Edinburgh Research Explorer

Global Englishes language teaching

Global Englishes Language Teaching: Bottom-up Curriculum Implementation

NICOLA GALLOWAY AND TAKUYA NUMAJIRI
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh, Scotland

In today's globalised world, the needs of English language learners have changed, particularly those learning to use the English language as a lingua franca. Growing research showcasing the global use of English as a lingua franca (ELF), the creativity of ELF users, and the diverse ways in which they negotiate successful communication in multilingual encounters has numerous implications for the field of TESOL. This article reports on a study with preservice and in-service TESOL practitioners taking a Global Englishes for Language Teaching (GELT) option course in a 1-year Master's in TESOL programme at a Russell Group university in the United Kingdom. The study explores attitudes towards GELT but also towards the proposals for, and barriers to, curriculum innovation as well as factors influencing such attitudes. Interviews ($n = 21$) and questionnaires ($n = 47$) revealed that attitudes remain norm bound, yet the study revealed a positive orientation towards GELT and provided insights into the feasibility of GELT-related curriculum innovation and teacher education syllabus design. The study calls for more research with preservice and in-service TESOL practitioners at different stages of the innovation process to ensure successful and sustainable GELT curricular innovation.

With increased globalisation, the most common use of English today is English as a lingua franca (ELF). Such a shift in usage and the evolution of English into a global language require a reconceptualisation of TESOL curricula as well as the language itself. ELF users communicate with people from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds in transient encounters, utilise their multilingual repertoires, and use the English language in creative ways, going beyond the "native" English speaker code introduced in "traditional" TESOL curricula. Growing research within the Global Englishes paradigm provides education policy makers, curriculum planners, practitioners, materials writers, and test writers alike with a wealth of data on how the

language functions as a global lingua franca. The growth in the importance of communicativeness, and the need to expose students to "real" and "authentic" language, prompted an earlier paradigm shift towards communicative language teaching (CLT) in the 1970s. This shift towards communicative views of language learning related to sociopolitical changes and an increasingly mobile community of speakers that highlighted a need to be able to communicate languages. However, we have witnessed further globalisation and the entrenchment of English as a global language used by speakers from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds. The needs of English language learners have changed; for many today, real and authentic use of English is as a lingua franca with speakers from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds. CLT may have been "the most significant development within ELT over the last 50 years" and "generally regarded as a clear paradigmatic break with the past" (Hall, 2016, p. 214), but we have yet to witness a movement away from native-English-speaking norms. Needs remain diverse, of course, and, for some, "native" English norms may be relevant. However, for the majority, the target interlocutor will not be a native English speaker. New needs require new goals; multilingualism is now the norm and, if a learner's goal is to learn how to function in multilingual contexts, then a TESOL curriculum focusing on target language structures and fixed native norms is not aligned with such a goal. This article responds to the need for a further paradigm shift in TESOL, one that promotes a more global ownership of the English language and places much less emphasis on native norms.

The need to reconceptualise TESOL curricula in light of the global spread of English is gathering momentum, particularly in the field of Global Englishes. Curriculum innovation is, however, a complex process, particularly given the conceptual transition it requires of the E in TESOL. Promoting a new ontological view of language and language teaching may also be daunting for some practitioners, and in the TESOL community, native English norms prevail. To encourage bottom-up innovation, we report on a study conducted with preservice and in-service TESOL practitioners, those who will be involved in the innovation process—the receivers of the innovation. Growing interest in the pedagogical implications of Global Englishes has prompted research into TESOL practitioners' attitudes towards Global Englishes, both in general and regarding curriculum innovation. However, although applied linguists and language educationalists increasingly acknowledge the need for change, until recently a concrete plan for achieving this has been lacking and practitioners' attitudes have not been examined in the wider context of curriculum.

Thus, this study aims to aid the paradigm shift away from native English norms by explicitly exploring the proposals put forward for

change. Compatibility (Rogers, 2003) is an important factor in ensuring successful and sustained innovation. In order to contribute to a bottom-up and context-sensitive approach to curriculum innovation, we examined pre- and in-service practitioner attitudes towards the very proposals being put forward for pedagogical change in the Global Englishes literature as well as the factors influencing these attitudes to gain an in-depth understanding of what moulds their attitudes. Our exploration of the barriers to change identified in the literature also aimed to provide a contextualised understanding of what this new paradigm shift may entail in order to shed light on the Global Englishes for Language Teaching (GELT) curriculum innovation process.

In an *enacted curriculum* (Richards, 2017), practitioners individualise curricula to suit their contexts. Our study aimed to investigate whether innovations discussed at the theoretical level are feasible and how they may have to adapt to fit the local setting. Conducted with those taking a GELT course on an MSc TESOL, the study also formed part of a needs analysis to inform syllabus design at the start of the course. Examining possible barriers to innovation also provides directions for future research.

GLOBAL ENGLISHES

Global Englishes (GE) is an umbrella term inclusive of research in the diverse but overlapping fields of World Englishes, ELF, English as an international language (EIL), and translanguaging and plurilingualism (Rose & Galloway, 2019). Scholars in the field of World Englishes (cf. B. Kachru, Kachru, & Nelson, 2006), ELF (cf. Seidlhofer, 2011), EIL (cf. Alsagoff, McKay, Hu, & Renandya, 2012; Matsuda, 2012), and translanguaging (cf. Canagarajah, 2013; Garcia, 2009) highlight the pluricentricity of English, how it functions in today's globalised world, and how it has a global ownership. In language contact situations, speakers use their plurilingual resources and hybrid language practices to communicate, and an integrated view of languages has emerged, evident in the proliferation of such terms as *polylanguaging* (Jørgensen, 2010), *translanguaging* (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; E. Garcia, 2009; O. García & Wei, 2014), *plurilingualism* (Canagarajah, 2011), *contemporary urban vernaculars* (Rampton, 2011), *translingualism* (Canagarajah, 2013), *metrolingualism* (Pennycook, 2010; Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015), and *lingua franca multilingualism* (Makoni & Pennycook, 2012). This new orientation to language, one that views it in a more dynamic and multifaceted way and recognises how users of the language are creative and adapt to different speakers and situations, has numerous implications for TESOL. It is an ontological view of language that is also

gaining ground in the field of second language acquisition, where multilingualism has been at the forefront of recent discussions. "Multilingualism, it seems, is the topic du jour—at least in critical applied linguistics" (May, 2014, p. 1). This has been referred to as the multilingual turn (May, 2014) and is a movement in which Global Englishes can be situated. Thus, even if the object of instruction is presented as one static native variety of the language, there is increased recognition that acquiring a language in today's globalised world is the acquisition of multilingual/translingual and cultural competencies.

Scholars in all of these fields have discussed the implications of their research for pedagogy and, as such, despite their different orientations, they have been identified as having a similar underlying ideology and placed under the Global Englishes umbrella term. Growing interest in the pedagogical implications of the globalisation of English is evident in the publication of entire books on the topic (Alsagoff et al., 2012; Galloway, 2017; Matsuda, 2012, 2017; McKay, 2002; McKay & Brown, 2016; Rose & Galloway, 2019), sections on TESOL in Global Englishes books (Galloway & Rose, 2015; Jenkins, 2015; Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2007, 2010; Seidlhofer, 2011), articles related to Global Englishes in language teaching journals (Cameron & Galloway, 2019; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Fang & Ren, 2018; Galloway & Rose, 2014, 2018; Jenkins, 2012; Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011; Rose & Galloway, 2017; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018; Sung, 2015; Suzuki, 2011; Syrbe & Rose, 2018), and articles on TESOL in Global Englishes journals (Berns, 2015; Galloway & Rose, 2013; Pullin, 2015). In recent years we have also witnessed reference to Global Englishes in TESOL practitioner books. Hall (2016), for example, includes chapters on World Englishes and ELF, others refer to ELF as a phenomenon (McDonough, Shaw, & Masuhara, 2013), and some refer to World Englishes and ELF research specifically (Harmer, 2007; McDonough et al., 2013; McGrath, 2013), albeit in a superficial manner.

GLOBAL ENGLISHES LANGUAGE TEACHING

Proposals for change have been categorized under six broad proposals, referred to as the GELT proposals (Galloway, 2011; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019). These include: increasing World Englishes and ELF exposure in language curricula; emphasising respect for multilingualism in ELT; raising awareness of Global Englishes in ELT; raising awareness of ELF strategies in language curricula; emphasising respect for diverse culture and identity in ELT, and changing English teacher hiring practices in the ELT industry. In addition to putting forward proposals for change, several scholars have

conceptualised the differences between the "traditional" TESOL curricula and curricula that are more reflective of how the language is used today (Canagarajah, 2005, 2013; Galloway, 2011, 2017; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Jenkins, 2006, 2009, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019; Seidlhofer, 2011). The main principles of EIL teaching have also been outlined (McKay, 2002, 2003, 2012; McKay & Brown, 2016), and there have been calls for *plurilingual pedagogies* within the field of plurilingualism (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013; Lin, 2013). Recent publications also include lesson plans (Galloway, 2017; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Matsuda, 2012, 2017). Proposals include calls for increased exposure to the diversity of English, multilingualism, and the strategies used in successful ELF encounters in order to emphasise respect for diverse cultures and to decrease the focus on native English norms in practitioner recruitment. The GELT framework (Galloway, 2011, 2017; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019) builds on these proposals and was created to provide a usable framework for curriculum innovation and research purposes. It aimed to consolidate interconnected themes in a reader-friendly format and was originally informed by similar comparisons to traditional approaches to teaching English (Canagarajah, 2005; Jenkins, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2004).

In GELT, language is promoted not as being fixed, bound, and constituting fixed grammatical structures, but as constantly in a state of flux, and there is recognition that there are no clear boundaries between languages. The notion of languaging is important, and practitioners are encouraged to provide learners with opportunities to develop strategies to navigate multilingual encounters. It encourages practitioners to present a new orientation to language in the TESOL curriculum, introducing students to the idea of a flexible language and one that is used in dynamic and multifaceted ways. Learner agency is central, and learners are encouraged to draw on all the languages they have at their disposal and to be creative with the language, given that they are likely to adapt it to suit their purposes of communication in the future. The aims are to prepare learners for multilingual and multicultural communication and empower them by validating their entire linguistic repertoire. Language proficiency and competency are not measured with reference to native norms, the goal is not to acquire native or near-native competence, and it aims to foster intercultural communicative competence. A shift in perspectives of language proficiency and assessment criteria is central. The washback effect of criteria based on native norms is likely to stifle innovation attempts, yet GELT does not aim to replace one standard with another. The very idea of a 'standard' is incompatible with the fluid nature of ELF use; communicative competence, not accuracy according to a standard, is key. It aims to reflect the increasing

interconnectedness of our world and expose students to how English functions today as a lingua franca in multilingual scenarios. It also encourages a critical approach, examining the impact of the dominance of standard language ideology and native-speakerism in learners' contexts. With a focus on meaningful tasks, learner autonomy, and language in use, not form, GELT seems compatible with CLT. Indeed, GELT and CLT share many of the same fundamental principles, with an overall goal of developing an ability to communicate in the English language. Authentic activities and tasks are promoted in both, and learners' needs are central. However, in CLT, communicative competence is based on native English norms and a further paradigm break is needed.

CURRICULUM INNOVATION

Curriculum innovation is a complex process, and several models have been proposed showing the phases and factors involved. In the field of TESOL, Wedell (2003) and White, Martin, Stimson, and Hodge (1991) provide guidance to practitioners and curriculum designers. To date, researchers have focused on general attitudes towards Global Englishes. However, in order to achieve successful and sustainable innovation, it is important to explore this in the context of curriculum. Others have discussed curriculum theory in relation to the global spread of English (cf. Alsagoff et al., 2012) and the implications for curriculum studies of research into multilingualism and translanguaging have also been discussed (Sembiante, 2016). Such contributions are helpful, but research is needed on attitudes towards innovations being discussed in the literature to explore the feasibility of GELT. In this study, we draw on curriculum innovation literature to explore the process, and feasibility, of moving towards GELT as well as the complexities surrounding introducing this perspective into ELT classrooms.

Relative Advantage

The greater the perceived relative advantage (Rogers, 2003), the greater the chance that an innovation will be adopted. Potential adopters "want to know the degree to which a new idea is better than an existing practice" (Rogers, 2003, p. 233). The increasing body of literature outlining GELT and the increasing research reporting the positive influence of GELT on English language learners' attitudes (Galloway 2011, 2013, 2017; Galloway & Rose, 2013; Sung, 2015) is promising, as are the increasing calls for the incorporation of a Global Englishes perspective

into TESOL practitioner education (Blair, 2015; Dewey, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019; Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2018). However, potential adopters may not "perceive an innovation in a positive light, as we ourselves may perceive it" (Rogers, 2003 p. 116). Research on the feasibility of GELT, how it may be received, and how it may have to be adapted is crucial. This can also contribute to teacher education course planning, where the relative advantage may have to be emphasised further.

Context

The *culture*, or context, into which the innovation is to be implemented is another important consideration. *Compatibility* (Rogers, 2003) refers to the degree to which an innovation is consistent with the "existing values, past experiences, and needs of potential adopters" (p. 15). An innovation that is more compatible will be more readily accepted than one that is not, and much can be learned from studies on previous innovation attempts, particularly with regard to CLT. Fullan (2007) identifies three broad phases of curriculum innovation: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. A successful GELT innovation strategy requires consideration of such institutional factors from the outset. "The questions to be dealt with here are concerned with clarifying the current situation *before* looking to the future" (White et al., 1991, p. 172), and this is something the present study seeks to address. Research on current pedagogical approaches, resources, educational culture, institution type, the norms and beliefs of key stakeholders, and other factors can shed light on potential barriers to GELT. Those identified to date include language assessment, attachment to "standard" English, teacher education, lack of materials, and teacher recruitment practices (Galloway, 2011; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019). However, research is needed on TESOL practitioners' attitudes towards these, and only a few researchers report on their experiences introducing a GELT perspective. In Australia, Manara (2014) reported on her own experience teaching EIL, noting a resistance and questioning of its usefulness in contexts with tests using standard norms. Giri and Foo (2014) found a similar resistance in Japan in their study with one nonnative-English-speaking teacher, highlighting attachments to native-English-speaking norms. Similar barriers have been identified in the field of translanguaging with regard to implementing a more flexible multilingual education. Weber (2014), for example, refers to "major pedagogical and attitudinal obstacles" (p. 186). Normative beliefs are clearly problematic for GELT, and in both Conteh and Meier (2014) and May (2014), two books with the phrase *multilingual turn* in the title, there are

discussions on the dominance of monolingual ideology and the lack of support for practitioners in schools (Meier, 2017). Implementing change is challenging, and consideration of context-specific factors is necessary to maximise the opportunity for sustainable innovation.

Practitioner Education and Attitudes

Some studies have been conducted on the attitudes of those taking Global Englishes practitioner education courses. Suzuki's (2011) study in Japan with three student teachers found that attitudes to English varied according to past exposure and knowledge of "nonnative" English. Instruction in the diversity of English influenced attitudes, and all agreed on raising learners' awareness of the pluralistic nature of English, yet how to approach this was not explored and the only barrier identified was standard language ideology. Although not taking a Global Englishes course, Doan's (2014) Vietnam-based study using interviews with 11 lecturers on a practitioner education course called for an inclusive EIL paradigm that endorses the diversity of English. Implementation was not explored in any depth, yet Doan concluded that "in the absence of practical know-hows" the default option is to "teach the culture(s) of the native speaker" (p. 87).

In Christopher, Rachel, Shu, Yuan, and Xu (2013), teachers entertained the idea of a *plurilithic* ontology of English, yet attachments to native norms prevailed regarding ELT. Criticisms were raised of standardised tests focusing on monolithic target varieties and societally induced beliefs about the nature of grammar as a monolithic system, although barriers to innovation were not explored in depth. The authors designed a course to raise awareness of the plurilithic nature of English, which triggered a change in beliefs. However, attachments to a monolithic view of English were evident, and the authors concluded that, without a change in teachers' ontologies of English, it is premature to expect major changes in practice.

Vettorel (2016) also aimed to investigate whether a WE- and ELF-aware teacher education module can influence preservice teachers' attitudes in Italy. The course raised awareness of the issues, influenced their attitudes, and some were ready to move towards this new approach. Unlike other studies, participants were asked to reflect on potential barriers. The important role of grammar and error correction, the need to provide learners with a standard reference model, the lack of materials, perceived difficulty for the students, the sheer number of varieties of English, and lack of time were highlighted, which were noted to concur with those barriers identified by Author 1 and Other (Galloway & Rose, 2015).

Lopriore's (2016) study in Italy with trainees taking a teacher education course that introduced ELF samples and literature and implications for pedagogy found that participants were keen to explore new ways of teaching English inclusive of World Englishes and ELF but lacked ways to improve learners' negotiating strategies. The focus again was on the influence of course instruction, yet some difficulties with innovation were briefly mentioned, including limited time and lack of materials.

In Turkey, Dilek and Özdemir (2015) found preservice teachers to be more open towards ELF and more likely to question the normative perspective of ELT. ELF instruction and familiarity with ELF had a positive effect, and the authors called for the inclusion of an ELF-aware approach in practitioner education. Sifakis and Bayyurt's (2015, 2018) teacher education project raised participants' awareness of their deep-rooted convictions and helped them explore new perspectives. Participants were enthusiastic, but many continued to resort to traditional methods when teaching. In an adaption of this study with 10 senior pre-service teachers taking a university-level ELF-aware teacher education programme, Kemaloğlu-Er and Bayyurt (2018) found that ELF-aware pedagogy was introduced in different ways when microteaching and in real-life situations where they felt the pressure of native and standard English norms.

Practitioner education is an important factor to consider in the curriculum innovation process. The growth in English for academic purposes (EAP) has led to a need for EAP-oriented teacher education programmes (Basturkmen & Wette, 2016), the demand for which is likely to increase with the growing global phenomenon of English-medium instruction in higher education in non-Anglophone contexts. Similarly, the globalisation of the English language has implications for TESOL practitioner education, and many postgraduate TESOL and applied linguistics programmes now offer Global Englishes components (see Table 1). A range of courses are on offer, and although the studies above provide insights into the influence of such courses and syllabus design, research is needed on attitudes towards the specific proposals for change being put forward at the theoretical level as well as the feasibility of implementing GELT innovation in diverse teaching contexts.

THE STUDY

The study was conducted with pre-service and in-service TESOL practitioners taking a GELT course in a 1-year master's in TESOL programme at a Russell Group university in the United Kingdom,

TABLE 1

Postgraduate TESOL and Applied Linguistics Programmes Offering a Global Englishes Component

Country	University	Programme		Module
United Kingdom	University of Bath	MA	TESOL	Teaching and Assessing English as an International Language
	University of Bristol	MSc	TESOL	Globalisation and the Politics of English
	University of Durham	MA	Applied Linguistics for TESOL	Global Englishes
	University College London (UCL)	MA	TESOL	English in Diverse World Contexts
	UCL Institution of Education	MA	TESOL	English in Diverse World Contexts
	Birkbeck, University of London	MA	TESOL	Language, Culture and Communication
	King's College, London	MA	TESOL	Sociolinguistics: World Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca and Implications for ELT
	University of Cambridge	MPhil/ MEd	Research in Second Language Education	Policy Context: International Perspectives on Language Education Policy and Multilingualism
	Newcastle University	MA	Applied linguistics and TESOL	English in the World: Global and Cross Cultural Issues Surrounding English as a Lingua Franca
	University of Glasgow	MSc	TESOL	Which English? Language Teaching and Sociolinguistics
	University of Edinburgh	MSc	TESOL	Global Englishes for Language Teaching
	University of Southampton	MA	ELT/TESOL Studies	English as a World Language
		MA	Global Englishes	* The programme addresses various key issues in Global Englishes
	University of London School of Oriental and African Studies	BA	Linguistics	Issues in World Englishes
	University of Kent	BA	English Language and Linguistics	Global Englishes
United States	International Center, University of Florida	BA	Linguistics	World Englishes
	Arizona State University	MA	Linguistics and Applied Linguistics	World Englishes
Sweden	Uppsala University	MA	English Studies	Syllabus for World Englishes

Table 1 *(Continued)*

Country	University	Programme		Module
Italy	University of Verona	MA	Comparative European and Non-European Languages and Literatures	Varieties of English
Norway	University of Oslo	MA	Linguistics and Its Applications for a Multilingual Society	Global English
Turkey	Bogazici University	MA	English Language Education	World Englishes
China	Shantou University	MA	English Language and Literature	Global Englishes
	University of Hong Kong	MA	English Studies	Global Englishes
Vietnam	Vietnam National University, Hanoi	BA	English Language Teacher Education	World Englishes
Japan	Chukyo University	MA	World Englishes	English as an International Academic Language
	Seisen University	MA	Global Citizenship	World Englishes
	Tamagawa		Campus-wide programme	English as a Lingua Franca
Australia	University of Sydney	MA	Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics and TESOL	World Englishes
	Monash University	BA	English as an International Language	Englishes in the Global Context

designed and delivered by one of the authors. It aimed to contribute to the growing body of research on practitioner attitudes towards Global Englishes but aimed to take this further, examining its relevance and feasibility in their familiar TESOL contexts. By explicitly exploring proposals for curriculum innovation, the study aims to provide insights into the potential of GELT-related curriculum innovation. Data were collected at the start of the course, which also aimed to inform syllabus design.

The Setting

The master's programme attracts pre- and in-service TESOL practitioners (those with and without teaching experience), the majority of whom are from China. The GELT option course was introduced in 2013. The 8-week course includes weekly lectures and workshops covering the following topics: the history of English, language variation, Global Englishes (World Englishes, EIL, ELF, translanguaging, and the multilingual turn), the role of English in different contexts and domains, language attitudes, identity, ELT, GELT, English-medium

instruction, and the future of English (and ELT). The GELT framework facilitates reflection on familiar TESOL contexts.

Research Design

The data were gathered from students at the start of the course from two cohorts in 2016 and 2017. An online questionnaire ($n = 47$) was administered via SurveyMonkey, and interviews ($n = 21$) were conducted in the same week and a pilot study in 2015 ($n = 20$). The pilot results were not used in the main study. The questionnaire included open and closed questions and attitudes towards GELT and to the course, and the GELT proposals and barriers were explored using a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). Semistructured interviews started with questions about language learning and/or teaching backgrounds, followed by questions about GELT and the proposals and barriers.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analysed with SPSS version 22. Qualitative analysis was conducted in NVivo 11. Qualitative data sets (interviews and open-ended questionnaire responses) were analysed separately, and the data were coded and analysed inductively to develop thematic frameworks before being cross-compared.

Limitations

The questionnaire sample was relatively small ($n = 47$), so nonparametric tests were used (Mann-Whitney U-test, Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test, and Kendall's tau correlation). Interviews enabled a deeper investigation. The possible influence of the researcher/course instructor cannot be denied, yet the data were collected unobtrusively, anonymity was protected, participation was voluntary, and data collection did not influence course grades. Because it was an elective course, participants may have had more favourable attitudes towards GELT, but the aim was to gain insights into curriculum innovation, not into the topic. The majority of respondents were also preservice TESOL practitioners, although their attitudes are deemed to be just as essential to explore curriculum innovation at the institutional, department, and course level, given their experience as language learners and their role as future practitioners, as well as the large number of preservice

practitioners on TESOL training programmes. Furthermore, in the interviews, 12 had more than 1 year of teaching experience.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Participant Overview

The majority of participants were female ($n = 41$), under the age of 30 ($n = 42$), and from China ($n = 35$). Other countries of origin included Indonesia ($n = 3$), the United Kingdom ($n = 3$), Hong Kong ($n = 2$), the United States ($n = 1$), Malaysia ($n = 1$), Japan ($n = 1$), and Thailand ($n = 1$). Prior to commencing the programme, the majority had no experience of living abroad ($n = 20$), although some had less than 1 month ($n = 9$), 1–6 months ($n = 10$), 7 months to 1 year ($n = 3$), 1–3 years ($n = 1$), and more than 3 years ($n = 4$). About a quarter did not have any teaching experience, but most had some, including less than 1 month ($n = 8$), 1–3 months ($n = 8$), 4–6 months ($n = 8$), 7 months to 1 year ($n = 2$), 1–2 years ($n = 2$), 3–4 years ($n = 3$), and more than 5 years ($n = 3$). In the TESOL context they were most familiar with, as either a practitioner or a learner of English, TESOL practitioners were mainly recruited from the same country as the students and English-dominant countries, including the United States ($n = 25$), the United Kingdom ($n = 15$), Australia ($n = 9$), and Canada ($n = 6$). Nearly all reported that the textbooks used in these contexts include English-dominant contexts, including the United Kingdom ($n = 35$), the United States ($n = 33$), Australia ($n = 16$), Canada ($n = 10$), and New Zealand ($n = 5$), as well as India ($n = 1$).

Thirty-one agreed and one strongly agreed that the *English-speaking contexts/models of English that learners are exposed to in their context are relevant to learners' needs* ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.49$). Many agreed or strongly agreed that *the native English speaker model is relevant for English learners in their context* ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.65$) but also strongly believed that *Global Englishes should be a topic on all MSc TESOL/English language teacher education programmes* ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 0.49$).

They had positive attitudes towards all the GELT proposals (Galloway, 2011; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019), with all mean scores being over 3.00, except for the need to *change English teacher hiring practices* ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 0.61$), and thought they would be possible to achieve in their contexts. With regards to the GELT, 22 agreed and 16 strongly agreed that *language assessment* would be a barrier in their context ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.54$), followed by *attachment to "standard" English* (23 agreed and 16 strongly agreed, $M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.54$), *teacher education* (25 agreed and 14 strongly agreed, $M = 3.33$, SD

= 0.53), *lack of Global Englishes ELT materials* (30 agreed and 9 strongly agreed, $M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.46$), and *teacher recruitment practices* (29 agreed and 8 strongly agreed, $M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.52$).

Factors Influencing Attitudes

A Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, a nonparametric alternative to a one-way ANOVA, was used to compare three-group means (according to teaching experience). The only significant difference was regarding the feasibility of *changing English teacher hiring practices*, χ^2 (2, $n = 39$) = 6.527, $p = .038$, with a mean score of 2.44 for *more than 6 months* ($n = 9$), 3.00 for *no teaching experience* ($n = 12$), and 3.17 for *less than 6 months* ($n = 18$). A Mann-Whitney U-test revealed that those between 20 and 30 years old were significantly more in agreement that the *English-speaking contexts/models of English learners are exposed to in their context are relevant to learners' needs* ($M = 2.82$) than those between 31 and 40 years old ($M = 2.20$), $U = 39$, $p = .006$, $r = .41$. Thirty-one to forty-year-olds also placed higher importance on the need to *increase respect for multilingualism* (M = 3.75 versus 3.14; $U = 27.5$, $p = .005$, $r = .45$) and *respect for diverse culture and identity* ($M = 4.00$ versus 3.34; $U = 26$, $p = .020$, $r = .37$). Compared to those who were familiar with ELT contexts where the majority of English teachers are recruited from learners' own countries ($M = 2.71$), those familiar with contexts where teachers are mostly recruited from English-dominant countries ($M = 3.20$) were more in agreement that the *native-English-speaker model* is relevant for English learners in this context, $U = 134.5$, $p = .019$, $r = .36$. In addition, those familiar with contexts where the materials mostly include native-English-speaking contexts reported significantly higher levels of agreement that the *native-English-speaker model is relevant for English learners in their context* ($M = 3.11$ versus $M = 2.33$, $U = 52$, $p = .044$, $r = .36$). Although the correlation was not strong, Kendall's tau correlations revealed some interesting findings. Those who thought *the native-English-speaker model is relevant for English learners in their context* were more likely to think it would be possible to implement two GELT proposals: *emphasise respect for diverse culture and identity* ($\tau b = -.520$, $p < .01$) and *raise awareness of Global Englishes* ($\tau b = -.315$, $p < .05$). Items regarding the feasibility of implementing the GELT proposals in their familiar contexts were highly correlated with each other; *increase Global Englishes exposure* was strongly correlated with *raise awareness of Global Englishes* ($\tau b = .583$, $p < .01$), *raise awareness of ELF strategies* ($\tau b = .556$, $p < .01$), and *emphasise respect for diverse culture and identity* ($\tau b = .570$, $p < .01$). Moreover, *raise awareness of Global Englishes* was significantly correlated with *raise awareness of ELF strategies* (τb

= .695, $p < .01$) and *emphasise respect for diverse culture and identity* ($\tau b =$ .590, $p < .01$). *Raise awareness of ELF strategies* was also significantly associated with *emphasise respect for diverse culture and identity* ($\tau b = .582, p < .01$). On the other hand, with regards to the GELT barriers, *lack of Global Englishes ELT materials* was strongly correlated to *attachment to "standard" English* ($\tau b = .519, p < .01$) and *teacher recruitment practices* ($\tau b = .630, p < .01$).

Open-Ended Questionnaire Results

Forty-five of the 47 respondents provided open-ended responses; the main themes generated are displayed in Table 2. Unsurprisingly, given that it was an elective course and the students were introduced to the topic in the first semester, the students recognized that "there is a hot debate on Global Englishes" and that GELT is "a trend in English teaching." When discussing their *reasons for choosing the course*, the

TABLE 2
Thematic Framework for Open-Ended Questionnaire

Theme/subtheme	N
Reasons for choosing the course	71
Interest in Global Englishes	35
Relevance for ELT and/or own career	16
Clear GELT guidelines	11
Dissertation	3
Other (structure of the course and assignment)	6
Relevance to career	19
Incorporate GELT	15
Dissertation	2
PhD or other future research	2
The need to raise awareness of Global Englishes	27
Students' awareness	13
Practitioners' awareness	9
Others' awareness (e.g., parents, people, policy makers)	5
Barriers to GELT	11
Language assessment	4
Attachment to "standard" English	3
Lack of materials	2
Lack of awareness of Global Englishes	1
Teacher recruitment practices	1
The ultimate goal of students learning English in their own context	54
Pass the exam	24
Gain English competence	11
For future career	7
Other (e.g., personal development)	5
To communicate with native english speakers/learn native english	4
To meet parents' expectations	3

majority were "interested in this field and want to learn more about Global Englishes." *Interest in Global Englishes* was the main reason, and *interest* was the sixth most frequent word in the data set. In 10 responses it overlapped with belief in the *relevance* [of Global Englishes] *for ELT and/or own career*, the second main reason:

> I am interested in the idea of the "native speaker" and the role/value that is place on it in some countries. Also I am interested in learning how to use [introduce] ELF in a classroom of a EFL [English as a foreign language] country.

As future TESOL practitioners, the students were interested in learning "what [they] should do and what [they] should avoid in language teaching." Eleven wanted *clear GELT guidelines* for "how to use ELF in a classroom." Beliefs about *relevance to career* were also coded separately when outlining future plans: 15 plan to *incorporate GELT*, two think it is relevant to their *dissertation*, and two think it is relevant for *PhD or other future research*.

The only GELT proposal mentioned was *the need to raise awareness of Global Englishes*, of which 13 mentioned raising awareness of students, 9 awareness of practitioners, and five awareness of people or society in general:

> English should be taught in a global context and it is important to raise people's awareness of world Englishes [varieties of English].

On the other hand, five *barriers to GELT* were mentioned: language assessment, attachment to standard English, lack of materials, lack of awareness of Global Englishes, and teacher recruitment practices:

> I think the hardest part for language teaching related to GE should be that, it is hard for teachers to choose a possible assessment.

> Lack of material could be one of the reasons why teachers have to rely on conventional textbooks.

When commenting on the *ultimate goal of students learning English in their own context*, the majority thought their goal is to *pass the exam*, and some *to communicate with native English speakers/learn native English*.

INTERVIEW RESULTS

Among 21 interviewees, 13 were Chinese and the remaining 8 were from Indonesia ($n = 2$), Taiwan ($n = 2$), the United Kingdom ($n = 2$), Japan ($n = 1$), and the United States ($n = 1$). Teaching experience varied from no experience ($n = 5$) to 0–3 months ($n = 4$), 1–3 years ($n =$

7), 3–5 years ($n = 3$), 8 years ($n = 1$), and 18 years ($n = 1$). Their undergraduate degrees were in English ($n = 7$), English teaching ($n = 3$), Chinese teaching ($n = 2$), communication studies ($n = 1$), civil aviation ($n = 1$), Japanese and English language teaching ($n = 1$), Japanese literature ($n = 1$), Japanese ($n = 1$), translation ($n = 1$), and English literature ($n = 3$). Familiar ELT contexts predominantly matched their country of origin, with the only exceptions being the three native English speakers, two of whom taught English in Japan and one in South Korea, for 2, 4, and 5 years, respectively. Table 3 lists the main themes in the data.

TABLE 3
Thematic Framework for Interview

Theme	Interviewees	References
Reasons for choosing the course	21	111
-Relevance to ELT and/or own career	21	69
-Interest in Global Englishes	16	22
-Clear GELT guidelines	12	13
-Dissertation	2	4
-Other (e.g., course structure, assignment)	3	3
Relevance to career:	21	50
-Incorporate GELT	12	19
-Questionable relevance of GELT	11	31
Familiarity with ELT context	21	84
GELT proposals:	20	97
-*The need to raise awareness of Global Englishes:*	18	62
• Students' awareness	16	30
• Practitioners' awareness	15	27
• Awareness in general	5	5
-*Increasing WE and ELF exposure in language curricula*	12	16
-*Emphasizing respect for diverse culture and identity in ELT*	5	8
-*Changing English teacher hiring practices in the ELT industry*	5	6
-*Emphasizing respect for multilingualism in ELT*	5	5
Barriers to GELT:	21	93
-Attachment to "standard" English	15	30
-Language assessment	14	19
-Lack of awareness of Global Englishes	10	17
-Teacher recruitment practices	10	14
-Parents	8	15
-Lack of materials	8	10
-Teacher education	3	5
Suggestions to overcome barriers:	7	9
-Changing assessment	3	3
-Changing educational policy	3	3
-Creating new materials	2	3
Own attachment to Standard English	11	11

As in the open-ended questionnaire, interviewees recognised that "Global Englishes has become really important in the whole world" (Fei, no teaching experience, China) and the relative advantage was clear to them, yet some raised concerns about its compatibility with their context. The *relevance* [of Global Englishes] *to ELT and/or own career* was the main reason for choosing the course, believing GELT to be "something really helpful for [their] teaching in the future" (Indah, 2 years' experience, Indonesia). *Interest in Global Englishes* was discussed, and students were "curious about Global Englishes" (Rob, 5 years' experience, South Korea, United Kingdom) and wanted to "understand more about Global Englishes" (Do, 3 years' experience, Taiwan). Some desired *clear GELT guidelines* to learn "how to apply GE [Global Englishes] in a classroom" (Sandy, 8 years' experience, United States).

The interviews offered an opportunity to reflect on the feasibility of GELT in their context (*familiarity with [their own] ELT context*), particularly when discussing *GELT proposals* and *barriers*. As in the questionnaire, they believed it is important to raise *students', practitioners',* and *general awareness* of Global Englishes. TESOL practitioner education was seen to be important, because "the teachers themselves should change first" (Fan-ko, 2 months' experience, China) and "the higher the awareness the English teachers possess, the more the possibility they will introduce those kind of varieties to students" (Do, 3 years' experience, Taiwan).

Indah (2 years' experience, Indonesia) believed that "*increasing WE and ELF exposure in language curricula* will encourage students to reflect on questions such as 'What's wrong with different varieties?' and 'Do you have to have a native-like accent to be able to speak English?'" Others referred to students' lack of awareness. Those who commented on the need to *emphasise respect for diverse culture and identity in ELT* referred to the need to "separate the culture [native English culture] from the language" (Indah, 2 years' experience, Indonesia). Those who discussed the need to change *English teacher hiring practices in the ELT industry* noted a need to employ more "local teachers" (Ching, no experience, China) who "know better about their students and they can also ... [compare] the two languages, so they can get more attached with the students" (Peng, 2 years' experience, Taiwan) as well as "have more understanding ... of what the students are going through, ... why they have this accent or variance or certain ways of using certain structures, grammar" (Yang, 1 year experience, China). Regarding *emphasising respect for multilingualism in ELT,* Rob (5 years' experience, South Korea, United Kingdom) thought this "already exists" in the Korean context and Fei (no experience) and Lingyi (3 months' experience) from China believed that this is "needed" (Fei) and "is good for China" (Lingyi). However, Amir (2 years' experience,

Indonesia) raised concerns that people "are not respecting those people who use English" and Sam (2 years' experience, Japan, United Kingdom) believed that in Japan "emphasizing respect for multilingualism is possible, but it might be slightly difficult, because of Japan's modernist sort of nature."

Recognition of the *relative advantages* of GELT was evident; 12 participants were determined to *incorporate GELT*, considering "implementing this Global Englishes concept in classroom practices" (Amir, 2 years' experience, Indonesia). However, 11 raised concerns about the *questionable relevance of GELT* [to their career], mostly due to unclear guidelines:

> I'm curious about, ehm, implementing this Global Englishes concept in classroom practices, like I don't know how it's going to happen and how to do it (Amir, 2 years' experience, Indonesia).

> What Global English really is, we don't know, and nobody can really explain . . . . The thing I'm really interested in is that if there's no standard, this Global English, what shall we teach? (Yun, 2 months' experience, China)

> There's scope for these things to work but it'll need to wait 30 or 40 years (Rob, 5 years' experience, South Korea, United Kingdom).

Suggestions for guidelines were not offered, which is unsurprising given that it was the first week of the course, but reflections on potential barriers to innovation provide insights into the feasibility of GELT and practitioner education syllabus design. *Attachment to "standard" English* was most frequently mentioned. Referring to the South Korean context, Rob (5 years' experience, South Korea, United Kingdom) noted that Korean society has "embraced the myth of perfect attainment of 'standard' English, they still think that's attainable," which was also noted to be the case in China ("Teachers just want standard proper English. . . . [S]tudents rank teachers' proficiency, their professionalism, by their [native] accent" (Chengxin, no experience, China). Many referred to *parents*, believing that they "have a sense that native like English is the best English, it's good English, and . . . the parents prefer native speakers" (Jiaying, no experience, China). *Attachment to "standard" English* was believed to influence *teacher recruitment practices*, where it is "very obvious" (Jiaying, no experience, China) that "the English training institutions, most of them will still hire [native] English teachers" (Yifan, no experience, China). *Lack of awareness of Global Englishes* was also believed to be a problem, "because many people, we have the idea that like British, American or Australian, their English is the best English" (Jiaying, no experience, China).

As in the questionnaire, *language assessment* was seen as a major challenge. In China, "one of the big, major purposes of learning English is to pass examinations, like the NCEE, National College Entrance Examination, or IELTS or TOEFL" (Chengxin, no experience, China) and "exam orientated education, ... the structure of the exam influences the teaching practice" (Fan-ko, 2 months' experience, China). Nobuko (3 years' experience, Japan) noted that in Japan, "when I think about introducing Global Englishes into my language class, the biggest obstacle is the examination," and Rob (5 years' experience, South Korea, United Kingdom) noted that to "incorporate [Global Englishes] into the exams" requires major changes and "the nature of Global Englishes makes it tricky to test in any standardisable way." Further barriers included *lack of materials* for GELT and current *teacher education* that focuses on British and American English. Indah (2 years' experience, Indonesia) was "surprised" when she "heard about Global English" in the introductory lecture and hadn't realised "that there were varieties and everything."

GELT curricular innovation was felt to be "possible but it takes a long time" (Fan-ko, 2 months' experience, China), although some *suggestions to overcome barriers* included *changing educational policy* and "the structure of the education system" (Fan-ko, 2 months' experience, China) and *changing assessment* and *creating new materials.* Those with teaching experience referred more to their experiences as a teacher and to more barriers than those with no or less than 1 year of teaching experience. Those with no or less than 1 year of experience did not refer to *teacher education* as a potential barrier and made fewer comments about potential barriers than those with experience. Attitudes were also influenced by their *attachment to "standard" English.* American and British English is "proper" (Chengxin, no experience, China), "appropriate" (Fei, no experience, China), "more professional" (Jiaying, no experience, China), and "authentic" (Yun, 2 months' experience, China), and as with the quantitative results, the majority thought the native English model relevant to their contexts. As Sihan (no experience, China) noted, only "native speaker teachers ... can give us the right pronunciation and the right tongue of how to speak English."

DISCUSSION

Successful and sustainable curriculum innovation requires the involvement of key stakeholders to ensure that those involved have a sense of ownership. It has to be informed with a bottom-up approach that considers the attitudes of TESOL practitioners to proposals for change in relation to their context, but also examines the complex

process of curriculum innovation and consideration of the factors at the institutionalisation phase. The view of the "*change* agent" and "that of the *receiver* or *changer*" (White et al., 1991, p. 179) may differ. This study aimed to investigate preservice and in-service TESOL practitioners' attitudes towards the proposals for, and barriers to, curriculum change in relation to Global Englishes put forward at the theoretical level. Few participants had extensive teaching experience and, as such, the study mainly involved preservice practitioners. Furthermore, although some other contexts were covered, due to the overwhelming majority of Chinese postgraduate students in the United Kingdom, where they constitute around one-third of all non-EU students (International Student Statistics: UK Higher Education, 2018), the majority of the questionnaire respondents (n = 35) and interviewees (n = 13) were from China. The three native English speakers interviewed also had experience in the East Asian context. Although the Chinese, or East Asian, bias may be seen as a limitation, the study provides insights into the attitudes of those working and preparing to teach in the world's largest English-speaking country, where English education has become a major part of the government's modernisation agenda. It also provides in-depth insights into the compatibility (Rogers, 2003) of GELT innovations. Furthermore, many of the participants were discussing their future profession, and preservice TESOL training is an optimal time to address attitudes and concerns regarding curriculum innovation as students are considering what teaching involves. In addition, as "receivers" of English language education in their respective contexts, we believe our participants had sufficient knowledge of TESOL curricula in their contexts. In this study, most had some experience, yet we acknowledge the need for further research with more in-service practitioners once they are exposed to the environment as more experienced practitioners. Such research reporting on their experiences implementing GELT, how it is interpreted and operationalised, can then feed back into teacher education programmes to encourage reflection on introducing innovations in curricula and bring real-life practice into the classroom.

Unsurprisingly, the native English model dominates (Giri & Foo, 2014), evident in materials, practitioner recruitment practices, models, and assessment. Attachments to native English are also unsurprising, viewed as being both relevant to learners' needs and suitable, particularly by the older participants, who also placed more emphasis on the barriers to GELT, particularly teacher training. Monolingual ideology remains strong, and as Kramsch (2014) notes, "the purity ideal embodied in the authentic NS [native speaker] still remains intact for FL [foreign language] educators" (p. 299). However, unlike other studies, the results provide insights into factors influencing attitudes. Interviewees

revealed an attachment to standard English and a belief that American and British English are "proper" (Chengxin, no experience, China) and "appropriate" (Fei, no experience, China) and it is only "native speaker teachers … who can provide the right pronunciation" (Sihan, no experience, China). Those familiar with English language teaching contexts where the majority of English teachers are recruited from native-English-speaking contexts and where the materials also mostly come from native-English-speaking contexts were also more positive about the relevance of native norms for learners in their context.

This study provides insights into achieving a successful and sustainable GELT innovation strategy by highlighting the need for research with the receivers of the change and also into the institutionalisation phase of innovation from the outset. Many factors influence the complex process of curriculum innovation. Some of these relate to the innovation itself and others to the resource system and the users of the innovation. Consideration of such factors is essential to determine if GELT can exist as "part of the 'fabric' of the 'host' system into which it has been introduced" (Waters, 2014, p. 98), and such research can also be informative for teacher educators.

There is a curiosity about GELT—taking the course to get to know more about the relative advantage of this proposed innovation (Rogers, 2003)—and there is a desire for clear guidelines, something that the GELT framework aims to address. However, there is some ambiguity in attitudes (Lopriore, 2016). All data sets in this study revealed positive attitudes (Dilek & Özdemir, 2015), which may be unsurprising given that it was an elective course. There was also agreement that it is an important topic for TESOL practitioner education (Blair, 2015; Dewey, 2015; Doan, 2014; Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2018). However, despite seeing GELT as relevant to their career and positive attitudes towards innovation proposals, the students raised concerns about possible barriers to innovation and were unsure how to overcome them. The mere introduction of the topic, and the course, on the programme indicated a change in attitude in line with previous studies. With increasing practical suggestions and lesson plans in the literature, as well as coverage of GELT on practitioner education programmes (see Matsuda, 2017, for an overview of programmes), it is hoped that Yun's (China) feeling that "nobody can really explain" what Global Englishes is will soon not be the norm. We call for researchers to go beyond investigating general attitudes towards GELT and explore the feasibility of proposals for curriculum innovation. However, simply introducing Global Englishes into teacher education programmes, and materials, is insufficient. Merely making reference to ELF as a phenomenon (McDonough, Shaw, & Masuhara, 2013) or to Global Englishes research (McDonough et al., 2013; McGrath, 2013) is

insufficient to instigate a paradigm shift away from native-English-speaking norms. Overall, the curriculum discourses circulating in Western TESOL programmes are still informed by attitudes of Western superiority (Ilieva & Waterstone, 2013). This study highlights the need for clear guidance for curricular innovation if GELT is to make any headway into TESOL curricula. Arguments such as "if there's no standard, this Global English, what shall we teach?" (Yun, China) abound and assessment is clearly seen to be a major barrier (Manara, 2014), followed by attachments to standard English. The questionnaire also revealed that the lack of Global Englishes materials was strongly correlated with attachment to standard English. Concerns over English learners' motivation to pass exams and communicate with native English speakers abound, and until we address such issues it is likely that curricula will continue to be "pegged to the pure linguistic standard established by the national gatekeeping academies monitored by [native speakers]" (Kramsch, 2014, p. 299).

CONCLUSION

A sense of curiosity, and doubt, is to be expected when something detracts from the norm. GELT curricular innovation is complex, particularly due to the conceptual transition that it requires, but this should not deter TESOL practitioners from considering the relevance of GELT for their contexts. There is certainly "scope" for change (Rob, United Kingdom), but let us just hope we do not "need to wait 30 or 40 years" as he suggests. TESOL practitioners' attitudes are important in the curriculum innovation process. In this study, we examined their views on the proposals and barriers being discussed in the literature and it is imperative that any innovation be considered with reference to the wider context within which it will take place, rather than bombarding them with new ideas and practices. As Zacharias and Manara (2013) noted, "The lack of studies on EIL classroom pedagogy needs to be addressed urgently, because, for a new pedagogical paradigm to take root, studies in classroom contexts are crucial" (preface).

We end with a call for more research to inform the GELT curriculum innovation process, both before and after implementation.

THE AUTHORS

Nicola Galloway is a lecturer in TESOL at the University of Edinburgh, where she organises a course on second language teaching curriculum and Global Englishes for language teaching. Her main research interests relate to the pedagogical implications of the global spread of English and English-medium instruction in higher education.

Takuya Numajiri is a PhD student in education at the University of Edinburgh. His dissertation focuses on factors affecting the mathematics achievement of primary school students in St. Lucia.

REFERENCES

Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language.* Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Basturkmen, H., & Wette, R. (2016). English for academic purposes. In G. Hall (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 164–176). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Berns, M. (2015). Pedagogy and world Englishes: The legacy of Yamuna Kachru. *World Englishes, 34*(1), 22–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12113.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: a critical perspective.* London, England: Continuum International.

Blair, A. (2015). Evolving a post-native, multilingual model for ELF-aware teacher education. In Y. Bayyurt & S. Akcan (Eds.), *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a lingua franca* (pp. 89–102). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Cameron, D., & Galloway, N. (2019). Local thoughts on global ideas: Pre- and in-service TESOL practitioners' attitudes towards the pedagogical implications of the globalisation of English. *RELC Journal, 50*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218822853.

Canagarajah, S. (2005). Introduction. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). The plurilingual tradition and the English language in South Asia. *AILA Review, 22*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.22.02can.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations.* Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Toward plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*, 591–599. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.121.

Christopher, J. H., Rachel, W., Shu, L., Yuan, Q., & Xu, X. (2013). English reconceived: Raising teachers' awareness of English as a "plurilithic" resource through an online course. ELTRA Research Papers, 13–05. Retrieved from http://teachingenglish.britishcouncil.org.cn/sites/teacheng/files/D053%20Raising%20teachers%20awareness%20of%20English_ONLINE%20FINAL.pdf

Cogo, A., & Pitzl, M.-L. (2016). Pre-empting and signalling non-understanding in ELF. *ELT Journal, 70*, 339–345. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw015.

Conteh, J., & G. Meier (Eds.) (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dewey, M. (2015). ELF, teacher knowledge and professional development. In H. Bowles & A. Cogo (Eds.), *International perspectives on English as a lingua franca: Pedagogical insights* (pp. 176–193). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dilek, İ., & Özdemir, E. (2015). Re/considering the English language teacher education programs in Turkey from an ELF standpoint: What do academia, pre-service and in-service teachers think?". In S. Ackan & Y. Bayyurt (Eds.), *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a lingua franca* (pp. 135–152). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Doan, N. B. (2014). Teaching the target culture in English teacher education programs: Issues of EIL in Vietnam. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 79–93). Basel, Switzerland: Springer.

Fang, F., & Ren, W. (2018). Developing students' awareness of Global Englishes. *ELT Journal, 72*, 384–394. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy012.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Galloway, N. (2011). An investigation of Japanese students' attitudes towards English (PhD dissertation). University of Southampton, England.

Galloway, N. (2013). Global Englishes and English language teaching (ELT): Bridging the gap between theory and practice in a Japanese context. *System, 41*, 786–803. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.019.

Galloway, N. (2017). *Global Englishes and change in English language teaching*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2013). "They envision going to New York, not Jakarta": The differing attitudes toward ELF of students, teaching assistants, and instructors in an English-medium business program in Japan. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 2*, 229–253. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2013-0014.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2014). Using listening journals to raise awareness of global Englishes in ELT. *ELT Journal, 68*, 386–396. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu021.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal, 72*, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010.

Garcia, E. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giri, R. A., & Foo, J. M. S. (2014). On teaching EIL in a Japanese context: The power within and power without. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 239–256). Basel, Switzerland: Springer.

Hall, G. (2016). Method, methods and methodology: Historical trends and current debates. In G. Hall (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 209–223). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Harlow, England: Longman.

Ilieva, R., & Waterstone, B. (2013). Curriculum discourses within a TESOL program for international students: Affording possibilities for academic and professional identities. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 10*(1), 16–37.

International Student Statistics: UK Higher Education. (2018, April 3). Retrieved from https://www.ukcisa.org.uk/Research–Policy/Statistics/International-stude nt-statistics-UK-higher-education

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16*(2), 137–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192. 2006.00111.x.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 200–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x.

Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal, 66*, 486–494. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs040.

Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 44*, 281–315. https://doi.org/10. 1017/S0261444811000115.

Jørgensen, J. N. (2010). Languaging: Nine years of poly-lingual development of young Turkish-Danish grade school students, Vol 1–2. In *Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, the Køge Series, Vols K15–16*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.

Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kemaloğlu-Er, E., & Bayyurt, Y. (2018). ELF-awareness in teaching and teacher education: Explicit and implicit ways of integrating ELF into the English language classroom. In N. C. Sifakis & N. Tsantila (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca for EFL contexts* (pp. 159–174). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge handbook of World Englishes*. London, England: Routledge.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 98*, 296–311. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12057.x.

Lin, A. (2013). Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*, 521–545. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.113.

Lopriore, L. (2016). ELF in teacher education: A way and ways. In L. Lopriore & E. Grazzi (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: New perspectives from ELF* (pp. 167–188). Rome, Italy: Roma TrE-Press.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2012). Disinventing multilingualism: From monological multilingualisim to multilingua francas. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 439–453). New York, NY: Routledge.

Manara, C. (2014). "So what do you want us to do?": A critical reflection of teaching English as an international language in an Australian context. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 189–202). Basel, Switzerland: Springer.

Matsuda, A. (Ed.) (2012). *Teaching English as an international language: Principles and practices*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A., & Duran, C. S. (2012). EIL activities and tasks for traditional EFL classrooms. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Teaching English as an international language: Principles and practices* (pp. 201–238). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

May, S. (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education.* London, England: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1039835.

McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide* (3rd ed.). Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

McGrath, I. (2013). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching.* Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00035.

McKay, S. L. (2012). Teaching materials for English as an international language. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Teaching English as an international language: Principles and practices* (pp. 70–83). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. L., & Brown, J. D. (2016). *Teaching and assessing EIL in local contexts around the world.* Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Meier, G. S. (2017). The multilingual turn as a critical movement in education: Assumptions, challenges and a need for reflection. *Applied Linguistics Review, 8* (1), 131–161. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-2010.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as local practice.* London: Routledge.

Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the city.* Abingdon, England: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315724225.

Pullin, P. (2015). Culture, curriculum design, syllabus and course development in the light of BELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 4*(1), 31–53. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2015-0006.

Rampton, B. (2011). From "multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia" to "contemporary urban vernaculars". *Language and Communication, 31*, 276–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2011.01.001.

Richards, J. C. (2017). *Curriculum development in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, E. (2003). *Diffusions of innovations* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2017). Debating standard language ideology in the classroom: Using the "speak good English movement" to raise awareness of global Englishes. *RELC Journal, 48*, 294–301. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216684281.

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, H., & Montakantiwong, A. (2018). A tale of two teachers: A duoethnography of the realistic and idealistic successes and failures of teaching English as an international language. *RELC Journal, 47*(1), 88–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217746206.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 209–239. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000145.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Sembiante, S. (2016). Translanguaging and the multilingual turn: Epistemological reconceptualization in the fields of language and implications for reframing

language in curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry, 46*(1), 45–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2015.1133221.

Sifakis, N. C., & Bayyurt, Y. (2015). Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes, 34*, 471–484. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12150.

Sifakis, N. C., & Bayyurt, Y. (2018). ELF-aware teacher education and development. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 456–467). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Sung, C. C. M. (2015). Implementing a Global Englishes component in a university English course in Hong Kong. *English Today, 31*(4), 42–49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078415000383.

Suzuki, A. (2011). Introducing diversity of English into ELT: Student teachers' responses. *ELT Journal, 65*(2), 145–153. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq024.

Syrbe, M., & Rose, H. (2018). An evaluation of the global orientation of English textbooks in Germany. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 12*(2), 152–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1120736.

Vettorel, P. (2016). WE- and ELF-informed classroom practices: Proposals from a pre-service teacher education programme in Italy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 5*(1), 107–133. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2016-0005.

Waters, A. (2014). Managing innovation in English language education: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 47*(1), 92–110. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000426.

Weber, J.-J. (2014). *Flexible multilingual education: Putting children's needs first.* Birstol: Multilingual Matters.

Wedell, M. (2003). Giving TESOL change a chance: Supporting key players in the curriculum change process. *System, 31*, 439–456. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2003.02.001.

White, R., Martin, M., Stimson, M., & Hodge, R. (1991). *Management in English language teaching.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Zacharias, N. T., & Manara, C. (2013). *Contextualizing the pedagogy of English as an international language: Issues and tensions.* Newcastle, England: Cambridge Scholars.