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This paper deals with three themes. Firstly, there are the changes and transformations undergone by English during its spread as the language of an imperial nation, giving rise to a range of national and regional varieties, culminating in its use as an international lingua franca. Secondly, there is the associated dissemination of language teaching methodology, with its origins in the UK, but modified by its encounters with diverse teaching contexts. Thirdly, there is the theme of conformity, arising from the development of a UK ELT infrastructure and methodology, which has also given rise to a range of models of ELT based on age, student type and pedagogical purpose. The hegemony of mainstream UK methodology is now being challenged, however, with a reassertion of indigenous educational traditions. Furthermore, it is argued that ELT needs to connect with mainstream education to continue the evolutionary changes which have characterized both the language and pedagogical approaches during its emergence as a global language.

Introduction

One of the problems faced by an author reviewing the development and current state of a field like English Language Teaching (ELT) is the way in which complexity will inevitably be sacrificed in the interests of presenting a coherent narrative. For this I apologize in advance and in mitigation express the hope that the perspective presented in this paper will prove to be not only coherent, but also moderately enlightening to some, and a stimulus for debate and discussion to others.1

When considering ELT in 2007, it is impossible to separate the evolution of English as a global language from globalization, which is ‘a process of interaction and integration among the people, companies, and governments of different nations, a process driven by international trade and investment and aided by information technology’ (Globalization 101). Following Friedman’s (2004, 2005) three stages of globalization, we see that the initial expansion of English beyond the British Isles occurred in his ‘Globalization 1.0’ (1492 to about 1800).

During the latter half of ‘Globalization 2.0’ (1800-2000), a language teaching methodology partly influenced by the 19th century European Reform Movement in foreign language teaching, was exported from the UK to parts of the world, where it was transformed, returning to the UK where it evolved into methodology that ultimately laid the foundations for British English Language Teaching (ELT) in the latter half of the 20th century (Smith, 2003, 2005).

Meanwhile, in Globalization 2.0, new varieties of the English language had become well established in parts of the British Empire, notably in India. In the final phase of
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Globalization 2.0 (c.1970-2000), the demand for English grew exponentially, but the exporting of a UK approach to ELT to the world proved increasingly problematic. At the same time, the roles and reference points for the English language had changed, and with non-native now outnumbering native English speakers, the primacy of a native English speaker model was no longer taken for granted. With the transition from Globalization 2.0 to ‘Globalization 3.0’ at the start of the present century, Global English or English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) has achieved an autonomous status, with implications for ELT, some of which I will now consider in this paper, whose focus will be mainly the British circle of ELT rather than the full spectrum of global ELT, including the American, since I am most familiar with the former.

**Background**

**History**

The teaching of English, as Howatt (1984) shows, has a very long history, being linked to two recurrent factors: trade and migration. Richard Smith (2003, 2005), in his introductions to the two series of edited volumes of works by pioneers of UK ELT, argues that the development of the post-war UK ELT enterprise has its roots in their work, carried out before World War II, notably in Japan, at the Institute for Research in English Teaching (IRET), under the leadership of Harold E. Palmer. This work was continued by one of his colleagues, A. S. Hornby, who had already established a ‘modernist’, technical linguistic pedagogy for ELT in his work at IRET before returning to the UK. In papers published under IRET auspices, Hornby outlined an approach which evolved into the Structural-Oral-Situational (S-O-S) approach which was so influential in early post-war UK ELT.

In addition to its academic and pedagogical base, the global post-war expansion of British ELT benefited from the creation and evolution of institutions:

- Establishing of British Institutes by the British Council
- 1946: the launching of *ELT Journal*
- 1947: the setting up of a Diploma course at Institute of Education in London, to train post-graduates for ELT outside the UK
- 1947: the founding of BBC English by Radio with a global audience of 149 million (2004-5). In the 1980s, the BBC’s *Follow Me* attracted an audience of 100 million Chinese viewers – twice the population of the UK.
- Encouraged by the British Council, the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES) became more involved in English language examinations for foreign students
- 1950s: two visionary and charismatic individuals – John Haycraft and Frank Bell – respectively established International House and the Bell Educational Trust, presaging a major expansion in the private language school sector.
- 1960: the founding of the Association of Recognized Language Schools (ARELS) with a membership of about 220 private sector members.
- 1967: the founding of the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL).
Where the private sector led, the public sector followed, with comparable expansion in the Further Education (FE) and Higher Education (HE). In 1983, the British Association of State English Language Teaching (BASELT), the FE/HE counterpart to ARELS, was formed as an association of 100 language centres in these two sectors. Twenty years later, ARELS and BASELT merged to form English UK, which currently has 350 member institutions.

As UK ELT was largely concerned with teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL), it stood outside mainstream public sector education. Consequently, it lacked an institutionalized and accredited means of training teachers, a need recognized by John Haycraft, who promoted the development of initial training leading to a certificate which subsequently was taken under the wing of the Royal Society of Arts (RSA), and ultimately under UCLES, now Cambridge Assessment (Butler, 2007). Although these qualifications did not then, and still do not, confer Teacher Qualified Status in the state school system, they provide one of the main routes whereby private sector teachers acquire the training required by many employers worldwide.

By the 1970s, ELT was well established in the UK. Firstly, it had a professional and academic base in prestigious universities. Secondly, an initial teaching qualification for the burgeoning private sector had been successfully launched. Thirdly, it had a powerful and global means of projecting itself through the British Council and the BBC. Fourthly, several UK publishers – notably Longman, Macmillan, and Oxford University Press (OUP) – had already well established ELT publishing divisions, founded originally to serve a captive empire market, which provided a platform for subsequent worldwide expansion. Fifthly, UCLES and Trinity College London provided a suite of English language examinations, completing the UK ELT ‘package’.

The 1970s ushered in a period of massive expansion in UK ELT provision in all sectors, not least in FE and HE. It also proved to be a period of significant change, when structural approaches, such as Hornby’s S-O-S, came to be challenged by teachers and learners, who began to question the ‘surrender value’ (i.e. the limited quantity of language learned if a course is abandoned before completion) involved in proceeding through a syllabus based on a pre-determined structural sequence. Meanwhile, applied linguists and language educators began looking for an alternative basis for specifying linguistic content, and in the mid 70s, a Council of Europe project addressed the problem of defining a uniform, sequenced program for second language learning applicable to all European languages and in all European countries.

This project gave rise to the notional-functional ‘threshold-level’ (T-level) syllabus (Ek, 1977), focusing on the semantic and social aspects of language. The initial phase of transition from structural to notional-functional syllabuses was exemplified by the development of functional syllabuses focusing upon particular purposes of language and how these would be expressed linguistically. At the same time, special purposes syllabuses and teaching materials were developed to meet the needs of academic study and specific occupations: English for Specific Purposes (ESP) had arrived. Meanwhile, developments in teaching methodology gave rise to what became known as the Communicative Approach. With this combination of developments, ELT was now poised to participate in the next great period of expansion associated with the final phase of Globalization 2.0 in the last three decades of the 20th century.
Globalization

During Globalization 2.0, the so-called ‘new’ varieties of English acquired a very well established local or regional identity and ‘ownership’. Such autonomy has prompted Braj B. Kachru (2005) to develop a thesis that can be framed by a pair of questions (Schell, 2006):

- Is the English language inevitably linked with Western culture? Or
- Is it a tool or instrument that can be applied to local commerce and literature, like adapting the design of an automobile to fit life in Japan or using a violin to play an Indian raga?

Arguing in favour of the second question, Kachru believes that Anglophones in Asia have the right to determine the direction of their own varieties of a language that is no longer owned by the people for whom it was named.

Kachru’s recent position is an evolution of his earlier model of three concentric circles, which has become standard among linguists since he formulated it in 1985. The Inner Circle consists of Great Britain and the countries settled by it, whose people are called native speakers of English in the mainstream media and English-language teaching (ELT) industry. In fact, along with Kachru, Graddol (2006:110) feels that the Inner Circle ‘is now better conceived of as the group of highly proficient speakers of English – those who have “functional nativeness” regardless of how they learned or used the language’. The Outer Circle surrounding it consists of countries that have institutionalized the English language to one degree or another in the aftermath of being colonized by the British (or by the Americans in the case of the Philippines). Finally, the Expanding Circle consists of all other countries (eg., Japan, China, South Korea, Indonesia) that are promoting the study of English as a foreign language (EFL) by their populations.

Kachru claims majority rights for Asian Anglophones on the basis of one striking statistic: a total of 533 million people in China and India "use" English. The basis for this claim is, of course, open to question, because as Jian Yang (2006) demonstrates, not everyone in China who learns English is also a user of the language. Even so, Kachru makes a persuasive case for a regional variety called South Asian English (SAE), while also touching on issues of wider relevance for the role of English as a global language, notably:

- Mutual intelligibility across Englishes
- International standards
- The opposing influences of innovation, notably in spoken vernaculars, and conservatism in written varieties.

Kachru’s invokes a metaphor of ‘linguistic ecology’ in which the relationships and interactions of different languages and speakers are viewed as part of an ecosystem. This view matches a similar concept in the work of Holliday (1994a&amp;b) and the export of methodologies conceived, developed and used in the ELT sectors in Britain, America and Australia – the so-called ‘BANA’ based applied linguistics and methodologies.
As Bolitho (2005:188) comments, ‘these have established a kind of hegemony in the wider world of ELT, with the help of the major publishing houses and the growing influence of the international conference circuit’. Holliday (1994b) has dealt comprehensively with the issues associated with attempts at this kind of ‘technology transfer’ and the ‘tissue rejection’ which all too often ensues. Commenting on his own experience with partners in Central and Eastern Europe, Bolitho (ibid.) points out that ‘Educationalists there, with their own robust and long-established traditions and beliefs, do not take kindly to any implication that we necessarily have something better to offer. Seen another way, these traditions and beliefs are actually an integral part of any nation’s identity’.

Thus, it is clear that the status of the UK as being the ‘owner’ of English, and the arbiter of linguistic standards, is being challenged by the growth of so-called ‘New Englishes’ with their own standards, not only in the long established Outer Circle Englishes, but also in the ‘Expanding Circle’ (Hu Xiao Qiong 2004, Cui Xiaoxia, 2006, Chen Meilin & Hu Xiaojiqiong, 2006). The export of BANA methodologies is also being challenged on ideological as well as practical grounds. Such developments confirm Holborow’s (1999) observation that, like railways, language can be used for many purposes, and ‘not always those laid down by British engineers’.

Models of English

Like English itself, the teaching of English in Kachru’s three circles also varies, and Graddol (2006:82f) has classified the range of ‘models of English’, by which he means ‘a complex framework, which includes issues of methodology and variety, but goes beyond these to include other dimensions of the context and practice of learning English’. He points out that there are many stakeholders involved in the teaching and learning process, each of whom may have different views, and ‘an interest in the English language business’. Although there is considerable debate about the best methods and approaches for teaching English, in Graddol’s view, these are framed within only two models: the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL), and the teaching of English as a second language (ESL).

In the former, the learner is positioned as an outsider, as a foreigner, and the target language is always someone else’s mother tongue. He contends that ‘the practice of EFL can and does tolerate high levels of failure’ because, of course, a native speaking model sets an unrealistic target for most learners. Tolerance of a high drop out rate is also characteristic of education functioning as a sieve (Petty, 2007), whereby weaker students are ‘sieved out’.

In the latter model, ESL, ‘the role of English in the society in which it is taught’ is recognized. Historically, Graddol (2006:84) defines two major strands of development, both dating from the 19th century. The first ‘arose from the needs of the British Empire to teach local people sufficient English to allow the administration of large areas of the world with a relatively small number of British civil servants and troops’, and it is from meeting this need that the range of ‘New Englishes’ evolved.

The second approach to ESL arose in the USA and later, in countries such as Australia and New Zealand (and the UK in the 1960s) ‘where generations of immigrants had to be assimilated and equipped with a new national identity’. As such, ‘citizenship’
is often a key component in the ESOL curriculum, an issue that has become prominent in government policy making in the UK in recent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EFL</th>
<th>ESL a</th>
<th>ESL b</th>
<th>EYL</th>
<th>Global English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target variety</td>
<td>Native speaker, usually American or British</td>
<td>Native speaker – host country, may be non standard</td>
<td>Local variety (e.g. Indian English); might include a local standard as well as a non standard</td>
<td>Typically aims to use native speaker variety as target, but problems of teacher supply often makes this unrealistic</td>
<td>Focus on internationally intelligibility rather than a specific variety; carry over of some L1 characteristics; expected to maintain national identity through English; need for receptive skills in a range of international varieties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Models of English, Graddol (2006: 90-91)

EYL: English for Young Learners. Global English: an emerging variety of English used as an international language.

Each model (Graddol, 2006: 83) may vary in terms of the following:

- What variety of English is regarded as authoritative?
- Which language skills are most important (Reading? Speaking? Interpreting?)
- What is regarded as a suitable level of proficiency?
- How and where will the language be used?
- Is the motive for learning largely ‘instrumental’ or also ‘integrational’?
- At what age should learning begin?
- What is the learning environment? (Classroom only? Family? Media? Community?)
- What are the appropriate content and materials for the learner?
- What will be the assessment criteria? What kind of exams?

**English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)**

Leaving aside the English for Young Learners (EYL) model in Graddol’s scheme, we come to Global English and a domain which, as both McArthur (2004:3) and Seidlhofer (2004:210) point out, is characterized by terminological diversity. I will follow the term favoured by Seidlhofer, *English as a Lingua Franca*, a variety of the language that ‘has taken on a life of its own, independent to a considerable degree of the norms established by its native speakers [which] warrants recognition’ (212). In recognition of its autonomy as a language variety, Seidlhofer goes on to cite Brutt-Griffler’s (2002) account of the spread of English, in which she argues for the ‘active role of ELF users as agents in the
spread and development of English: they are not at the receiving end, but contribute to the shaping of the language and the functions it fulfils and so, as speech communities, take possession of the language’ (214). Such a perspective, she observes, has ‘very considerable implications for the conceptualization of English as a Lingua Franca’ (ibid.)

Turning to descriptions of ELF, Seidlhofer (2004) refers to the ground-breaking research of Jenkins (2000), whose work on the phonological Lingua Franca Core (LFC) has led to the identification of those pronunciation features which resulted in intelligibility problems for a different L1 interlocutor, and those which did not. ‘Those that caused intelligibility problems were then incorporated into the LFC, while those that did not were considered, as far as ELF is concerned, to be non-core – different from NS production, but not for that reason, “wrong”’ (216). Variation in the production of non-core features, which do not impede intelligibility, can not only be tolerated, but also given reduced priority in teaching, whereas those that are core, will be prioritized.

Moving on to pragmatics, an area of relevance to the theme of this conference, Seidlhofer points out that, unlike phonology, this is not a closed set of features, and is less manageable in research. Even so, she suggests that it is possible to make some generalizations about the pragmatics of ELF (218):

- Misunderstandings are not frequent in ELF interactions; when they do occur, they tend to be resolved either by topic change or, less often, by overt negotiation using communication strategies such as rephrasing and repetition.
- Interference from L1 interaction norms is very rare – a kind of suspension of expectations regarding norms seems to be in operation.
- As long as a certain threshold of understanding is obtained, interlocutors seem to adopt what Firth (1996) has termed the ‘let-it-pass principle’ which gives the impression of ELF talk being overtly consensus-oriented, cooperative and mutually supportive, and thus fairly robust.

There are, however, some contradictory findings, which indicate the need for further research. For example, ‘interlocutors’ cultural background and shared knowledge (or lack thereof) have been found to be important factors in ELF conversations’ (218).

Such research is giving rise to descriptions that can be referred to by language teaching professionals if they so wish (Seidlhofer 2004:225), and may lead to a situation whereby native English norms may be replaced by emerging ELF norms where this is deemed desirable. Seidlhofer refers to the teaching priorities identified by McKay (2002):

| Goals: |
| Ensuring intelligibility rather than insisting on correctness |
| – Helping learners develop interaction strategies that will promote comity (friendly relations) |
| – Fostering textual competence (reading and writing skills for learner-selected purposes) |

| Approaches: |
| – Sensitivity in the choice of cultural content in materials |
| – Reflexivity in pedagogical procedures |
| – Respect for the local culture of learning. |
While acknowledging that it is premature to make detailed pedagogical proposals at this stage, Seidlhofer notes that there are a number of implications for the curriculum, content, assessment and the education of teachers. Graddol (2006), in his overview of models, also lists a number of features of Global English under skills, teacher skills, learner motives, primary purposes, learning environment, content/materials, assessment and failure pattern. Under learning environment, he suggests that while the classroom is a key context, it is not sufficient, with the private sector and home tutoring often playing a role, while under content, he notes the emergence of a Content and Language Integrated Instruction (CLIL) approach.

Graddol also considers the changes to assessment that the move to Global English will necessitate, an issue of considerable concern to examining boards, like Cambridge ESOL, as discussed by Taylor (2002), who notes that with their extensive corpora of candidates’ English, they are well placed to contribute to research in this area.

The case for ELF is not without its critics. Rias van den Doel (2007) argues that it is difficult to define intelligibility in terms of widely variant standards of non-native speech while ignoring native speaker English, and to do so denies learners access to a type of English that can be used with native and non-native speakers alike. This argument is also pursued by Kuo (2006), who considers that adopting an intelligibility-driven model is problematic, and she points out that the views of learners themselves have been largely overlooked in much of the discussion on ELF. Furthermore, she points out that the significant role of English in educational gate keeping militates against wholesale adoption of intelligibility at the expense of conformity to the prevailing native speaking linguistic norms of the academy.

Having now surveyed briefly some of the issues associated with EFL and global English, I will now move to a specific location with which I am most familiar: UK ELT.

**ELT in the UK**

Although the UK is a major EFL provider, with a significant private language school sector, the ELT situation is, in fact, complex and diverse, with the following range of English language learners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>1.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages)**

ESOL students come from a diverse range of backgrounds, and their number is likely to grow. The demand for ESOL has tripled since 2001 – enrollment among Polish nationals alone increased from 151 in 2000/01 to 21,313 in 2004/05 (Salman, 2006).
ESOL provision is largely in the hands of the Learning and Skills Council, which, in the academic year 2004-2005, spent £279 million on ESOL funding, providing 538,700 ESOL ‘learning opportunities’. While the demand is increasing, provision has not been well targeted, and there is a shortage of qualified ESOL teachers (NIACE, 2006). A government proposal in October 2006 to restrict access to English language courses led to an outcry (Ford, 2007a, Kingston, 2007), which prompted a policy revision and the provision of more funding (Ford, 2007b). ESOL provision is considered to be an important means of increasing social cohesion and inclusion (NIACE, 2006). However, where the government looks to English in terms of Britishness, speaking English also offers learners the chance to communicate their own values (Jones & Bradwell, 2007:51), while the existence in the UK population of linguistically and culturally diverse citizens is an undervalued and overlooked resource.

Since the over-riding goal of UK ESOL provision is social inclusion, the target variety of English is that of the educated native speaker, although ESOL learners will be exposed to regional and non standard varieties in their day to day life in the community and if, as is the case for some immigrants, their interactions are with members of their own language community, their English exposure may also include a variety strongly influenced by L1 features. Such effects have contributed to the rise to so-called ‘Hinglish’ (Asthana, 2004, Coughlin, 2006), adding to the mélange that is contemporary British English.

**EAP (English for Academic Purposes)**

The UK is the destination for around 350,000 students in higher education (UKCOSA), coming from a wide range of providing countries in all three of Kachru’s circles: inner, outer and expanding. Roughly a third come from the EU, and will therefore come from the outer circle, their exposure to English having been within the EFL model as described by Graddol (2006). The remaining two thirds come from countries in all three circles, of which the largest group in 2004-2005 were from China, at 52,675 students amounting to 24% from Non-EU senders. International students are a significant presence in UK universities, predominantly at post-graduate level. At Oxford, for example, they constitute 24% of all students.

Indicative of the instrumental goals of many international students are their subject preferences. Forty-four percent of them follow courses in business and administrative studies, engineering and technology, and computer science, making up 74% of students in those three subject areas (UKCOSA). This means that in such courses, over a quarter of students will be non-British (and therefore mostly non-native English speakers), with implications for the role of ELF.

International students from outer circle countries may find that, depending on test scores (typically IELTS), they may be required to follow a pre-sessional course before joining their degree programme. In 2004, BALEAP, the British Association of Lecturers in English for Academic Purposes, founded in 1972, had 74 institutional members, which means that out of 132 higher education institutions, of which 88 are universities, over half will have a centre or unit devoted to such EAP teaching. Again, as with ESOL, the target variety will be that of the host country, and specifically that of the academy. However, in their classes, international students following EAP preparation
courses will typically mix with a cross-section of other international students, so they will find themselves in situations in which they will switch varieties of English according to context and interlocutor. Thus, by default, part of their linguistic exposure and development will include English as a Lingua Franca.

Although English dominates academic publishing, the gate-keeping linguistic criteria that are applied are increasingly being challenged by the impact of ELF, presaging the development of new norms detached from those of the native speaker and writer. Even within the HE sector, subject teachers are having to address such gate-keeping issues when assessing students’ work, and trading-off competing criteria of fidelity to native speaking linguistic norms and quality of academic content.

**EFL (English as a Foreign Language) in the UK**

EFL is predominantly provided by the private sector, English UK reporting that 243,000 students studied ELT in the UK in 2006, over 80% of them in private language schools, which range from small independent specialist ones to branches of global groups. Bell International, one of the largest UK owned providers, exemplifies on a relatively large scale, many of the features that characterize this sector. In the UK, Bell International caters for around 4,500 students annually, and provides intensive English courses ranging in length from a week to an academic year. Courses cover general English and English for specific and academic purposes, as well as executive training for Professional students and ELT teacher training. In addition, the Bell Young Learners department runs residential courses for over 2,000 younger students (aged 8 - 17 years), mostly during the British summer. The overall balance of provision is roughly two-thirds ‘general English’, and one third other types of course.

Bell courses, like those offered by its competitors, fall within Graddol’s EFL model, with British English as the target variety. However, the situation is more nuanced than this would suggest, since the students themselves learn within nationally mixed groups so that they also communicate with each other within an ELF context. Thus, although both the target model and the national setting are English, such EFL students actually use English with a nationally and linguistically diverse group of fellow learners, something that would be difficult to achieve in their home countries. Indeed, it is exactly this kind of student group that contributed to the spoken corpus on which Jenkins developed her analysis of the phonology of English as an International Language. So, while UK ELT is based on an EFL model, the nationality mix in many EFL classrooms provides precisely the context in which ELF is used.

Whether the classroom and the curriculum actually meet the priorities proposed by McKay (2002) is open to question, however, although both published materials and curricula are beginning to take account of the range and diversity of English users, as well as aspects of intercultural communication, the latter largely prompted by the needs of business English learners. Interestingly, the importance of adapting to the changing status of English and accommodating to new versions of English is a theme recently taken up in an unexpected quarter: Demos, a left-wing think tank which published the arrestingly titled *As You Like it: Catching up in an Age of Global English* (Jones & Bradwell 2007). In a *Guardian* article on this publication, Ford (2007c) noted that among their recommendations, they emphasized that ‘the UK should focus English
teaching on how the language is now used around the world, “not according to arcane stricture of how it should be spoken and written”.

**The Common European Framework (CEF)**

Just as in the 1970s, when the Council of Europe Threshold Level had a significant impact on language educators and materials writers and publishers, so in the 21st century, the Council of Europe Common European Framework (CEF), is having a comparable effect. The CEF is intended to provide ‘a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe. It describes in a comprehensive way what language learners have to learn to do in order to use a language so as to be able to act effectively.’ (Council of Europe 2001: 1) Taking a lead from the earlier work in the 1970s, the CEF defines a global scale of six reference levels, from basic to proficient user, expressed as a set of illustrative descriptors of language proficiency, which provide a basis for self-evaluation as well as assessment. Complementary to the CEF is a language portfolio for learners, in which they can maintain a record of their language proficiency.

What is particularly significant is the way in which learning goals are specified as so-called *can-do* statements, indicating a move away from the EFL ‘failure’ model as described by Graddol (2006:83), bringing them in closer alignment with Petty’s concept of education as a ladder (Petty, 2007):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal-oriented co-operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level B2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Can understand detailed instructions reliably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Can help along the progress of the work by inviting others to join in, say what they think, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Can outline an issue or a problem clearly, speculating about causes or consequences, and weighting advantages and disadvantages of different approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curiously, in view of the linguistic and cultural diversity of Europe, the CEF makes only very limited reference to cultural factors in communication, and while both sociolinguistic appropriateness and pragmatic competences are listed, there is no reference to the kind of generalizations about the pragmatics of ELF discussed earlier.

Even so, the CEF is influencing ELT in the UK and internationally. The British Council, for example, is aligning its language teaching curriculum to the CEF, as are language institutes like Bell, assessment authorities such as Cambridge Assessment, and textbook publishers.

The influence of the CEF is an example of the influences on conformity within UK ELT. There are others, of which teacher training is very significant. As noted earlier, such training was originally prompted by the needs of the private language school sector, and initial and further teacher training is dominated by two accrediting boards: Cambridge Assessment and Trinity. These boards provide ELT teaching qualifications which have been the basis of the formation of generations of teachers, and these (or comparable) qualifications are a requirement for teachers working in schools under the
Accreditation UK scheme, which is managed by the Accreditation Unit of the British Council in partnership with English UK, the UK's national, professional ELT Association, with nearly 400 accredited member institutions. Such schemes, while raising the overall quality of provision within the sector, also have the effect of imposing a common level of uniformity, which is mitigated to some extent by the diversity of institutions that are accredited.

**External Influences on EFL**

**Managerialism/New Public Management**

Given the significance of the private sector in UK ELT, it is not surprising that there has been growing concern with the effective management of language teaching organizations as commercial enterprises. This has coincided with the controversial but widespread application of managerialism or New Public Management to the provision of all public services, not least education. (Ferlie, no date, Fitzsimons, 1999). With its emphasis on efficiency, value for money and the power of the market, managerialism has established a climate in which both public and private sector ELT providers are encouraged to take management seriously. The publication of White et al. (1991) and the provision of management training programs for the sector (such as the International Diploma in Language Teaching Management) are indicative of this development in UK ELT.

**Methodology & the Mainstream**

As to mainstream EFL methodology in UK language schools, we noted earlier how in the 1970s, the structural-situational paradigm was challenged, to be replaced initially by the Communicative Approach, in which the emphasis is on acquiring the language through engaging in communicative activities. An extension of this appeared in the guise of Task Based Learning, while the lexical approach provided an alternative basis for curriculum design. Indeed, over the last three decades of the 20th century, a wide range of influences, some from research, came to bear on ELT, and many UK practitioners would now claim to follow an ‘eclectic’ approach, combining diverse influences and practices based on their own education, training, teaching materials, and further development.

There are limitations to such an approach, however, as is clear when looking beyond the rather hermetic world of EFL to mainstream education which, over the past thirty years, has undergone enormous changes, becoming focused on outcomes, influenced by a results-oriented managerialist educational regime which, in turn, has been driven by national political agendas. While subject to many external pressures, UK ELT has not had to meet the same pressing requirements of public accountability.

There are two important areas in which EFL has lagged behind its mainstream counterpart: research into teaching and learning, and the pedagogical applications of emerging technologies. Regarding the first of these, educationists have been busily occupied investigating what characterizes effective teaching (and learning). This is exemplified in the work of two educationists: John Hattie in New Zealand (e.g., Hattie, 2003), and Geoff Petty (2006) in the UK. On the basis of the analysis of a huge body of
educational research, they advocate active learning. The approach is summarized in Petty’s ‘PAR’ model, depicted below.

**Figure 1. Petty (2006): PAR model**

As ELT itself becomes progressively integrated into mainstream education, drawing on the huge evidential research base and evolving pedagogical approaches in this sector has to be considered essential.

Secondly, and not unrelated to the first, are the ways in which mainstream education is adapting to the potential of emerging technologies. Thanks to generous funding, it is in the state or public sector that large-scale initiatives in the pedagogical applications of IT are taking place, and by and large, UK ELT institutions find that they have been surpassed. This state of affairs is well illustrated by the nationwide rolling out of interactive whiteboards (IWB) in state sector schools and colleges. Although, so far, the results of evaluating their pedagogical effectiveness are equivocal (Moss, Jewitt, et al, 2007), the introduction of this particular piece of technology in the UK ELT sector is in its infancy (leaving aside the British Council’s worldwide introduction of IWB in their teaching centres). There are, of course, benefits in being a late adopter. For the moment, however, the Bell International Institute in London is, as far as is known, the only UK ELT school to have an IWB in every classroom and teaching staff trained in their use.

**Exporting English**

While the main focus of my account has been on the provision of ELT, in its various guises, in the UK, there is another very important way in which English is provided through the export of textbooks, examinations, and teaching. I will not dwell on the first two, save to say that in 2006, UK ELT publishers’ exports of textbooks were worth £263
million, with Europe representing 46% of exports, and Asia 15% (Publishers’ Association, 2007). There is, of course, growing local competition for UK publishers.

UK examinations are also an important export, as indicated by this excerpt from the Cambridge ESOL homepage.

Cambridge ESOL's internationally recognised Teaching Awards are taken by over 12,000 people each year. They provide a route into the English Language teaching profession for new teachers, and first class career development opportunities for experienced teachers.

Cambridge ESOL exams are the world's leading range of certificates for learners of English. Each year they are taken by over 2 million people, in 150 countries

http://www.cambridgeesol.org/index.htm

The third form of export is exemplified by the diversity of Bell International’s activities outside the UK:

- Wholly owned centres: Switzerland, Czech Republic, Malta
- Partnerships: Bulgaria, China (4), Poland (3), Thailand (7) Ukraine and Vietnam.
- In-country projects, such as the oil and gas industry language training in Libya
- Consultancy services
- Distance support services for multinational organizations.

This is a very broad range of ELT-related activities, in which Bell International— as well as other comparable UK providers – is meeting the diverse and emerging needs of its global clientele. In some settings, such as Thailand, this means meeting the needs of young learners and of implementing a CLIL-based approach to instruction. In others, such as Libya and Macao, it means developing work related courses within an ESP framework. In yet others, it means using distance learning tools in order to provide 24-hour support for a globally dispersed corporate clientele. So, ‘English exported’ embraces an extremely broad spectrum, which means that providers like Bell International are constantly dealing with the emerging realities of global English.

**Conclusion**

Several interconnected, cyclical themes have emerged in this paper. The first concerns change and transformation. The founding fathers of UK ELT, who exported a European-based approach, discovered that it failed to work without substantial adaptation to its new circumstances. In turn, this adapted approach was re-exported to the UK, becoming the theoretical and practical foundation for post-war UK ELT, which in turn has been exported to the world. Yet, even this transformed version of ELT hasn’t always been easily assimilated into local pedagogical traditions and practices, resulting in adaptation or even ‘tissue rejection’.
At the same time, the English language itself has evolved and diversified. Although ‘Outer Circle’ varieties of English had been long recognized and described, newer varieties have been evolving in the ‘Expanding Circle’, while, under the impact of globalization, English has become a lingua franca, with an evolving set of new norms that are independent of those of the native speaker. In short, English has become the property of all of its users.

Another theme of this paper has been diversity: in the ways in which the English language has spread and evolved, in the demography of the UK, in the huge range of languages spoken among people who visit and settle there, in the range of institutions providing English language tuition in the UK.

Counterbalancing the theme of diversity has been that of uniformity through the influence of the long established UK ELT infrastructure, which has supported a distinctively British approach to ELT. The limitations of such an approach, largely isolated as it is from mainstream education, have also been noted, with the suggestion that ELT could benefit from closer contact with research and developments in that sector.

Above all these themes stands the emerging challenge to the orthodoxies of both the English language and ways of teaching it, associated with the expansion of ELF and the role of English as a global language. As yet, the implications for UK ELT are not entirely clear. What is certain, however, is that UK ELT will not be immune from the influence of ELF, and, like the language itself, it will have to adapt and evolve. Its demonstrated capacity in Global 2.0 to meet comparable challenges suggest that it would be unwise to underestimate the capacity of UK ELT to meet the challenges of Global 3.0.
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**Glossary**

EIL: English as an International Language
ELT: English Language Teaching – a cover-all term
EFL: English as a Foreign Language
ESL: English as a Second Language
ESOL: English to Speakers of Other Languages (now a commonly used cover-all term)
ELF: English as a Lingua Franca
EYL: English for Young Learners
ESP: English for Specific Purposes
EAP: English for Academic Purposes
CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Instruction   (also called Content Based Teaching, CBT)