Global Englishes and Language Teaching: A Review of Pedagogical Research

Heath Rose
University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
heath.rose@education.ox.ac.uk

Jim McKinley
University College London, London, UK
j.mckinley@ucl.ac.uk

Nicola Galloway
University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
Nicola.galloway@ed.ac.uk

Author's biographical note

Heath Rose, Department of Education, 15 Norham Gardens, Oxford, OX2 6PY, UK

Heath Rose is an associate professor of applied linguistics at the University of Oxford. At Oxford, he is course director of MSc in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching. His current research interests are in Global Englishes, particularly focusing on the impact of the spread of English on second language teaching and learning.

Jim McKinley, UCL Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, Bloomsbury, London WC1H 0AL, UK

Jim McKinley is an associate professor of applied linguistics at University College London, and Director of Studies for the MA TESOL Pre-Service. His research explores implications of globalisation for L2 writing, language education, and teaching in higher education. He currently serves as an editor-in-chief for the journal *System*.

Nicola Galloway, Moray House School of Education, Holyrood Rd, Edinburgh EH8 8AQ, UK

Nicola Galloway is a lecturer in TESOL at The University of Edinburgh, where she coordinates courses on second language curriculum development and Global Englishes for language teaching. Nicola's main research interests relate to the pedagogical implications of the global spread of English and more recently on English Medium Instruction in higher education.

Abstract

The rise of English as a global language has led scholars to call for a paradigm shift in the field of English language teaching to match the new sociolinguistic landscape of the 21st century. In recent years a considerable amount of classroom-based research and language teacher education research has emerged to investigate these proposals in practice. This paper outlines key proposals for change in language teaching from the related fields of World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, English as an International Language, and Global Englishes, and critically reviews the growing body of pedagogical research conducted within these domains. Adopting the methodology of a systematic review, 58 empirical articles published between 2010-2020 were short-listed, of which 38 were given an in-depth critical review and contextualized within a wider body of literature. Synthesis of classroom research suggests a current lack of longitudinal designs, an underuse of direct measures to explore the effects of classroom interventions, and under-representation of contexts outside of university language classrooms. Synthesis of teacher education research suggests future studies need to adopt more robust methodological designs which measure the effects of Global Englishes content on teacher beliefs and pedagogical practices both before and throughout the program, and after teachers return to the classroom.

1.0 Introduction

Aligned with the growth of research into the international spread of English and its influence on international business and education, Global Englishes research, focusing on the use of English as an international language and a global lingua franca, has continued to expand, to change shape, and to take clear directions toward pedagogical concerns. Influential discussion of the pedagogical impact of the spread of English began with Kachru's (1985) once highly influential circles of English stipulating norm-providing countries (inner circle), norm-developing (outer circle), and norm-dependent countries (expanding circle), along with the idea of World Englishes (WE) that identifies English use at the country level. With increased global mobility, the field has outgrown this model with English now used fluidly within and across geographic contexts, and so-called 'native English' now in minority usage on a global scale. This has given rise to a number of inter-rated conceptualizations of English as a global language, including English as a lingua franca (ELF), English as an International Language (EIL), and Global Englishes, which is used in this paper as an inclusive term.

Considering the functional use of Global Englishes in international contexts, ELF research has played a pivotal role in challenging assumptions of English language use. ELF research has raised controversial discussions around the importance of focusing on intelligibility and the abandonment of native-speaker norms. While the concept of a lingua franca core may not have been strongly supported with empirical evidence, it is an influential one that continues to challenge the way we view the English language as 'owned and ruled' by native speakers. These challenges especially concern grammatical accuracy and native-speaker-defined pragmatics in English language teaching (Haberland, 2011), as well as 'English-only' classrooms. As English is an international language, in many contexts it maintains dissimilar characteristics to the teaching and learning of other foreign languages, changing the way we understand English as a *foreign* language.

Pedagogical implications are currently gaining attention across the research domains of WE, EIL, ELF and Global Englishes, offering possibilities for breaking free from fixations on native speaker norms. The field of has been driven by a large number of volumes

2

dedicated to implications and recommendations for language teaching (e.g. Kirkpatrick, 2007; Alsagoff, McKay, Hu, & Renandya, 2012; Matsuda, 2012; McKay & Brown, 2016). The influence of this movement towards more global approaches to language teaching can also be observed at the nexus of research and pedagogy in teacher education (e.g. Matsuda, 2017), sparking an increase in research. In this paper, we explore how and why research is taking shape in language classrooms and teacher education programs to evaluate the effects of proposed innovations in practice, and to offer ideas for future research on this rapidly emergent topic.

1.1 Global Englishes: an inclusive research and teaching paradigm

With increased connectivity, the most common use of English is as a global lingua franca. We have witnessed a shift in usage of English, from being the language of a small minority of native English speakers to one with a global ownership. Today, English functions as a lingua franca amongst people from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds, the majority of whom are adding to their multilingual repertoire. It is used for various purposes, in diverse settings and in hybrid ways, where speakers draw on their other languages to communicate successfully. It is a contact language, a lingua franca, and a language in flux. Whatever we call it, what cannot be denied is that it is a language that is used in very different ways to how it is presented in 'traditional' TESOL curricula.

As English spread beyond its original boundaries and is used on a truly global scale, related fields of research within applied linguistics emerged to document the use of English globally, how it manifests itself, and more recently, how it should be taught. While researchers position their work in different fields, we group these shared endeavours under the broad term of Global Englishes. This is an inclusive paradigm that aims to consolidate the work of WE, ELF, and EIL to explore the linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural diversity and fluidity of English use and the implications of this diversity of English on multifaceted aspects of society, including TESOL curricula and English language teaching practices. Global Englishes draws on key work from WE scholars (c.f. Kachru, B., Kachru, Y. & Nelson, 2006), ELF scholars (c.f Jenkins, 2006a; Seidlhofer, 2011), EIL (c.f. Alsagoff et al., 2012; Matsuda, 2012) and translanguaging (c.f. García, 2009; Canagarajah, 2013), given their focus on the global use of English.

Researchers in these fields highlight the pluricentricity of English use and showcase how it is adapted and used alongside other languages. 'Multilingualism, it seems, is the topic du jour – at least in critical applied linguistics' (May 2014, p. 1), and Global Englishes research is part of this movement (Rose & Galloway, 2019), where 'multilingualism has been at the forefront of recent discussions' that challenge prevailing conceptualisations of second language acquisition (SLA) within the wider field (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020, p. 121). Thus 'Global Englishes' consolidates work in these related fields; it also unites similar movements in SLA, such as translanguaging and the multilingual turn.

1.2 Rationale for innovation in language teaching

The global spread of English and the changing sociolinguistic landscape of the twenty-first century have changed the foundations of how English is taught and learned. The majority of English speakers has been traditionally labelled so-called 'non-native' speakers, but these multicompetent speakers (see Cook, 2016) use English alongside other languages for the purpose of communication in diverse and flexible speech communities. Such changed usage, and the growing research documenting this change, have led scholars to call for a paradigm

shift in TESOL curricula to address the mismatch between what is taught in classrooms and how English functions outside of the classroom (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). The changing sociolinguistic use of English 'has implications for language learning goals, for language teachers and for the curriculum' (Kirkpatrick, 2012, p. 131). Matsuda and Friedrich (2012, p. 17) have urged innovation, arguing that the 'linguistic, cultural and functional diversity associated with English today challenges some of the fundamental assumptions of English language teaching (ELT) and requires that we revisit our pedagogical practices'. Clearly the needs of English-language learners who are learning the language to use as a global lingua franca have changed. Of course, discussions of the diversity of English and the dominance of 'native' English in TESOL are not new: scholars in the field of applied linguistics have long lobbied for more accurate representation of the variation in English in language-learning contexts (Gass & Varonis, 1984). Likewise, in his seminal article in 1976, Larry Smith noted that those working in English language education should showcase how English functions as a global language. In 1985, Smith and Nelson also critiqued the role of the native speaker in intelligibility assessments.

Global Englishes research provides new perspectives on these issues. With an increasing body of research showcasing how language is constantly in a state of flux—that there are no clear boundaries between languages, that English is used in dynamic and multifaceted ways, that learners will have to use languaging and navigate multilingual encounters—it showcases the irrelevance of a curricula based on static native English norms for the majority of English learners today. Such research calls for a new orientation to language in the TESOL curriculum, one that promotes a more flexible view of language, that emancipates non-native speakers from native speaker norms, that repositions the target interlocutor and where learner agency is central and language creativity is nurtured. Ultimately, it calls for curricula that recognises that multilingualism is the norm, validates learners' linguistic repertoires and does not measure proficiency and competency with reference to native norms. It also encourages a critical approach, examining the impact of the dominant standard language ideology and nativespeakerism in learners' contexts.

1.2.1 Proposals for change: Global Englishes Language Teaching

However, despite such increased attention, calls for change have made little headway into TESOL. The evidence is there, yet the curricula continues to be misaligned. Global Englishes researchers, particularly ELF researchers, have also faced severe criticism for a theory-practice divide, where scholars have abstractly argued without exploring the effects of such change in classroom practices. To bridge the gap between theory and practice, and to unite the shared agenda of the research fields hosted, the theoretical calls for change to TESOL were summarised as the 'Global Englishes Language Teaching' (GELT) proposals (Galloway, 2011; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019), which call for:

1. Increasing World Englishes and ELF exposure in language curricula
2. Emphasising respect for multilingualism in ELT
3. Raising awareness of Global Englishes in ELT
4. Raising awareness of ELF strategies in language curricula
5. Emphasising respect for diverse culture and identity in ELT
6. Changing English teacher-hiring practices in the ELT industry

The grouping of these proposals aimed to consolidate interconnected themes and to help instigate the paradigm shift. The first proposal focuses on the need to expose students to the

diversity of English 'so that they are better prepared to deal with English interactions in international contexts' (McKay, 2012, p. 73). The second proposal stipulates developing respect for multilingualism in line with movements in translanguaging research and the multilingual turn in SLA, which are challenging the monolingual orientations that underpin 'traditional' TESOL curricula, and meet calls for *plurilingual pedagogies* in TESOL (e.g. Lin, 2013). The third proposal relates to the need for a critical approach to ELT and to raise awareness of how English is used as a global language. The fourth proposal stems from ELF research and considers the need for students to develop strategies to adapt to different communities of language users and diverse interlocutors. The fifth proposal concerns the need to respect cultural differences and reconsider what an English-using culture is (c.f Baker, 2009, 2012, 2015). The final proposal calls for changes to teacher hiring practices and training to reduce positioning of the native speaker as expert (see McKay, 2012). Non-native speaking teachers do, after all, make up the majority of the profession (Braine, 1999) and as such, 'on a global level, the ELT profession is perhaps the world's only occupation in which the majority faces discrimination' (Ali, 2009, p. 37).

Curriculum innovation is, however, a complex process and a number of barriers to change were also identified alongside the proposals. These include a lack of materials that promote global approaches, strong adherence to standard language ideology in TESOL, traditional perspectives in teacher education, and hiring practices that favour native-speaking teachers (Galloway & Rose, 2015).

2.0 Innovations in English Language Teaching

Over the past two decades there have been a few notable attempts to theorize innovations in English language teaching from the various perspectives within the Global Englishes domain. We will first briefly outline the various proposed models for change in ELT, before then exploring models of the innovation process.

2.1 Frameworks for pedagogical change

All of the major schools of scholarship within the Global Englishes domain have lobbied for transformation in language teaching practices, which have culminated in articulated models for change. This section will evaluate four prominent models that underpin most of the classroom-based research reviewed in this paper: *WE-informed ELT* from; the *EIL Blueprint*; *ELF aware pedagogy* (including the *post-normative approach*); and *Global Englishes Language Teaching*.

Notions of WE-informed English language teaching have their origins in early applied work from the field. Since the 1980s, WE scholars have called for a paradigm shift in language pedagogy to better reflect the changing function of English globally. Kachru's (1992a) well-cited 'Six Fallacies about the Users and Uses of English' offered a concise critique on the incorrect assumptions underpinning ELT, offering areas where a WE perspective could innovate the field, particularly in terms of challenging the established target interlocutors, cultures, goals, and norms in ELT. Brown's (1993) paper summarizes calls from scholars (e.g. Vavrus, 1991; Kachru, 1992b) and presents these as eight recommendations for teachers and teacher educators. These recommendations call for greater incorporation of WE perspectives within language teaching and teacher education.

Almost two decades later, Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) were critical of discussions still largely remaining at an abstract level regarding the pedagogical implications of WE, criticising scholars for not yet providing adequate research-informed pedagogical ideas for use in the classroom. In response, they created the *EIL Curriculum Blueprint*, which provided

specific guidance for teachers in their selection of instructional models in the curriculum. The blueprint also encouraged greater exposure to Englishes in the curriculum and focused on a need to teach strategic competence to learners for use with a diverse range of English users. It encouraged the selection of appropriate cultural materials, as well as language learning activities that aimed to increase awareness of the global politics of English. More recently, these ideas were articulated into a framework of *Teaching English as an International Language*—a model built on the theoretical foundations of *WE-informed ELT* (Matsuda, 2019).

By the early 2010s, the field of ELF had been very influential in lobbying for change in ELT. Building on influential groundwork from key ELF scholars (Jenkins, 2006b, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2011), Dewey (2012) introduced his post-normative approach to curriculum change. This approach sought to heighten teachers' awareness of ELF, which he argued was an essential first step instigating ELF-oriented change in pedagogical practice. In a post-methods era of teaching (see Kumaravadivelu, 2003), this awareness could then help teachers to inform innovative teaching approaches that are appropriate to each teachers' own unique context. The post-normative approach encouraged teachers to:

- Foreground the sociocultural context in which their students would use English(es)
- Expose students to the diverse varieties of English and the ways it is used
- Have students critically discuss the impact of globalization on English
- Spend less time on standard language forms, and focus instead on intelligible forms
- Teach communicative strategies for students to use in ELF contexts

Most ELF scholarship has since focused predominantly on raising teachers' awareness through ELF-centred language teacher education (LTE), as illustrated by the work of Bayyurt and Sifakis (2015a, 2015b). Sifakis (2019) introduced an *ELF Awareness Continuum* to conceptualize the gradual processes of raising teachers' ELF awareness. The concept of a continuum resonates well with similar conceptualizations within the GELT framework. ELF-aware pedagogy within this framework focusses on the teacher, setting this framework apart from the *EIL Blueprint* and *GELT framework*, which both focus on curricular change. Sifakis (2019) states ELF-aware pedagogy can be operationalized in a similar way as an English for specific purposes approach, which is developed according to contextual needs.

The *Global Englishes Language Teaching* (GELT) framework for curriculum innovation was developed by Galloway (2011) based on her doctoral research in Japan. The framework was underpinned by earlier ELF scholarship comparing EFL and ELF, as well as shifts in pedagogical practice. The framework was further developed and the most recent version (Rose & Galloway, 2019) includes additional curriculum elements, drawing on Richards' (2001) curriculum development model. In total, there are 13 dimensions within the framework that seek a movement away from traditional teaching practices towards more global teaching practices, encouraging change in: target interlocutor; ownership; target culture; linguistic norms; teachers; role-models; sources of materials; positioning of other languages and cultures; needs; assessment criterion; goals of learning; ideology; and theoretical orientation. The authors state that movement from one category to the next is best visualized on a continuum for each category, and the GELT framework does not embody an 'all-or-nothing' position (Rose & Galloway, 2019).

Whatever the term, whether it be *Teaching English as an International Language*, *WE-informed ELT*, *ELF-Aware pedagogy*, or *Global Englishes Language Teaching*, each of these 'different names indicate different intellectual history and affiliation, but they are more similar to each other than different in their assumptions, visions and suggested practice' (Matsuda, 2019, p. 146). Many of the ideas and values underpinning each movement for

change share a central endeavour to challenge the status quo in TESOL and to innovate the English language teaching industry.

2.2 Innovation processes

In the 1990s, Brown (1993) drew on Rogers' (1983) diffusion of innovation model to conceptualize the processes via which World Englishes ideas could be implemented in ELT practices. Brown draws on Rogers' examination of variables affecting the perceived attributes of an innovation—that is, the aspects that might make an innovation more appealing: compatibility, relative advantage, complexity, trialability, and observability. In more recent work, Rose and Galloway (2019) outlined a diffusion model in greater detail, exploring the processes via which an innovation might catch on or fail in various educational contexts. Their innovation model borrows from Rogers' (2003) later work, where he organizes adopters of an innovation into five categories: innovators, early adopters, the early majority, the late majority, and laggards. In the field of technological innovation in language learning, Porter and Graham (2016) drew on various definitions of these adopters (e.g. Rogers, 2003) to highlight the important role of the innovators and early adopters in leading and creating space for new pedagogical practices. The broader domain of Global Englishes, likewise, requires agents of change to introduce and trial innovations, and then to importantly research and report on the effects of these innovations.

While some scholars focus on teachers as agents of change, other scholars have focused on the importance of teacher educators to plant the seeds of innovation (e.g. Seidlhofer, 2011; Dewey, 2012, 2014; Sifakis, 2014; Blair, 2015; Dewey, 2015a, 2015b; Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015, 2018; Rose & Galloway, 2019). Teacher education is a powerful context within which to transform the prior expectations and beliefs held by teachers, which can have lasting effects throughout their careers (Borg, 2018). Some ELF scholars argue that change must emerge from direct engagement with the teachers themselves (e.g. Dewey, 2012; Widdowson, 2012), and teacher education is an obvious context where contact between researchers and teachers can easily occur.

2.2 A need to take stock of Global Englishes innovations in practice

While Global Englishes and its adjacent fields of study have long observed a theory-practice divide, in recent years a considerable quantity of classroom-based and LTE-based research has emerged to bridge this divide. Currently, there is a need to take stock of what research has taken place thus far in language classrooms to better understand the effects of Global Englishes innovations practice. Similarly, we need to know what innovations have been researched in teacher education thus far to make recommendations for future practices. Finally, in light of recent disruptions to student mobility and face-to-face teaching due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we see an urgent need to review the uses of technology in curriculum innovation to ensure we meet current and future pedagogical needs. Thus, this paper aims to systematically investigate what innovations have been put forward and what has been researched regarding implementation of these innovations.

2.3 Research questions

Building on the current knowledge gaps in the field, our review aims to answer the following review questions:

1. What Global Englishes (including ELF, EIL and World Englishes) innovations have been trailed and reported in research on language teacher education?

2. What Global Englishes (including ELF, EIL and World Englishes) innovations have been trialled and reported in research within language classrooms?

3. How has technology been used as a facilitator of curricular innovation?

In answering these questions, we intend to ask a number of sub-questions to guide our synthesis of the studies. These are: What is the reported impact of these innovations? Within which theories is research conducted? In what contexts and on what populations has research been conducted? What research methodologies have been used? What suggestions for future research have emerged? What implications for future practice are suggested?

3.0 Methodology for systematic review

We have elected to conduct this review of research as a systematic review, rather than a traditional narrative review to try to minimize bias. A systematic review is defined as a review which 'adheres closely to a set of scientific methods that explicitly aim to limit systematic error (bias), mainly by attempting to identify, appraise and synthesize all relevant studies' (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006, p. 9). As Macaro (2020, p. 230) observes:

> 'traditional reviews can be affected by bias and lack of systematicity: bias in terms of how many and which previously published studies are selected for inclusion; lack of systematicity with regard to whether these studies are read in any kind of depth, the extent to which they are then described in the review, how they are juxtaposed against other studies, and whether and how they are critiqued.'

To reduce individual bias, systematic reviews should always be carried out in teams (Macaro, 2020). As two of the authors are scholars of Global Englishes, whose work was likely to be included in the review, a systematic approach allowed these authors to minimize their own biases by applying strict frameworks when reviewing their own work, as well as the work of others we were more familiar or unfamiliar with. It also facilitated opportunities to uncover new pieces of research via an extensive search protocol. As it is important for systematic review teams to apply different perspectives to the review process (Macaro, 2020), our team intentionally included one researcher who works outside the field of Global Englishes, but whose research on global language education would provide an alternative critical perspective.

3.1 Sample

Our sample included all potential empirical studies on Global Englishes innovation in language teaching. Our inclusion criteria for the studies were:

1. Must contain empirical research
2. Must have been published between 2010-2019
3. Must be about English language teaching or teacher education
4. Must be about one or more of our key constructs (Global Englishes, World Englishes, EIL or ELF)

Articles were excluded if they were deemed to be:

1. Theoretical articles or reports on practice with no research methodology
2. Research on topics other than language teaching, but with stated pedagogical implications
3. Studies on attitudes towards our key constructs rather than the pedagogical innovations underpinned by them

We required articles to contain empirical research and excluded theoretical articles and reports to better understand what research was being conducted within the space of theory and practice. As numerous review articles have appeared over time (e.g. Jenkins, 2006b; Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011), the aim of this review was to explore actual innovation in practice, rather than re-hashing proposals for change. After an initial search of papers, 2010 was chosen as the cutoff date for inclusion in the review; search results in library databases showed this to be a clear year when the volume of available research had increased.

Some scholars may find systematic reviews more constrained than traditional reviews. Certainly, in our application of strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, we will have inevitably missed some important work which has appeared in unindexed book chapters, peripheral academic journals, and unindexed dissertations. Nevertheless, 'a positive result of following these stringent criteria is the limitation of bias, thereby increasing the trustworthiness, and arguably the value, of the results and recommendations of the study' (Rose, Briggs, Boggs, Sergio, & Ivanova-Slavianskaia, 2018, p. 153).

3.2 Procedures

The following databases were searched to find potential articles.

- British Education Index
- Education Abstracts
- Education Research Complete
- Education-Line
- ERIC
- Academic Research Complete
- SCOPUS
- MLA International Bibliography

In each of the databases, we conducted the following search: "global Englishes" OR "English as a lingua franca" OR "English as an international language" OR "world Englishes" AND "teaching" OR "pedagogy" AND "English". The search was conducted on August 10-12, 2019. An updated search was conducted on June 1, 2020 to screen more recent articles. The initial searching produced over 1000 potential papers. While some of the search engines connected to the databases such as EBSCO and ProQuest allowed the searching of multiple databases, which reduced the number of duplicates from the outset, many duplicates still remained. To reduce these, papers were exported as .ris files and then uploaded to EndNote to use its automatic tool to delete duplicates. The list was then manually searched for partial matches in author and titles, and when duplicates were confirmed, these were deleted. While this search took place, other unsuitable articles were removed from screening based on publication source—papers which were published in non-research periodicals, such as *The Economist*. This left 406 articles which were shortlisted for abstract screening (and 92 further articles were added to this total in the updated search).

The shortlisted articles were then imported into Rayyan (Ouzzani et al., 2016)—a web application for systematic reviews, which allows remote access and blind reviewing by multiple team members. During the abstract screening, the researchers worked together in the same room to ensure they could check their understanding of the criteria with the other members. Papers were marked as 'include', 'exclude, or 'maybe'. Those marked 'maybe'

were then reviewed by all of the researchers and included if two or more researchers agreed that they should be retained for full-text review.

In total, this procedure identified and reviewed in-depth 38 papers: 10 on research of Global Englishes innovations in teacher education; 17 on research of Global Englishes innovations in language classrooms; and 11 on the use of technology to raise awareness of Global Englishes issues.

3.3 Data analysis

After the review process, 68 papers were retained for data extraction in the first phase of the review process. Electronic labels were also attached to the papers in Rayyan to help group them, using inductive coding processes. These included: attitudes, teachers, curriculum change, classroom intervention, teacher education, intelligibility, materials, pronunciation, intercultural communication, assessment, and identity. The papers were then grouped according to our review questions, which were: teacher education; classroom research; and technology. Some studies on materials or attitudes, which did not connect directly research on innovation were not included in the critical in-depth review stage. The full papers were then divided between the researchers maintaining those within their theme, so the same reviewer judgements were made on similar studies. The researchers then extracted key information on topic, sample, context, theory, research methods and findings and added these to a single-spreadsheet data extraction grid. Weight of evidence scores (high, medium and low) were given to evaluate the study's relevance to our review, the appropriateness of its methodology, the contribution of its findings to our review questions, and the trustworthiness of its analysis and reporting. One of the key functions of a systematic review is to assess the reliability of research evidence (Gough, Oliver, & Thomas, 2017); thus, these evaluation scores help to reveal the most important studies to showcase in our in-depth review so that stakeholders are able to glean the most relevant and important research findings (Macaro, 2020). The extraction grid was then used to produce simplified tables for inclusion in this paper to compare and contrast the studies on key dimensions such as participants, theoretical frameworks, research context, research methodology, and types of analysis.

3.4 Limitations

Our systematic review has several limitations, which must be acknowledged. First, our review did not include grey literature—that is unpublished research, or research that might not be in the form of published papers but available elsewhere, such as in conference presentations, dissertations, blogs, and teacher newsletters. By not including such work, our review has introduced 'file drawer bias' by not catering to unpublished work. One of the reasons we did not include such research was an inability to systematically search for them. While we are aware of unpublished masters and doctoral work by our own students and the students of certain other scholars, we felt including this research would introduce the very type of bias we aimed to avoid by adopting a systematic method. A second limitation was papers were not blind reviewed by multiple members (only the 'maybe' papers were). This may have impacted the reliability of the first screening process. A final limitation is that our search parameters may have missed relevant papers that did not include our key terms in their abstracts. Nonetheless, by restricting our search to transparent and replicable procedures we have facilitated future extensions and updates to this review.

It is important to note that many studies of teacher education practice and overviews of innovations since 2013 are book chapters, and due to not being indexed, were not captured in searches for the systematic review. Although not included in this paper, we are emphatic that Global Englishes researchers should be aware of the contributions these chapters make to knowledge in the area—especially as important avenues of reporting on action research. For example, Fang and Widodo's (2019) edited book discusses how Global Englishes can be transformed into practice and includes chapters that offer empirical evidence in the Asian context. Sifakis and Tsantila's (2019) edited book also includes a mix of conceptual and empirical chapters exploring ELF in classroom curricula, language materials and tests, and teacher education programs. Rose and Galloway's (2019) book on Global Englishes contains three chapters of empirical research. Zein's (2019) edited book on ELF in teacher education in Indonesia, and Hino's (2019) book on Japan are also good examples of research literature targeted to specific regions.

4.0 What Global Englishes innovations have been trailed and reported in language teacher education research?

This section aims to answer our first research question, which aimed to explore Global Englishes innovations in language teacher education research. Even though our initial screening of LTE papers highlighted many studies that discussed innovative practices in language teacher education, some of which provided a very good overview of instructional activities and modules to inform teacher education curriculum development, these were ultimately excluded from analysis due to a lack of empirical evidence reporting the effects of the innovations. Our review also revealed a number of excellent studies which focused on in-service and pre-service teachers' attitudes to innovation, as opposed to reporting on the innovations themselves (Buckingham, 2015; Lee, Lee, & Drajati, 2019). Although these were excluded from our in-depth review, the study by Lee et al. (2019) is worth noting due to its use of an original questionnaire to measure attitudes towards EIL, which could be of potential relevance to future research on changes in attitudes via teacher education.

The systematic review ultimately identified ten empirical studies that specifically examined innovation in language teacher education research, and which our weight of evidence scores highlighted as most relevant to our research question (Table 1). In terms of methodological assessments, two of these studies were described as pilot studies, working with a small dataset, and the data collection and analysis procedures of one article was not well articulated. We conclude that the majority of these papers reflect research-in-progress pieces, which is surprising given that there have been calls for innovations to teacher education for decades.

Table 1: Studies reporting on curriculum innovation in language teacher education research

Study	Year	Country	Context	Main paradigms
Love	2013	Korea	In-service teachers	Critical pedagogy (but included WE)
Ates, Eslami & Wright	2015	USA	Pre-service teachers	WE
Sifakis & Bayyurt	2015	Greece and Turkey	In-service teachers	ELF, WE

Vettorel & Corrizzato	2016	Italy	In-service teachers	WE, ELF
Zacharias	2016	Indonesia	Pre-service teachers	ELF
Cameron & Galloway	2019	UK	Mostly pre-service teachers	GE
Eslami, Moody & Pashmforoosh	2019	USA	Pre-service teachers	EIL, WE
Galloway & Numajiri	2020	UK	Mostly pre-service teachers	GE
Biricik Deniz, Özkan & Bayyurt	2020	Turkey	Pre-service teachers	ELF
Prabjandee	2020	Thailand	In-service	GE

Four of these studies were conducted in Anglophone contexts. Two (Cameron & Galloway, 2019; Galloway & Numajiri, 2020) were conducted with pre- and in-service teachers (mostly pre-service) on a UK-based master's program and the other two Anglophone studies (Ates et al., 2015; Eslami et al., 2019) were conducted in the US, responding to the changing demographics in native English-speaking classrooms as a result of increased migration. The only other contexts included in this group are Italy (Vettorel & Corrizzato, 2016), Indonesia (Zacharias, 2016), Korea (Love, 2013), Thailand (Prabjandee, 2020) and Turkey (Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015; Biricik Deniz et al., 2020). The lack of research in other regions of the globe is significant. Zacharias (2016) points out that research with pre-service teachers is under-represented, yet only two studies were conducted solely with in-service teachers (Love, 2013; Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015). However, in some studies, small numbers of participants had teaching experience (e.g. Cameron & Galloway, 2019) and in Vetterol and Corrizzato (2016), a quarter of the participants had more than five years of experience. Notably, definitions of pre- and in-service teacher education were not always clear in these studies and length and lack of experience differed greatly.

The studies draw mostly on WE, although we can see that in some studies, ELF and EIL were also drawn upon. Love (2013) focuses on critical pedagogy, but the critical pedagogy workshop used in this study included WE content. The studies in this section are reviewed in three groups: those reporting on reflections of short-term innovations (4.1), those reporting on longitudinal innovations and their impact on perceptions (4.2), and those offering frameworks for teacher education (4.3).

4.1 Studies Reporting on reflections of short-term innovations

In this review, two studies reported on short-term innovations in teacher education research. The first is Love's (2013) study, which focused on critical pedagogy with a two-hour workshop organized for two groups of ten Korean in-service primary and middle school teachers. In this short intervention, World Englishes was only one of several topics, but it highlights the connections between Global Englishes and critical pedagogy. The study also responds to the need for more research with young learners and the focus on reflection and

adaptation of TESOL materials responds to the lack of materials, a key barrier to innovation. Not clearly an action research project beyond the author conducting the research in their own classroom, this pilot project provided only anecdotal evidence of participant views, leaving the claim that participants were adept at evaluating materials unsupported. The study suggested that participants currently use critical approaches in their classrooms and calls for an approach that aims 'to work within existing curricula and systems rather than overturn them' (p. 127), a conclusion that resonates with GELT and ELF-aware pedagogy.

Eslami et al. (2019) reported on six activities designed to promote understanding of WE and EIL with undergraduate pre-service teachers in the US. The sample size is unclear, but the aim was to challenge pre-service teachers' knowledge about WE and heighten their sensitivity towards the cultural and linguistic diversity they will face in American public schools. As with Love (2013), there is an overview of the WE unit and an overview of activities. Data were collected via written journal reflections, completed in-class after each activity—although with no sample size, it is unclear how many were collected. As such, claims that activities were beneficial for raising participants' awareness, tolerance, and respect of WE and that they resulted in attitudinal change and enabled participants to challenge their own ideologies about 'standard' English are questionable, particularly since pre-intervention data were not collected. Perceptions were noted to be the result of many factors, namely experiences with language learning and professional training background but it is unclear how these factors were explored.

4.2 Studies reporting on longitudinal interventions

Ates et al. (2015) investigated the effectiveness of incorporating WE perspectives into undergraduate ESL education courses in a teacher education program in the US. Like the two studies in 4.1, the study involved those preparing to teach younger learners (Pre K-6 and grades 4-8), but this was over a full 15-week semester, conducted by researchers not teaching the course, that collected data from multiple classes. The sample size was also much larger, with 215 pre-service teachers. Data were collected via pre- and post-course questionnaires with closed and open-ended questions. The analysis applied statistical methods to compare pre- and post-course data (using multiple t-tests, but without a Bonferroni adjustment). Statistically significant changes in attitudes were revealed, and both students and teachers were found to have benefited from exposure to WE perspectives. Although no follow-up data from the teachers were collected, the researchers called for more observational research on the actual implementation of WE perspectives into classrooms. The researchers conclude that appropriate interventions can foster awareness and acceptance of the diversity of English.

Zacharias's (2016) qualitative study explored the formation of teacher identity with 10 pre-service undergraduates on a teacher training programme in Indonesia taking a 15-week microteaching course orienting them to ELF pedagogy. They were interviewed three times to explore their understanding of ELF pedagogy, experiences enacting it in mini lessons, and their identity formation influenced by the course (although no pre- and post-course data were collected). Teaching documents for the mini lessons (lesson plans, power point presentation, and handouts) were also collected, although analysis of these materials was unclear. Participants gained confidence and using ELF pedagogy changed the way they saw their roles in teaching English and how they utilised local cultures in materials; most showed agreement with the importance of constructing a teacher identity independent of native-speaker norms. Although participants had real teaching practice after the course, no follow-up study was reported. Zacharias concluded by pressing for inclusion of more NNEST

issues in teacher education and encouraged the use of mediation tools such as mini lessons to enable pre-service teachers to reflect on their identity formation.

Vetterol and Corrizzato's (2016) study in Italy included the design and implementation of a WE- and ELF-aware teacher education module and investigated how it influenced pre-service teachers' attitudes towards teaching practices. The two-year mixed methods study involved two cohorts of students and data collected via questionnaires, reflections in e-learning discussion forums, interviews and final reports. Because the sample size, research design and data collection procedures are unclear, and only open-ended data analysis procedures are outlined, replication would be difficult; and although participants were positive about the innovation, conclusions that such innovations can broaden perspectives of English language teaching are questionable. However, some of the post-course interview comments provide initial insights and as with Ates et al. (2015), the study explored what aspects of WE and ELF should be included in teacher education. The authors also explored potential barriers to incorporating these aspects into curricula in the participants' context. Citing Love (2013), they note that this study also emphasises critically evaluating ELT materials for adapting rather than abandoning traditional TESOL curricula.

The study reported in Prabjandee (2020) was conducted with 38 Thai lower secondary school English teachers to investigate attitudes towards GELT and provides insights into the activities that could be used for teacher training. Informed by transformative learning theory, the author designed a 16-hour teacher development course, collecting data via a pre- and post-course questionnaire, researcher field notes and artefacts (materials produced by participants). The author acknowledges the descriptive nature of the pre-post course questionnaire analysis, yet unlike other studies, participants were also asked to reflect on their experiences and the usefulness of certain activities two weeks after the course, providing insights for curriculum design. Teachers were positive towards the activities, but attitudes towards GELT remained unchanged. The authors note that this reflects Galloway and Rose's (2015) point that a paradigm shift in thinking may not occur quickly. The study also highlights the potential of transformative learning theory; the activities did not result in a major change in attitude, yet they did create a willingness to learn new concepts, so the author calls for activities that provoke a strong emotional reaction and ones which enable participants to scrutinize their prior knowledge. However, as with other studies, the author also recognises the limitation of self-report data, which may not reflect authentic behaviours of implementing GELT in the classroom.

Biricik Deniz et al.'s (2020) qualitative study, referred to as a 'multiple case study', reports on the implementation and impact of a theoretical ELF-aware teacher education course ("Globalization in ELT") on an English language teacher education programme, which was originally developed for in-service teacher education and was imbued with the syllabus of the ELFTEd project (Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015). This study was part of a PhD study (Biricik Deniz, 2017) with 26 pre-service teachers in Turkey. Data were collected via open-ended-questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and other course documents, including portal journals and reflection reports. The questionnaire and short ten-minute interviews were conducted at the start of the semester and also administered at the end, although there is no information on the length of semester or frequency of the course. Data were also collected throughout the course via journals, and at the end of the course participants wrote a reflection report. The pre- and post-course qualitative data comparison is reported to have revealed a change in mindset. The course raised their awareness of the phenomenon of ELF and ELF-aware pedagogy, although the authors acknowledge that this needs to be further investigated to "clarify how this change occurs". The study also acknowledges that, given the small group of teachers, generalizability of the research

findings is limited. The authors call for a follow-up study to explore the impact of the course on the participants actual teaching practice.

4.3 Studies reporting on frameworks for teacher education
Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015) describe a 'transformative' framework for TESOL practitioner education informed by ELF and WE designed to promote practitioners' critical engagement with their own teaching practice. The study, conducted in Turkey, offers a thick description of the curriculum. The 'ELF-aware teacher education' (ELF-TEd) project had three broad phases including a *theoretical phase*, an *application phase*, and an *evaluation phase*. Twelve teachers (11 from Turkey and one from Greece) completed all phases of the project, but the two focus groups included only those from Turkey and the study reports only on the pilot phase. Lessons were audio or video recorded, uploaded to the project website and self and peer evaluations were conducted, but these data were not explored. The framework was reported to prompt participants to rethink their teaching practices, but without a pre- and post-course comparison, it is unclear how the course re-orientated beliefs about 'non-native speakers', and practices such as their use of error-correction, whether it actually increased their self-confidence as teachers. The detailed overview of the framework is nonetheless helpful to inform future LTE interventions.

Another study that promotes the importance of reflecting on context and own-teaching practice is Cameron and Galloway's (2019) study with pre- and in-service TESOL practitioners taking a Global Englishes (GELT) course on a one-year master's program in Scotland. As with all other studies in this section, it was conducted in a single setting. The focus was on attitudes towards proposing changes in their current or future teaching contexts. Data were collected from five students and triangulated with a survey of 66 students on the wider TESOL master's. It is unclear, however, if any questionnaire participants also took the GELT course, as while the nationality of interviewees is stated, there is no information on the questionnaire respondents. However, the study responds to the need for research exploring the practicalities of GELT and specifically addressed attitudes towards GELT proposals and barriers to implementing innovation. Findings report that explicit Global Englishes instruction can increase beliefs in change, but the claim is weakened by the fact that the data collected were retrospective. The authors call for more research both prior to and after Global Englishes instruction.

Galloway and Numajiri (2020) investigated pre- and in-service TESOL practitioners taking a GELT elective course in a one-year Master's in TESOL programme in the UK. They used interviews (n=21) and questionnaires (n=47) at the start of the course to investigate attitudes towards the GELT framework, and GELT proposals for, and barriers to, curriculum innovation, as well as factors influencing such attitudes. The authors did not investigate the influence of the course on attitudes in this study (although this is reported in Rose & Galloway 2019), but it does provide insights into the feasibility of GELT-related curriculum innovation and proposals being put forward. Findings revealed GELT was seen to be an important and relevant topic for the TESOL practitioners however, attitudes remained norm-bound and there were concerns about several possible barriers to innovation and uncertainty over how to overcome them, calling for more clear guidance for curricular innovation. The authors call for more research to explore the feasibility of proposals for curriculum innovation, as well as to examine what happens in the classroom after teacher education courses. The authors also acknowledge that, as an elective course, participants may have had more favourable attitudes towards GELT than others.

4.4 Evaluating the research

As noted in section 1.2.1, teacher education has been identified as a key avenue to instigate Global Englishes-related innovation in TESOL. Teachers' attitudes are central to innovation uptake, and while attitudinal studies are certainly important, studies such as Zacharias (2016) that focus on teacher identity are also welcome. However, despite increased proposals from scholars to raise teachers' awareness, and the increased presence of postgraduate TESOL and applied linguistics programmes (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020), it would appear that research on innovation in teacher education research is still in a state of infancy. The amount of published research in this area in vetted indexed journals is scant, although it should be acknowledged that several studies have been reported in book chapters not included in this review.

Overall, the studies in this category showcase some excellent pedagogical innovations and some provide detailed overviews of the syllabus and activities used, but there are many limitations. The innovations reported here do appear to have been successful, yet there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate the heightened awareness claimed. The research designs are often lacking in direct measures and the data analysis procedures of many studies are unclear, so we have to rely on anecdotal accounts of innovation. Short-term interventions and pilot projects need to be supplemented with studies that include pre- and post-course data collection to explore the influence of such innovations. More longitudinal research is also needed after the innovation to explore how (and if) these changes are implemented in practice when teachers enter, or return to, their respective classrooms.

4.5 Strengths and Limitations of Current Research into Innovations in teacher education

Table 2 outlines the methodological approaches utilized by the studies within this section. As can be seen, mixed and qualitative methods dominate, although as noted, the vast amount of different types of data collected was also a weakness of several studies, given the lack of systematic data collection and analysis. In summary, many approaches are being taken to introduce innovations in teacher education in relation to Global Englishes. Only Vettorel and Corrizzato (2016) and Ates et al. (2015) utilized pre- and post-course data to examine the influence of the innovation and both used questionnaires to do so. However, as noted above, data were only robustly reported in Ates et al. (2015).

Table 2: Methodologies of classroom-based research

Study	Approach	Sample size	Time	Main Data Source
Love, 2013	Qualitative	10	Cross-sectional	Workshop observations
Ates et al., 2015	Mixed	215	Longitudinal	Questionnaire
Eslami et al., 2019	Qualitative	Not stated	Cross-sectional	Reflections, journal entries after activity, awareness raising activities, written reflections

Vettorel & Corrizzato, 2016	Mixed	Not stated	Not stated	Course instruction, questionnaire, pair and group reflective activities
Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015	Mixed	12 of 32	Longitudinal	Focus groups
Zacharias, 2016	Qualitative	10	Longitudinal	Interviews, lesson plans, ppts, teaching materials (handouts)
Cameron & Galloway, 2019	Mixed	66+5	Cross-sectional	Questionnaire and Interviews
Biricik Deniz et al., 2020	Qualitative	26	Longitudinal	Interviews, open-ended questionnaires, and reflection reports.
Galloway and Numajiri (2020)	Mixed	47	Cross-sectional	Interviews and questionnaires
Prabjandee (2020)	Mixed	38	Longitudinal	Questionnaires; field notes; artefacts; teacher's reflection

In all other studies, attitudinal change was claimed drawing on retrospective data collection instruments. Many used a mixture of tools to explore innovation. These include questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, lesson plans, teaching materials (handouts), journal entries, written reflections, and audio and video recordings of microteaching lessons. The retrospective nature of data collection at the end of many of the courses reported in this research makes it difficult to attribute change to particular aspects of the intervention, as no before measures are used to account for attitudes before taking the course.

Many of the studies provided a detailed overview of the types of activities that can be used to integrate a Global Englishes perspective. These studies also highlight the need to develop ways to work with teachers' own curricula and promote reflection. As Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015, p. 482) state, ELF-aware instruction should not 'prescribe a particular teaching methodology or even a specific curriculum', and while the study provides a detailed overview of the framework, more robust evidence of teachers' transformative journeys in teacher education is required.

The lack of trustworthiness of many of these studies is concerning and the unclear designs and analysis procedures of most of the studies makes replication difficult. Four of the studies were teacher-led, and even though Love (2013) refers to this as action research, there is no evidence of this beyond collecting data in the researcher's own classroom. In most of the studies reviewed, it was difficult to categorise them into a particular research design—an indication of a lack of methodological structure. For Global Englishes innovation to be successfully incorporated into the curriculum, more transparency in research design is needed, not only to improve the trustworthiness of the studies but also to enable replication. Thick descriptions of the innovations are certainly helpful, but data collection and analysis procedures also need to be clear, otherwise the impact of such innovations remain uncertain.

The lack of longitudinal data (with some notable exceptions in the more recent studies) and the lack of follow-up studies with teachers in their own classrooms is also problematic. Ates

et al. (2015) call for more longitudinal research, and it is clear that to date, no research has been conducted examining the long-time and real-life impact of innovations. Microteaching was used in Zacharias (2016), providing a window into observable practices. We call for follow up studies of this nature with robust data collection procedures, analysis and reporting of results to be able to demonstrate the success of these innovations in observable practice, as well as studies exploring long term change in actual classrooms. The studies indicate that participants, albeit often conflicted, are generally supportive of change (Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015, 2018), yet there is no research on what happens when they enter or return to the classroom. In Vetterol and Corrizzato (2016), Cameron and Galloway (2019), and Galloway and Numajiri (2020), barriers to innovation were explored and it is hoped that more research will explore the feasibility of curricular innovation in a range of teaching contexts.

Nevertheless, the studies are a promising starting point for future research. A degree of scepticism about change is unsurprising and norm-bound attitudes are deeply entrenched. However, in all of these studies, participants were positive about the innovations and they do provide insights into how to implement innovations within teacher education. It is hoped with the increase in Global Englishes courses in TESOL programs that we will see more studies in different contexts. Teacher education is a key factor to ensure successful and sustained curriculum innovation and remains central to discussions on the need for change in ELT in relation to ELF (see Dewey & Patsko, 2017).

5.0 What Global Englishes innovations have been reported in research within language classrooms?

This section explores published research related to Global Englishes innovations within actual classrooms and curricula to answer our second review question. Table 3 includes the 17 studies highlighted in our systematic review as most relevant to this topic. Our review initially revealed a good number of studies which reported on innovative practices, but did not do so within a clear research design. Examples of this included Lwin and Marlina's (2018) interesting article advocating for the of use of folktales to engage English language students in developing their intercultural communicative competence. Similarly, Rose and Montakantiwong (2018) conducted a joint autoethnography (or duoethnography) of their own lived experiences of teaching EIL in Japan and Thailand, offering two very different tales of successful and failed curriculum innovation. However, articles such as these, while relevant to the theme of this review, did not present empirical evidence of innovations in practice and thus were excluded from our in-depth analysis. For different reasons, other papers that made it to the extraction grid stage (e.g. Bokor, 2011; Lanvers, Hultgren, & Gayton, 2019) were excluded during review due to their focus on L1 English speakers, as too were those connected to pure textbook analysis (e.g. Syrbe & Rose, 2018) or textbooks in classroom use (e.g. Yu, 2018). Our review also revealed a number of excellent studies which focused on students' and teachers' attitudes to innovation, rather than research on innovations themselves (He & Zhang, 2010; Fang, 2011; Sung, 2016; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Takahashi, 2017). Although these have been excluded from our in-depth review, these are worth noting as being potentially important investigations of stakeholders' readiness for change.

Table 3: Studies reporting on curriculum innovation

Study	Year	Country	Context	Main paradigm
Marlina	2013	Australia	University	EIL

Galloway	2013	Japan	University	GE
Galloway & Rose	2014	Japan	University	GE
Teixeira & Pozzi	2014	USA	University	WE
Chang	2014	Taiwan	University	WE
Ali	2015	Pakistan	Postgraduate	EIL
Sung	2015	Hong Kong	University	GE
Rahimi & Ruzrokh	2016	Iran	High School	ELF
Rose & Galloway	2017	Japan	University	GE
Fang & Ren	2018	China	University	GE
Galloway & Rose	2018	Japan	University	GE
Sung	2018	Hong Kong	University	ELF
Lee	2019	Korea	University	EIL
Milliner & Dimoski	2019	Japan	University	ELF
Rosenhan & Galloway	2019	Japan	University	GE
Sert & Özkan	2020	Turkey	University	ELF
Tardy, Reed, Slinkard, & LaMance	2020	USA	University	GE

The earliest studies in our sample were Marlina's (2013) investigation of teaching EIL in an undergraduate context in Australia, and Galloway's (2013) investigation of teaching Global Englishes in Japan, however there is an indication of recent growth in research with over half these studies published since 2018. Innovations have been reported in 12 different countries, with Japan represented in six studies. Undergraduate university learning contexts represent the vast majority of studies, with only two studies at the high school level, and one at the elementary-school level. Global Englishes is the main paradigm of research in eight of the studies, EIL underpins five of the studies, ELF informs four of the studies, and World Englishes just one. This indicates that classroom-based research is led by Global Englishes and EIL research, with the latter representing a more regionally diverse range of studies. Scholarship from ELF and World Englishes are heavily drawn upon in a majority of papers, but often as a secondary paradigm underpinning the study.

5.1 Studies Reporting on Classroom Activities

Most published studies that reported on classroom innovations were conducted by teacher-researchers, or researchers in collaboration with teachers. Rose and Galloway (2017) investigated the impact of a Global Englishes awareness raising activity with 108 university-level English language students in Japan. The activity involved learning about, and independently researching, the *Speak Good English Movement* in Singapore, after which students engaged in a debate over the legitimacy of Singaporean English and the need for people to adhere to perceived standards. Data were collected via reflection papers from each student and analysed thematically. Findings indicated that the activity helped to raise explicit awareness of non-standard Englishes and to challenge standard language ideologies. Based

on these findings, the authors concluded that the activity "demonstrates how Global Englishes can be incorporated into an everyday ELT classroom in a country like Japan, where 'native' norms prevail" (p. 300) and helps teachers and learners to realize that language in use sets different standards than the imagined benchmarks. The strength of the study as a report of pedagogical practice is also its weakness as a piece of research, as there is a high risk of bias in the conclusions drawn.

In another study with the same group of 108 Japanese university students, Rosenhan and Galloway (2019) analysed poems produced by the students to explore whether creative pedagogies can provide a means to show creative self-reflection regarding the global spread of English. The poems were analysed via corpus and literary analysis to explore metaphors that students used as a means of emancipation from native English norms. The study concludes that the use of poetry for this purpose helped students to develop their own identities by allowing them to subvert the rule-governed nature of English through creative use of the language.

Galloway and Rose (2018) used a presentation task to raise awareness of Global Englishes with 19 Japanese university students. In the task, the students were required to research one regional variety of English in terms of its development, features and use, and then present this information in small groups using PowerPoint slides or posters. Data were collected in the form of handwritten reflections on the task. Data were coded thematically according to reasons for choosing the variety, and their reactions to the information presented in their groups. The authors conclude that the activity facilitated in-depth exposure to a wide variety of Englishes. Implications were that teachers could adapt the activity for their own classrooms to create a more globally oriented and learner-centered curriculum. The trustworthiness of findings of this study were similarly problematic to the debate study (Rose and Galloway 2017), where data were collected via a single method in which students might have told the teacher-researchers what they wanted to hear.

Sung (2015) conducted a study on a group of 25 students in Hong Kong, where the curriculum included a number of Global Englishes awareness-raising activities. Thirteen of the students were interviewed in two focus groups after the course concluded. Data were analysed thematically, and findings suggested that the activities were received positively and were successful in raising awareness. The author notes, however, that the course did not result in radical change, and that future innovation might be best spread across language curricula and include both critical activities and out-of-class learning opportunities. Like many of the studies within this group, the study is somewhat limited in its one-shot end-of-course data collection, which affects the trustworthiness of the findings. Pedagogically, however, the study offers a lot to teachers, with its good description of the innovations, including some example tasks in the published study.

Sert and Özkan (2020) report on a seven-week intervention with 30 university students in Turkey. The intervention consisted of a series of one-hour long weekly ELF-informed activities, mainly focused on accents, pronunciation, and intelligibility. Data were collected before and after the course via a list of statements about ELF that students had to agree or disagree with. Interviews with five students at the end of the course were also conducted. As the statement list produced binary data, results were somewhat simplistic, but nonetheless showed that the activities led to greater confidence in students' own variety of English, and less attachment to British and American standards. Interview data attributed these attitudinal changes to the ELF-informed activities. Future research might choose to adapt the statement list to a Likert scale format to produce data with greater sensitivity.

Milliner and Dimoski (2019) reported on the effects of an innovation comprising of twelve ELF-informed listening strategy training activities at Japanese university. The participants were 147 Japanese students, and data were collected via pre and post-course listening assessments (TOEIC and Listening Vocabulary Levels Test), a listening self-efficacy questionnaire, student diaries, and a post-course questionnaire. Analysis of the pre-and post-course listening assessments revealed no significant change in listening proficiency but seeing as both of these tests do not measure ELF use, this is perhaps unsurprising, and speaks more to the efficacy of the listening training than the ELF-informed aspects of it. The self-efficacy questionnaire descriptively indicated a slight raise in students' listening confidence, although inferential statistics were not conducted to check if this change was significant. Post-course questionnaires indicated students responded positively to the activities. Overall, due to the adopted measures and analysis embodied in this study, it is difficult to conclude an overall effect of the ELF-informed aspects of the listening training.

Overall, the studies in this category showcase excellent pedagogical innovations in English language classrooms, but all have limitations in embodying one-shot or retrospective explorations of the impact of these activities. In all of these studies, there are no measures to directly capture students' beliefs before and after the tasks, and thus there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate change. Moreover, data collection methods tend to be confined to written reflections and retrospective interviews. Thus, the validity of the students' responses may be called into question and it is unknown whether changes in beliefs are sustained over time, beyond completion of the task. As the activities are mostly transparently reported, displaying evidence of pedagogical soundness, future research might wish to trial the same types of tasks with a different group of students and use a mixed-methods approach to capture beliefs before and after the task, which would increase trustworthiness of the results. The use of multiple data collection instruments would also help to increase the validity of any changes found.

In one of the only truly longitudinal studies in this category, Rahimi and Ruzrokh (2016) outline a quasi-experimental study examining the effects of teaching a pronunciation course based on the lingua franca core in comparison to a traditional one based on accuracy benchmarked to native norms. Two groups of 28 students in a high school in Tehran were selected from a pool of 120 students and randomly allocated into the experimental and control groups. The experimental group received two 45-minute pronunciation sessions per week for six months based on the lingua franca core, and the control group had a syllabus underpinned by traditional British pronunciation norms. Students were given a receptive and productive intelligibility test, and an attitude questionnaire at the start and end of the course. The findings suggested that attitudes did not change as a result of the intervention, but the experimental group outperformed the control group according to the intelligibility measures. Reasons for differences in intelligibility are discussed, including the notion that the lingua franca core lessens the difficulties of mastering pronunciation and thus eases the task. However, as no qualitative data were collected from students, this could not be confirmed by the participants themselves. The study design was effective in that it offered longitudinal evidence of change, based on a before measure, but reporting was at times unclear, especially surrounding the opaque use of factor analysis on the attitudinal questionnaire. A future study might aim to replicate the methodology of this study, which was very transparent in design, but add qualitative elements to data collection, as well as additional steps into analysis to explore data at a greater depth.

5.2 Studies Reporting on Out-of-class Learning Activities

Galloway and Rose (2014) used an out-of-class compulsory listening task to expose students to non-standard English varieties and ELF exchanges. The task involved 108 English language students at a Japanese university, who selected 10 audio samples to listen to throughout the term. After listening, the students recorded in a journal what they had listened to, why they had selected it, and their reaction to it. In total, the dataset included 1,092 journal entries, which were thematically analysed for content and frequency counts. Interviews were conducted with a subset of these students. The findings revealed that students were drawn towards English speakers from all of Kachru's three circles, although Expanding Circle speakers were most popular. The reasons for students' choices predominantly centered around familiarity due to previous contact via teachers, friends, travel, or pop culture. The reflections revealed that the activity raised awareness of the diversity of English, but also reinforced some stereotypes the students had about non-standard English varieties. Overall, this study showed that out-of-class tasks can be used in class to create opportunities for discussion and reflection of Global Englishes. Although the interviews suggested changes in attitudes over the course of the activity, this was not explored within the journal entries, as all 1,092 entries were treated as one cross-sectional dataset rather than tracking changes in choices, motivations, and reactions over time. This is one limitation in the analysis, which future replication research should explore.

Sung (2018) trialed an out-of-class learning activity with 18 of his own students in a small liberal arts university in Hong Kong. In the activity, students engaged in a real-life ELF exchange for 10-20 minutes and recorded this interaction in a weekly logbook. Data were drawn from these worksheets and two written reflections of 1,500-2,000 words each on how the activity impacted students' understanding of using English in a global context. Data indicated that the activity led students to increase their appreciation of diverse forms of English, to question native speaker norms, and to recognize the importance of communication strategies and multilingual resources as a tool for communication. The study concludes that such out-of-class tasks increase students' critical awareness of ELF, and lead to their own positive identity development as legitimate users of English. The study does not report on the worksheet data nor changes in students' awareness from the first critical reflection to the second, meaning that like Galloway and Rose (2014), the data are presented cross-sectionally as a one-shot study, and does not explore longitudinal change. Nevertheless, the study has clear pedagogical implications as a report on successful ELF-aware pedagogy put into practice as part of out-of-class learning.

Lee (2019) reports on a classroom activity with 17 Korean students in an English language class at a university in Busan. The activity involved students planning and interviewing international visitors to the Busan International Film Festival and making recordings of the interviews to present in class. Data were collected from students via a reflective essay (n=17) and semi-structured interviews with a subset of students (n=13). The researcher concludes that the teacher was a significant agent of change in shaping students' attitudes regarding English as an international language, as the activity led to a number of critical events which challenged students' previously held biases and beliefs about non-native English. However, from the data presented, it is unclear how much this single activity brought about long-term, sustained change.

This study, like the three others in this category, involved data collected via reflection papers in a one-shot data collection design, and thus attitudinal change is only retrospectively reported by the students to the teacher-researcher, eroding the trustworthiness of the findings. Future research into out of class learning should try to replicate these types of activities, which showcase innovations in action, but aim to collect data within a longitudinal research design. Teachers of English may also need to think critically on the amount of time spent on

using EIL when deciding on good activities. The activity in Sung (2018) would require minimal preparation by the teacher to implement) but requires access to a multilingual context. The Galloway and Rose (2014) activity requires support from the teacher in finding suitable resources but may be well suited to lower level students in largely monolingual EFL contexts. In Lee's (2019) study, students spent most of their time editing and preparing videos as opposed to using EIL, so teachers may need to weigh the value of the activity against time required.

5.3 Studies Reporting on Teaching World Englishes and EIL

This group of studies includes research that explores the effects of teaching World Englishes and EIL to students. These studies are slightly different to the above studies as the aim of the curriculum is to teach sociolinguistic rather than language content, thus blurring the lines between content and language learning.

Fang and Ren's (2018) study in China explored the influence of teaching a World Englishes course to English language students on their attitudes towards their own English. It also aimed to explore attitudes towards Global Englishes more generally after taking the course. Approximately 50 students took the course over two terms, from which 12 student interviews were conducted in the first term, and reflective journals from 13 students were collected in the second term. Data were analysed thematically, and indicated the course helped students to develop an awareness of diversity in English, leading to greater confidence in their own variety of English. The data also suggested students developed a critical perspective of standards in English and tolerance for non-standard (but intelligible) English use. The authors note limitations to their study including the lack of a pre-test post-test design to capture attitudinal change, as the interviews and journals only reported retrospectively on such change. Also, as the whole course focused on Global Englishes, it is unclear from the findings how such content might be best integrated into a language curriculum, or which activities in particular led to the greatest change in attitudes. The authors suggest future studies should include more sources of data to capture the factors that influence changes in student attitudes in response to global Englishes content.

Chang's (2014) study of the impact of introducing WE topics in an English language class of 22 students in a Taiwanese university suggests that WE content is both valuable and important for inclusion in ELT. The study analysed the students' writing on WE topics to identify what the students found meaningful about English and learning English, what power the students noticed of what the English language has, the value of English varieties, and countering hegemony. While the findings are very selective (we do not know what they might have mostly written about), they are effective in showing an example of how WE topics are being introduced in ELT.

Teixeira and Pozzi (2014) explored the effects of teaching a World Englishes course on a group of seven international students from a range of L1 backgrounds. Data were collected in the form of accent-recognition quizzes at the start and end of the course, a background questionnaire, student writing reflections, recordings of group discussions, an exit questionnaire, and course evaluations. Findings suggest the World Englishes course encouraged contemplation of local and global English use, and improved students' ability to recognize varieties of English. Unfortunately, despite the healthy pool of data to draw upon, the procedures of data analysis and data presentation were not transparent. It was unclear what the accent recognition test included, and the use of a "two group" t-test on a paired sample of seven students was problematic, especially as no descriptive statistics from these

tests were reported. Overall, the study appeared to report on an innovative curriculum, but readers are left to accept the findings at face value without a rich description to either replicate the course content or the data collection procedures.

Marlina (2013) reports on a case study of three university students who took an EIL elective course in their undergraduate studies at an Australian university. Data were collected by Marlina, who was also the teacher, at the end of the course so as not to influence students' perceptions. The study found that the course benefited the students in terms of increasing their awareness and theoretical knowledge of variation in English, but the students had difficulties reconciling the political messages underlying EIL with their immediate and contrasting sociopolitical contexts. For example, while the curriculum taught them that their own English was acceptable, the context in which they studied often presented ethnocentric, racist, and native-speakerism behaviours and attitudes. The study points to the importance of EIL curricula to discuss resistance to EIL ideas. A strength of Marlina's study is the thick description that it offers of its EIL curriculum including the course outcomes. Marlina also details several limitations to his research design, suggesting future research employ richer data collection throughout the course to avoid the issues surrounding his cross-sectional, and retrospective, examination of the course via one source of data only.

Ali (2015) reports on the effects of teaching a series of five workshops on EIL to a group of 15 postgraduate linguistics students in Pakistan. Data were collected during the workshops via fieldwork observational notes and document collection, as well as post-study interviews with the participants. Data were stated to have been analysed via grounded theory, but this process was not entirely transparent in the write-up of the study. The study highlighted the fact that while the intervention did challenge students' ideas on standards in the language, the students held a deficit perception of their own use of English, surmising that this is reinforced through the Pakistan Army and by teachers who are not enthusiastic about EIL. A strength of the study is that it is one of the few examples of an EIL intervention in an Outer Circle context, where postcolonial ideals may act as a substantial barrier to change. Limitations of this study are that it was conducted only with linguistic majors, who may not represent the majority of learners in this context. Moreover, Like Marlina's (2013) study, the retrospective nature of data collection via interviews at the end of the course makes it difficult to attribute change to particular aspects of the intervention, as no before measures are used to capture attitudes before taking the course.

Tardy et al. (2020) took a content based instructional approach to incorporate Global Englishes content within a university-level writing course. This study is significant as it is one of the few studies to investigate the "challenges and benefits of a GELT-informed approach to EAL academic writing" (p. 2), and included a detailed overview of the course content, which comprised of two units of study on language variation and language the global spread of English. Data were collected in the form of pre- and post-course surveys with both students and teachers, university course evaluations, and a focus group with three students. They also observed monthly teacher meetings. As the main thrust of the paper was to communicate the innovative approach to a practitioner readership, presentation of empirical data was very minimal. Nonetheless, the post-course surveys and focus group data reported enthusiasm from students and teachers regarding course content, with 67 of the 72 students (93%) indicating interest in the topics covered.

5.4 Strengths and Limitations of Current Research into Classroom Innovations

Table 4 outlines the methodological approaches used in the studies in this section. As can be seen, the studies are predominantly qualitative in their approach, with only one quantitative and one mixed method design present in our sample of classroom studies. The studies are also predominantly action research projects led by teacher-researchers, or case studies conducted on teachers' own classrooms. However, in reality none of these studies labelled as action research in the table adhere to an action research methodological design in that they do not track modifications to innovations over time, but rather offer snapshots of the effects of innovations based on data collected after the completion of innovative tasks (and not before). As a result, only three studies embody a longitudinal design in their use of a quasi-experimental methodology. Only five of the studies provide evidence of the innovation in multiple classrooms.

Many of the studies purport that their innovations change students' attitudes and knowledge, but very few have concrete instrumentation to measure this (with the exceptions of Galloway, 2013, and Rahimi and Ruzrokh, 2016). A lack of direct measures of change may be hindering our current understanding of the exact impact of interventions. The prominence of self-reported and retrospective data collection instruments such as interviews and written reflections (often as the only source of data) is also problematic in that they do not provide strong evidence of causality. Many of the studies labelled as action research and case studies in Table 4 in fact lacked a concrete research design, thus eroding the trustworthiness of the findings, as much is left to the researchers' interpretations of the data, as it is impossible to trace the findings through multiple data collection points and instrument, nor via thick descriptions of the procedures. Often when pre-test measures are used in the studies, they are the wrong type of measures (i.e. they do not directly address Global Englishes) or are not subjected to rigorous tests of analysis to show significance or causality.

In summary, all of the studies presented in this section provide powerful pedagogical evidence from the language classroom of the positive benefits of innovations based on Global Englishes, World Englishes, ELF and EIL proposals for change. Future studies need to match this pedagogical contribution with research rigour, using robust data collection procedures to create a body of undisputable findings of proposals in action.

Table 4: Methodologies of classroom-based research

Study	Approach	Sample size	Time	Research Design	Main Data Sources
Marlina, 2013	Qual	3	CS	Case study	Interview
Galloway, 2013	Mixed	52	Long	Quasi-experimental	Questionnaires; focus groups
Galloway & Rose, 2014	Qual	108	CS	Action	Listening journal; interviews
Teixeira & Pozzi, 2014	Mixed	7	Long	Quasi-experimental	accent-recognition quiz; questionnaire; reflections
Ali, 2015	Qual	15	CS	Case study	Observations; post-study interview
Chang, 2014	Qual	22	CS	Case study	Reflection paper

Sung, 2015	Qual	13	CS	Action	Focus group
Rahimi & Ruzrokh, 2016	Quant	56	Long	Quasi-experimental	Intelligibility test; attitude questionnaire
Rose & Galloway, 2017	Qual	108	CS	Action	Reflection paper
Fang & Ren, 2018	Qual	25	CS	Case study	Interview; reflective journal
Galloway & Rose, 2018	Qual	19	CS	Action	Reflection paper
Sung, 2018	Qual	18	CS	Action	log; written reflection
Lee, 2019	Qual	17	CS	Action	Reflective essay; semi-structured interview
Rosenhan & Galloway, 2019	Qual	108	CS	Action	Poems
Milliner & Dimoski, 2019	Mixed	147	Long	Action	Questionnaires; language tests; diaries
Sert & Özkan, 2020	Qual	30	Long	Action	Semi-structured interviews; statement list
Tardy et al., 2020	Mixed	72-260	Long	Action	Questionnaires; language tests; diaries

6.0 How has technology been used as a facilitator of curricular innovation?

When categorizing the themes of studies, the review process revealed a body of research at the intersection of technology and Global Englishes. Given the increased use of online teaching and technology-mediated pedagogy since the COVID-19 outbreak, this section investigates the research related to technology as a tool to support Global Englishes in language teaching, which might inform future curricular innovation. Table 5 includes the 11 studies highlighted in our systematic review as most relevant to this topic. As many of these studies focus predominantly on investigating the use of technology, rather than specific outcomes of Global Englishes innovations, they are briefly reviewed according their pedagogical, rather than research, contributions. In reviewing the uses of technology at the periphery of Global Englishes research, these studies might highlight ways in which technology could be integrated into future research and practice. Geographically, the studies took place in a variety of wealthier locations in Europe and Asia, and the US and Australia, where the use of technology as an enhancement or intervention in educational contexts may have been more accessible.

Table 5. Studies reporting on technology in language teaching

Study	Year	Country	Sample size	Context	Main Data Sources

Ke & Suzuki	2011	Japan and Taiwan	111	Classroom / online	Questionnaire; online written reflections
Ke & Cahyani	2014	Taiwan (and Indonesia)	58	Classroom / online	Questionnaires; students' writing; focus group
Verzella & Tommaso	2014	US and Italy	22	Classroom / online	Peer feedback
Juan-Garau & Jacob	2015	Spain and Poland	42 + 43	Classroom / online	Questionnaire; online forum
Bueno-Alastuey & Kleban	2016	Spain and Poland	18	Classroom / online	Questionnaires
McCorkle, Halasek, Clinnin, & Selfe	2016	US, but global student cohort	approx. 50	Online (MOOC)	Forum posts
Bozoglan & Gok	2017	Turkey	58	Online (app)	Pre/Post-VGTs; peer feedback
Kohn & Hoffstaedter	2017	France, German, Netherlands, and Spain	Not stated	Classroom / online	Pair work tasks; interviews
Lee, Nakamura & Sadler	2018	Japan	41	Classroom / online	Questionnaires; classroom observations; student evaluations
Xu	2018	Australia	approx. 60	Classroom / online	Online responses and forum discussions
Lee & Lee	2019a	South Korea	317	Outside classroom / online	Questionnaire

6.1.1 Studies facilitating ELF opportunities using technology

Ke and Suzuki's (2011) early study provides a typical example of a classroom-based online activity designed as a pedagogical intervention to put students in authentic ELF interactions. The study involved the creation of a nine-week long activity requiring Taiwanese and Japanese university students to communicate online. It generates some useful discussion around students' attitudes towards NNS involvement in English language education, particularly focusing on ELF and native speaker norms. Another Taiwan-based study (Ke & Cahyani 2014) challenged 58 Taiwanese students' predilections towards native English and NESTs by having them interact in an online ELF context, this time paired up with 48 interlocutors with lower English language proficiency in Indonesia over one term. The study was effective in showing how such activities can raise awareness of, and lead to more positive attitudes towards, ELF usage.

Four studies investigated outcomes of projects connecting ELF users via online platforms. Verzella and Tommaso (2014) used an online platform to connect undergraduates in the US receiving peer feedback on their writing from 11 non-native postgraduate students in Italy. The researchers provide brief anecdotal descriptions of the US students' reflections, but do not delve deeper into issues surrounding the positioning of non-native English speakers as experts in the language compared to their American juniors. In another study, Kohn and Hoffstaedter (2017) use English and German as lingua francas in telecollaborative conversations at an unstated number of secondary school students in four European countries. The pedagogical intervention allowed for authentic written and spoken communicative exchanges between students. The main implication was that use of telecollaboration for authentic communication increases learner autonomy and agency.

Two more ELF studies involved connecting learners in Europe—these both with learners in Spain and Poland. Juan-Garau and Jacob (2015) used an online platform with 42 secondary students in Spain and 43 secondary students in Poland, where they worked in a shared third space to complete a project. While the focus of the study was on the development of transcultural understanding, the activity itself clearly facilitated the creation of a space for authentic ELF communication. Bueno-Alastuey and Kleban (2016) used technology to establish an ELF context to connect 18 pre-service teachers in Spain and Poland to build intercultural competence and language skills (for the Spanish participants) and techno-pedagogical skills (for the Polish participants). As this was a pilot study designed to assess the feasibility of the proposed design, it points toward future research and adaptations of this pedagogical framework for longer term initiatives.

In each of these studies, the researchers did not aim to explore the direct implications of the use of technology for global Englishes innovation, but rather the global use of English was the platform via which to mediate the benefits of technology for other educational outcomes. Nevertheless, each of these studies highlight the potential for using technology to create unique activities that bring together non-native learners of different L1s in different geographic locations for authentic ELF encounters. Such platforms may open possibilities for more targeted Global Englishes research.

6.1.2 Studies challenging EIL student perceptions using technology

Technology has also been explored as a platform to raise awareness of Global Englishes. McCorkle et al. (2016) reflect on their own MOOC on English composition and World Englishes. Although the limited qualitative data (students' forum posts), unclear sample ("approximately 50" students), and lack of pre- and post- tests do not allow them to explore the explicit effects of the MOOC, there is pedagogical value in this report due to the innovative WE content in the MOOC module, which was created in response to concerns they had about students' attitudes to language varieties in the original MOOC.

Bozoglan and Gok (2017) used WhatsApp for dialect awareness training with an experimental group in their mixed-methods study of 58 pre-service English language teachers in Turkey. The training involved 14 weekly sessions, including conducting a contrastive analysis of nine different dialects with 'standard Englishes'. WhatsApp was used for the teachers to record their own attempts to read texts using the dialects they learned, and to evaluate each other's efforts. Through pre- and post-verbal guise tests, the teachers' attitudes toward different English varieties were found to become more positive, suggesting that such awareness training could be effective for improving tolerance of non-standard dialects in ELT in Turkey.

Lee et al. (2018) investigated EIL pedagogy and students' attitudes towards EIL in a Japanese university using an intervention involving a videoconference-embedded classroom (VEC). While the questionnaire data were not analyzed beyond simple percentages (and no pre-test to measure change), the pedagogical benefits of VECs as an awareness raising platform are well articulated, including five concluding 'challenges' for using VEC, which could inform future research.

Xu (2018) analysed online forum discussions of "approximately 60" students taking an existing undergraduate unit on EIL at an Australian university via qualitative content analysis. While the conclusions and implications are rather far-reaching from the qualitative data presented, the article does provide insights into an existing unit on EIL, and the uses of online discussions to raise awareness outside of the classroom.

Lee and Lee (2019a) collected questionnaire responses from 317 EFL university students in South Korea to gauge the direct effect of informal digital learning of English (IDLE) practice on EIL perceptions. They conclude that the frequency of practice with digital language learning enhances EIL attitudes. The content of IDLE practices engaged by the students is unclear and appears to be of a general nature. A follow-up study might specifically use IDLE tasks that target Global Englishes content, as well as to collect qualitative data. Further explorations around projects involving these researchers pointed to a useful quantitative tool to measure attitudes, which could be used in future pre-/post-test research designs: the EIL Perception Scale (EILPS) (see Lee & Lee, 2019b; Lee et al., 2019).

Regarding the use of technology in Global Englishes research, a prominent feature is the use of online communication in classroom activities. While connecting ELF learners in different geographic locations is a valuable use of internet technology, it appears that the research is limited to this use. Global Englishes studies on the use of video games, virtual reality simulators, and MOOCs are very few, and given that only one study on MOOCs (McCorkle et al. 2016) made it into our systematic review, it seems that much more could be done on the use of technology in different forms. We have much more access and ability for technology to reveal valuable insights, yet these are not appearing in the Global Englishes literature.

7.0 Setting a future research agenda

Having reviewed a selection of the most relevant studies conducted in the past nine years, this concluding section aims to build on this synthesis to outline a future research agenda. Drawing on the findings of our review, and discussed within a larger body of literature, we make suggestions for research topics, methodological approaches, and contexts for future research. In keeping with the suggestions of previous research (e.g. Brown, 1993; Rose & Galloway, 2019; Galloway & Numajiri, 2020), we frame this discussion within Rogers' (2003) five factors of innovation diffusion (introduced in section 2.2) to examine how research currently addresses the needs of successful adoption:

1. Relative advantage: is research demonstrating a perceived benefit of a Global Englishes approach over existing methods?
2. Compatibility: is research exploring the compatibility of new innovations with existing beliefs, practices, and contexts?
3. Complexity: is research highlighting ways to make innovations simpler to implement for adopters?
4. Trialability: is research exploring the ease which ideas can be put into practice?
5. Observability: are the findings of research easily observable for researcher and practitioner communities?

Although research will be discussed against all five factors, extra focus is placed on relative advantage, because one of the central roles of research is to provide evidence for the advantages of a new innovation over existing practices.

7.1 What areas need to be explored?

A first area of needed investigation is research into the effects of curriculum interventions. Many of the studies outlined in section five reported on single activities in the classroom, which is an important starting point in evaluating small-scale innovation. Future research needs to investigate the effects of greater and sustained curricula innovation. While some research into whole programs has been reported in recent monographs (e.g. Galloway, 2017; Marlina, 2018), the field requires more empirical studies in a greater range of contexts to show how a Global Englishes approach to language teaching is beneficial to learners, teachers and the curriculum. This research is needed to make convincing arguments to the *relative advantage* of the proposed innovations.

A second area of suggested investigation is explicit research into teacher education, which explores changes in teacher beliefs and practices of Global Englishes content in pre- and in-service TESOL programs. In keeping with the main ideology of ELF-aware pedagogy, we need to see more studies that position in-service and pre-service practitioners as 'experts' in their contexts, and not as passive receivers of an education. Teachers are important agents of change in the curriculum innovation process, and future research should embrace this notion by investigating how new ideas are integrated into practice when teachers return to, or enter, their own classrooms. Such research will help to better investigate the *trialability* of proposed curricula changes—that is, how effortful new ideas from TESOL programs can be implemented.

A third area of needed investigation is into attitudes of teachers and learners towards suggested curriculum change. While the field of applied linguistics abounds in studies of language attitudes, more studies like Galloway and Numajiri (2020) are needed that explore practitioners' attitudes within the wider context of curriculum innovation. Research into these attitudes can help inform pedagogical innovations in both classroom and teacher education settings. Such research can feed into a better understanding of the *compatibility* of proposed innovations for various educational contexts.

A fourth area of future research could investigate the use of technology as a platform for sustained innovation both in and out of the classroom. While the technology studies reviewed in this paper tended to be methodologically weak, the platforms via which they introduced Global Englishes content (e.g. the MOOC in McCorkle et al., 2016) and ELF opportunities (e.g. Ke & Suzuki, 2011) were pedagogically innovative. Scholars have pointed to a lack of materials as a major barrier to introduce Global Englishes in classrooms, and this affects the *complexity* associated with teachers adopting new practices. The use of technology to both expose learners to speakers of global varieties of English, and to connect them with other L2 users, may be a powerful tool to reduce this complexity. Following from this, we need specific and robust research investigating the effects of these tools on learner attitudes and educational outcomes, as opposed to the use of the technology itself.

Finally, when new ideas are put into classroom practice, we need to ensure that these ideas are shared in research venues and professional domains to increase the *observability* of Global Englishes in language teaching (discussed further in section 7.3). Without such sharing, innovations will remain unseen by teachers and researchers who are seeking new ways to globalize their curriculum.

7.2 What contexts and populations need to be explored?

The research reviewed in this paper shows most research emerging from certain regions, such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the USA. Table 7 provides an overview of the location of the studies in the first review phase of the study. We suggest that while we still need more research across all regions, that areas such as South East Asia, the Middle East and Latin America are under-represented in research, especially considering these regions contain large numbers of English language learners, who predominantly acquire the language through formal education. For the same reasons, more research is needed in China.

Table 6 Location of studies

Location	Number of studies
Japan	10
South Korea	7
Taiwan	6
China	3
TOTAL EAST ASIA	26
Hong Kong	3
Thailand	2
Indonesia	1*
TOTAL SOUTHEAST ASIA	6
Spain	3
Italy	2
Poland	2
United Kingdom	3
France	1*
Germany	1*
Greece	1*
Netherlands	1*
TOTAL EUROPE	14
Pakistan	1
Nepal	1*
TOTAL SOUTH ASIA	2
Turkey	3
Iran	2
Saudi Arabia	1
Oman	1
TOTAL MIDDLE EAST	6
USA	10
Australia	2
TOTAL OTHER	12

*Denotes that this country only appeared as part of the sample of one study

In terms of populations, 40 studies were conducted in universities at the undergraduate level, seven at the graduate level, and six at the school level, with the remaining studies capturing participants across a spectrum of contexts. The over-representation of tertiary-level research may be a product of many researchers being based at universities, where they have direct

access to learners and teacher education programs. This trend means there is a danger of drawing conclusions based on convenience samples, which are chosen predominantly due to ease of access, rather than representativeness of typical language learners and teachers. Our review suggests we need more classroom-based studies across the spectrum of educational domains, including many more at the school-level, where most compulsory education takes place. We also note an absence of studies in commercial ELT domains. The commercial sector has been noted as one where the 'native speaker' is used as a selling point (Seargeant, 2009), and thus might be more resistant to change. These overlooked segments may be less susceptible to accepting the *relative advantage* of Global Englishes curricula innovations, especially compared to motivated English majors at the undergraduate level. Studies need to collect attitudinal data from such domains to better understand contextual differences that may create barriers to implementation, and thus erode both *compatibility* and *trialability* of new ideas received in teacher education.

7.3 What methodological approaches are needed?

Our synthesis of studies has highlighted an over-abundance of one-shot, cross-sectional data collection methods in classroom research, usually at the end of a course or task. Quasi-experimental designs are clearly needed to conduct research with groups of students engaging in new curriculum changes. Research designs also need to include more pre- and post-intervention data collection methods to measure actual change. Designs that incorporate a comparison group of a matched class, which did not receive the intervention, would also be valuable in attributing observed changes to curriculum innovations, and not to other factors. Mixed methods approaches to data collection are also essential to highlight specific elements of intervention that worked best.

Action research is another longitudinal research design that could measure the effects of on-going interventions in real classrooms. Our systematic review has revealed that many studies in the field are labelled as action research simply because they have been conducted in a researcher's own classroom, without the inclusion of the requisite cycles of planned innovations and multiple data collection points that can be powerful to pinpoint effect, and demonstrate causality to the innovation. Robustly-designed action research designs were absent, perhaps due to a lack of methodological expertise or time for the teachers reporting on them. McKinley (2019, p. 876) calls for 'more TESOL research to be conducted in the teaching-research nexus; specifically, for the research to be more grounded in classroom contexts'. He stipulates that greater collaboration is needed between teachers and researchers, and action research is an ideal design to facilitate such collaboration, with researchers providing methodological expertise, and teachers providing pedagogical expertise to ensure good implementation and reporting on innovations.

Research into teacher education appears to be at a pilot stage, and would also benefit from more systematic approaches to data collection, particularly with the inclusion of pre- and post- course data. We need more studies to adopt a longitudinal research design to explore how innovations manifest into actual teaching practices after teacher education programs conclude. One avenue to explore this would be follow-up studies to those which have already reported the activities of teacher education programs to see whether the innovations have impacted future practices of the participants. Suzuki (2011), in her attempts to raise awareness of linguistic diversity among English language teachers in Japan, revealed that they developed a better understanding of diversity, but expressed reluctance to introduce this in their teaching. She concluded that 'single-shot instruction' is not enough to make a difference due to their deeply ingrained beliefs. Thus, there is also a need to explore what

type of interventions in teacher training work best to ensure *compatibility* with existing practices.

Finally, we need better instruments via which to explore the effect of global approaches to language teaching and teacher education to make more convincing claims about its *relative advantage* over existing practices. Our review pointed to two such quantitative tools: the EILPS (Lee et al., 2019), and the questionnaire in Galloway and Numajiri (2020), which reported information on their reliability. Use of quantitative instruments also needs to be accompanied with appropriate statistical analysis. Only one study applied advanced statistical methods to show causality via structural equation modeling (Lee & Lee, 2019a). Many of the studies followed either unclear or questionable statistical procedures: for example, they did not check assumptions had been met before applying parametric tests to the data; descriptive statistics did not report basic information like standard deviation; internal reliability of grouped items was not reported; effect sizes were not reported; and multiple t-tests were run without correction.

Future research should be equally cautious with its qualitative methods—many of the studies relied on somewhat unreliable methods to elicit evidence of the impact of an innovation such as reflective papers from students at the end of the course and retrospective interviews with the teacher-researcher. The greatest lack of clarity was in the explanation of data analysis procedures in many of the studies, often loosely referring to some kind of 'qualitative content analysis', without support from research methods literature, nor details of the coding procedure or codes. All of this amounts to research that would be impossible to replicate and draws into question the trustworthiness of the findings. Since many of these studies involve investigating participants' attitudinal changes via particular tasks and awareness-raising activities, the lack of analytical rigour highlights a clear gap in the research.

Finally, there is a need for better reporting of research across all domains to increase *observability* of good pedagogical and research practices. Some on the studies were unclear in terms on the methodological design underpinning the study, descriptions of interventions, and at times even the number of participants in the study. Sometimes data collection instruments were mentioned in the studies, but little data from them were presented in the findings. Future research should be sure to include thick descriptions of innovations, as well as a clearly articulated research procedure. Ideally, instruments should be appended to published papers or uploaded to a repository like IRIS (Marsden, Mackey & Plonsky, 2016) so that studies can be replicated in multiple classrooms and contexts, thus increasing *trialability*. We also urge researchers to report their research in accessible domains: we observe that much research is being buried in book chapters, which are not as widely available, or in unpublished dissertations. Journal articles are, generally, more easily obtainable electronically than books and book chapters, and self-archiving of author versions increases public accessibility. If they are indexed journals, they are easier to find in searches, and thus offer enhanced *observability* to a research and practitioner community.

7.4 Looking forward

Our intention in this review is not to be overly critical of extant research in the field, but rather point to valuable avenues for future research. Much of the research reviewed has established a concrete platform for sharing innovative practices. At present, the field of Global Englishes—inclusive of ELF, EIL and WE—has a solid theoretical foundation stemming from earlier theoretical work (e.g. Smith, 1976), and calls for pedagogical innovation (e.g. Brown, 1993; Jenkins, 2006a), which has helped communicate the *relative*

advantage of innovations from a conceptual standpoint. This has recently been accompanied with initial explorations of what these calls might look like in classroom and teacher education practices, which has helped to increase awareness of this *relative advantage* from a professional perspective. What is needed next is greater attention to exploring these innovations in practice from a research perspective via robustly planned studies to ensure that scholars are able to articulate the advantage of these curricula proposals from a conceptual, professional AND empirical standpoint. Currently, the rising level of research interest in Global Englishes has not been accompanied with an equal level of research rigour. In the future we hope to see more studies emerge to fill this gap.

Questions arising

1. What are the (measurable) effects of Global Englishes innovations on the students themselves, and educational outcomes?

2. What kind of curricular tasks, materials and content induce long-lasting effects on students in terms of their beliefs and identity?

3. What are the tangible effects of increased exposure to WE and ELF on students' abilities to use English a global language?

4. How can Global Englishes innovation be best achieved within TESOL curricula?

5. What are the major barriers to introducing Global Englishes innovations within English language classrooms?

6. What are the (measurable) effects of Global Englishes teacher education on teacher beliefs?

7. How does Global Englishes content within teacher education programs influence the future pedagogical practices of in-service and pre-service teachers?

8. What kind of teacher education practices induce long-lasting effects on teacher cognition and pedagogical practices?

9. How can Global Englishes attitudes be reliably and validly assessed to measure attitudinal change?

10. How can technology be used to facilitate future innovation?

References

Ahn, S.-Y., & Kang, H.-S. (2017). South Korean university students' perceptions of different English varieties and their contribution to the learning of English as a foreign language. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 38*(8), 712–725. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1242595

Ali, S. (2009). Teaching English as an international language (EIL) in the Gulf Corporation Council (GCC) countries: the brown man's burden. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 34–57). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Ali, Z. (2015). The prospect and potential challenges of teaching Englishes in Pakistan. *Asian Englishes, 17*(2), 152–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.1006350

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

Ates, B., Eslami, Z. R., & Wright, K. L. (2015). Incorporating World Englishes into undergraduate ESL education courses. *World Englishes*, *34*(3), 485–501. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/weng.12149

Baker, W. (2009). The cultures of English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(4), 567–92. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00187.x

Baker, W. (2012). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: Culture in ELT. *ELT Journal*, *66*(1), 62–70.

Baker, W. (2015). Culture and complexity through English as a lingua franca: rethinking competences and pedagogy in ELT. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *4*(1), 9–30.

Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. C. (2015a). Developing an ELF-aware pedagogy: Insights from a self-education programme. In P. Vettorel (Ed.), *New frontiers in teaching and learning English* (pp. 55–76), Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. C. (2015b). ELF-aware in-service teacher education: A transformative perspective. In H. Bowles & A. Cogo (Eds.), *International perspectives on English as a lingua franca: Pedagogical insights* (pp. 117–135), London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Biricik Deniz, E. (2017). *A case study on ELF-aware pre-service language teacher education model: Theory into practice* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.

Biricik Deniz, E., Özkan, Y. & Bayyurt, Y. (2020). ELF-awareness in pre-service English language teacher education: A case study from Turkey. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *35*(2), 270-284.

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, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bokor, M. J. K. (2011). Connecting with the "Other" in technical communication: World Englishes and ethos transformation of U.S. native english-speaking students. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *20*(2), 208–237. http://10.0.4.56/10572252.2011.551503

Borg, S. (2018). Teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. In P. Garrett & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 75–91). Abingdon: Routledge.

Bozoglan, H., & Gok, D. (2017). Effect of mobile-assisted dialect awareness training on the dialect attitudes of prospective English language teachers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *38*(9), 772-787.

Braine, G. (Ed.) (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, K. (1993). World Englishes in TESOL programs: An infusion model of curricular innovation. *World Englishes*, *12*(1), 59–73.

Buckingham, L. (2015). Shades of cosmopolitanism: EFL teachers' perspectives on English accents and pronunciation teaching in the Gulf. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *36*(6), 638–653. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.994638

Bueno-Alastuey, M. C., & Kleban, M. (2016). Matching linguistic and pedagogical objectives in a telecollaboration project: A case study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *29*(1), 148–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.904360

Cameron, A., & Galloway, N. (2019). Local thoughts on global ideas: Pre- and in-service TESOL practitioners' attitudes to the pedagogical implications of the globalization of English. *RELC Journal*, *50*(1), 149–163. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218822853

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

Chang, Y.-J. (2014). Learning English today: What can world Englishes teach college students in Taiwan? *English Today*, *30*(1), 21–27. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078413000527

Cook, V. (2016). Premises of multicompetence. In V. Cook & Li Wei (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multicompetence* (pp. 1–25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a lingua franca*, *1*(1), 141–70.

Dewey, M. (2014). Pedagogic criticality and English as a lingua franca. *Atlantis Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, *36*(2), 11–30.

Dewey, M. (2015a). 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: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dewey, M. (2015b). Time to wake up some dogs! Shifting the culture of language in ELT. In Y. Bayyurt & S. Akcan (Eds.), *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a lingua franca* (pp. 121–134). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Dewey, M. & Patsko, L. (2018). ELF and teacher education. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 441–455). Abingdon: Routledge.

Eslami, Z., Moody, S., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2019). Educating pre-service teachers about World Englishes: Instructional activities and teachers' perceptions. *TESL-EJ*, *22*(4), 1–17.

Fang, F. (2011). International cultures in the framework of World Englishes: What should EFL teachers do? *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *8*(1), 111–137.

Fang, F. & Ren, W. (2018). Developing students' awareness of Global Englishes. *ELT Journal*, *72*(4), 384–394. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy012

Fang, F. & Widodo, H. P. (Eds.) (2019) *Critical perspectives on Global Englishes in Asia.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Galloway, N. (2011). *An investigation of Japanese university students' attitudes towards English* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southampton.

Galloway, N. (2013). Global Englishes and English language teaching (ELT) – Bridging the gap between theory and practice in a Japanese context. *System*, *41*(3), 786–803. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.019

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

Galloway, N., & Numajiri, T. (2020). Global Englishes language teaching: Bottom-up curriculum implementation. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(1) 118–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.547

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2014). Using listening journals to raise awareness of Global Englishes in ELT. *ELT Journal*, *68*(4), 386–396. http://10.0.4.69/elt/ccu021

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

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT Classroom. *ELT Journal*, *72*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gass, S. & Varonis, E. M. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of nonnative speech. *Language Learning*, *34*(1), 65–87.

Gough, D., Oliver, S. & Thomas, J. (2017). Introducing systematic reviews. In D. Gough, S. Oliver & J. Thomas (Eds.), *An introduction to systematic reviews* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1–18). Los Angeles: Sage.

Haberland, H. (2011). Ownership and maintenance of a language in transnational use: Should we leave our lingua franca alone?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 937–949.

He, D., & Zhang, Q. (2010). Native speaker norms and China English: From the perspective of learners and teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*(4), 769–789.

Hino, N. (2018). *EIL educations for the expanding circle: A Japanese model*. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2006a). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(2), 137–62.

Jenkins, J. (2006b). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 157-181.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A. & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, *44*(3), 281–315.

Juan-Garau, M., & Jacob, K. (2015). Developing English learners' transcultural skills through content- and task-based lessons. *System*, *54*, 55–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.04.017

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992a). *Teaching World Englishes: The other tongue*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992b). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, *25*(1), 1-14.

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

Ke, I.-C., & Cahyani, H. (2014). Learning to become users of English as a lingua franca (ELF): How ELF online communication affects Taiwanese learners' beliefs of English. *System*, *46*, 28–38. http://10.0.3.248/j.system.2014.07.008

Ke, I.-C., & Suzuki, T. (2011). Teaching global English with NNS-NNS online communication. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *8*(2), 169–188.

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

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an Asian lingua franca: The "lingua franca approach" and implications for language education policy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *1*(1), 121–139.

Kohn, K., & Hoffstaedter, P. (2017). Learner agency and non-native speaker identity in pedagogical lingua franca conversations: Insights from intercultural telecollaboration in

foreign language education. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(5), 351–367. http://10.0.4.56/09588221.2017.1304966

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). Individual identity, cultural globalization and teaching English as an international language: The case for an epistemic break. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Teaching English as an international language: Principles and practices* (pp. 9–27). New York: Routledge.

Lanvers, U., Hultgren, K., & Gayton, A. M. (2019). 'People can be smarter with two languages': changing anglophone students' attitudes to language learning through teaching linguistics. *Language Learning Journal*, *47*(1), 88–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1196384

Lee, J. S. (2019). Teacher as change agent: attitude change toward varieties of English through teaching English as an international language. *Asian Englishes*, *21*(1), 87–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2018.1434396

Lee, J. S., & Lee, K. (2019a). Informal digital learning of English and English as an international language: The path less traveled. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(3), 1447–1461. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12652

Lee, J. S., & Lee, K. (2019b). Perceptions of English as an international language by Korean English-major and non-English-major students. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*(1), 76–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1480628

Lee, J. S., Lee, K., & Drajati, N. A. (2019). Preservice English teachers' perceptions of English as an international language in Indonesia and Korea. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*(3), 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1503669

Lee, J. S., Nakamura, Y., & Sadler, R. (2018). Effects of videoconference-embedded classrooms (VEC) on learners' perceptions toward English as an international language (EIL). *ReCALL*, *30*(3), 319–336.

Lin, A. (2013). Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(3), 521–545.

Love, M. C. (2013). Carving critical spaces in high-stakes systems through materials analysis workshops. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *10*(3), 103–131.

Lwin, S. M., & Marlina, R. (2018). Using folktales as a way to operationalise the paradigm of teaching English as an international language. *Asian Englishes*, *20*(3), 206–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2018.1440279

Macaro, E. (2020). Systematic reviews in applied linguistics. In J. McKinley & H. Rose (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 230–239). Abingdon: Routledge.

Marlina, R. (2013). Learning about English as an international language in Australia from three students' perspectives. *Asian EFL Journal*, *15*(3), 201–228.

Marlina, R. (2018). *Teaching English as an international language: Implementing, reviewing, and re-envisioning world Englishes in language education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Marsden, E., Mackey A., & Plonsky, L. (2016). The IRIS Repository: Advancing research practice and methodology. In A. Mackey & E. Marsden (Eds.), *Advancing methodology and practice: The IRIS Repository of Instruments for Research into Second Languages* (pp. 1-21). New York: Routledge.

Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes*, *30*(3), 332–344.

Matsuda, A. & Friedrich, P. (2012). Selecting an instructional variety for an EIL curriculum. In A. Matsuda, ed., *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 17–27.

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

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

Matsuda, A. (2019). World Englishes in English language teaching: Kachru's six fallacies and the TEIL paradigm. *World Englishes*, *38*(1-2), 144-154.

May, S. (2014). Introducing the "Multilingual Turn". In S. May (Ed.) *The Multilingual Turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education* (pp. 1–6). New York: Routledge.

McCorkle, B., Halasek, K., Clinnin, K., & Selfe, C. L. (2016). Negotiating World Englishes in a writing-based MOOC. *Composition Studies*, *44*(1), 53–71.

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

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

McKinley, J. (2019). Evolving the TESOL teaching-research nexus. *TESOL Quarterly, 53*(3), 875–884.

Milliner, B., & Dimoski, B. (2019). Explicit listening strategy training for ELF learners. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *16*(3), 833–859.

Ouzzani, M., Hammady, H., Fedorowicz, Z., & Elmagarmid, A. (2016). Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews*, *5*(1), 210. https://doi.org/10.1186/s1364

Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. John Wiley & Sons.

Porter, W. W., & Graham, C. R. (2016). Institutional drivers and barriers to faculty adoption of blended learning in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *47*(4), 748–762.

Prabjandee, D. (2020). Teacher professional development to implement Global Englishes language teaching. *Asian Englishes, 22*(1), 52–67.

Rahimi, M., & Ruzrokh, S. (2016). The impact of teaching lingua franca core on English as a foreign language learners' intelligibility and attitudes towards English pronunciation. *Asian Englishes, 18*(2), 141–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1173466

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, E. M. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations* (3ʳᵈ ed.). New York: Free Press.

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

Rose, H., Briggs, J. G., Boggs, J. A., Sergio, L., & Ivanova-Slavianskaia, N. (2018). A systematic review of language learner strategy research in the face of self-regulation. *System*, *72*, 151–163.

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*(3), 294–301. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688216684281

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. 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, 49*(1), 88–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217746206

Rosenhan, C., & Galloway, N. (2019). Creativity, self-reflection and subversion: poetry writing for Global Englishes awareness raising. *System*, *84*, 1–13.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

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

Sert, S., & Özkan, Y. (2020). Implementing ELF-informed activities in an elementary level English preparatory classroom. *Multicultural Learning and Teaching*, *15*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1515/mlt-2018-0003

Sifakis, N. C. (2014). ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: a transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *3*(2), 317–35.

Sifakis, N. C. (2019). ELF awareness in English language teaching: Principles and processes. *Applied Linguistics*, *40*(2), 288–306.

Sifakis, N. C., & Bayyurt, Y. (2015). Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes*, *34*(3), 471–484. https://doi.org/http://dx.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: Routledge,

Sifakis, N. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.) (2019*). English as a lingua franca for EFL contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters

Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, *4*(3), 333–342.

Smith, L. E. (1976). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC Journal*, *7*(2), 38–42.

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

Sung, C. C. M. (2016). Exposure to multiple accents of English in the English language teaching classroom: From second language learners' perspectives. *Innovation in Language Learning & Teaching*, *10*(3), 190–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2014.936869

Sung, C. C. M. (2018). Out-of-class communication and awareness of English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, *72*(1), 15–25. http://10.0.4.69/elt/ccx024

Suzuki, A. (2011). Introducing diversity of English into ELT: Student teachers' responses. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 145–153.

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.

Takahashi, R. (2017). Attitudes of Japanese learners and teachers of English towards non-standard English in coursebooks. *Changing English*, *24*(1), 42–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2016.1228444

Tardy, C. M., Reed, K., Slinkard, J. R., & LaMance, R. (2020). Exploring Global Englishes content and language variation in an academic writing course. *TESOL Journal*, e520, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.520

Teixeira, A., & Pozzi, R. (2014). Introducing English as an international language in the Inner-Circle classroom: Exploring World Englishes. *CATESOL Journal*, *26*(1), 50–59.

Vavrus, F. K. (1991). When paradigms clash: The role of institutionalized varieties in language teacher education. *World Englishes*, *10*(2), 181-195.

Verzella, M., & Tommaso, L. (2014). Learning to write for an international audience through cross-cultural collaboration and text-negotiation. *Changing English*, *21*(4), 310–321. http://10.0.4.56/1358684X.2014.968469

Vettorel, P., & Corrizzato, S. (2016). Fostering awareness of the pedagogical implications of World Englishes and ELF in teacher education in Italy. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *6*(3), 487–511. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.3.6

Widdowson, H. G. (2012). ELF and the inconvenience of established concepts. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *1*(1), 5–26.

Xu, Z. (2018). Exploring English as an International Language – Curriculum, Materials and Pedagogical Strategies. *RELC Journal*, *49*(1), 102–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217753848

Yu, M. H. (2018). Exploring the orientation and use of textbook lingua-cultural resources to teach and learn English for lingua franca communication. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *27*(4), 257–266. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-018-0381-6

Zacharias, N. T. (2016). Exploring identity construction of student teachers practicing ELF pedagogy in a microteaching course. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *26*(2), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.26.2.08zac

Zein, S. (Ed.) (2019). *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca*. New York: Routledge.