Joachim Grzega

# Reflections on Concepts of English for Europe
## British English, American English, Euro-English, Global English

Abstract

The article presents linguistic, pedagogic-didactic and socioeconomic reflections on native and, particularly, non-native Englishes. It first emphasizes that native Englishes not only differ in the language system, but also in language use; the latter is still not adequately studied. Then phonetic, grammatical, lexical and pragmatic features of non-native Englishes are drawn on the basis of various corpora. Emphasis is especially placed on the illustration of features unproblematic in conversations between non-native speakers. It is also shown that there is no specific form of European non-native English. With respect to teaching English, already the lingua franca in nearly all civilizations, teachers should evaluate "errors" according to their "degree of endangering comprehensibility" (not according to their "deviation from native norms"). English should first be taught to enable learners to communicate "successfully" (not "native-like") and "internationally" (not "to natives") as soon as possible. At the same time, native speakers must learn to speak ("over"-)distinctly and avoid culture-bound metaphorical expressions in international communication. The final section argues that, for global peace and economic growth, everyone must be able to communicate with everyone, everyone should be able to retain their identity and everyone should be able to understand others' ways of thinking. Therefore, everyone should have command of "the mothertongue + one common global language (at least a basic level) + a 3rd language of choice" (= "global triglossia"). As a global language, English is the best candidate (with Basic Global English to be taught as soon as possible). By looking at the history of other linguae francae, it is shown that English can remain in this position only if it is continually used in all forms of international communication and if it is bound to some form of global culture that still allows for regional identities.

Sommaire

L'article présente des réflections linguistiques, pédagogiques-didactiques et socioéconomiques sur des anglais natifs et non-natifs – surtout les derniers. D'abord, l'article souligne que les anglais natifs ne diffèrent pas seulement dans le système de langue, mais aussi dans l'usage de langue; le dernier n'est toujours pas étudié de manière appropriée. Ensuite sont présentés, sur le base des corpus, des traits phonétiques, grammaticaux, lexicaux et pragmatiques des anglais non-natifs. L'accent est mis sur des traits non-problématiques dans des conversations entre des interlocuteurs non-natifs. Il est aussi illustré que l'on ne peut pas trouver des caractéristiques non-natifs exclusivement européens. Quant à l'enseignement de l'anglais, déjà lingua franca dans presque toutes les civilisations, il est recommandé d'évaluer des "erreurs" selon leur "degré d'entrave de la compréhensibilité" (non pas selon leur "déviation de normes natives"). L'anglais doit être enseigné ainsi qu'il puisse rendre les apprenants capables, aussitôt que possible, de communiquer "avec succès" (non pas "avec un accent natif") et "sur le plan international" (non pas "avec les natifs"). Les locuteurs, eux, sont appelés à utiliser des formes ("supra")-distinctes et à éviter des métaphores liées à leur culture. La section finale propose que, pour la paix et la croissance économique globales, chacun devrait être capable de communiquer avec chacun, chacun devrait être capable de guarder son identité et chacun devrait être capable de comprendre la mentalité d'autres humains. De conséquence, chacun doit être maîtriser "sa langue maternelle + une langue globale commune (au moins sur un niveau de base) + une 3e langue au choix" (= "triglossie globale"). Comme langue globale, l'anglais est le plus qualifié (et "Basic Global English" doit être enseigné aussitôt que possible). La comparaison des histoires d'autres lingua franca montre que l'anglais peut seulement garder cette position s'il est usé continuellement dans toutes les formes de communication internationale et s'il est lié à une forme de culture globale qui néanmoins permette des identités régionales.

Zusammenfassung

Der Beitrag bietet sprachliche, pädagogisch-didaktische und sozioökonomische Überlegungen zu muttersprachlichen und nicht-muttersprachlichen Formen des Englischen. Er unterstreicht zunächst, dass sich muttersprachliche Formen des Englischen nicht nur in den Sprachstrukturen unterscheiden, sondern auch im Sprachgebrauch; letzterer ist immer noch nicht adäquat untersucht worden. Anschließend werden auf der Basis eines Korpus Merkmale nicht-muttersprachlicher Formen des Englisch beschrieben. Der Schwerpunkt wird dabei

auf Merkmale gelegt, die sich im Gespräch zwischen Nicht-Muttersprachlern als unproblematisch erweisen. Es wird auch gezeigt, dass es keine nichtmuttersprachlichen Merkmale gibt, die spezifisch europäisch wären. Für den Unterricht der englischen Sprache, die bereits in fast allen Kulturkreisen Lingua franca ist, wird geraten, "Fehler" nach ihrer Kommunikationsgefährdung zu bewerten (nicht nach ihrer Abweichung von muttersprachlichen Normen). Englisch muss so unterrichtet werden, dass Lerner möglichst schnell befähigt sind, "erfolgreich" (und nicht "wie ein Muttersprachler") und "international" (und nicht "mit Muttersprachlern") zu kommunizieren. Der Muttersprachler wiederum ist aufgerufen, sich in internationalen Situationen einer ("über"-)deutlichen Sprache zu bedienen und kulturgebundene bildhafte Ausdrücke zu vermeiden. Der letzte Abschnitt argumentiert, dass es für Weltfrieden und Weltwirtschaftswachstum notwendig ist, dass sich alle mit allen verständigen, dass alle ihre Identität bewahren können und dass alle ein Verständnis für die Denkweise anderer entwickeln. Folglich sollten alle "ihre Muttersprache + eine gemeinsame globale Sprache (wenigstens auf Mindestniveau) + eine dritte Sprache nach Wahl" beherrschen (= "globale Triglossie"). Als globale Sprache ist Englisch der geeignetste Kandidat (wobei ein "Basic Global English" möglichst früh zu erwerben ist). Ein Vergleich mit der Geschichte anderer Linguae francae zeigt, dass Englisch diese Rolle nur halten kann, wenn es beständig in allen Formen internationaler Kommunikation verwendet wird und wenn es mit einer globalen Kultur verbunden ist, die gleichzeitig aber auch regionale Identität ermöglicht.

In my JELiX opening article (Grzega 2004: 6) I stated that one of the topics that still need be delved into more deeply is the role of English and its varieties as a lingua franca in Europe. This article will analyze some of these aspects in a more thorough way.

For students and scholars of English, the fact that English has become the first global language in terms of native and non-native speakers is of paramount importance. Both native speakers of English English as well as native speakers of American English are nowadays in the minority. Of course, specialists of foreign language teaching have already long been dealing with the phenomenon of "interlanguage" (cf., e.g., Kasper 1981, James 1998). But, it has always been clear that the model of English Language Teaching should be British English, which is the traditional model, or American English, which has by now become accepted as an equally valuable model by a large number of teachers.

In the following contribution I would first like to shed light on various concepts of English in traditional or more recent foreign language teaching: the native national Englishes (especially British English and American English) and non-native English(es). My focus will be on language as a means of communication rather than as a set of normative rules. I will list several features of non-native English(es) from around the world. In recent years, linguists have also come up with the notion of a specific European variant of non-native English. We will try to see whether there really is a typically European non-native English. These analyses will be followed by some pedagogic and didactic reflections on Teaching English as a Foreign Language and Teaching English as a Native Language. Both groups of teachers must take into account that English is now the most salient lingua franca in the world, which means that communication between non-natives is much more frequent than communication between a non-native and a native speaker of English. Finally, I would like to discuss briefly the socioeconomic pros (and the potential cons) of agreeing on English as a global lingua franca.

## 1.   British English, American English and Other National Varieties

American English (AmE) and British English (BrE) are generally known as the two original standard varieties from which all other native varieties of English descend. Instead of British English I actually prefer the term English English (EnglE) (to separate it from Welsh English and Scottish English, who have nowadays their own prestige varieties, also accepted in the mass media—English English would be represented by a variety such as BBC English). AmE and BrE/EnglE are also the two varieties that nowadays serve as the two model varieties in European teaching English as a foreign language. More traditionally, only BrE was considered

to be the model variety, but this has been changing since the global importance of the US can no longer be overlooked. Of course, we may ask whether other national varieties should not be granted equal rights in the classroom. Especially in Europe, dealing with Indian English may be helpful for the interaction with Indian computer experts who come to work here; and if we observe our European students' target countries for a stay (or even a life) abroad then we may note that Australia, New Zealand and Canada have become more and more popular over the last years.

What do comparative linguistic studies tell us about the differences between the national varieties of English? Sound, spelling, grammar and vocabulary differences have to a large extent been analyzed and presented in various survey books (e.g. Trudgill/Hannah 2002, Hansen/Carls/Lucko 1996, CHEL). What is still missing, though, are more detailed looks on pragmatic, conversational differences (which I've already pointed out in Grzega [2000]). As an example one may recall that apart from *dear* Brits prefer *love* and *pet* as affectionate address terms for strangers, while Americans rather choose *dear* and *hon'*. We may also think of the highly codified and fossilized language in British Parliament unknown to the American Congress. Such differences are spread over all national varieties of English. Not only systemic/structural, but also pragmatic features belong to the linguistic identity of a culture, maybe more than the systemic features. Moreover, systemic differences are easily visible surface differences and perceived as linguistic differences. Pragmatic differences, however, are "hidden" differences and may be traced back—especially if it is the same basic language system—to a lack in politeness. In other words: people don't see a flaw in the person's skills, but a flaw in the person him/herself. Both native and non-native speakers should therefore be aware of such differences.

## 2. Non-Native World English

Among linguists, non-native English (NNE), or rather non-native Englishes, was detected as a phenomenon worth dealing with on its own about a score years ago. By now the articles and monographs on NNE abound. It suffices to have a look into the last issues of journals such as *English Today*, *ELT Journal* and *World Englishes*. There are also two books entitled *World Englishes* (Melchers/Shaw 2003, Jenkins 2003), one *English in the World* (Rubdi/Saraceni [in press]) and one *Global English* (Brumfit 2002). A recommendable and comprehensive state-of-the-art article on NNE research was composed by Seidlhofer (2004).

Several corpora of NNE have come into being. The largest ones are:
– Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) (cf., e.g., Seidlhofer 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2003, 2004)
– Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA) (cf. Mauranen 2003)
– Alpine Adriatic Corpus (AAC) (cf. James 2000)
– International Corpus of English (ICE) (cf. Greenbaum 1996)
– International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) and Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI)
(For a list of smaller learner corpora see the homepage of the Centre for English Corpus Linguistics at the Université catholique de Louvain (Belgium) under http://www.fltr.ucl.ac.be). VOICE, ELFA, AAC and LINDSEI contain data of spoken language, ICLE data of written English (student essays). ICE contains both written and spoken material, but ICE is not a typical NNE corpus, since the informands observed are all from nations where English is co-official language and where children are formally raised in

English.[1]

Based on such corpora Jennifer Jenkins and Barbara Seidlhofer have been trying to define a "Lingua Franca Core" of English: Jenkins for pronunciation, Seidlhofer for lexicogrammar[2]. Pronunciation has been shown to be the most frequent cause of intelligibility problems. However, some very frequent phonetic features of the unproblematic "Lingua Franca Core" are (cf. Jenkins 2000, 2003: 126f., 2004):

–   the absence of weak forms (strong forms rather support intelligibility)
–   the substitution of /θ/ and /ð/ by /t/ and /d/ or /s/ and /z/
–   not entirely correct quality of vowel sounds (except for /ɜː/)
–   additions, e.g. [ˈpəradʌkətɔ] instead of [ˈprɑdʌkt] for *product* (consonant cluster, on the other hand, can cause intelligibility problems if done at the beginning of the word, e.g. [ˈprɑdʌkt] for *product*)
–   "wrong" word-stress
–   the absence of assimilations in connected speech

Native speakers from England consider these errors as very serious as far as intelligibility and/or aesthetics are concerned, as has been shown by Dretzke (1985). In Dretzke's study on English English speaker's evaluation of German learners' mistakes the five most urgent error areas are: (1) final voiced consonants, (2) medial[ŋg], (3) [θ] and [ð], (4) weak forms, (5) [ɹ]. For NNS-NNS communication Jenkins (2004: 64) attaches a quite different label to these features: "Indeed, their *non*-use may even be counterproductive." Similarly, Jenner (1987: 133) observes that some features of "Dutch English" (viz. "tension throughout the [vocal] tract, except at the tongue-tip" as well as larynx rising) are also found in dialects of native English, "but they tend [...] to be those of low prestige from large industrial conurbations". This does not mean, of course, that all NNE features are unproblematic in NNS-NNS talk. On the contrary: "certain features emerged as critical for intelligible pronunciation:

–   consonant sounds except for substitutions of /θ/ and /ð/ and of dark 'l' [ɫ]
–   vowel quantity (but not quality except for /ɜː/)
–   aspiration after initial /p/, /t/, and /k/
–   word initial and medial consonant clusters
–   nuclear (tonic) stress" (Jenkins 2004: 64)
–   rhoticity (like AmE rather than BrE)
–   /t/ should always stay /t/ (like BrE rather than AmE)
–   allophonic variation permissible as long as there's no overlap onto another phoneme (e.g. Spanish [β] for [v] is often perceived as [b] by other speakers; non-aspirated [p, t, k] in word-initial position instead of [pʰ, tʰ, kʰ] is often perceived as [b, d, g])
–   simplification of consonant clusters only in mid- and final position according to native English rules of syllable structure (e.g. for *factsheet* [-kʃ-] is permissible, but not [-tʃ-] or [-kt-].

As to grammatical "mistakes", it seems clear that they are more probable with more differentiated categories (e.g. the English future tense system in comparison to other European future tense systems) and with categories that are structured in a different way (e.g. the different use of indicative vs. subjunctive in English as compared to other European languages). On the basis of the VOICE corpus Seidlhofer (2004) could determine a list of

---

[1]   Unfortunately, these corpora are not generally accessible. The VOICE corpus wasn't made accessible to me either.
[2]   Cf., e.g., Jenkins (2000, 2004, in press) and Seidlhofer (2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2003, 2004).

grammatical errors that appear to be generally unproblematic and no obstacle to communicative success[3]:

–   using the same present tense form for all persons
–   treating *who* and *which* as interchangeable relative pronouns
–   not placing an article in front of nouns
–   using just the verb stem in constructions such as " *look forward to see you tomorrow*
–   inserting redundant prepositions
–   overusing certain verbs of high semantic generality (e.g. *do, have, make, put, take*)
–   replacing infinitive construction (e.g. *I want that*)
–   using *isn't it?* as a universal question tag (e.g. *You're very busy today, isn't it?*)

It would be desirable now to know what the grammatical features of the Lingua Franca Core are and to know which error types are rather problematic in NNS-NNS communication. Johnson/Bartlett (1999) have found some more grammatical features common to pidgins and International Business English:

–   elimination of pre- and postpositions (e.g. *I'll pay the coffee* instead of *I'll pay for the coffee*)
–   preference of the infinitive over *ing*-forms (e.g. *it's worth to do* instead of *it's worth doing it*)
–   avoidance of passive forms

It seems clear to me that serious problems can only occur when NNS speakers choose a structure that would make the meaning or reference unclear or that the hearer (NS or NNS) would interpret in a way different than what the speaker intended. Thus, a sentence like *Tomorrow I go to the cinema.* is unproblematic, since the time adverbial makes it clear that the sentence is supposed to have future reference. A sentence like *On Monday I go to the cinema* can potentially cause misunderstanding if the context is not clear enough. The sentence could be interpreted either as (1) StE *On Mondays I go to the cinema* or as (2) StE *On Monday (i.e. Next Monday) I'll go (or: am going / am going to go) to the cinema*. As mentioned before, sometimes the context will make it clear (e.g. after a question *How do you pass your leisure time?* meaning 1 is more likely) or the correct meaning isn't even necessary (e.g. after a question *How about going to the concert on Monday?* – no matter what the exact meaning is, the person doesn't have time on Monday). Generally spoken, the unmarkedness of future tense is unproblematic. Other unproblematic features in context should be (according to my experience as a university examiner):

–   the mixing of present perfect and simple past
–   wrong plural formations
–   wrong past tense and past participle formations
–   the mixing of progressive and simple forms as long as adverbs are there (or other elements in the context make clear that you are either talking about a currently on-going action or giving a general description)

As to lexis, too, some errors and error types are certainly less problematic for intelligibility than others. As one instance of unproblematic errors Seidlhofer (2004) mentions overdoing explicitness, e.g. saying *black colour* rather than *black*, or *How long time?* rather than *How long?*. Pseudo-Anglicisms, which are very prominent among young Europeans (and also young Japanese) (cf. Cheshire 2002, Sellner 2003), and which may be wrongly classified by speakers as actual English words, might be interpretable within a given context, but may nevertheless arouse some sort of discomfort. Clearly problematic areas are lexical gaps, "serious" false friends, English metaphorical (or idiomatic) expressions that are not

---

[3]   This must be pursued although some native speakers may consider some of these errors as quite serious (cf., e.g., the evaluations in Hultfors's study [1986-1987]). On the right of non-native speakers of English, cf. also Ammon (2000).

interpretable word for word, as well as foreign metaphorical (or idiomatic) expressions simply translated into English word for word, but not interpretable word for word[4]. The case that idiomatic expressions are only known by one interlocutor is termed "unilateral idiomaticity" by Seidlhofer (2001c: 16). Her example is: *Can I give you hand?* for *Can I help you?*. Another potential problem lies in the culture-dependence of prototypes. The word *football* will most probably be at first associated with "soccer" by most Europeans, but with "American football" by North Americans and by Australians. Also of note, categorizations may differ (which, however, is connected with language only secondarily). The banana, for example, is categorized as a fruit in Europe and North America, but as a vegetable in Latin America. Finally, connotative differences, which often go unnoticed, may also lead to communicative discomforts or breakdowns. As an example I would like to remind you of the word *federal*, which was so prominent in the EU constitution debate in 2004: while the word has positive connotations for Germans, Blair's description of the future EU has clearly shown that it is negative for the British. For the French the inclusion of the adjective *religious* was unwelcome because of their traditional habit of a much clearer separation of the secular and the laicistic spheres. Of course, the connotational differences are not just linguistic, but conceptual differences connected with the individual histories of the various European countries.

From my experiences with exchange students who have to write seminar papers I've not infrequently stumbled over uninterpretable passages due to the wrong use of a word or a word combination (i.e. a presumably idiomatic expression). If the seminar papers were written by students with French or Italian as mothertongues, languages that I am personally quite familiar with, I could sometimes detect L1 interferences. This occurred with too general use of a word, a metaphorical use of the word as used in L1 or a non-literal meaning of a combination of words that was obviously transferred from L1. However, interpretation becomes impossible if you have to correct papers from somebody with a mothertongue that you are not familiar with. The frequency of such non-native (and potentially L1-influenced) use definitely depends on the student's command of the language.

Pragmatic analyses include those of Firth (1996), House (1999, 2002), Meierkord (1996, 2002 [together with Knapp]), Lesznyák (2002, 2003, 2004), Schwartz (1980), Varonis/Gass (1985), Wagner/Firth (1997) and Yule (1990). As an example we could list Meierkord's main results from her participants observations of 23 talks (13.5 hours, total of 45 non-native speakers from Western Europe, the Arabic world, the Hinduistic World, the Far East excluding Japan, central and southern Africa):

1.  With opening phrases, closing phrases and requests NNE speakers use a limited set of (textbook-like) forms[5]. With requests Meierkord notices a concentration on head acts (= sentence part with the core message/request), a preference of the strategies "mood derivable"[6] and "preparatory"[7] and a frequent use of the politeness marker *please*.
2.  In general, fast and abrupt changes in topics can be observed in NNE speakers. They mostly choose safe topics, topics related to the here and now.
3.  Backchannelling is significantly more frequent with NNE speakers than BrE speakers, but

---

[4]  Tannen (1985: 210) thinks that this last type of error might even have positive effects: "cross-cultural differences do not always have negative effects. The possibility of misinterpretation can lead to positive as well as negative misattributions. As a simple example, the turns of phrases and common expressions of another language, when translated into one's own, can seem especially charming, novel, or creative, and one can therefore attribute special creative verbal ability to speakers of other languages who are simply translating common expressions from their native language."

[5]  On this see also Jaworski (1990).

[6]  = directness signaled by grammatical mood of the verb, e.g. *Go to sleep!*

[7]  = preparing the hearer for the ensuing request, e.g. *I have a request to make.*

NNE speakers use less gambits than BrE speakers. The length of the turns and the amount of overlaps yield parallel findings for native speakers. Supports such as *mhm, yeah, OK, I know* and *I see*, sentence completions and restatements are more frequent with NNE speakers than with native speakers.

4. As to gambits[8] Meierkord observes a frequent use of cajolers and rare use of underscorers with both NNE speakers and native speakers. Differences lie in the fact that starters are rarer and appealers more frequent in NNE speech than in native speech.

5. Linguistic deficits are sometimes "concealed" by laughing.

As far as successful communication is concerned, Meierkord surprisingly notices only 9 communicative breakdowns in the 23 talks. It should be noted that all of Meierkord's observations occur independent of the geographic origin and the linguistic competence of the speakers. Significant differences depend on sex, cultural group, linguistic competence only with the lengths of turns and the formation of requests. Moreover, Asian speakers prefer situation-related topics, while speakers of other cultures choose topics from the field "studies/job". Speakers always put effort in formulating their thoughts in a way aimed at achieving a maximum of comprehensibility (and obviously these forms are oriented toward native norms). The data show the following features:

1. Misunderstandings are rather rare in NNS-NNS interaction. When problems do occur, they are resolved by topic change or, less frequently, by rephrasing and repetition.

2. Pragmatic interference from the native languages seems rare.

3. As long as a certain degree of understanding is achieved interlocutors allow a relatively high degree of vagueness (Firth [1996] calls it the "let-it-pass principle").

Despite Meierkord's observations, there are also studies that have shown that there certainly are pragmatic L1 interferences (cf. the state-of-the-art book by James 1998)[9]. From my own experiences I could also add some L1 interferences. For instance, I remember very well from a 6-month stay in the United States as a student that one Japanese girl obviously transferred her backchannelling behavior from her mothertongue. On the other hand, I have also noted the phenomenon of "over"-politeness, i.e. that a NNS used a very "high" (if not the "highest") politeness strategy current in the US on every occasion. Whereas the first example of the Japanese girl could be termed pragmalinguistic failure (including pragmatic "false friends", e.g. with compliments), the second may rather be termed sociopragmatic failure[10]. In other words: you can either come up with a non-existing form (because you are not familiar enough with the formal and semantic system of the language) or you can apply an existing form in the wrong way (because you've misinterpreted the situation).

Let us summarize the most important results from the various observations. The most striking result was produced by Meierkord's study. In contrast to NS-NNS discourse, which according to the traditional literature, often seems to fail, NNS-NNS conversations normally work without problems. Altogether there were only 9 communicative breakdowns in Meierkord's 23 talks. And all but one miscommunication resulted from personal differences of background knowledge or personal attitudes toward the topic, but not from cultural differences. **The**

---

[8] A gambit is a word or phrase which helps one express what he or she is trying to say. A major distinction can be made between: (1) uptakers (= to signal to your partner that you have received his/her message and accept it as relevant, e.g. *That's right*), (2) cajolers (= hearer-oriented, to increase harmony between the two conversational partners, especially when you have to say something that might be unwelcome, e.g. *you know* and *I mean*), (3) underscorers (= message-oriented, to stress the importance of a point, e.g. *look* and *that's the problem*), (4) starters (= to express 'I now have something to say', e.g. *Well...* and *Now...*), (5) appealers (= to involve the hearer, e.g. *okay?* and question tags like *isn't it?*)

[9] The "waffle phenomenon" frequently observed in foreigners' speech (cf., e.g. Edmondson/House 1991), i.e. that utterances of foreigner speakers are longer and include more paraphrasing than those of native speakers, is not dealt with in Meierkord's study.

[10] On this distinction cf. Thomas (1983: 99).

**solution for overcoming the breakdown is not an attempt of leveling out the misunderstanding, but a change in the topic. Five communicative breakdowns are due to vocabulary deficits; in the explanation process the speakers with a lower linguistic competence prove themselves to be more cooperative than the more competent speakers**. If no understanding can be achieved, the ambiguity is accepted. **Neither the more competent nor the less competent speakers are capable of verbalizing the communicative breakdown in an adequate way**. Apart from Meierkord's observations on conversational strategies, Jenkins and Seidlhofer have concluded that many phonological and grammatical deviations from Standard English do not hinder successful communication among non-native speakers either. Similar observations can be made if you follow discussions among non-native speakers in internet forums: orthographic, grammatical and pragmatic deviations from standard English are only rarely obstacles to communication in comparison to lexical deviations. In brief: NNS-NNS conversations are cooperative, consensus-oriented and mutually supportive.

Despite the rarity of breakdowns in the vast data, there should be some warning, however. House (1999, 2000) voices some skepticism and warns against assuming superficial consensus while there may be hidden sources of trouble at a deeper level. Similarly, Meierkord (1996: 226) states that if breakdowns occur they may not only be triggered off by linguistic and pragmatic differences, but possibly also by more profound, psychological reasons.

What is still missing are studies on the success of monologic texts (spoken and written). University teachers can observe nationally different choices of discourse strategies in seminar papers, for example. Future studies with the ICLE corpus will allow some insights here.

## 3. "Euro-English"

Rather recent is the concept of Europe-specific non-native English. The term "Euro-English" has occurred in the title of several articles: Modiano (1996, 2000)[11], Jenkins/Modiano/Seidlhofer (2001), Murray (2003). It has also been taken up in other articles. But to what extent can we really speak of typically European English?

Modiano (2000: 34) states that, "as to pronunciation, a 'neutral' variety of spoken English is coming into being, one which is difficult to locate geographically (note many of the young commentators on the satellite TV networks who are difficult to place, being 'more' European' and less 'Dutch' or 'Belgian' or 'French')." McCluskey (2002: 41) says: "As in all enclosed systems, a special language has emerged inside the EU apparatus. It takes two forms, Euro-jargon, a set of terms created by the need to name new things invented by the EU, and Eurospeak, the hermetic insider medium with its own idiosyncratic grammar and syntax". Modiano/Jenkins/Seidlhofer (2001) give grammar examples that could become accepted by a large European community, e.g. Swedish English *we were five people at the party* instead of *there were five people at the party*. But here, too, it is unclear whether such constructions are really specifically European or whether they can also be found in other parts of the globe.

Concerning vocabulary Modiano (1996: 34) observes a growing preference for AmE terms in lieu of BrE synonyms. However, he admits that this also holds true for non-native English world-wide. The prestige of AmE is also visible world-wide. In Jenkins/Modiano/Seidlhofer (2001: 13) we read: "One form of 'Euro-English' can already be observed in the emergence of

---

[11] Cf. also Modiano (1998, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c).

a 'culture' among EU citizens wherein a wide range of terms, (new coinages, jargon, as well as proper nouns that symbolize grand movements, e.g., *Maastricht*, *Schengen*) make the English used in Europe distinct from other varieties. One hears of *Euro-speak*[12], the language of *Eurocrats*, which is the vernacular of EU politicians and civil servants. Through processes of discoursal nativization [...] and fossilization, where 'non-standard' structures become acceptable forms of language, as well as the existence of distinct European 'accents,' a new variety of English peculiar to the European experience is taking form. [....] instead of the term *state*, *country*, or *nation*, the convention in Europe is to refer to the various countries that have joined the EU as *Member States*, a distinction which has subtle but important political implications. [....] Throughout the EU we find terms which are peculiar to the European experience and which are not generally understood by users of English living in other parts of the world." McCluskey (2002: 41) writes as well: "There is [...] one area where EU language does have a public effect, and that is terminology." Further, we may ask whether there are any European pseudo-Anglicisms? If we check Görlach (2001), *autoreverse* 'a device which automatically plays the other side of a tape', *autostop* 'hitchhiking', *happy end* 'happy ending' and *matchball* 'a matchpoint needed to win a game' seem good candidates, for example.

With regard to pragmatics there is a lack of analyses of strictly European NNS-NNS conversations in comparison to others. But I would like to remind the reader of Meierkord's statement that her observations are independent of her informands' geographical origins. Still, if we take aside Meierkord's (1996) non-European informands and stick to the Europeans, then many of the few differences and thus potential communicative obstacles observed might also vanish. (However, I would also like to remind the reader of House's statement that there might be hidden problems.)

To sum up: Although Murray (2003) thinks that we might be able to describe a specifically European variety of English as a Lingua Franca, at present **there seem to be no typically and specifically European deviations from standard native Englishes as far as pronunciation and grammar are concerned. Lexical particularities only exist in the field of EU administration**; but these particularities can be treated as some form of proper nouns, whereas the general vocabulary seems devoid of Europeanisms. Also Modiano (1996: 37) thinks that a "Euro-English" is yet to be developed, a "Euro-English", "which can be shaped to fit the particular needs of non-native speakers of English living and working in the EU". This view is also shared by Graddol (2001) and Piette (2004). McCluskey (2002: 43), on the other hand, is very sceptical: "The fact remains, though, that in the narrow compass of the EU institutions, the official language referred to as English in EU law is definitely not any newly emerging international creole but the standard form of that language current in the two Member States which officially use it, and that is warrant enough for the EU's translators [...] to insist that at least public utterances in English by the EU should be in the standard of the British Isles".

Even if specifically European features of NNE were still detected or constructed, would they have any effect on foreign language teaching or on the definition of European civilization in a globalizing world? Is a Europe-specifc variety of English necessary at all? How I would answer these questions will, hopefully, be clear after the remaining two sections of pedagogic-didactic and socioeconomic reflections.

---

[12]  Some also speak of "Bruxellish" (Chaudenson 2001: 145, 156).

## 4. What Kind of English in Language Teaching?

One may argue that if NNS-NNS communication functions better than NNS-NS communication then why deal with NNS-NNS communication at all? Wouldn't it be better to focus on the more problematic areas with NNS-NS communication? But there are numerous reasons and motives that encourage us to investigate NNS-NNS communication and NNE in a still more thorough way:

1. We should try to find out why NNS-NNS communication functions better (at least on the surface) than NNS-NS communication. Does it possibly only work in equal-power relationships, e.g. in student dorms?
2. What may be hidden (psychological) misunderstandings? Different types of NNE may be intelligible, but they may also nurture stereotypical opinions of native speakers and non-native speakers on foreign speakers' capacities.
3. The success of NNS-NNS communication is due to the dialogic situation and to the observed generally cooperative attitude of the interlocutors[13]: this can also be observed in internet communication, where people could always ask for clarification. To what extent does NNE succeed in monologic, especially written, language? Where are the major problems to be focussed on in language teaching? To what degree do deviations from NE use of register, style, conversational strategies disturb communication?
4. When is written NNS-NNS communication relevant (e.g. as a customer no, as a salesperson yes)? When is successful NNS-NS written communication relevant (e.g. for companies, but it is their right to select, as it is their right to select among native speakers' linguistic competences—people must convince their potential employers )?
5. When are speakers considered ridiculous due to their using NNE? (menus, commercials with pseudo-English)
6. What does using English as an international language mean for native speakers of English (e.g. getting to know interlanguage tendencies, allow variation—or: more variants, refraining from culture-specific/metaphorical phrases)?
7. Finally, what implications do all these findings have for language teaching? And to what degree do these findings need further corroboration?

At present, the following conclusions may be drawn for teaching English as a foreign language[14].

1. English is the most prominent European and international lingua franca. NNS-NNS communication is more probable in people's everyday life than NNS-NS communication. Thus, the teaching of English must be different from the teaching of other European languages. (I therefore disagree with the "European Profile for Language Teacher Education—A Frame of Reference", which holds that in principle all language teaching should pursue the same goals). I agree with Jenkins/Seidlhofer (2001) that "authentic" classroom material offered to learners—at least to beginners—should not only consist in corpora of native-speaker speech. Students don't need teaching materials that present and discuss just "native English" cultures. They need **teaching materials that provide some knowledge of (European and non-European) cultures they will most likely have to deal with (although this should include "native English" cultures, of course)**.
2. Kirkpatrick (2000) suggests: "if students were given a regional variety of English to learn, educated speakers of the regional variety could provide the models. Suitably qualified and

---

[13] Already Götz (1977: 80f.) pointed out that an attitude of wanting to understand is more important than linguistic competence.

[14] For several modern views on teaching English cf., e.g., Davies/Hamp-Lyons/Kemp (1993) and the collection of papers in Gnutzmann/Intemann (2005). Some of these ideas, e.g. those by Jenkins and Seidlhofer, are included in the following passages.

trained speakers of the regional variety could be the teachers." It is probably better to have both NS and NNS teachers. Kirkpatrick (2000) continues: "Instead of spending large sums of money on importing native-speaking teachers and externally developed materials, funding should be set aside for the professional development of local teachers". Another idea would be to import other NNS speakers as teachers.

3. I agree with Jenkins/Seidlhofer (2001) that the time spent on teaching and learning phonetic/phonological elements such as the 3rd person marker -s and grammatical elements such as the distinction between present perfect and simple past bear "very little relationship to their actual usefulness, as successful communication is obviously possible without them." This means that curricular priorities have to change. In-depth treatments of certain grammar chapters such as future tense, present perfect vs. past perfect, if-clauses could be postponed. McKay (2002), too, thinks that intelligibility must come before correctness. In contrast, MacKenzie (2003: 60) thinks: "The majority of continental European students studying English today clearly use the language in an identificationary rather than a merely instrumental way. They want to learn English or American expressions and they ask their teachers to correct their non-native 'errors'." This may hold true for students majoring in English at universities. But what about other users of English? Let's continue with MacKenzie's (2003: 61) observations: "business students worldwide are being fed the notions of 'Total Quality Management', which includes the dogma that all company documents should be error-free, and that a great many ENL speakers would throw a business proposal or a catalogue that seemed to contain as few as two 'errors' straight in the bin. A job application ending 'I look forward to hear from you' is, unfortunately, likely to meet the same fate." But, first of all, non-native can also become stylized and fashionable (cf. the English of the Ali G. Show) and, second, there are also customers who do not wish to sound native-like. Andy Kirkpatrick (2000) quotes a senior minister in the Singapore government: "When I speak English I want the world to know I'm a Singaporean." A similar utterance is reported for a Singaporean ambassador by Strevens (1992: 39). These different demands should be respected in foreign language teaching. It therefore seems very plausible to me when Seidlhofer (2004: 227; my emphasis) writes: "What can be done in teaching is to **provide a basis that students can learn and can subsequently use for fine-tuning** (usually after leaving school) to any native or nonnative varieties and registers that turn out to be relevant for their individual requirements". I don't know whether the fine-tuning phase should only start after leaving school; what I could fully support, though, is that beginners of learning English should be provided with functioning non-native forms and native forms as equal variants. What I can definitely say from my own experience is that the oft-heard claim that if mistakes remain uncorrected they become systematic and systemic errors is exaggerated. I think that most language teachers have had the experience that errors can be levelled out, for instance, during a lengthy stay abroad (if the learner is provided with some basic metalinguistic knowledge and if s/he is really interested in acquiring the linguistic system used there).

4. These observations also have implications for error evaluation. Of course, deviations from NE should not be left unmarked. But **teachers should clearly distinguish several degrees of seriousness of errors/mistakes** (in written texts as well as in spoken discourse). Teachers could choose the following "native deviation" scale:
    (4)  communication-breaking mistake because the sense is unclear
    (3)  communication-breaking mistake because hearer may not feel treated in an adequate way (i.e. unconscious and serious violation of politeness rules)
    (2)  unusual, not native form, but without endangering communication
    (1)  not native standard English, but element of the Lingua Franca Core
    (0)  native-like (or native-near) standard English (AmE or EnglE)

In this context I would like to point out Murray's (2003) study, which shows that native speakers of English seem to be more tolerant toward non-native variants and varieties than non-native speakers of English.

5.  As far as politeness strategies are concerned Sneyd (2001) has suggested that, if we proceed from three levels of formality (formal—neutral—informal), **the neutral politeness strategy should be selected**: "So for the linguistic function of suggesting we can say, informally, 'Let's do so and so'. What we call normal politeness is exemplified by 'I suggest that we ...'. At the highest level of politeness we would say something like 'In my opinion it seems to me that we should ....' Of these three possibilities the second one, the normal polite, is most useful. For it can be used in most situations without causing offence or confusion whereas 'Let's' might be regarded as too casual in some situations while the very formal one could cause linguistic confusion because of its indirectness."

6.  These thoughts remind us that there are still some walls to be torn down, such as teachers' requests of learners to speak in "complete", albeit unnatural sentences, teachers' neglect of their students' individual (pre-)knowledge when they first officially learn the language, and teachers' request of learners to be consistent in their choice of an English standard (this should only be required at a very advanced level, given the fact that more and more convergence is observable on the lexical and grammatical level anyway).

7.  What we need are some pedagogic **guidelines that enable a rather rapid acquisition of communicative skills** in Global English. 75 years ago Charles Ogden proposed BASIC English as an easy access to English. Ogden's BASIC English (1930) is a good incentive, but it is doubtful whether his presentation of grammar is a very good approach from a pedagogic and didactic point of view. The reader gets the impression of a lack of important information and an abundance of unnecessary information (unnecessary with respect to successful BASIC communication). Teaching materials to enable fast progress in Global English must include:

    1)  remarks on the sound system (incl. Lingua Franca Core sounds)
    2)  remarks on sound-letter-equivalences
    3)  remarks on basic (i.e. Lingua Franca Core) morphological and syntactical patterns and important regularities
    4)  basic vocabulary and hints on how to use it for paraphrasing
    5)  remarks on politeness strategies[15]
    6)  hints on differences between NNE and NE

I am currently working out such **Basic Global English** material. This material for Basic Global English (BGE) will include sections on sounds, grammar (about 20 basic rules), vocabulary (800 general words + 200 words of individual choice + internationalisms + "dangerous false friends" + word-formation rules) and communicative strategies. Descriptions will be like the following (in the respective mothertongues, though):

(1) Examples from the sound section:
  •  "[θ], e.g. _Thank you_: Put the tip of the tongue at the upper alveolar ridge, behind your incisors. The vocal chords don't vibrate. If you have difficulty in  producing the sound, replace it by [t] or [f], if necessary also by [s]." [e.g. in the BGE material for the German and the French]
  •  "[iː], e.g. _beat_: Distinguish clearly between the long [iː] here and the short and slightly more open [ɪ] as in _bit_." [e.g. in the BGE material for Italians and Spaniards]

(2) Examples from the grammar section:
  •  "With nouns we distinguish between (a) referring to one item (= singular) and (b) referring to more than one item (= plural). With (a) you use the basic form, with (b)

---

15   The phenomenon of pragmatic fossilization has been pointed out by Romero Trillo (2002).

you normally write an *s* or, if the word already ends in an *s*-like sound (i.e. [s, z, ʃ, ʒ], *es* attachted to the basic form. This *(e)s* is pronounced [ɪz] after an *s*-like sound (*glasses*)*,* [z] after any other voiced sound (*boys, girls*), [s] after any other voiceless sound (*cats*). Important irregularities are: *man* [mæn] > *men* [men], *woman* [ˈwʊmən] > *women* [ˈwɪmɪn], *child* [tʃaɪld] > *children* [ˈtʃɪldrən], *foot* [fʊt] > *feet* [fiːt], *tooth* [tuːθ] > *teeth* [tiːθ]."

- "If you want to describe something in the past, a frequent possibility is to write an *ed* attached to the basic form. This *ed* is pronounced [ɪd] after an *s*-like sound (e.g. *he painted*), [d] after any other voiced sound (e.g. *lived, died*), [t] after any other voiceless sound (e.g. *he walked*). For describing something in the past you may also use the present form of *have* (*have* or *has*) and the so-called past participle which is also frequently form by attaching *ed* to the stem (e.g. *I have painted, he has lived*). This latter solution is preferred when the past action has some connection with the present. Unfortunately, there are a number of frequent irregularities in the forms. Here the past form comes before the dash, the past participle after it: *be > was* (with *I/he/she/it* or a singular noun) or *were* (with *you/they* or a plural noun)—*been, have > had—had, go > went—gone, do > did—done*. In native English there are still more irregularities: [....]. However, if you just add *ed* to the basic form you will mostly be understood by everybody."

(3) Examples from the conversational strategies section:
- "When you want somebody to do something, don't use the imperative, but formulate your wish as a question and add *please*, e.g. *Can you open the door, please?*"
- "Prefer the positive element of an adjective pair: instead of using *good—bad*, rather use *good—not good*, or, more politely, *good—not so good*."

It should be said that some of the claims of NNE researchers have been misunderstood and some of these misunderstandings are corrected by Jenkins (2004). What has been pleaded for, however, is a codification of NNE in forms of dictionaries and grammars (cf. Modiano/Jenkins/Seidlhofer 2001: 14). If codification means that NNE, or rather: the Lingua Franca Core, should be "listed" and "described", then I regard this a valuable task[16]. If, however, codification is supposed to mean establishing a norm (which is, in fact, a usual connotation of the term), then I would be less happy. A norm always requires a model. A linguistic model can be a certain highly estimated group of people, a certain sociolect, a certain geolect: who shall represent this model? The advantage of NNE is that the only "model" is intelligibility. This should not be destroyed by some standardizing institution.

We should now ask whether there are also any reasons to include NNE in teaching English as a mothertongue? Or is it merely the right of the fittest to neglect deviations from their mothertongue? I have already pointed out MacKenzie's observations that many business job applications fail because of only a few linguistic errors. This could lead us to the conclusion that in internationally working American firms one could only succeed with an extremely high command of the English language. However, there are also other observations. Embleton/Hagen (1992: 162) report that several well-known European companies have refused to employ native English-speaking management trainers or consultants because they spoke too quickly, too idiomatically and too unintelligibly, they have preferred Dutch, Swiss and French people speaking excellent International Business English. In other words knowledge of NNE can be vital for native speakers of English on the global market, too. As a consequence, in international conversation native speakers of English should be capable of at

---

[16] I can agree with D'Souza (1986: 6) when he says: "The common core of English (basic grammar and vocabulary and the essential phonemic distinctions) must remain intact if English is to remain English". However, D'Souza doesn't say what he means by *common core*.

least two things[17]:
1. Using **an adequate, not too fast speed of speech and an adequate, not too slurred pronunciation** (which would include a statistical preference of so-called "strong" forms over "weak" forms).
2. Using **expressions whose meanings can be decoded literally** or marking idiomatic and figurative expressions with a phrase such as *as we say*.

In both teaching English as mothertongue and teaching English as a foreign language the following skills should be trained:
1. Learners need to acquire **a metalinguistic knowledge of possible mistakes**. Of course, we cannot teach students all possible English variants of learners with different mothertongues. But we can give a few insights in major areas of systemic and pragmatic differences among languages, or speech communities. Learners and teachers should be familiar with different interlanguage phenomena. We can teach them some sort of sensitivity to enable them to correctly interpret what seems not right in the other's utterance. This also includes a certain awareness of possible invisible misunderstandings.
2. As Cameron (2000: 41; my emphasis) puts it: "The standards that define a 'good communicator' have more to do with the **ethics of interpersonal behaviour** than with traditional linguistic value judgements: valued qualities include clarity, honesty, openness, directness and readiness to listen, but not (or not usually) correctness, elegance or wit".

## 5. Global English for a More Unified Europe and a Better World? Some Socioeconomic Remarks

What are important goals for humans' future? World peace and economic growth (especially in the sense of welfare) for everybody. If we hinder people from having their share of education, freedom, wealth, happiness, the privileged will soon be endangered in their positions as well—as the underprivileged will soon (maybe forcefully) demand that the privileged support them. It is by now a well-known (though frequently neglected) fact, which has often been shown by history, that the only way to secure and increase wealth, work, freedom and happiness is to make sure that others are also wealthy, working, free and happy. In this respect I would also like to remind the reader of two UN documents, namely the Declaration of Rights and the Millennium Project, which was initiated by Nobel Peace Prize winner Kofi Annan.

How can linguistics help in these instances? Language is the most vital human means to transport and exchange information, to convey cultural values, to express feelings, to attract the addressee's attention, to reflect about problems, and to create social bonds—the latter should not be underestimated. How does this relate to global peace and economic growth?
With respect to **global peace** we can state the following:
1. Global peace is secured by a feeling of belonging to a common culture with access to equal rights. A global language helps to achieve this goal.
2. Global peace is endangered if freedom of individual thinking, living, speaking etc. is restricted. Promoting ethnic/national/regional languages helps to prevent this.
3. Global peace is secured by understanding each other. Knowing somebody else's language helps to achieve this goal.
With respect to **economic growth (particularly as to welfare)** we can state the following:
1. Global economic growth is secured by competition and selection of innovative ideas. A

---

[17] For other views see, e.g., Kubota (2001).

global language helps to spread ideas from all parts over all parts of the world.
2. Global economic growth is endangered by monocultural thinking, with a lack of intercultural thinking. Promoting ethnic/national/regional languages helps to prevent this.
3. Global economic growth is secured if humans show empathy for others' ways of thinking. Knowing somebody else's language helps to achieve this goal.

From this I deduce that the linguistic formula for the world's future is **"global triglossia"**. What do I mean by this? The linguist Charles Ferguson has introduced the term *diglossia* to refer the linguistic situation in a speech community where there are two languages with (more or less) clearly distinct functions. "Triglossia" then refers to a situation where there are three languages with distinct functions. "Global triglossia" means that everybody would have to be competent in (at least) their mothertongue, the global language and a third language of their choice[18].

How should the functions be distributed? If we look at the Middle Ages, ideas were exchanged in the following ways: "horizontally", inter-nationally via Latin, "vertically", inter-socially via the respective national language. If two interlocutors do not share a common linguistic code, they always need an interpreter or translator. This slows down the exchange of ideas, contents may be misinterpreted or associations may get lost. A common global language not only minimizes these dangers and simplifies, accelerates and democratizes the exchange of ideas and knowledge, but also the risk of double inventions with time-consuming and expensive parallel ideas is lowered. (Of course, a good administration of information and knowledge is necessary then). However, the problem of different, culture-bound associations will remain, which will make "intercultural training" an important and early component in education.

The acquisition of the "third language", the language of choice, should be included in school curricula. Due to financial reasons schools will, of course, only be able to offer a small selection of languages. But states could allow extra-institutional acquisition of this third language; central exams would then guarantee specific standards.

The question now arises: which language can serve as the global language? For demographic, cultural or economic reasons candidates for a global language are: English, Chinese, Spanish, Arabic, French, Latin, or an artificial language. The following arguments have also been in my article on socioeconomic linguistics (Grzega 2005a). English already is the most widely used lingua franca in all civilizations except Latin America. Even the Japanese automatically switch into English when they speak to a foreigner (even if the foreigner has a fairly good command of Japanese). There are more first and second language speakers of English than of Chinese. Consequently, English is the first choice as a global language.
What are possible counterarguments?
1. It could be said that being "forced" to learn a language is uneconomic. It suffices to translate research results into Global English after the qualitatively best ideas and results have emerged from a national selection. However: this unnecessarily slows down the gain in insights and knowledge, many ideas might be pursued in several nations, in the translation process many misunderstandings may come up.

---

[18]  This resembles a little bit Lüdi's (2002) idea that everyone at the end of his education should be competent in at least three (or four) languages, viz. the region's official language (+ the mothertongue, in case it is not the region's official language) + the neighbor's language + the lingua franca (which must predominantly mastered on a minimum level of communicative competence); however, the opinion on what language should take the role the lingua franca differs from follows here. I also think that it is not necessary to force students to learn the neighbor's language if another idiom would better fulfil their personal needs, goals and wishes.

2.  It could be said that if English is chosen as the global language, one culture is advantaged, all others disadvantaged. It is better to choose Latin or an artificial language such as Latino sine flexione or Esperanto. However: viewing the success of all the artificial languages so far, we have to admit that the attempts to make them used world-wide have failed. Even though all of them have been easier in grammatical and phonetic respects and even though they were less tied to a certain national or regional culture, people have nevertheless chosen "more difficult" and "culture-specific" natural languages with a long history. There is no reason to believe that these things have changed by now. As far as Latin is concerned, it is actually not "culture-free": it is the language of the Catholic church, it is the language of Christianity—just as Arabic is the language of Islam. English, however, is the mothertongue and official language of many religious groups and societies and therefore a better candidate. Moreover, I don't say that the linguistic norms of any one of the English-speaking countries should be adopted automatically. Modiano (2000: 34), for instance, writes: "One possible way to counteract the impact of Anglo-American cultural, linguistic, and ontological imperialism is to develop a form of English which allows Europeans [and I add: also people from other civilizations], when communicating in English, to retain their divergent cultural distinctiveness." To be more blunt: the English we need is an English that is tied to a basic "global" culture that allows finer regional "identities". Elements of such a "global" culture can be, for instance, the contents of the declaration of human rights, modern technology, and international food (Coca Cola type drinks, McDonald's type food, Disney, pizza, coffee etc.)—of course, with varying degrees of prominence in the individual nations of the world.

3.  It could be said that the English language, because of negative associations linked to an imperialistic America, will hardly have a chance of being acknowledged in some regions of the world, such as the Arab world and Latin America. French, on the other hand, has been an accepted language of diplomacy and administration in many parts of the world (Europe, North America, Africa, Middle East). However, in many parts of the world French is not given any important status; plus, we need more than "just" a diplomatic language. This also underscores point 2.

4.  It could be said that English may be prominent at the moment, but that its role is endangered because of developing nations such as China, Arab and some Latin American countries. Looking at the future, Chinese, Arabic or Spanish could also be chosen as the global language. However: English is now tolerated and, to a large degree, fully accepted as a lingua franca in all functions in the Arab world and in the Far East—despite their not unimportant position on the global economic market. This tolerance and acceptance of English has even grown with the economic progress in these countries. Of course, some measures should be taken to increase and retain this acceptance.

This last thought brings us to the next step. If English wants to be accepted as a global lingua franca permanently, the following aspects should be kept in mind as we look back on the fate of other "international" languages in world history, such as Latin, French, Church Slavonic, Persian and Esperanto.

1.  The rise and fall of international languages is connected with the rise and fall of the corresponding culture and its role in economics, politics and way of life. The main argument of Esperanto adherents world-wide is that Esperanto is not linked to any specific culture. On the other hand, artificial languages were also blamed for the same reason. Therefore, a global language must not be classifiable as the "possession" of a national culture, but of a global culture. English language teaching should be organized accordingly. "Authentic material" must also include international communicative situations in which no British, American, Australian etc. native speakers are involved (especially in the field of grammar). This clearly does not mean that we should fix certain

deviations of native standard English as international norms or categorize native variants as errors in Global English. If this were the case, we would be dealing with a new artificial language again that would soon be rejected. What should be done, however, is to provide learners with a useful linguistic and communicative basis that they can quickly acquire. From a certain point onward the use of a general and unique curriculum diminishes. More in-depth learning must more and more respect individual needs.

2. Latin has survived after the fall of the Roman empire because it was the language of a community sharing equal values. Its fall only began when the international language was only mastered by the priviliged social class. Gradually, its functions were taken over by other languages: in the fields of diplomacy (first by French, then by English), international everyday communication (first by French, then by English) and the academics (by English); what had eventually remained was Latin's role as language of the Christian or Roman-Catholic community. This was the end of its role as international language. A language that is only connected with religion cannot remain an international language. This is also proven by the fall of Church Slavonic. English must be well taught in all social groups. Plus, it must be taught for all occasions and functions.

3. Linguae francae not only die when there are no native speakers any longer. A good example is Arabic. The Arabs' mothertongues are national varieties of Arabic. High Arabic (i.e. Classical Arabic with a modernized vocabulary) is taught only secondarily, but it is taught and used comprehensively and permanently. A second example is Chinese. The bracketing element is the graphic system while the phonetic forms that are bound to the graphic forms are multifarious. What the Chinese call dialects would be termed different languages by other peoples. But due to the general presence of the graphic system, all Chinese are provided with a generally intelligible communication system. This system is now endangered, though, due to the gradual introduction of the sound-oriented Latin script. This also makes Global English important.

One problem that will remain, though, is how we should deal with the phenomenon of phonetic, grammatical and lexical change with respect to Global English. I think that Global English must be diachronically flexible if we don't want it to become artificial and dead. Vocabulary changes is understandable and unproblematical when new things come up, but more problematical with semantic changes due to metaphorical and metonymical uses. Grammatical changes will more likely result in a simplification, or regularization, of forms, less likely in the development of new irregular forms or new categories. Thus, Global English may in the future simplify the variability of *he writes ~ he write* to *he write* only. It is very unclear, however, how pronunciation will develop. It seems that some sort of normative, but descriptive institution would have to check, say every 30th year what has developed as unproblematical variants in lingua-franca-communication. The questions is: should the result be (a) an adoption to developments in native English(es) or (b) an adoption to variants of prestigious non-native nations or individuals or (c) marking some forms (especially phonetic forms) as divergence dangers which lead away from the original Global English? In case (c) we risk that there will be a split like the one between Latin and French, in case (b) we risk that there will be a split like the one between French and Italian, in case (a) we risk that it is again one specific nation that would constantly function as a model. The usual case in first language speech communities is that some prestigious subgroups or individuals come up with new variants that are then secondarily adopted by the entire speech community and tertiarily by the norming institution. Case (b) is thus the most natural one even if it means that the gap between native English and Global English may some day widen to a degree that we would face two languages: English and Globalese. But this would only speak in favor of this modal as Globalese would then really be a universal means of communication detached from any national culture.

## 6.  Final Remarks

To sum up: "Global triglossia", i.e. (Global) English + mothertongue + third language, contributes best to world peace and global economic growth (especially welfare). Everybody needs to acquire at least a stage of **Basic** Global English at a comparatively early age. Teaching English, i.e. Teaching Basic Global English, will also require from teachers to change objectives for less advanced learner groups. The success of the learners' goals must be put in the foreground (and this means primarily being able to communicate in international speaker-hearer situations). For native speakers of English, Global English means speaking distinctly (although this may appear unnatural to them) and avoiding expressions that are only understandable with a cultural background of their country. As I've already pointed out, I am about to present a first draft of my idea of Basic Global English in the forthcoming weeks.

People in high official positions (politicians and researchers) need acquire still another skill. They must be able to express their ideas and results at least in (Global) English and their mothertongue not only in technical language but also in general, everyday language. This facilitates additional velocity and connection of ideas—especially from an interdisciplinary perspective.

*Joachim Grzega*
*Englische Sprachwissenschaft*
*Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt*
*85071 Eichstätt, Germany*
*joachim.grzega@ku-eichstaett.de*
*or:*
*Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität*
*48143 Münster, Germany*
*grzega@uni-muenster.de*
*www.grzega.de*

## References

Ammon, Ulrich (2000), "Towards More Fairness in International English: Linguistic Rights of Non-Native Speakers?", in: Philippson, Robert (ed.), *Rights to Language: Equality, Power, and Education*, 111-116, Mahwah (N.Jers.). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brumfit, Christopher J. (2002), *Global English and Language Teaching in the Twenty-First Century*, Centre for Language in Eudcation Occasional Paper No. 59, University of Southampton.

Cameron, Deborah (2000), "Good to Talk? The Cultural Politics of 'Communication'", *The European English Messenger* 9,1: 38-43.

Chaudenson, Robert (2001), "Rapport de synthèse", in: Chaudenson, Robert (ed.), *L'Europe parlera-t-elle anglais demain?*, 139-157, Paris: L'Harmattan.

CHEL = Hogg, Richard M. et al. (eds.) (1999-2001), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheshire, Jenny (2002), "Who We Are and Where We're Going: Language and Identities in the New Europe", in: Gubbins, Paul et al. (eds.), *Beyond Boundaries. Language and Identity in Contemporary Europe*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Davies, Alan / Hamp-Lyons, Liz / Kemp, Charlotte (2003), "Whose Norms? International Proficiency Tests in English", *World Englishes* 22,4: 572-584.

Dretzke, Burkhard (1985), *Fehlerbewertung im Aussprachebereich: Objektive Fehlerbeurteilung versus subjektive Fehlerbewertung – eine Untersuchung von Aussprachefehlern deutscher Anglistikstudenten in der Zielsprache Englisch*, Hamburg: Buske.

D'Souza, Jean (1986), "Codification of Non-Native English: Is It Necessary/Possible?", *Studies in the Linguistic*

*Sciences* 16,1: 1-11.

Edmondson, Willis / House, Juliane (1991), "Do Learners Talk Too Much? The Waffle Phenomenon in Interlanguage Pragmatics", in: Phillipson 1991: 273-287.

Embleton, Doug / Hagen, Stephen (1992), *Language in International Business: A Practical Guide*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Firth, Alan (1996), "The Discursive Accomplishment of Normality: On 'Lingua Franca' English and Conversation Analysis", *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 237-259.

Gnutzmann, Claus / Intemann, Frauke (eds.) (2005), *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Görlach, Manfred (2001), *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms: A Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen European Languages*, Oxford: University Press.

Götz, Dieter (1977), "Analyse einer in der Fremdsprache (Englisch) durchgeführten Konversation", in: Hunfeld, Hans (ed.), *Neue Perspektiven der Fremdsprachendidaktik*, 71-81, Kronberg: Scriptor.

Graddol, David (2001), "The Future of English as a European Language", *The European English Messenger* 10,2: 47-55.

Greenbaum, Sidney (ed.) (1996), *Comparing English Worldwide: The International Corpus of English*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Grzega, Joachim (2000), "On the Description of National Varieties: Examples from (German and Austrian) German and (English and American) English", *Linguistik Online* 7 (http://www.linguistik-online.de).

Grzega, Joachim (2004), "Why We Need an Internet Venue for Studying European Language Culture", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 1: 1-8.

Grzega, Joachim (2005a), "Socioeconomic Linguistics (or Linguistic Socioeconomics—a New Field of European and Global Research and Teaching", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 2: 19-43.

Grzega, Joachim (2005c), "Towards Global English Via Basic Global English (BGE): Socioeconomic and Pedagogic Ideas for a European and Global Language (with Didactic Examples for Native Speakers of German)", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 2: 65ff.

Hansen, Klaus / Carls, Uwe / Lucko, Peter (1996), *Die Differenzierung des Englischen in nationale Varianten*, Berlin: Schmidt.

House, Juliane (1999), "Misunderstanding in Intercultural Communication: Interaction in English as a Lingua Franca and the Myth of Mutual Intelligibility", in: Gnutzmann, Claus (ed.) (1999), *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language*, 73-89, Tübingen: Stauffenberg.

House, Juliane (2002), "Pragmatic Competence in Lingua Franca English", in: Knapp, Karlfried / Meierkord, Christiane (eds.) (2002), *Lingua Franca Communication*, 245-267, Frankfurt (Main): Peter Lang.

Hultfors, Pär (1986-1987), *Reactions to Non-Native English: Native English-Speakers' Assessments of Errors in the Use of English Made by Non-Native Users of the Language*, 2 vols., [Stockholm Studies in English 67 & 71], Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

James, Allan (2000), "English as a European Lingua Franca: Current Realities and Existing Dichotomies", in: Cenoz, Jasone / Jessner, Ulrike (eds.), *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*, 22-37, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

James, Carl (1998), *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*, Harlow: Pearson Education.

Jaworski, Adam (1990), "The Acquisition and Perception of Formulaic Language and Foreign Language Teaching", *Multilingua* 9,4: 397-411.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2000), *The Phonology of English as an International Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2003), *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*, London: Routledge.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2004), "ELF at the Gate: The Position of English as a Lingua Franca", *The European English Messenger* 13,2: 63-69.

Jenkins, Jennifer (in press), "Glocal Intelligibility and Local Diversity: Possibility or Paradox?", in: Rubdi// Saraceni (in press).

Jenkins, Jennifer / Modiano, Marko / Seidlhofer, Barbara (2001), "Euro-English", *English Today* 17,4: 13-19.

Jenkins, Jennifer / Seidlhofer, Barbara (2001), "Bringing Europe's lingua franca into the classroom", *The Guardian Weekly* 18 April 2001.

Jenner, Bryan R. (1987), "Articulation and Phonation in Non-Native English: The Example of Dutch-English", *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 17,2: 125-138.

Johnson, Christine / Bartlett, Catherine (1999), "International Business English—What Should We Be Teaching?", *BESIG Business Issues* 3/1999: 8-10.

Kasper, Gabriele (1981), *Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimssprache*, Tübingen: Narr.

Kirkpatrick, Andy (2000), "It Is Time for East and Southeast Asia to Learn Its Own Version of English", *The Guardian Weekly* 23 November 2000.

Knapp, Karlfried / Meierkord, Christiane (eds.) (2002), *Lingua Franca Communication*, Frankfurt (Main): Lang.

Kubota, Ryoka (2001), "Teaching world Englishes to native speakers of English in the USA", *World Englishes* 20,1: 47-64.

Lesznyák, Ágnes (2002), "From Chaos to the Smallest Common Denominator: Topic Management in English Lingua Franca Communication", in: Knapp/Meierkord 2002: 163-193.

Lesznyák, Ágnes (2003), *Dynamism Versus Stability: Nonnative Speaker Discourse in a Lingua Franca and a Foreign Language Context*, unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation.

Lesznyák, Ágnes (2004), *Communication in English as an International Lingua Franca: An Exploratory Case Study*, Norderstedt: Books on Demand.

Lüdi, Georges (2002), "Braucht Europa eine lingua franca?", *Basler Schriften zur europäischen Integration* 60: 7-29.

MacKenzie, Ian (2003), "English as a Lingua Franca and European Universities", *The European English Messenger* 12,1: 59-62.

Mauranen, Anna (2003), "The Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in International Settings", *TESOL Quarterly* 37,3: 513-527.

McCluskey, Brian (2002), "English as a Lingua Franca for Europe", *The European English Messenger* 11,2: 40-45.

McKay, Sandra Lee (2002), *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meierkord, Christiane (1996), *Englisch als Medium der interkulturellen Kommunikation: Untersuchungen zum non-native/non-native-speakers-Diskurs*, [Europäische Hochschulschriften – Angelsächische Sprache und Literatur 308], Frankfurt (Main) etc.: Lang.

Meierkord, Christiane / Knapp, Karlfried (2002), "Approaching Lingua Franca Communication", in: Knapp/Meierkord 2002: 9-28.

Melchers, Gunnel / Shaw, Philip (2003), *World Englishes*, London: Arnold.

Modiano, Marko (1996), "The Americanization of Euro-English", *World Englishes* 15,2: 207-215.

Modiano, Marko (1998), "The Emergence of Mid-Atlantic English in the European Union", in: Lundquist, Hans et al. (eds.), *The Major Varieties of English: Papers from MAVEN 97*, 241-248, Växjö: Acta Wexionensia.

Modiano, Marko (1999a), "Cultural Pluralism in an English-Speaking European Union", in: Loeb, Monica / Potter, Gerald (eds.), *Dangerous Crossing: Papers on Transgression in Literature and Culture*, 97-103, Umeå: Umeå Studies in the Humanities.

Modiano, Marko (1999b), "International English in the Global Village", *English Today* 4/1999: 22-27.

Modiano, Marko (1999c), "Standard English(es) and Educational Practices for the World's Lingua Franca", *English Today* 10/1999: 3-13.

Modiano, Marko (2000), "Euro-English: Educational Standards in a Cross-Cultural Context", *The European English Messenger* 9,1: 33-37.

Murray, Heather (2003), "Swiss English Teachers and Euro-English: Attitudes to a Non-Native Variety," *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée* 77: 147-175.

Ogden, Charles K. (1930), *BASIC English: A General Introduction with Rules and Grammar*, London: Paul Treber.

Phillipson, Robert et al. (eds.) (1991), *Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research: A Commemorative Volume for Claus Færch*, [Multilingual Matters 64], Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Piette, Adam (2004), "Communication, Culture, Community, and the Idea of Europe", *The European English Messenger* 13,1: 18-23.

Romero Trillo, Jesús (2002), "The Pragmatic Fossilization of Discourse Markers in Non-Native Speakers of English", *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 769-784.

Rubdi, Randi / Saraceni, Mario (eds.) (in press), *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*, Bangkok: IELE Press at Assumption University.

Schwartz, Joan (1980), "The Negotiation for Meaning: Repair in Conversations Between Second Language Learners of English", in: Larsen-Freeman, Diane (eds.), *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research*, 138-153, Rowley (Mass.): Newbury House.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2001a), "Closing the Conceptual Gap: The Case for a Description of English as a Lingua Franca", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11,2: 133-158.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2001b), "Brave New English", *The European English Messenger* 10,1: 42-48.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2001c), "Towards Making 'Euro-English' a Linguistic Reality", *English Today* 17,4: 14-16.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2003), "English for Europe, or European English?", in: Ahrens, Rüdiger (ed.), *Europäische Sprachpolitik/European Language Policy*, 123-138, Heidelberg: Winter.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2004), "Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209-239.

Sellner, Manfred (2003), "Waei (Japanisches Englisch) als Lingua Franca und in der interkulturellen Kommunikation", lecture held at the 31st Österreichische Linguistiktagung in Vienna, 6 Dec 2003.

Sneyd, Michael (2001), "International Business English", lecture held at the University of Eichstätt, 2001.

Strevens, Peter (1992), "English as an International Language: Directions in the 90s", in: Kachru, Braj B. (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*, 2nd ed., 27-42, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Tannen, Deborah (1985), "Cross-Cultural Communication", in: Dijk, Teun van (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 4, 203-215, London: Academic Press.

Thomas, Jenny (1983), "Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure", *Applied Linguistics* 4: 91-112.

Trudgill, Peter / Hannah, Jean (2002), *International English: A Guide to Varieties of Standard English*, 4th ed., London: Arnold.

Varonis, Evangeline / Gass Susan (1985), "Non-Native/Non-Native Conversations: A Model for Negotiation of Meaning", *Applied Linguistics* 6: 71-90.

Wagner, Johannes / Firth, Alan (1997), "Communication Strategies at Work", in: Kasper, Gabriele / Kellerman, Eric (eds.), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 323-344, London: Longman.

Yule, George (1990), "Interactive Conflict Resolution in English", *World Englishes* 9,1: 53-62.