic skill in education throughout the world, as is expected, for, as Graddol (2006:120) himself has noted, “it has the capacity to make the poor not just relatively worse off, but poorer in absolute terms […] with failure to master English as a basic skill [also meaning...] failure in other disciplines”. For instance, the “National Bilingual Program” of Colombia has stated the need for a minimum goal of B1 according to the Common European Framework for students finishing their degrees at universities. Conversely, this government is ignoring a greater problem which is the low language skill high school graduates have in their own mother tongue when they enrol in university programmes. So, we absolutely agree with Graddol (2006:120) when he suggests that students may fail in other disciplines. We understand the importance of English in the global world we live in, but we cannot ignore that there are priorities that leaders need to fulfil before they encourage a whole country to learn a new language.

**Conclusion**

There is a possibility that when the reader finishes this article, they may feel that we have ‘danced around’ the issues explored, and to a certain extent this view would be correct, as we have deliberately been tentative in our approach, as we feel that the way forward in ELT is not yet fully clear. We also feel that Graddol may be correct in describing our current situation in terms of ‘Gartner’s hype cycle’, in that “we may now be somewhere between the ‘trough of disillusionment’ and the ‘slope of enlightenment’” (2006:109).
That is to say, it is not yet fully clear if a new model of Global English based on ‘intelligibility’ will be successfully ‘birthed’ or if some kind of ‘miscarriage’ will occur, due to circumstances not yet foreseen, or whether traditional EFL models will somehow succeed in terminating the birthing process in order to maintain their traditional monopoly of a ‘Global English focused on native-like accuracy’. If the latter happens, then we are in agreement with Graddol’s prediction that such an outcome would be detrimental to international English as “tacking on a new chapter entitled ‘Global English’…[within the traditional framework]…may be a serious mistake…dangerously…[continuing]…the grand narrative by adding a coda, suggesting that English, which in modernity triumphed as a national language, has now triumphed as a global language” (2006:59). Hence, we are in agreement with Professor Anna Mauranen, Vice-rector, University of Helsinki and project director of The ELFA Project (“English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings”) 2008, when she notes that it is “important to capture the ongoing changes to see where English is going and, not least, to contribute to the practical challenges of coping with a global language along with local languages” (Mauranen A. Prof. 2008:17/01/16).

To conclude we feel that there is a need for a new global English ‘functionally native’ dance to emerge, wherein, both the majority non-native English speaking population and the native English-speaking population can creatively bring their strengths and needs to bear, on an equal footing. Perhaps ‘intelligibility’ could be the dance floor whereon these two groupings embrace and finally communicate without the hindrance of unnecessary musical steps?
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