Cambridge Elements

Language Teaching

Teaching English as an International Language

Ali Fuad Selvi,
Nicola Galloway, and
Heath Rose

ISSN 2632-4415 (online)
ISSN 2632-4407 (print)

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cambridge Elements

Elements in Language Teaching
edited by
Heath Rose
University of Oxford
Jim McKinley
University College London

TEACHING ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

Ali Fuad Selvi
University of Alabama
Nicola Galloway
University of Glasgow
Heath Rose
University of Oxford

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment,
a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of
education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781009462495

DOI: 10.1017/9781108902755

© Ali Fuad Selvi, Nicola Galloway, and Heath Rose 2023

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions
of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take
place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2023

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-009-46249-5 Hardback
ISBN 978-1-108-82123-0 Paperback
ISSN 2632-4415 (online)
ISSN 2632-4407 (print)

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence
or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this
publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will
remain, accurate or appropriate.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Teaching English as an International Language

Elements in Language Teaching

DOI: 10.1017/9781108902755
First published online: December 2023

Ali Fuad Selvi
University of Alabama

Nicola Galloway
University of Glasgow

Heath Rose
University of Oxford

Author for correspondence: Ali Fuad Selvi, afselvi@ua.edu

Abstract: This Element offers a comprehensive account of the unprecedented spread of English as a global language by taking historical, sociolinguistic, and pedagogical perspectives. To realise this mission, it opens with an accessible discussion of the historical trajectory of the English language with qualitative and quantitative connections to its contemporary diversity in terms of forms, roles, functions, uses, users, and contexts of English as a global and multilingual franca. Built upon this synchronic-diachronic symbiosis, the discussion is complemented by an overview of major analytical paradigms and trends that promote systematical scrutiny of the English language and its sociolinguistic and educational implications. It ends by showcasing instructional practices, recommendations, reflective questions, and future directions for language educators to revamp their beliefs, commitments, and practices in light of the changing needs and realities of the present-day glocal sociolinguistic ecology and individuals therein.

Keywords: teaching English as an International Language, English as a Lingua Franca, World Englishes, Global Englishes, Global Englishes Language Teaching

© Ali Fuad Selvi, Nicola Galloway, and Heath Rose

ISBNs: 9781009462495 (HB), 9781108821230 (PB), 9781108902755 (OC)
ISSNs: 2632-4415 (online), 2632-4407 (print)

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Contents

1 Background: More than a First, Second, or Foreign Language 1

2 From English to Englishes: How Did We Get Here? 4

3 English Today: A Truly Global Language 10

4 Major Paradigms and Trends in Teaching English as an International Language 15

5 Implications for Language Educators 25

6 Practical Applications for Language Educators 44

7 Conclusion: Implementing and Documenting Innovation 61

Appendix A: Checklist to Evaluate Quantitative and Qualitative Representations of Target Interlocutors in Instructional Materials 69

Appendix B: The Ownership of English Continuum 70

Appendix C: Identifying English Language Teachers: Raciolinguistic Perspectives 71

Appendix D: Popular Opinions about Global Englishes 72

References 75

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1 Background: More than a First, Second, or Foreign Language

Recent statistics indicate that more than 7,000 languages are spoken in the world today (Eberhard et al., 2023). Each of these languages comes in various forms, functions, sizes, and flavours and opens linguistic windows onto rich social, cultural, and historical values, meanings, and realities about the people of our planet, both past and present. They embody and animate intangible cultural heritage accumulated over thousands of years of human experience, interaction, and tradition. Of all these languages forming the 'contemporary global linguistic ecology' (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999, p. 20), one has a unique, unprecedented, and global status – the English language.

Built upon the forces of mercantilism, colonialism, cultural and economic globalisation, transnational movement, and technological innovations, the global spread of English has resulted in diverse forms, roles, functions, uses, users, and contexts around the world. The developmental trajectory of the English language beyond the British Isles that has been growing since the mid-sixteenth century took an exponential leap in the last century and expanded both in *qualitative* (e.g., forms, functions, domains) and *quantitative* terms (e.g., the number of first and additional language speakers). This has meant a transformation of English from a national language, confined to the British Isles, and spoken by roughly five to seven million people as a first language (L1) (Crystal, 2018), to a set of varieties spoken 'on every continent and in every sea; in the air and space; in thought, speech, and writing' (McArthur, 1998, p. 30). Although it is difficult to estimate the exact numbers of English users, some sources suggest more than two billion people now use it as a second, foreign, and additional language (L2/Lx) in varying degrees of proficiencies (Crystal, 2018) (see Section 2 for diachronic and Section 3 for synchronic accounts on the global spread of English). On the one hand, English is celebrated for being a utilitarian global lingua franca serving as a linguistic tool to bring together people from diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds in a range of international domains and intercultural encounters. On the other hand, it is criticised for being 'a language which creates barriers as much as it presents possibilities' (Pennycook, 2016, p. 26), exacerbating existing social, political, and economic inequalities (Tollefson, 2000), reducing the global linguistic diversity (Hultgren, 2020), and resulting in 'linguistic imperialism' (Phillipson, 1992), and even 'linguistic genocide' (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Collectively, these observations are a testament to the multifaceted nature of English as 'the first truly global language' today (Crystal, 2018).

Informed by the present-day 'globalinguistic' order in an increasingly superdiverse world (Dewey & Jenkins, 2010) and 'messy' sociolinguistic realities

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Matsuda & Matsuda, 2018, p. 64) surrounding English, researchers have developed several conceptual, theoretical, analytical paradigms to systematically scrutinise the English language and its implications. These include *World Englishes* (WE), *English as a Lingua Franca* (ELF), and *English as an International Language* (EIL), which were later grouped under the umbrella term of *Global Englishes* (GE) alongside the multilingual turn and translanguaging trends. Each of these paradigms has its own diverse set of implications for language use, users, and instruction (see Section 4 for a more detailed account of these paradigms). In tandem with these paradigms, current trends in multilingualism and second language acquisition (SLA) (e.g., the multilingual turn and translanguaging) have provided promising future directions to inform and transform instructional practices in ELT. The emergence of these paradigms and trends has not just created fertile and vibrant fields of scholarly inquiry but also offered a set of implications at the nexus of ELT, applied linguistics, and sociolinguistics. Even though each paradigm exhibits different nuances in its approach, focus, and scope, a common denominator is their critical ideological stance that calls for broadening, blurring, complexifying, and transforming our deeply inherent notions, values, and practices that underpin English and ELT (practices, profession(als), literature). Considerable overlaps in underlying ideologies and convergences in goals and vision have encouraged some scholars to create paradigmatic synergy under the more encompassing GE term (Galloway & Rose, 2015).

Responding to the pressing need to align current principles and practices with changing sociolinguistic realities of the twenty-first century necessitates the adoption of a critical stance in revisiting and revamping our theoretical commitments (e.g., linguistic norms and standards, cultures, teacher qualities, and identity) and pedagogical practices shaping different aspects of the ELT enterprise (e.g., teaching approaches, curriculum development, assessment, and instructional materials) (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2012; Rose & Galloway, 2019). This stance is perhaps best captured by McKay (2002), who argued that 'the teaching and learning of an international language must be based on an entirely different set of assumptions than the teaching and learning of any other second or foreign language' (p. 1). Departing from this realisation, scholars associated within and across various paradigms developed frameworks that inform teaching and teacher education practices aligned with the new sociolinguistic order in the world: *ELF-aware pedagogy* (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015; Sifakis, 2014), *WE-informed ELT* (Matsuda, 2020), *EIL pedagogy* (McKay, 2018), *EIL curriculum blueprint* (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011), *Teaching English as an International Language* (TEIL) (Matsuda, 2012), and *Global Englishes Language Teaching* (GELT) (Galloway & Rose, 2015).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.1 The Aim and Scope of This Element

This *Cambridge Elements* aims to offer a comprehensive account of the remarkable and unprecedented spread of English as a global language by taking historical, sociolinguistic, and pedagogical perspectives. It opens with *a diachronic approach* illustrating the historical evolution of English in the past 500 years or so and portraying its transformation from a national language to one characterised by varieties all around the world, whether by choice or by force. The discussion is complemented by *a synchronic approach* presenting a qualitative and quantitative overview of the present-day role, function, and status of English as a global and multilingual franca. Built upon this synchronic-diachronic symbiosis, the discussion moves onto a paradigmatic level offering an accessible discussion of major paradigms and trends that help us scrutinise the English language within the global linguistic ecology. The next two sections (on implications and practical applications) showcase the 'how' of teaching EIL firstly by offering an overview of implications for language educators and then concretising these implications into classroom applications. It ends with a conclusion section bringing these historical, sociolinguistic, and pedagogical threads together, underscoring the vitality of aligning EIL practices, within the broader linguistic ecology and offering recommendations, questions, and future directions for language educators and researchers interested in revamping their practices in the light of the winds of change in ELT.

At a time characterised by ever-growing and ubiquitous demand for English proficiency through various forms and approaches, ELT professionals are facing a real need to revisit and revamp their professional principles and practices which are historically fixated on outdated, static representations of English use, users, functions, and contexts. In response to this pressing need, this Element aims to add to the growing volume of work calling for change to ensure that ELT practices meet the diverse and dynamic needs of learners today who are acquiring English to use as a global mutlingual franca. In closing, we hope that our work will catalyse to synthesise and contribute to the growing body of scholarship that initiates innovation, change, and transformation of the conventional modes of thinking, principles, and practices into a pedagogy that promotes teaching EIL.

1.2 Why Do We Use the Term 'Teaching English as an International Language' in This Element?

In our previous work on this topic, we have adopted the term GE or GELT to capture calls for change in ELT practices (see Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose and Galloway, 2019; Selvi & Yazan, 2021). We use these terms to underscore the

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plurality of Englishes and to make important connections to the related fields of WE and ELF (discussed further in Section 3). While GE is our preferred theoretical paradigm, in this Element, we have elected to adopt the title of TEIL for two main reasons. First, we feel the term is more semantically transparent to ELT professionals, who might be introduced to the notions laid out in this Element for the first term. In recent decades, a growing divide has been noted between language researchers and language teachers (see McKinley, 2019). It has been noted that many language teaching professionals may find research and concepts in applied linguistics overly intellectual and written for a researcher-only readership (Kramsch, 2015). The transparency of the term TEIL may be more readily grasped by a wider audience, inclusive of ELT researchers and ELT practitioners who are less familiar with GE as a research paradigm. Second, the term TEIL grew out of language teaching scholarship and thus fits more neatly into an Elements series on Language Teaching. Other overlapping terms such as WE, ELF, and GE incorporate a lot of research outside of the realm of language teaching, including considerable work in linguistic and sociolinguistic domains. As the focus of this Element is on pedagogical implications, we have titled the Element with a term that was largely informed by ELT research(ers) (e.g., McKay, 2002). In one of its first usages, Hassall (1996) argued that TEIL as a term sets it apart from more narrowly defined acronyms such as TEFL and TESOL by foregrounding the situation of 'interlocutors of different nationalities conversing together without reference to whether either of the participants are 'native speakers' of English or not' (p. 419). This original intended use of the term EIL resonates with our previous scholarship on the pedagogical implications of GE.

Nonetheless, the term TEIL is not without its caveats. We acknowledge that the word 'international' is not as inclusive as the word 'global', as it invokes imagery of communication between nation-bound states, which is incongruent with how English is used in today's local, global, and glocal physical and virtual communities. We also recognise that the emphasis on linguistic plurality achieved with 'GE' is somewhat conceptually narrowed in our adoption of 'TEIL'. Nonetheless, this is a compromise we have made to potentially reach new readers and expose them to the diverse and rich ideas that have emanated from WE, EIL, ELF, and GE research over the past decades.

2 From English to Englishes: How Did We Get Here?

In this section, we provide a historical overview of the development of the English language, to establish a sociohistorical understanding of the diversity of English today. A historical understanding of English in this Element serves

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

three main purposes. First, it establishes that English – like any language in contact with other languages – is constantly subjected to change and is continually reshaping itself. Second, it emphasises that English was never a single monolithic language, so while the term 'Englishes' is relatively new, the phenomenon is not. Third, it establishes that ideologies of a standard English language are problematic, despite centuries-long, failed obsessions to standardise the language. Fourth, it underscores the idiosyncratic status of EIL, by exploring its history.

2.1 From Old to Early Modern English

Old English is the term used to describe the English language around the turn of the eleventh century. The origins of Old English were in the Germanic languages of the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, who migrated en masse to Great Britain as part of the Anglo-Saxon invasion from 449 CE to fill a power void created by the departure of the Roman Empire (Fennell, 2001). Old English was far from a unified language and was greatly influenced by the diverse backgrounds of a mixed linguistic community. In areas less settled by the Anglo-Saxons, many Celtic language speakers remained and influenced the language spoken. In areas that were heavily invaded or settled by Nordic travellers and Vikings, Old Norse had a more dominant influence. Indeed, up to 400 words in English, especially those concerning fauna, remain in modern English, but the influences in Northern Yorkshire and Scottish dialects of English are still evidently greater (Townend, 2006). As a product of centuries of invasion, settlement, and conflict within and between the kingdoms of Great Britain, a language discernible as 'Old English' had emerged, even though some speakers across the island would have been mutually unintelligible across politically and geographically distant regions.

In 1066, England was invaded by Normans from France – a historical event referred to as the Norman Conquest. This established a French-speaking government in English for 300 years. Norman French was established as the prestige language of England for some time. It was the language spoken by kings and nobles and in the royal court. Prestige and power play an important role in whether languages are adopted over others, and as a result French greatly influenced and changed English during this era, with major grammatical changes that took some language features away from its Germanic roots. During this time more than 10,000 French words were introduced. Restrictions on English in politics, law, and government administration also had an impact and were largely indicative of an endangered language (Melchers & Shaw, 2011). With a loss of territory in Normandy and increased detachment

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from France, English was reinstated as the language of the courts in 1362, by which time the English language had dramatically changed to one referred to as Middle English.

In the late Middle Ages and early modern periods, English continued to evolve due to numerous linguistic factors. The language was subjected to the influence of external factors such as contact with Latin through religion and science in addition to the continued influence of French (which still held social prestige) through literature and culture. Trade brought new flora, fauna, objects, and ideas to Great Britain, accompanied by the words used to describe them in foreign languages. English was also influenced by social changes, including increased population mobility, literacy, and education, bringing communities in contact with speakers and sources of different dialects of English. Driven by prestige attached to the dialects spoken by powerful classes, some linguistic properties of English changed – the most famous example of this being the Great Vowel Shift, which was driven in part by an upper class trying to distinguish their speech from the encroaching middle and lower classes (Gramley, 2012). Through these processes, by the late 1600s, a form of modern English not dissimilar to that found in parts of England today had emerged.

Several lessons can be learned about English from this historical overview of the language. First, it is clear that languages always change; there are constant forces that shape language and move it closer and further away from other dialects, languages, and speech communities. Second, the amount of contact with other languages matters in terms of its influence on a language and within a linguistic community; light contact, such as the contact generated from trade with foreign lands, might result in vocabulary borrowing, but intense contact such as the contact between the Celts and different dialects spoken by the Anglo-Saxons created deep shifts in the morphology and syntax of a language. Finally, it is clear that power and prestige matter in terms of the influence they exert on speakers. English now occupies a prestige position in the global hierarchy of languages (Chan, 2016), and is in contact with more languages than any other language in history. These facts have clear implications for how it is used as an international language. Before we delve into that topic, however, we must first explore how English emerged as a global lingua franca.

2.2 English Goes Global

English first spread globally as part of British colonialism, and then more recently as part of globalisation. Both eras of language spread are tied to economic drivers at the time, pointing to the interconnectedness of language

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to other parts of society. Colonialism emerged as a means to fulfil the ideals of mercantilism, which positioned economic growth as achieved via the rapid expansion of new land and resources. Globalisation emerged from neoliberal capitalist ideals linked to free trade, privatisation, and deregulation. Four main facets of globalisation tend to include trade and transactions, capital and investment movements, migration and movement of people, and the dissemination of knowledge. English now plays a primary role in all of these domains, which has further spurred its use around the world. Various historical and political factors associated with the global spread of English means that it has not spread in the same manner, at the same time, or evenly in terms of its sociolinguistic impact. Models of spread in this section have been used to capture these key differences.

One model that aims to capture the spread of English is to align it with two diasporas of the British Empire (see Jenkins, 2014). The first diaspora refers to the spread of English through the creation of new colonies which were settled by large populations of English speakers from Britain. For example, English speakers settled in large numbers in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, quickly overpowering and eventually outnumbering indigenous populations. The second diaspora refers to the spread of English through the creation of new trade and exploitation colonies in contexts where British people settled in much smaller numbers, remaining in a linguistic minority. Countries often included in the second diaspora of the British Empire include Ghana, Hong Kong, India, and Singapore.

In other WE literature, a four-diaspora model is referred to (see Nelson et al., 2020a). The first diaspora describes the spread of early forms of English across the British Isles to places such as Scotland. The second refers largely to Jenkins's (2015) first and is characterised by nations where 'Englishes took firm root and became the major, if not the single most important language' (Nelson et al., 2020a, p. xxvii). This includes settlement colonies in the United States, penal colonies in Australia, and the plantation colonies of the Caribbean, where English was quickly established as the major language of a majority slave population. The third diaspora label refers to contexts where 'colonial administrations, politics, and economics planted English where it was in competition with numerically superior languages' (p. xxvii), thus mirroring the second diaspora in the two-diaspora model. The fourth diaspora refers to the spread of English via non-colonial activities, such as its more recent adoption as a learned language in China, Sweden, and Russia. This diaspora largely encompasses the Expanding Circle in Kachru's model of WE (1992), discussed in Section 4.

While diaspora models of the spread of English examine the use of English as derived from nation-state histories, they are neither chronologically nor

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linguistically representative of the varieties of English that emerged as part of this global spread. The spread of English to India (as part of the second or third diaspora, depending on the model) preceded the spread of English to Australia and New Zealand (as part of the first or second diaspora). Furthermore, the linguistic forces that shaped the English used in Ghana and Singapore, for example, are drastically different even though they are placed in the same diaspora. Finally, the English used within single nation-states is far from uniform and may differ according to a heterogeneous linguistic community. For example, francophone Canadians may speak a variety of English that is more formally learned than has been derived from British colonisation; and South Africans include large populations who speak English as a first, second, or learned language.

To overcome these issues, Galloway and Rose (2015) proposed four channels of English spread to account for the linguistic processes that shaped varieties of English and to differentiate the contexts within which people acquire English. The channels shift the focus to speakers of English, rather than geographical regions, acknowledging that speakers of different Englishes can be found in a single nation (e.g., in Australia, it is possible to find speakers of Australian English, Australian Kriol, Indian English, and formally learned English, all of whom have acquired their English via different historical and sociolinguistic processes). These are summarised in Table 1.

The four-channel model aims to capture differences in the historical and linguistic forces associated with the spread of English and includes concepts such as koineisation (or dialect mixing), which shaped new varieties of 'native' English, for example Australian English. Creolisation refers to the linguistic development of 'native' varieties of English, such as Patios (Jamaican Creole), through the enforcement of English on displaced slave communities, who spoke a mixture of different first languages that disappeared within a single generation of speakers. Pidginisation refers to the lengthier process of English used alongside other first languages in trade and exploitation colonies – some of which eventually underwent creolisation to produce new 'nativised' forms of English, which were standardised through societal use. Finally, 'second' language learning refers to the formal learning of the English language, often carried out in educational systems such as English language learning in China as a response to its connections to globalisation.

Of course, all these depictions of the global spread of English are necessarily reductive of the diversity with which English is now used globally, within and across regions. The messiness has only been exacerbated by increased population mobility in the late twentieth century. Nonetheless, there are several issues associated with the global spread of English, which have an impact on its use as

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1 Four channels of English spread (adapted from Galloway & Rose, 2015)

Channel	One	Two	Three	Four
Historical processes underpinning the spread	Settler colonisation	Slavery (as part of colonialism)	Trade and exploitation colonisation	Globalisation
Linguistic process underpinning the development	Koineisation	Creolisation	Pidginisation and creolisation	Second language learning / acquisition
Type of English	'Native'	'Native'	Nativised	Learned / acquired
Example speakers as a result of this spread	L1 English speakers in Australia	L1 English speakers in Jamaica	Multilingual English speakers in Nigeria	English learners in China or Chinese immigrants in the United Kingdom

an international language today. First, the various linguistic forces that have shaped English as it has spread globally have given rise to a rich tapestry of linguistic variation in the English language. As different dialects have mixed, and different languages have come into contact, different varieties of English have emerged around the globe. This variation is so distinct that many linguists prefer to use the term *Englishes* instead of *English* when emphasising the multiple forms that the language takes across the world. Second, the socio-historical processes that have underpinned the spread of English have given rise to sociolinguistic differences and inequalities in these Englishes and the speakers who use them. Due to the social, economic and political power and prestige afforded to British English speakers throughout colonial history, ‘Channel One’ Englishes are often granted more legitimacy in global society than those which have emerged as part of Channel Two and Three, even though all varieties of English are spoken as ‘native’ languages.

Finally, many people globally now learn English as a second, foreign, additional, or international language. Thus, the decision of which English to teach in the curriculum is often a complex political decision that is intertwined with globalisation. Decisions are often made based on power and prestige and perceived access to global markets and the upward social and economic mobility of English speakers. While this may appear to be a decision detached from English’s colonial past, decisions over which English to learn are complexly embedded in centuries-long historic and sociolinguistic biases about what is considered ‘correct’ or ‘standard’. This history has dictated that Englishes are still attached to power and prestige in the global community of the twenty-first century.

3 English Today: A Truly Global Language

This section explores the current status of English as a global language. It first unpicks what factors contribute to the growth and adoption of a language, before answering the central question of ‘Why English?’ It also explores the topic of whether other languages could dethrone English as the dominant global lingua franca in the future. The section concludes with statistics on the use of English globally today.

3.1 What Makes a Language Global?

What causes one language to be adopted over another is a complex social phenomenon driven by ‘supply and demand, push and pull factors’ (Phillipson, 2009, pp. 18–19). These push and pull factors are underlined by explicit language and educational policies as well as the structures and

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ideologies of societies and people. First and foremost, understanding the growth of English as a global language is more complex than the factors associated with colonialism and globalisation, but also the various factors that have drawn people to English as it has achieved critical mass in its global growth.

Push factors refer to top-down explicit and implicit language policies that force or encourage the adoption of one language over another. The colonialist era brought with it numerous push factors that promoted colonial languages over local indigenous languages. The effects of this were severe and resulted in the loss of numerous languages. Policies of the past can have a long-lasting legacy on the use of languages in a community in the future. For example, in Alaska, there are currently only 20 indigenous languages remaining, of which only 2 have more than 1,000 speakers, and only 1 is being passed down to younger generations (Krauss, 2007). Much of this language death is attributed to the brutality of previous language policies that discouraged local languages in education and the community, as well as creating a social stigma of lower socio-economic status attached to local languages.

When the negative inequalities of these policies are known, but they are pursued regardless of consequences by governments, organisations or communities, it has been referred to as *linguistic imperialism*. Phillipson (2012) states that the 'study of linguistic imperialism focuses on how and why certain languages dominate internationally and attempts to account for such dominance in a theoretically informed way' (p. 1). Linguistic imperialism interconnects with a structure of imperialism and is pervasive in culture, education, the media, communication, the economy, and politics, bringing about exploitation, injustice, and inequality for speakers of the dominant language (Phillipson, 1992, 2009). Under linguistic imperialism, linguistic injustices and discrimination manifest as normal beliefs and practices in everyday social structures and ideologies. Under British rule, linguistic discrimination was reinforced in education systems, legal structures, society, and political systems, which afforded privileges to speakers of English at the expense of speakers of other languages; and these practices were ingrained into societies. But linguistic imperialism is not only a practice of the colonial past. As Phillipson (2012) observes: 'Linguistic imperialism is a reality in many contexts worldwide. An extreme case is the oppression that linguistic minorities are exposed to in China . . . dovetailing with measures to crush traditional economic, cultural and religious practices of the Uyghurs.' (p. 6).

However, top-down policies do not fully explain the growth of global languages. As Spolsky (2006) and Ferguson (2006) note, if the growth of English as a global language was purely the result of language policy, it would be the most successful demonstration of language planning in history.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus, in addition to the push factors that have forced dominant languages through colonialism and globalisation, numerous pull factors have drawn speakers to languages associated with power or prestige.

Pull factors in language policy and migration refer to a range of economic, political, and social factors that draw speakers to languages, such as perceived employment opportunities, economic prosperity, and access to desirable social networks (Schoorl et al., 2000). In some language policy circles, this is referred to as *linguistic pragmatism*. Bhatt (2001, p. 533) argues that the 'success of the spread of English, tied to the economic conditions that created the commercial supremacy of the United Kingdom and the United States, is guaranteed under the econocultural model by linguistic pragmatism, not linguistic imperialism'. Linguistic pragmatism highlights the important role of globalisation and the need to communicate in a global lingua franca as the primary driving force behind the expansion of English (Mustafa & Hamdan Alghamdi, 2020).

To express the situation bluntly, Mufwene (2007) explains, 'languages do not kill languages; their would-be speakers kill them, by shifting away from them to others that they find more advantageous' (p. 381). When language is tied to upward social or economic mobility, more and more speakers are drawn to them to access these advantages. It is a combination of these factors, built on top of a centuries-long foundation of language policies that have favoured English, that saw the meteoric rise of English as a global lingua franca starting in the period after the end of the Second World War.

3.2 Why Did English Become the Global Lingua Franca?

The dichotomisation of push and pull forces is a simplification of the complexities associated with language and society, but they are useful to explain how English has managed to grow from a language of a small island nation to a global lingua franca. The reason English became the dominant global language is a complex mixture of push and pull factors associated with colonialism and spurred on by globalisation.

First, there is little doubt that British colonialism sowed the seeds for the growth of English as a global language. It took the language to all continents, encompassing large swathes of Africa stretching from Egypt to South Africa; Pakistan to Malaysia in Asia; Australia to Tonga in Australasia; and from Canada to British Guyana in the Americas. Britain still retains sovereignty over fourteen territories outside the British Isles, and the British monarch is still the head of state in sixteen nations. The Commonwealth of Nations, which is an association of former British colonies and protectorates, includes more than two billion of the world's population.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

British colonial history may explain why English is pervasive in nations such as New Zealand, but it does not explain its strong presence in nations such as the Netherlands or Sweden. It also does not explain why, after gaining independence from the United Kingdom, nations such as India and Kenya maintained connections to English despite a strong regional lingua franca of their own. Colonialism also does not explain why English, and no other colonial languages such as French and Spanish, became the dominant lingua franca.

The reason English became the world's dominant lingua franca is attributed to 'historical coincidence' (Melchers et al., 2019, p. 10), or as Crystal (2012) explains, the 'English language has repeatedly found itself in the right place at the right time' (p. 77–78). Globalisation gathered momentum after the Second World War when governments sought to lower trade barriers to achieve greater international monetary policies and a more globally integrated commerce and finance sector. Advances in travel and communication further paved the way for a more mobile economy, and in the 1980s a modern era of globalisation emerged, which spread via the expansion of capitalist economies (Benería et al., 2016). During this era, the United States was (and still is at the time of publication) the world's largest national economy and was a strong proponent of capitalist-led globalisation.

Kachru (1986) used the term 'the alchemy of English' (p. 1) during this era of modern globalisation and wrote: 'knowing English is like possessing the fabled Aladdin's lamp, which permits one to open, as it were, the linguistic gates to international business, technology, science and travel. In short, English provides linguistic power' (p. 1). For this reason, many countries, business and political organisations, educational systems, and individuals have increased their investment in the English language, which has further cemented English as the dominant lingua franca of the twenty-first century.

3.3 Statistics

It is a difficult task to accurately measure who uses English today and to what extent it is used in various domains. This is because of the difficulties in defining precisely what is English, who is an English speaker, and what constitutes English use. For example, is Patios (Jamaican Creole) English, or its own language? Is every learner of English an English speaker? If not, at what point does an English learner become counted as a competent English user? In a multilingual community, how do we define the use of English when used alongside other languages? Despite the inherent difficulties in mapping English, some sources have aimed to capture the current use of English around the globe.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ethnologue's *Languages of the World* survey lists 1,121 million people who speak English as a first and/or second language (Eberhard et al., 2023), with another source citing nearly 1,500 million (Statista, 2023). It is unclear from this estimate, however, how English language learners are counted. More than 20 years ago Graddol (1997) claimed there to be 750 million users of English as a foreign language, and 375 million speakers of English, each as a first and second language. Since this time, it is common to still cite 1.5 billion competent users of English in total, despite the increased predominance of learners of English worldwide since Graddol's estimate (Melchers et al., 2019). More than ten years ago, Crystal (2008) estimated that there were two billion speakers of English, equivalent to one-third of the world's population. Despite discrepancies in total figures, there is one fact that all estimates agree on – second or foreign speakers of English are the majority of English users worldwide, far outnumbering 'native speakers' of the language.

Due to its global growth, English is now the most common language of information. By December 2022, English constituted 52 per cent of the content of the top ten million websites on the internet (W3Techs, 2023), making it by far the most dominant language (Spanish is second at only 5.4 per cent). English is the dominant language of scientific academic publishing, and it is clear that if authors want their research read by a global audience, they need to publish in English.

English is also an important language of international communication. It is the official working language of economic communities such as ASEAN. It is the predominant de facto working language of the European Union, despite a choice of three main working languages as well as options to translate into twenty-four official languages. It is also one of six working languages of the United Nations. It is the language of aviation and shipping communication and is growing as the foremost lingua franca of business.

English is also the most studied foreign language in school education. In the European Union (excluding the Republic of Ireland), 96 per cent of students learn English (Eurostat, 2018). In many places, such as Japan, English is the only foreign language option offered in many schools and is compulsory on admissions tests to enter university regardless of the course discipline (Galloway, 2017).

3.4 What the Current Status of English Means for Language Education

This section has raised several issues of relevance to English language teaching (ELT). First, the rise of English as a global lingua franca is far from fair: it is built on the foundation of a dark colonial history that has seen English spread at the

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expense of other languages. In many contexts where English is taught, there may be sources of resistance or other sociolinguistic complexities that have placed English in competition with other languages. This has implications for ELT, as English may be more than 'just a language' in many contexts, and may be attached to substantial social, historical, and political 'baggage' that may need to be critically addressed in an EIL curriculum. With the spread of English into global and local domains, it is also certainly questionable whether traditional English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts can be classified as English as a 'foreign' language, as it is intertwined within the fabric of most societies today.

Second, because English has been tied to globalisation for more than half a century, it is unlikely to be dethroned as the world's lingua franca, as it is already pervasive in so many domains, and driven by its use by a global community of speakers. As Melchers et al. (2019) observe: 'Mandarin Chinese and probably Spanish have more "native speakers" but at present, they have neither the global sway nor the multi-functional use that characterizes English today' (p. 10). For this reason, even if we see a changed global economic hierarchy in the future, the power attached to English due to globalisation is unlikely to falter.

Third, the perpetuation of English as a global language is now driven by people who use it as a lingua franca, and who are in the global majority. This means that many learners of English today will more frequently use English with other English speakers, who also have learned the language. As English has spread into diverse domains, it is clear that it operates as more than a foreign or second language for its speakers. This has implications for ELT in terms of ensuring students have the tools to use EIL. This diversity in English use globally has led to the emergence of several linguistic and educational fields of research to capture the diversity in English used globally, and to inform a need for change in ELT in response to the use of English as a global language.

4 Major Paradigms and Trends in Teaching English as an International Language

Anyone interested in understanding the English language in the contemporary world today is faced with a unique challenge: our traditional conceptualisations of English as a 'foreign', 'second', or 'native' language no longer capture the incredible complexity, diversity, and fluidity surrounding the English language use(r)s (Rose & Galloway, 2019). As a transnational language, it serves as a common linguistic link, context, and function (i.e., a lingua franca) between individuals coming from diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds in various

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

domains. It exhibits enormous diversity and plurality in terms of these forms, functions, uses, and users (i.e., the shift from 'the' English language to English'es'). Since the late-1970s, scholars have been developing research paradigms conducive to capturing the multifacetedness of English in an increasingly superdiverse world. These paradigms include WE (focusing on pluralisation, nativisation, localisation, legitimisation, and codification of varieties of English around the world), ELF (focusing on the use of English as a linguistic medium enabling individuals from diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds to communicate in various domains), and *English as an International Language* (focusing on contexts, functions, uses, and implications for pluricentric communicative needs). More recently, these paradigms were synergised under the term GE, which refers to 'an inclusive paradigm looking at the linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural diversity and fluidity of English use and English users in a globalised world' (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 5). Global Englishes also interweaves some key trends in ELT and second language acquisition (SLA), such as the *multilingual turn* (emphasising multilingual orientation to shape theory, pedagogy, and practice) and *translanguaging* (emphasising language users' dynamic utilisation of linguistic repertoires and other semiotic resources for communication). Despite their nuances in terms of scope, focus, and methodological approaches, these paradigms share overlapping ideological commitments as delineated next.

4.1 World Englishes

Even though the plurality of the English language within and beyond the Anglo-American world is not a new phenomenon, it was not studied systematically until the late-1970s. The pioneering works of Braj B. Kachru and Larry E. Smith on the 'English language complex' (McArthur, 2003, p. 56) or 'multiplex of Englishes' (Seargeant, 2016, p. 15) from the 1980s onwards paved the way to the emergence of WE as bona fide area of scholarly inquiry. In its early days, scholars predominantly adopted a descriptive perspective and offered structural, typological, and sociological modelling of variation within and across different varieties of English around the world and linguistic codification with an ultimate motivation to promote the legitimacy of language uses, users, and contexts. Over the years, researchers have developed several models to capture, visualise, and theorise the spread of English around the world: Strevens's (1980) *Model of English in the World*, Kachru's (1985) *Three Circles of English*, McArthur's (1987) *Circle of World English*, Görlach's (1988) *Circle of International English*, Modiano's (1999) *Centripetal Circles Model of International English*, and Schneider's (2007) *Dynamic Model of the*

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Evolution of Postcolonial Englishes, just to name a few (see Buschfeld & Kautzsch (2020) and Galloway & Rose (2015) for extensive discussions). The most influential descriptive model is that of Kachru's, which captures the varieties of English within three concentric circles, each of which showcases 'the type of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages' (Kachru, 1985, p. 12), as summarised in Table 2.

Despite the fact Kachru's seminal work and vision forged a new line of thinking and inspired scholars(hip) on the global spread of English, it also received its share of criticism (see Table 3 for a summary) mainly for the oversimplification of the spread of English and the lack of clarity in its definition of various circles (see Bruthiaux, 2003; Galloway & Rose 2015; Modiano, 1999; Pennycook, 2007). With increased globalisation and the use of English both within and across the circles, it became increasingly clear that this three-circle model failed to capture the complex sociolinguistic landscape. This understanding ultimately led to the development of ELF research, but ELF scholars praised WE researchers for showcasing the diversity of English around the world.

Today, WE is recognised as a rich, diverse, complex paradigm whose scope extends beyond well-established aerial studies adopting descriptive/historical approaches and cross-pollinates with a wide spectrum of interdisciplinary inquiries, including transnationalism (Bolander, 2020), second language acquisition (Bolton & De Costa, 2018; Buschfeld, 2020), pedagogy (Matsuda, 2020), corpus-based applications (Hundt, 2020), traditional (Martin, 2020; Moody, 2020) and new media (Mair, 2019), and literature (Thumboo, 2020). Even though its ontological orientation to diversity through pluralisation is regarded as somewhat limiting (see Pennycook, 2020a), the WE paradigm has made substantial contributions to our current understanding by underscoring (a) the incredible diversity of English as a global language, (b) the presentation of various local forms (formal/codified, informal/uncodified, national, regional, and emerging varieties, pidgins, and creoles, among others), (c) the decentralisation of a single variety as a universal 'norm' and 'standard' with prestige, and (d) the critical importance of contextually relevant and contextuallysensitive pedagogical decisions informed by linguistic, functional, and cultural diversity associated with the English language. The active ideological motive in pluralisation in uses, users, contexts, forms, and varieties of English has encapsulated the strategic choice in its nomenclature since, as Kachru argued, 'formally and functionally, English now has multicultural identities. The term "English" does not capture this sociolinguistic reality; the term "Englishes" does' (Kachru, 1992, p. 357).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2 Kachru's Three Circles of English model (1985): A summary

Circles	Definition	Speakers	Norms	Examples
The Inner Circle	Countries where English is used as a prime language or mother tongue by most of the population and used in most domains of life	English as a native language (ENL)	Norm-providing	The United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand
The Outer Circle	Countries where English is used as a second/additional language alongside other national/local language(s)	English as a second language (ESL)	Norm-developing	Singapore, Hong Kong, India, and Nigeria
The Expanding Circle	Countries where English is learned, taught, and used as a foreign language	English as a Foreign Language (EFL)	Norm-dependent	China, Germany, Japan, Turkey, and Brazil

Table 3 A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of Kachru's Three Circles of English model (1985)

Advantages	Disadvantages
It brings considerable attention to the diversity and plurality of English	It does not account for the multiethnic, multilingual realities of the world characterised by global mobility and interaction
It captures the varieties of English around the world in a visually comprehensive way	It takes a reductionist approach to the realities of how language is used in each of and across these circles
It contributes to the legitimisation of varieties of English through codification	It is largely based on (nation-based) geography and colonial history in some contexts
It contributes to the establishment and expansion of WE as a scholarly paradigm	It perpetuates the hierarchical structure by positioning the 'Inner' Circle as a 'norm-providing' context

Today, WE is an established paradigm and a prolific area of inquiry through various outlets, including a professional association (International Association of World English or IAWE), an annual gathering for WE scholars (IAWE Conference), a top-tier scholarly journal (WE), handbooks published by major publishers such as Cambridge University Press, Routledge, Wiley, and Oxford University Press (Filppula et al., 2017; Kirkpatrick, 2010a, 2021; Nelson et al., 2020b; Schreier et al., 2019). With synchronic and diachronic investigations documenting the reality, diversity, and plurality of the English language around the world, developmental cycles, channels, and trajectories and the sociolinguistic profiles, WE serves as a powerful catalyst for linguistic/educational policymakers and ELT professionals to reexamine their beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions about English and ELT. More specifically, implications for ELT include destabilising the 'standard' instructional variety associated with the Inner Circle contexts, increasing students' awareness of variation exhibited at various levels (e.g., phonetics/phonology, morphosyntax, lexis, and cultural conventions) within national/regional varieties, creating communication opportunities to promote interaction with English users from diverse linguacultural backgrounds, and revamping instructional materials and assessment practices to reflect the incredible linguistic, functional, and cultural diversity in the English language.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4.2 English as an International Language

Conceptualised as a comprehensive 'paradigm for thinking, research, and practice' (Sharifian, 2009, p. 2), EIL 'recognizes the international functions of English and its use in a variety of cultural and economic arenas by speakers of English from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds who do not speak each other's mother tongues' (Marlina, 2014, p. 4). Rather than being situated as a linguistic field of study of the English language per se (as in WE), the EIL paradigm is more concerned with the sociolinguistic, political, economic, and educational implications of the use of English internationally (Rose & Galloway, 2019). Similar to ELF, it focuses on the use of English by individuals from diverse ethnolinguistic/cultural backgrounds in the projection of cultural identities and the negotiation of communicative goals to achieve mutual intelligibility in various settings and domains. The pedagogical implications of this paradigm direct our attention to a need to establish a break from the traditions of EFL/ESL. In early discussions of this break in the 1990s, the pedagogical manifestation of EIL (TEIL) was argued to help ELT move away from traditional 'native speaker' benchmarks and terminologies in TEFL and TESOL (Hassall, 1996). Almost four decades since, EIL has become a centre of attention in mainstream research in ELT and ELT teacher education (Rose et al., 2020), and it shares similar endeavours to ELF and WE.

Despite the terminological debates over conceptual demarcations between these paradigms (WE, ELF, and EIL), especially in the early days of their inception (see Friedrich & Matsuda, 2010), the recent advances in scholarship (e.g., repositioning of ELF as a sociolinguistic construct and growing interest at the nexus of these paradigms and language teaching/teacher education) have contributed to the convergence of the ontological assumptions and ideological commitments of these paradigms in shaping principles and practices of ELT. Today, there is considerable ideological overlap between EIL, WE, and ELF, and all of these paradigms underscore the pressing need for a paradigm shift in ELT (and teacher education) in the light of present-day sociolinguistic realities of English.

Despite the absence of institutionalised academic structures (e.g., top-tier journal, dedicated handbook, or research network within or beyond professional associations), the EIL paradigm stood out as a fertile domain of inquiry offering insights into our understanding of the English language and its diverse implications for ELT profession(als) (e.g., Alsagoff et al., 2012; Marlina, 2018; Matsuda, 2012, 2017; McKay, 2002; McKay & Brown, 2016; Rose & Galloway, 2019; Selvi & Yazan, 2013; Sharifian, 2009, just to name a few). Even though there have been recent predictions that 'the [EIL] acronym may be of decreasing currency in coming years' (D'Angelo, 2018, p. 167), we believe its related term of TEIL

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

persists as a popular and accessible term for ELT practitioners. This understanding also serves as our rationalisation behind the adoption of this term for our work in this Cambridge Series (see Section 1 for rationale), even though we position our own broader research within the paradigm of GE.

4.3 English as a Lingua Franca

The forces of transnational mobility, (in)voluntary migration, border-crossing activities, global economic growth, recent technological innovations, and demographic shifts among English speakers validated the linguistic and functional role that English plays as a *lingua franca* in an increasingly superdiverse world and blurred the traditional nation-state demarcations emphasised in WE research (Selvi, 2019a). Consequently, the ELF paradigm emerged to shift the focus from the *linguistic* diversity of English around the world to *functional* diversity as an international language of communication. The paradigm was more focused on how ethnolinguistically diverse individuals use ELF to communicate around the world.

Even though the functional use of English (alongside other languages) lies at the crux of the ELF paradigm, early research in this area of inquiry in the late 1990s exhibited similarities with WE. This initial orientation conceptualised ELF as '*a contact language* between persons who share neither a common "native" tongue nor a common culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication' (Firth, 1996, p. 240). Thus, early ELF research studies documented linguistic features, patterns, strategies, and characteristics in ELF (or L2-L2) communication in various domains of the language (e.g., 'lingua franca core' in pronunciation research by Jenkins, 2000) or a variety as a whole (e.g., 'Euro-English' by Modiano, 2003 or 'ASEAN English' by Kirkpatrick, 2010b). In the 2000s, the ELF paradigm experienced a reorientation in its primary focus, and conceptualised ELF as 'any *use of English* among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option' (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7). This shift emphasised the dynamism and fluidity of use, users, norms, contexts, and strategies shaped by contextual parameters, discoursal variables, and communicative needs of the interlocutors. Furthermore, research on ELF pragmatics demonstrated the active use of bilingual/plurilingual repertoires in the negotiation and projection of cultural identity, solidarity, and linguistic efficiency beyond the widely held idealised 'native speaker' norms (Jenkins, 2012).

As a corollary, the ELF paradigm has gone through important waves of transformation, which has informed the scope of its scholarship. Today, ELF research acknowledges that although ELF interactions predominantly take

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

place without the presence of 'native English speakers', 'native English speakers' may also participate in ELF interactions (however small their numbers might be). Recent scholarship is also informed by the multilingual turn and translingualism/translanguaging trends in applied linguistics. ELF is now resituated as 'a multilingual franca' (Jenkins, 2015) and 'translingual franca' (Pennycook, 2010) within a broader framework of multilingualism working alongside other languages and semiotic resources. These shifts and changes occurring within the ELF paradigm and research have spearheaded new directions for scholars therein and new implications for the ELT profession(als).

As a paradigm and a bona fide area of scholarly inquiry, ELF has exhibited remarkable growth in the past two decades. It has helped inform important subfields of inquiry, such as Academic English as a Lingua Franca (ELFA) (Horner, 2017) and Business ELF (Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2018), similar to English as an Academic Language (EAP)/English for Specific Purposes (ESP) with an ELF perspective. Today, ELF scholars maintain their activities through a top-tier journal (*Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*), a dedicated handbook published by Routledge (Jenkins et al., 2018), an international conference (ELF Conference), research network groups within professional associations (cf. ELF ReN at AILA, and ELF SIG at JACET), and beyond (cf. The University of Vienna (Austria), The University of Helsinki (Norway), and Waseda ELF Research Group (Japan)). As with WE, ELF research brings about a set of pedagogical implications for ELT principles and practices, such as moving beyond idealised 'native speaker' models to equipping language users with communication/accommodation skills and strategies to successfully negotiate the fluidity and diversity of language use, users, and interactions where English is used alongside other languages as part of individuals' multilingual repertoires in intercultural encounters.

4.4 The Multilingual Turn and Translanguaging

Historically, the study of language learning and teaching has been siloed within disciplinary and professional contexts (e.g., linguistics, second language acquisition (SLA), ELT, and bilingual education) with limited interaction. Even though these fields all had the common goal of legitimising individuals' linguistic repertoires, their approach to language (as well as learning and teaching) was conceptualised in distinct and, in some cases, conflicting ways. More importantly, these fields were largely operating within monolingual and monoglossic ideologies (and policies and practices connected to them). More recently, we have been witnessing the burgeoning of trends within applied linguistics and SLA that offer a fresh ontological perspective and reorientation

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the way (named) languages (and thereby learners, language learning, teaching and related concepts such as policy) are constructed, viewed, used, learned, and taught, including but not limited to translanguaging and the multilingual turn. Intricately connected to the aforementioned paradigms (e.g., WE, EFL, EIL, and GE) at ideological levels, these trends serve as a powerful driving force in shifting perspectives related to principles and practices in ELT.

As the most recent 'turn' (following *the cognitive turn* which legitimised SLA as a field of research in the 1980s, and *the social turn* that centralised the contextual and situational dimensions of language use in SLA), *the multilingual turn* (May, 2014) challenged the monolingual orthodoxy and ideology dominating the fields of SLA, applied linguistics, and language education. Moreover, it stood out as an umbrella term in the recent terminological 'panoply of lingualism' (Marshall & Moore, 2018, p. 21) (e.g., translanguaging, polylingualism, metrolingualism, plurilingualism, among others), attempting to better capture the multilingual realities, complexities, and practices in today's world. From an ideological stance, the multilingual turn aims to counter a monolingual bias which is underpinned by deficit perspectives and hegemonic power structures that normalise oppression, marginalisation, minoritisation, discrimination, and dehumanisation of English language use(r)s. The forceful theoretical arguments and pedagogical calls made by the various lines of research that fall within the multilingual turn intersect with the WE, ELF, EIL, and GE paradigms. At this juncture lies the critical and pluricentric conceptualisation of 'E'nglish (as in W'E', 'E'LF, and 'E'IL) as an integral part of a wider linguistic repertoire offering important implications for ELT principles and practice. This understanding highlights 'issues of diversification, codification, identity, creativity, cross-cultural intelligibility and of power and ideology' (Kachru, 1996, p. 135) in moving beyond traditional essentialised 'standard' language ideology within and manifested through English.

Building upon the aforementioned changes that have recently gained momentum, *translanguaging* advocates for a shift from a discrete-point approach to languages (involving languages as separate entities) to an integrative approach (involving linguistic features, multimodalities, and other semiotic resources). Unlike code-switching, which refers to the performative act of switching from one code (language) to another within bilingual communicative encounters, translanguaging views all languages as part of an individual's linguistic repertoire (García & Wei, 2014), and thereby resonates with a multilingual approach to ELF. Along the same lines, Canagarajah (2013) adopted the term *translingual practice* underscoring the need for a multilingual repertoire consisting of communicative acts required in translingual/transcultural contact zones such as migration, transnational economic, cultural relations, and digital communication. In essence, both

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

translanguaging and translingual practices aim to dismantle the current hierarchical and decontextualised structures of languages that underlie ELT principles and practices, and to shift our attention to the translingual repertoires used in communicative encounters by English as a global lingua franca users. Recognising the vitality of these discussions revolving around the pluricentricity of English within a multilingual orientation to linguistic ecology, Rose and Galloway's (2019) framework has been a consolidating attempt to situate the implications at the nexus of critical applied linguistics and ELT.

4.5 Global Englishes

The term GE was initially coined and used by prominent critical applied linguists such as Alastair Pennycook and Suresh Canagarajah in the early 2000s, who underscored the glocal (symbiotically global and local) use of English due to the process of globalisation. However, in 2011, Galloway (2011) used it for the first time to underscore the fluidity of global language use serving as a common denominator across these paradigms. The most recent and comprehensive definition of GE by Rose & Galloway (2019) defines it as

> an umbrella term to unite the shared endeavours of these interrelated fields of study in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics. We use it to consolidate research in World Englishes, English as a lingua franca and English as an international language while drawing on scholarship from translanguaging and multilingualism in second language acquisition. Thus, we define Global Englishes as an inclusive paradigm that embraces a broad spectrum of interrelated research that has come before it and emerged alongside it. (p. 6)

As a supraparadigm, it encourages us to challenge and rethink the plurality, diversity, and fluidity surrounding English by building upon and extending our current understandings gleaned from existing paradigms (i.e., EIL, WE, and ELF) and critical perspectives (i.e., the multilingual turn and translingualism/translanguaging). In that regard, it would be safe to assume that GE establishes a symbiotic bridge linking sociolinguistics (understanding the English language within the broader contemporary global linguistic ecology) and ELT (challenging and transforming established principles and practices). The theoretical findings emerging out of the paradigms that constitute GE are presented in GELT as a framework that emerged from consolidating calls for change in all aforementioned paradigms (Galloway, 2011; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019). In tandem with major paradigms discussed so far (WE, EIL, and ELF) – and in resonance with other concepts such as the translanguaging and the multilingual turn – GE challenge monolingual bias and ideology that have plagued applied linguistics, SLA theory, and ELT practices for many decades.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4.6 Paradigmatic Shifts to Innovate English Language Teaching

The transdisciplinary paradigmatic developments and trends in the past couple of decades have characterised 'English as multilingual, as a language always in translation, as a language always under negotiation' (Pennycook, 2010, p. 685). These developments have served as an impetus for a paradigm shift at epistemological, ideological, and pedagogical levels, redefining the fundamental pillars forming ELT, as an activity, a profession, and a field of scholarly inquiry:

- **'E' –** pluricentricity of English (uses, users, functions, and contexts) characterised by cultural diversity, linguistic multiplicity, and functional complexity in a superdiverse world
- **'L' –** an ontological shift from seeing language as a discrete, monolingual, and separate set of structures disconnected from the people who use them to an understanding that views language as a multilingual and situated social practice within a broader multilingual context
- **'T' –** innovative pedagogical practices that equip English users with critical awareness and multilingual/multimodal repertoires necessary to participate in glocal lingua franca encounters.

Departing from these realisations, scholars situated within and across these paradigms and trends have forged new frameworks to bridge the gap between theory and practice and to transform theoretical perspectives into concrete pedagogical principles and practices – *ELF-aware pedagogy* (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015; Sifakis, 2014), *WE-informed ELT* (Matsuda, 2020), *EIL pedagogy* (McKay, 2018), *EIL curriculum blueprint* (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011), and GELT (Galloway, 2011; Galloway & Rose, 2015), just to name a few. As will be discussed and operationalised in the next two sections in greater depth, they serve as innovative attempts to challenge and transform our established norms and practices in ELT.

5 Implications for Language Educators

It is clear from the discussion thus far that the global spread of English has given rise to several diverse but overlapping fields of research into variation in the English language around the world since the 1980s:

- World Englishes – the study of the linguistic features of different varieties of English, their history, function, background, and sociolinguistic implications
- English as an International Language – the study of the implications of the spread of English as a global language, particularly pedagogy

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- English as a Lingua Franca – the study of the sociolinguistic use, forms, functions and contexts of English as a lingua franca amongst speakers of different first languages, and the sociolinguistic implications of such usage.

Two further-related concepts that showcase the pluricentricity of English and challenge the monolingual orientation in ELT include:

- Translanguaging – the study of how speakers utilise their multilingual repertoire to communicate in a hybrid, dynamic and fluid manner, highlighting that languages are not separate entities, but part of an interwoven system
- The multilingual turn – research emphasising the importance of other languages and critiquing monolingual ideologies of language.

As noted, research emerging from all of these fields showcases the changed sociolinguistic landscape of English, the diversity, pluricentricity, and global ownership of the language; how it functions as a global lingua franca; and how it is adapted and used alongside other languages by multicompetent speakers (see Cook, 2016). Such work also showcases how speakers from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds often use their entire multilingual repertoire to communicate in diverse and flexible speech communities, where the target interlocutor is a 'native speaker' of the language in only a minority of cases. World Englishes, EIL, and ELF scholars may operate in different fields, but they are united in their shared endeavours to change perceptions of English users, what English is, and who owns it (Rose & Galloway, 2019). Translanguaging research 'further pushes the boundaries of conceptualising the fluidity of language, and challenges the notion of English, or Englishes, as being separate from other languages in use' (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 11). Research in all of these five domains of inquiry has also been instrumental in showcasing how the English language is being used in very different ways today to how it is being taught in 'traditional' ELT curricula. This growing body of work has been instrumental in highlighting a mismatch between how the language is being used and how it is being taught, a mismatch between the needs of learners today and the norms they have to follow in their curricula and a mismatch between how their proficiency in English is assessed and how speakers communicate successfully using English as a global lingua franca. The five domains of inquiry may have different stances, but there is a clear desire in all of them to instigate a paradigm shift in ELT away from 'native speaker' norms to reflect the current sociolinguistic reality of English today (Galloway, 2017).

New realities require curriculum innovation to ensure that curricula are meeting the needs of those learning English to use as a global language. Calls for change have been made for decades. As discussed, scholars in all of these five fields discuss the need for change. In the field of WE, Kachru's (1985) norm-providing

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Inner Circle speakers have become a growing minority and Expanding Circle speakers have expanded. It has also become increasingly questionable to label Expanding Circle countries as 'foreign' language contexts, where 'native' norms in ELT have historically been justified due to limited exposure to the language. World Englishes research continues to flourish and 'pedagogy has continued to be one of the main preoccupations of the field' (Saraceni, 2015, p. 171). With more fluid use of the English language, and the use of English as a global lingua franca, ELF researchers have also criticised the irrelevance of adhering to a fixed, outdated 'native' norm, highlighting the need to prepare students for ELF contexts, encounters and uses with speakers from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds. EIL scholarship has also called for an 'epistemic break' from 'native' norms (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Translanguaging research, which emerged from bilingual educational contexts, continues to focus on pedagogical practice. Similarly, much of the discussions within the multilingual turn focus on pedagogy. Meier (2017) has described it as 'a critical movement in education' (p. 131) and scholars in the field have drawn applications to not only SLA theory but also TESOL (e.g., May, 2014).

Calls for change to ELT curricula and criticism of 'native' norms are, of course, not new. Gass & Varonis (1984) called for more accurate exposure to the diversity of English four decades ago. In 1976, Larry Smith stressed the need to showcase how English functions as a global language. Smith & Nelson (1985) critiqued the role of the 'native speaker' in intelligibility assessments back in 1985 and the 'native speaker' has been labelled as a 'fallacy' (Phillipson, 1992), a 'myth' (Davies, 2003), and a linguistic 'figment' of one's imagination (Paikeday, 1985). Nevertheless, the growing body of research in all of these paradigms throws new perspectives on this showing how the language is in a state of flux, how the language is used in dynamic and multilingual encounters, and also that there are no clear boundaries around languages in today's globalised world. Such work has also given rise to a growing body of literature on the pedagogical implications of the global spread of English.

Calls for change in the literature (and in the increasing number of articles being published in language teaching and applied linguistics journals on this topic) centre on the need for a more realistic representation of English in ELT curricula, for a change in views of the ownership of the language, a movement away from static 'native speaker' norms, a repositioning of culture, target interlocutor and role models, and the overall emancipation of the 'non-native speaker' from 'native' norms. They call for a reconceptualisation of the 'E' in the ELT curricula and key theories and concepts underpinning the teaching and learning of English. What is clear from these discussions is that the global spread of the English language has implications for the entire ELT curriculum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The shift in usage, as well as the evolution of the language, 'have forced a re-examination of the goals of English-language learning and teaching, as well as a reconceptualisation of the English language itself, along with sacredly held paradigms in ELT' (Nero, 2012, p. 153). Moreover,

> [t]he widespread use of English as a complementary language and/or lingua franca in different world locations, and the increasing use of English as an additional language (EAL) in contemporary ethnolinguistically diverse English-speaking countries for important social and educational functions have signalled other emergent complexities. All of this points to the need to take stock [of how we teach as assess communicative competence]. (Leung, 2014, p. 123)

However, despite such calls, and despite the growing literature on the topic, the field continues to suffer a theory–practice divide (although recent classroom research over the past decade has considerably bridged this divide (see Rose et al., 2021 for an overview). Four decades or so after discussions on the need for change in the WE paradigm, a period that has seen the development of several more related fields of research strengthening the case for change, dominant ideologies such as 'native speakerism' and standard language ideology prevail. We are certainly closer to achieving this paradigm shift, but we have not quite achieved it. It is little surprise that ELT practitioners may feel a sense of frustration. We have an increasing body of work telling them that their curricula are outdated and ill-fitting to prepare their students for the global use of English, yet we are not providing concrete proposals on how to instigate this much-needed paradigm shift. Translating theoretical rationales and ideological commitments into contextually relevant and sustainable practices to achieve a paradigm shift in ELT necessitates concerted efforts of various stakeholders in ELT, as an activity, profession, and area of scholarly inquiry. To address this point and alleviate a sense of frustration among ELT professionals, we need to move beyond telling them that their curricula are outdated and ill-fitting to prepare their students for the global use of English and show and collaboratively develop concrete proposals on how to instigate change.

5.1 Proposals for Change

In an attempt to unite the shared agenda of the diverse but overlapping fields, the theoretical calls for change to TESOL being made in the literature were summarised as the GELT proposals (Galloway, 2011; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019). This was also an attempt to help move the field forward; a first step towards providing more concrete proposals and examining how to achieve this paradigm shift. Six main proposals in the literature were identified which called for ELT curricula to:

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. Increase WE and ELF exposure in language curricula
2. Emphasise respect for multilingualism in ELT
3. Raise awareness of GE in ELT
4. Raise awareness of ELF strategies in language curricula
5. Emphasise respect for diverse cultures and identities in ELT
6. Change English teacher-hiring practices in the ELT industry.

Grouping these into six main proposals was an attempt to consolidate interconnected themes in the literature to get a sense of what change was being called for and ultimately address the theory–practice divide and help instigate the much-needed paradigm shift.

Informed by WE, ELF, and EIL research, the first proposal relates to the need to expose students to the diversity of English used around the world and in different contexts to ensure that they are better prepared to use English in international contexts. This proposal is also based on research that highlights that a lack of exposure to varieties of English can lead to negative attitudes and, therefore, confidence in successfully communicating with speakers from different varieties.

The second proposal reflects the need to acknowledge the dominance of multilingualism and that students use English alongside other languages, as showcased in research on translanguaging research and the multilingual turn in SLA. Related to the need to raise awareness that multilingualism is the norm and knowledge of English-only is not enough to fully function in global contexts, it aims to challenge monolingual orientations in ELT curricula. While traditional ELT curricula often see students' additional languages as a hindrance to language learning, this perspective embraces the valuable use of students' multilingual repertoires for successful communication using English as a global lingua franca.

The third proposal focuses on the need for a critical approach to ELT, raising students' awareness of the spread of English, as well as how it functions as a global language. This proposal also stems from research on the direct teaching of GE, which was found to help students move beyond preconceived notions of standard language and challenge deeply ingrained 'native-speaker' norms (Galloway, 2011, 2013, 2017).

The fourth proposal stems from ELF research and translanguaging, focusing on the need for students to develop communicative strategies to help them adapt to different communities of language users in a more fluid context. The 'native speaker' may well be the target interlocutor for some students, but for those likely to use the language as a lingua franca, there is a need to equip them with strategies to navigate such encounters. This proposal relates to the need to facilitate language awareness among learners and enables them to develop

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

communicative strategies to help them 'negotiate resources from diverse languages and construct meaning situationally' (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 19).

The fifth proposal centres on the need to respect cultural differences in ELT classrooms, and to widen the lens of what an English-using culture is. Traditional ELT curricula often posit English-using cultures as Inner Circle and there is a clear need to move away from such static regional cultures as the contexts for language use and emphasise the dynamic and fluid cultures that English is used in today (Rose & Galloway, 2019).

The final proposal calls for a shift in focus on the problematic causal relationship between speakerhood (traditionally captured by terms 'native' and 'non-native') and teacherhood (traditionally captured by terms 'native English-speaking teachers' and 'non-native English-speaking teachers') in teacher recruitment, training, and workplace settings. Instead, multicompetent ELT professionals whose qualities, qualifications, competencies, effectiveness, and legitimacy are defined beyond the essentialised and juxtaposed categories of identity are seen to be far more suitable models (Selvi et al., forthcoming).

The identification of these proposals was seen as an important first step in consolidating calls for change. However, it is important to note that discussions on the need for change go beyond merely adding a lesson or new materials to existing ELT curricula based on 'native' norms and a monolithic view of English. Instead, they advocate a complete shift in the way we think about language teaching, requiring a thorough interrogation of the curriculum from its assumed educational outcomes, goals, and student needs. In the same year that these proposals were identified, two frameworks for change were also proposed and several scholars have since proposed their frameworks for change in ELT. While these have been developed within different paradigms with different intellectual histories, they all embrace the plurality of English and all aim to make ELT curricula more reflective of the current sociolinguistic reality of English and raise awareness of the complex reality of the English language today.

5.2 Frameworks for Change

5.2.1 WE-informed ELT

As noted, WE scholars have been calling for change to ELT since the emergence of WE as a field of research in the late 1970s. Back in 1976, Kachru's article in *TESOL Quarterly* criticised the emphasis on Inner Circle norms in ELT and highlighted the valuable use of WE literature for the ELT curriculum. Since then, scholars in this field have documented the implications of their work for ELT. Kachru's (1992) 'Six Fallacies about the Users and Uses of English' raised

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

important implications and several incorrect assumptions about the ELT profession(als). These included the following wrong assumptions (p. 357):

1. That in the Outer and Expanding Circles, English is essentially learned to interact with 'native speakers' of the language
2. That English is necessarily learned as a tool to understand and teach American or British cultural values, or what is generally termed the Judeo-Christian traditions
3. That the goal of learning and teaching English is to adopt the 'native' models of English
4. That the international 'non-native' varieties of English are essentially 'inter-language' striving to achieve 'native-like' character
5. That the 'native speakers' of English as teachers, academic administrators, and material developers provide a serious input in the global teaching of English, in policy formation, and in determining the channels for the spread of the language
6. That the diversity and variation in English is necessarily an indicator of linguistic decay and that restricting the decay is the responsibility of the 'native' scholars of English and ESL programmes.

Many of these fallacies have been addressed in subsequent frameworks (e.g., see Matsuda, 2019 for a discussion within the EIL paradigm). World Englishes scholars have been instrumental in the movement towards change in ELT. Brown's (1993) paper summarises calls from scholars (e.g., Kachru, 1992; Vavrus, 1991) and presents these as eight recommendations that include calls for greater incorporation of WE perspectives within both the ELT curriculum and the field in general.

5.2.2 EIL Curriculum Blueprint and Teaching English as an International Language

Almost two decades later, and two decades of developments in the field of WE and EIL and further calls for change to ELT curricula, Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) were concerned that this has made little headway into the classroom. To address this theory–practice divide, the *EIL curriculum blueprint*, as a precursor to TEIL, aimed to guide ELT practitioners to select instructional models, encourage greater exposure to the diversity of English, the teaching of strategic competence, and the use of appropriate cultural materials and activities that increased awareness of the politics of English. These ideas and principles were then articulated into the framework of TEIL, which was based on the theoretical foundations of the *EIL curriculum blueprint* (Matsuda & Friedrich (2011) and *WE-informed ELT* (Matsuda, 2012, 2019). Today, the use of the term *EIL curriculum blueprint* has largely been abandoned in favour of the term *WE-informed ELT* or, more simply, TEIL.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.2.3 ELF-aware Pedagogy

As noted, many ELF researchers started focusing on the pedagogical implications of ELF research by the early 2010s. Raising teachers' awareness, and encouraging them to reconceptualise the language they are teaching, was seen to be an essential first step and Dewey's (2012) post-normative approach sought to help instigate ELF-oriented change in pedagogical practice. In a post-methods era of teaching (see Kumaravadivelu, 2003), this awareness of ELF could then help them adopt innovative practices appropriate to their context. This approach encouraged teachers to focus on the context in which their students would use English in the future, expose them to the diversity of English, develop a critical awareness of the politics of English, focus on intelligibility rather than static 'native' norms, and teach communicative strategies to help their students successfully nagivate ELF counters. There has been a lot of focus on ELT practitioner education within the ELF paradigm. Sifakis's (2019) *ELF Awareness Continuum*, for example, *was* introduced to conceptualise the processes of raising teachers' ELF awareness. This continuum was squarely centred on teachers and teacher awareness rather than classroom curricula, setting it apart from other frameworks such as TEIL.

5.2.4 Global Englishes Language Teaching

The GELT framework for curriculum innovation was developed by Galloway (2011) after the identification of the six proposals for change identified in the literature (i.e., traditional ELT versus GELT). It was informed by similar comparisons, such as Jenkins' (2006) EFL versus ELF conceptualisation and earlier work by Canagarajah (2005) and Seidlhofer (2004). The thirteen dimensions (see Rose and Galloway, 2019 for the latest version) draw on research in all of the five paradigms. Designed for curriculum evaluation and design and research, it seeks a movement away from traditional teaching practices and encourages change in target interlocutor, ownership, target culture, linguistic norms, teachers, role models, the sources of materials, positioning of other languages and cultures, needs, assessment criterion, the goals of learning, ideology, and theoretical orientation. These thirteen dimensions are outlined in detail in Section 5.3 as we explore how to relate theory to practice, and how to incorporate this perspective into ELT curricula.

5.3 Theory to Practice

While we base our discussion next on the thirteen dimensions from the GELT framework (see Figure 1), it is important to note that we aim to be inclusive of work in all of the related paradigms. It is also important to note that none of these, or this Element for that matter, promotes a one-size-fits-all curriculum or

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figure 1 Major practical dimensions for language educators (based on Rose & Galloway, 2019).

a single variety of English. All of these frameworks, or orientations to teaching English, were designed to increase student choice and ensure that the curriculum is reflective of the needs of our learners, which may, of course, vary according to context. All of these frameworks are intended to help instigate change. While these frameworks 'indicate different intellectual history and affiliation . . . they are more similar to each other than different in their assumptions, visions and suggested practice' (Matsuda, 2019, p. 146). In our discussion of the different dimensions in Sections 5.3.1–5.3.12, we hope to provide 'a roadmap for change in current practices so that this break [from "native speaker" norms] can be better facilitated' (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 26).

5.3.1 Dimension 1: Target Interlocutors

	Dimension #1: Target Interlocutors
For English users	Communication means using different forms of ELF (alongside other languages) with users from diverse ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and racial backgrounds in various modalities for a wide range of purposes.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices need to acknowledge and draw upon other L2 English users as target interlocutors and raise users' awareness and skills in ELF communication as a norm for their future interactions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Unlike many other foreign languages where 'native speakers' are in majority and may serve as the ultimate (and in some cases, only) future target interlocutor in communication, the situation in English is drastically different. As a language with a global presence, ownership, and user base, the English language serves as a preferred medium and context of communication predominantly among L2 speakers. If materials, curricula, and assessment represent only 'native English speakers' from a particular Inner Circle country (e.g., the United States), or an exclusive focus on 'native English speakers' from Inner Circle countries communicating with 'non-native speakers', it means that they are not in sync with the current realities of English users around the world. There is ample research that those learning the language today will need to use English with a global community of users and curricula should prepare students for this. Students are more likely to encounter speakers from various varieties of English and will need strategies to help them negotiate translinguistic/transcultural encounters. It is also imperative that we address the dominance of 'native speakerism' in ELT curricula and encourage our students to be critical of depictions of idealised 'native'-speaking target interlocutors in their curricula and raise their awareness that the notion of the 'native speaker' has been problematised and criticised for decades (see Cook, 1999; Davies, 2003; Holliday, 2005; Paikeday, 1985; Rampton, 1990; Swan et al., 2015).

5.3.2 Dimension 2: The Ownership of English

	Dimension #2: The Ownership of English
For English users	Communication involves an identity-oriented attachment to the language by a global community of speakers as well as a sense of right and the ability to adjust and use the language to suit individual communicative needs.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices need to position and draw upon English as a global language with glocal ownership.

Due to the aforementioned 'foreign' language mentality prevalent in ELT, English has traditionally been seen as an Anglo-American commodity. However, teaching, learning, and using EIL in a superdiverse world is a constant act of resistance, struggle, appropriation, and negotiation of ownership. Furthermore, it embodies a shift of authority in terms of norms ('standard' English), policies ('English-only'), and target users/interlocutors

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

('native English speakers'). For English users to develop a sense of ownership, the norms, policies, and target users/interlocutors shaping instructional principles and practices need to represent English uses taking place in various intercultural settings among successful multilingual users of English as the speakers of the language. Since the ownership of English is inherently connected to one's sociohistorical negotiation, construction, and reassertion of linguistic identity with an imagined global linguistic community. The dominance of 'native speakerism' in ELT curricula stems from the underlying ideology that ownership of the English language rests within the Inner Circle. We need to encourage students to engage critically with the politics of English and 'encourage a perception in the classroom that English belongs to a global community, rather than the traditional origins of it as being the language of the Inner Circle, or more broadly of those living in nations descended from the former British Empire' (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 21).

5.3.3 Dimension 3: Target Culture

	Dimension #3: Target Culture
For English users	Communication means the ability to use the English language with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds to promote transcultural communication and mutual understanding across national/cultural borders and boundaries.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to create spaces for transcultural pedagogical orientation to prepare individuals for translinguacultural diversity in communicative encounters in English.

It is now axiomatic that language and culture are inextricably intertwined, operating homogeneously, and tied to identity. This symbiotic relationship between the two is further complexified by the transcultural role, status, and function of EIL. Successful EIL communication means negotiating a range of socioculturally informed language use and situations with individuals coming from diverse cultural backgrounds. This can only be achieved by a three-level reconceptualisation: (1) breaking the exclusive connection to the nation-state conceptualisations exclusively limited to Anglo-American cultures, (2) moving beyond static representations of certain surface-level aspects of culture (e.g., customs and food), and (3) negotiating plurilingual resources and communicative skills/strategies. In selecting, evaluating, or constructing instructional materials or environments, the guiding principle should be transculturality, and the criticality it embodies in

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

questioning, deconstructing, and transgressing traditional categories of culture. Diversification of the source of cultural content and capitalising upon dynamism, flow, fluidity, and hybridity within and across cultures will promote transcultural communication and understanding among EIL users. More specifically, educators (material designers, test writers, classroom practitioners) need to adopt a critical transcultural lens to investigate all the cultural references and representations in their work and make necessary adaptations to suit the transcultural needs and realities of our world.

5.3.4 Dimension 4: Linguistic Norms

	Dimension #4: Linguistic Norms
For English users	Communication means moving beyond the adherence to the idealised 'native speaker' norms and the ability to use the English language alongside other languages and resources in a wide range of communicative encounters.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to expose students to a diverse range of Englishes and emphasise the fluidity, multiplicity, and variability of norms determined by communicative aims and demands in ELF encounters/discourses.

A major implication of the paradigms and trends related to the global spread of English is the destabilisation and reconceptualisation of linguacultural norms traditionally defined by the idealised 'native speakers', enacted through policies and ideologies (e.g., 'standard' language ideology, ratiolinguistic ideologies, English-only movement, Singapore's Speak Good English Movement) permeating into ELT practices. Informed by a postmodern orientation, this understanding redefined authenticity, not as a euphemism perpetuating the idealised 'native speaker' norms and cultures but as a powerful construct mirroring the diversity, dynamism, and variability in translingual/transcultural encounters. Rather than adhering to, and mimicking, the educational norms seemingly held only by an idealised group of 'native' English users, educators may adopt a post-normative approach and help translingual users to develop critical metalinguistic awareness, sociopragmatic and discourse skills. Students will benefit more from both exposure to and user of fluid, diverse, and multiple forms and functions of the language during their education.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.3.5 Dimension 5: Teachers

	Dimension #5: Teachers
For English users	Developing EIL competencies can be realised by diverse and qualified educators who have a heightened sense of epistemological, ideological, and professional commitment to and engagement with EIL principles and practices.
For English teachers	Principles and practices in ELT need to validate the notion of professional legitimacy in terms of qualifications, teaching experience, and professionalism over dichotomously juxtaposed and contested categories of professional identity.

The idealisation and essentialisation of the 'native speaker' episteme permeated into every facet of the ELT enterprise, and teachers' professional identities are no exception. Ranging from teacher education to hiring practices, the professional identities of teachers have been defined and measured by dichotomously juxtaposed constructs of 'native English-speaking teachers' versus 'non-native English-speaking teachers'. Unfortunately, this paved the way for the institutionalisation of simplistic ways to define teacher efficacy and competencies; the perpetuation of asymmetrical power relations among professionals; and essentialisation (in)equity, privilege, and marginalisation in a decontextualised fashion (Selvi, 2019b). However, EIL practices necessitate the establishment of a professional milieu characterised by teacher education, professional experience, and equity and professionalism for all, in which translinguistic/transcultural identity negotiations of ELT *professionals* are defined beyond oversimplified, essentialised, and idealised categories ('native' speaker and 'native' speaker and concomitantly 'native English-speaking teachers' versus 'non-native English-speaking teachers'). Practical implications of this understanding may take different forms, including *research activities* (e.g., articles, books, presentations, workshops, and theses/dissertations), *policy and advocacy initiatives* (e.g., advocacy groups within professional associations and position statements on employment practices), and *teaching and teacher education activities* (e.g., integrating issues surrounding language ownership, professional legitimacy, professional qualities, and hiring/workplace practices into pre- and in-service teacher education settings through readings, discussions, tasks, and assignments) (Selvi, 2014), collectively known as the 'NNEST movement' (Kamhi-Stein, 2016).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.3.6 Dimension 6: Role Models

	Dimension #6: Role Models
For English users	Communication means striving to use the language like other fellow experts and successful multicompetent English users in the immediate or imagined global community of English speakers.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to expose students to a diversity of successful English users who serve as realistic and authentic role models, as opposed to 'native' speakers.

Another major implication of the paradigms is that it showcases how students need to be exposed to successful, qualified, expert, and multicompetent users as role models. This inclusive representation of speakers and English teachers will help students to recognise themselves as legitimate users of the language and promote their sense of imagined community in which English is used as a lingua franca in different ways by different speakers and alongside other languages and resources. Having realistic (possible to encounter) and attainable (possible to achieve) role models in and beyond the classroom will eventually lead to more meaningful learning goals.

5.3.7 Dimension 7: The Sources of Instructional Materials

	Dimension #7: The Sources of Instructional Materials
For English users	Developing EIL competencies can be realised by instructional materials that represent and prepare for diversity in English usage, speakers, accents, cultures, contexts, norms, and functions in which English is used alongside other languages from local and global origins.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to be supported with contextually relevant and contextually sensitive materials representing a diversity of uses, users, functions and contexts of English, and competent teachers who can evaluate, diversify, complement, and 'talk around' these materials.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The materials industry in ELT remains a profit-driven business, driven by major publishing houses from the West and largely operating within the 'native' speaker episteme. To overcome this, materials in the EIL classroom need to represent English as a pluralistic and dynamic construct in our lingua-culturally diverse world and create opportunities for critical engagement with diverse voices, perspectives, lived experiences, and people. Furthermore, we need to ensure that students are exposed to a broad range of sources (e.g., diversity of voices, perspectives, lived experiences, and people), not only relevant to their context but ones that reflect the diversity of English usage today. Even though decisions regarding instructional materials (selecting, adapting, supplementing, etc.) are bound by institutional parameters and often vary from one context to another, teachers are often an organic part of this process in some ways. For this reason, in- and pre-service teacher education activities must equip teachers with knowledge, skills, and abilities to critically evaluate their materials and curricula, to make adaptations therein through diversification, and to develop their contextually relevant and sensitive teaching materials.

5.3.8 Dimension 8: Positioning of Other Languages and Cultures

	Dimension #8: Positioning of Other Languages and Cultures
For English users	Communication is the ability to transcend and transform the traditionally defined linguistic and cultural boundaries to achieve successful communication.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to instil multilingualism as the norm and develop students' translingual/transcultural repertoires to support learning and multilingual lingua franca interactions.

Even though the paradigms related to the global spread of English focus primarily on English as a global lingua franca, these hybrid encounters often take place among people from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds, alongside other languages in a pluricentric fashion. The complexity of these interactions catalysed a departure from a strict monolingual orientation to language in the classroom (e.g., strong forms of Communicative Language Teaching) where activities (e.g., translation), practices (e.g., code-switching), and metalinguistic knowledge related to other languages are strictly prohibited or marginalised as 'deviations', 'imperfections', 'interference', or 'gaps in the knowledge'. We are now moving towards a plurilingual orientation where other languages and related practices

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(e.g., translanguaging) are seen as valuable resources in English classrooms. This understanding translates into a more ecological approach to pedagogical practices that support learners to draw upon their entire multilingual repertoire (i.e., tools, resources, and practices) to communicate successfully in a range of intercultural communication settings.

5.3.9 Dimension 9: Needs

	Dimension #9: Needs
For English users	Developing EIL competencies involves reflecting upon and developing one's new and evolving communicative needs.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to be based on learners' diverse communicative needs.

Needs analysis is central to good curriculum development, and the growing research in the different paradigms provides a wealth of information on how students today may need to use the language. The growing body of research also showcases the need for 'a change in how we conceptualise students' needs' (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 24). For some, the 'native' model may well be relevant, but for the majority, for those learning English for global use, their needs are markedly different from the past. Many students today are learning the language to use as a global lingua franca. Given the diverse use of the language today, teachers need to make informed decisions based on careful analysis of their students' needs regarding English usage.

5.3.10 Dimension 10: The Goals of Learning

	Dimension #10: The Goals of Learning
For English users	Communication means having awareness, attitude, and skills to use the language as an expert and successful multicompetent English user in the immediate or imagined global community of English speakers.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to equip students with awareness, attitude, and skills to become successful multicompetent English users rather than impractical, inappropriate, and unfair approximations of idealised 'native' speakers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Learning a global language defined by incredible diversity, fluidity, and hybridity in a world characterised by an unprecedented state of flux makes it an unfathomably complex endeavour. Thus, English classrooms today are educational spaces where global realities, local needs, and individual aspirations are reconciled and incorporated into the curriculum, syllabi, methodology, and even assessment. In this picture, the goal of the curriculum should be preparing individuals who can navigate in a range of desired domains as successful multicompetent users of the language, rather than mimicking the idealised 'native' speaker of English.

5.3.11 Dimension 11: Assessment Criterion

	Dimension #11: Assessment Criterion
For English users	Communication means the ability to co-construct meaning underpinned by the parameters of the interlocutors (e.g., diverse ethnocultural backgrounds, different language varieties, and accents) and the communicative aims of the discourse.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to realign assessment focus and practices with the redefined, plural, and dynamic constructs of proficiency and goals of learning.

Tests and testing processes have a defining role and influence on learners' goals of learning and teachers' everyday practices, and central to a paradigm shift in ELT is a shift in perspectives of the assessment criteria against which language outcomes are measured. Without a change in assessment, we will continue to see a washback effect which would make curriculum innovation a difficult thing to achieve. Thus, assessment and other elements of the ELT curriculum require innovation. The results in commercial proficiency tests (e.g., TOEFL, IELTS, PTE, and Duolingo English Test) with international recognition and standardised tests for local contexts (e.g., English language sections as an entry requirement and proficiency exams in higher education institutions) stand as a benchmark for educational success, evidence of linguistic proficiency, and often the goal for learning. In that regard, they have a powerful gatekeeping role influencing the teaching–learning process (content, syllabus, materials, and activities) and the individuals therein – learners (goals and attitudes) and teachers (instructional choices). The paradigmatic shifts occurring in our conceptions of the English language, use, and success in communicative encounters have moved away from well-established idealised 'native' speaker norms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

These shifts can encourage teachers and test designers to rethink and revamp their assessment practices. We must consider what norms to apply and how to define proficiency in the English language (Canagarajah, 2013). If most speakers today are 'non-native' speakers, then we have to question the extent to which the constructs articulated in standards for English language proficiency are accurate. The target setting for using English has clearly changed and, therefore, so has the criterion. Thus, assessments making inferences about learners' future performance need to consider how students use the language in diverse encounters with ethnolinguistically diverse speakers and in a range of socio-educational contexts. This understanding necessitates the reconceptualisation of successful communication in English, which is commonly defined as conforming to static and idealised 'native' norms. Communicative competence is key, rather than accuracy according to a set standard.

5.3.12 Dimensions 12 and 13: Ideology and Theoretical Orientation

	Dimension #12 and 13: Ideology and Theoretical Orientation
For English users	Communication means a constant negotiation of one's stance towards the English language and being/becoming a glocal user of English across time and space.
For English teachers	Instructional principles and practices in English classrooms need to externalise one's ideological stance, attitudes, and biases towards the English language and promote a glocal identity and confidence as multilingual users of a global language.

The ever-intensifying globalisation in the last couple of decades paved the way for the emergence of communities, spaces, and opportunities in which English has been actively used in the construction, negotiation, and expression of identity (both real and imagined). In (re)constructing and negotiating their linguistic identity, users of English engage in a constant dialogue with the conceptualisations of the English language, the relationship they have with their actual and imagined community of interlocutors, and what it signifies in terms of social, educational, economic, political, and moral ramifications, collectively known as language ideologies. Their construals have the power to shape their idea(l)s, beliefs, and attitudes about the language (e.g., what it means to know English, what constitutes good English, how English functions alongside other languages, how English intersects with categories of identity such as race and gender), and to position themselves and others (e.g., who is a legitimate

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

language user, and who is a competent teacher). Prevalent coercive language ideologies surrounding the English language have traditionally suffered from monoglossic and raciolinguistic orientations to legitimacy (idealised 'native speakers'), norms ('standard' language), and ownership (exclusive birthright to Inner Circle countries), racial(ised)/gendered embodiment (Whiteness) and communicative practices often through dichotomous juxtapositions ('native' versus 'non-native speaker'). Our understanding of being an English language user and teacher is evolving due to the proliferation of paradigms and trends, shedding brighter light on the negotiation and projection of linguistic identities in translingual/transcultural encounters afforded by globalisation in a superdiverse world. Therefore, being and becoming an English user means a constant, dynamic, and discursive process of expressing, negotiating, and claiming identity about diverse roles, communities, settings, communicative practices, and intersectional categories of identities. Therefore, language educators must forge novel ways to externalise language users' ideological and attitudinal inclinations so as to align their instruction and teaching–learning goals to suit their learners' needs and interests. The paradigms presented in this Element highlight the need for an ideology underpinning ELT to embrace the diversity of English.

5.4 Informing Change

In conclusion, it is clear then that the rise of English as a global language calls for a change in how the language is taught and learned. It is clear from the dimensions outlined in Sections 5.3.1–5.3.12 that this paradigm shift, similar to the movement towards communicative language teaching fifty or so years ago, is very much needed. This, however, is certainly no easy feat. Nevertheless, it is hoped that by providing an overview of these frameworks and the various dimensions that need to be addressed, we can help further highlight how the ELT curriculum should and can be innovated. What is needed next in the field is rigorously planned and implemented classroom-based research, where pedagogical innovations are put into practice in English language curricula (Rose et al., 2021). In the following section, we outline some practical activities and lesson plans for each of these dimensions to further help practitioners achieve successful and sustainable curricular innovation for teaching EIL. While offering a detailed examination of what this approach may look like, our aim is not to prescribe a model for ELT. Teaching practices will vary according to context. Our intention is to offer insights into how to critically evaluate current curricula and materials and adapt them to local needs. Finally, while the practical activities in the following section may

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

specifically cater to ELT professionals, we believe and argue that a systemic change in language education requires a more comprehensive dialogue that involves key stakeholders beyond teachers, such as material developers, curriculum designers, test writers, administrators, and teacher educators, among others. Only then we can begin talking about the transformation of the ELT landscape and creating a more inclusive and effective teaching–learning environments.

6 Practical Applications for Language Educators

As delineated extensively in the previous section, proposals for curriculum innovation present a compelling set of implications for major stakeholders in ELT (e.g., students, teachers, teacher educators, test designers, curriculum developers, and policymakers) who are charged with the task of preparing English users for the changing conditions and communicative needs in globalised linguascapes. In this complex picture, the reconceptualisation of linguistic norms and pedagogical practices around the diversity, fluidity, complexity, and dynamism of interactivities necessitates change, dynamism, and innovation in ideological commitments, professional skills, and pedagogical practices. To further support this idea(l), this section presents a set of practical applications based on the thirteen dimensions explored in the previous section. These are aimed primarily towards teachers and teacher educators who wish to rethink and refresh their practices aligned with the present-day sociolinguistic realities surrounding EIL.

6.1 Dimension 1: Target Interlocutors

The notion of diversity related to the English language manifests itself in different ways, and the diversity in terms of users is certainly a prominent part of this picture. Therefore, practical applications in and beyond the classroom need to expand the traditional definition of ‘target interlocutor’ (often equated to ‘native speakers’ predominantly from both sides of the Atlantic) by drawing upon users (present and future, lived and imagined, local and global) from diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds with different levels of competence across contexts, cultures, time, and space. This understanding necessitates a closer and more critical look (by both teachers and learners) at instructional materials (e.g., coursebooks, handouts, flashcards, audiovisuals, websites, etc.) as primary sources of input, elicitation, exposure, and exploration in ELT through the lens of target interlocutors operating at two significant levels: *representation* and *interaction*.

At the level of representation, instructional materials should portray successful users on global (belonging to and moving across various circles of

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Englishes) as well as local scales (e.g., neighbouring countries and sociohistorically connected communities) exhibiting linguistic diversity (e.g., different accents and varieties, ELF use, and translanguaging practices). Such a glocal approach to ELT will be a testament to contextualised manifestations of the discourses of ELF. Quantitative representation of the diversity of users, however, must go beyond showcasing various speakers; otherwise, it would fall into the trap of tokenism. In other words, instructional materials should not only portray successful multilingual users of English as the speakers and rightful owners of the language but also represent individuals occupying varying roles in daily/professional life that exhibit equal power relationships – that is, not in a subordinate role to an idealised 'native speaker' (see Appendix A for a checklist to evaluate the quantitative and qualitative representation of target interlocutors in instructional materials).

At the level of interaction, language learners may be provided with real opportunities and environments that promote linguacultural exchanges with diverse English users (and thereby exposure and use in authentic communicative encounters). For instance, intercultural telecollaboration projects (e.g., Grazzi, 2016; Kohn & Hoffstaedter, 2017) may serve as great ways to recognise the diversity of English users and to promote communication strategies and accommodation skills through participation in web-mediated multimodal interactions through a range of a/synchronous tools (e.g., see Flowers (2015) for a pen pal exchange programme, Jenks (2012) for a use of Skypecast chat room, and Liang (2012) for the use of Second Life virtual world). In areas experiencing (in)voluntary human mobility (e.g., metropolitan areas, popular tourist destinations, border cities, and refugee settlements), learners may be encouraged to engage in ethnographic and intercultural encounters with individuals from various linguacultural backgrounds using English as a multilingual franca (e.g., reflections based on observations, visits, and encounters; interviews with community members; forging connections with ethnolinguistically diverse individuals; collecting audiovisual artefacts; and implementing questionnaires). Otherwise, learners may be directed to existing materials (such as online media or corpora) to perform such analyses (e.g., see Galloway & Rose (2014) for listening journals) or can create their own materials using Artificial Intelligence-based (AI) large language models such as ChatGPT or GPT-4. Furthermore, integrating critical values of multilingualism and linguistic diversity into high-impact practices (e.g., study abroad programmes, student exchange/mobility schemes, service learning, and school partnerships) will provide meaningful opportunities to appreciate incredible diversity in authentic lingua franca encounters.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6.2 Dimension 2: The Ownership of English

The ownership of English is inherently connected to one's sociohistorical negotiation, construction, and reassertion of linguistic identity and legitimacy in relation to an immediate or imagined global linguistic community due to nativisation (e.g., Outer Circle contexts), transnational communication (e.g., Expanding Circle contexts), and quantitative asymmetry between 'native' and 'non-native speakers' around the world. Therefore, practical applications focusing on the ownership of English manifest themselves on at least four different levels: *recognition*, *awareness-raising*, *identity*, and *participation*.

An essential prerequisite for individuals to claim an ownership with English as legitimate users is when they recognise manifestations of global ownership reflected, valued, and built upon in ELT practices. For this reason, different aspects of ELT, such as instructional materials (coming from various sources, representing diverse speakers in various roles), norms (a diverse range of Englishes), assessment practices (prioritising communicative competence), target interlocutors, and cultures (positive attitudes towards the diversity of user and cultural bases), should be aligned with changing dynamics and realities the new global linguistic order.

Furthermore, English teachers may take deliberate and explicit steps towards sensitising their learners about the current status of English as a global lingua franca through readings, facts and statistics, in-class discussions, debates, case scenarios, and vignettes (see the lesson plans in the appendix of Galloway (2017) and activities on the companion website to Galloway and Rose (2015)). Learning both *about* (through instructional materials and activities) and *for* (through recognising, valuing, and building uses of English for communicative needs) EIL will recognise students as 'speakers in their own right' (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 185) and strategically position English ownership beyond the confines of idealised 'native speaker' realm.

All stakeholders in ELT must afford complex, dynamic, and sophisticated spaces promoting legitimacy, intentionality, and critical self-reflexivity. To externalise learners' positionality on the ownership of English continuum (see Figure 2), teachers, for example, may utilise in-depth personal interviews, narratives, poems, diaries, and critical autoethnographic narratives.

These artefacts may offer glimpses of reflection for individuals to construct different positions, a range of identity options, and thereby degrees of ownership of the English language. This will enable teachers and users to adopt an intersectional approach to understanding different dimensions (e.g., history, race, ethnicity, and politics) influencing the ownership construct. Ultimately, these spaces of discussion and reflection showcasing one's negotiation of

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figure 2 The ownership of English continuum.

expertise and legitimacy in the language will offer unique insights for teachers to learn more about the individuals they work with and their struggles, complexities, and worldviews as language users. Alternatively, teachers may use the continuum figure as a springboard for more discussion and critical reflection, and promotion of multilingual identities (see Appendix B for sample discussion questions).

Departing from the symbiotic relationship among identity formation (within both local and global English-speaking communities), claiming ownership and agentive participation, teachers may take strategic steps in promoting students' understanding, negotiating, and countering hegemonic discourses as legitimate users in different contexts, known as symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2009). Online learning opportunities and the utilisation of technological tools (e.g., chat rooms, social networking sites, telecollaboration, online pen pal exchanges, digital storytelling projects, or AI platforms) around macro themes would give language users meaningful contexts to engage in multimodal, communicative, creative, and translingual encounters (see Rose et al., 2021 for a review). These activities will foster their symbolic identities of/in participation and positively contribute to their ownership of the English language.

6.3 Dimension 3: Target Culture

Embracing the idea of linguistic plurality brings about the need to reorientate culture due to the intricate relationship between these two constructs. Therefore, practical applications in ELT must encompass linguistic and cultural pluralism, fluidity, and hybridity in intercultural encounters. Let us take a reading passage about coffee and Starbucks, the world's largest coffeehouse chain based in Seattle, Washington (United States). A typical text like this would treat coffee as an essential aspect of American culture and offer insights into coffee as a product (e.g., types of coffee and different coffee products), practice (e.g., the language used in ordering coffee, coffee breaks, and coffeehouses as spaces for work/leisure), and perspective (e.g., convenience, symbolic value, and status).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Often influenced by the prevalent cross-cultural communication orientation accentuating 'differences' between cultures through comparisons, teachers' first attempt would often be establishing connections between the American culture and students' cultures. However, this intuitive first step may lead to essentialised understandings of cultures and nationalistic characteristics of individuals (e.g., 'They (Americans) always start the day by drinking a large cup of dark-roasted coffee, whereas we (Japanese) always prefer tea for breakfast'.).

In efforts to move beyond the traditional focus on Inner Circle (often portrayed as "target culture"), teachers can adopt Cortazzi and Jin's (1999) typology to expand their instructional content by including references from *source culture* (students' own culture) and *international target cultures* (the cultures other than the Anglo-American target culture and students' own culture). For example, a teacher in Brazil can diversify this reading text with references to prominent coffees found in (1) other contexts in the broader Anglosphere (e.g., Irish alcoholic coffee (Ireland) and flat white (Australia)); (2) international contexts (e.g., the affogato or espresso Romano (Italy), kaffeost (Sweden), Turkish coffee (Turkey), Einspänner (Austria), Ca Phe Trung (Vietnam), Qahwa (Saudi Arabia), CoffeeTouba (Senegal), Cafe Lagrima (Argentina), and Café au lait (France)); and (3) in the local context (e.g., Cafezinho (Brazil). This is definitely a more inclusive approach in terms of representing cultures associated with different circles around the world. However, it is still largely based on a relatively fixated conceptualisation of culture(s) connected to nation-states operating in a binary fashion (i.e., us versus them or West versus non-West).

Informed by the recent and ongoing waves of postmodern/poststructuralist understanding of culture, teachers may strategically utilise instructional materials to promote the heterogeneity and hybridity of cultural identity. More specifically, they can adopt Kubota's (2003) Four Ds approach as follows:

(1) **Descriptive understanding of culture –** A teacher may adapt the text in such a way as to include Starbucks's definition of their coffeehouse as a public space: 'a place for conversation and a sense of community. A third place between work and home' (Starbucks, n.d.). The teacher can then invite students to comment on this definition and confirm this assertion based on their (a) experiences and (b) observations.

(2) **Diversity within a culture –** A teacher in the United States may adapt the text by highlighting not just the company's essential contributions to the coffee culture and local economy, mainly through creating jobs, especially for the young workforce, but also its reputation for serving mostly middle/

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

upper-class living in predominantly white neighbourhoods, a catalyst for gentrification, and racial profiling (e.g., the failed #RaceTogether campaign in 2015 and the racial profiling incident in Philadelphia, United States, in 2018). This will afford critical pluralism and diversity within the culture.

(3) **Dynamic nature of culture –** A teacher in Turkey may adapt the text to offer deeper insights into the coffee culture and coffeehouses in the local context. The adapted text may begin by portraying the evolution of coffeehouses in the local context as social, artistic, and intellectual hubs during the Ottoman era and spaces of social interaction exclusive to men until the new millennium. Next, it may discuss the role that Starbucks played in the revitalisation of coffee as a new domain of commodification as part of globalisation in the local context from the 2000s onwards. Students can break into small groups and discuss the reasons why Turkey has the most Starbucks branches of any European country, except the United Kingdom, and design their competitor brand against it.

(4) **Discursive constructions of culture –** Demanding first names be written on coffee cups creates personalised and two-way communication with customers at Starbucks. However, this practice often results in misspelt and mispronounced names in a more subtle way. For example, in Japan, Baristas follow local cultural norms of harmony, privacy, and respect by writing on the side of the cup or using a removable sticker instead of writing prominently and permanently. They also hand the order to the customer rather than calling out their names in public. In some cases, this practice may be found awkward due to excessive informality. For instance, in France, where it was introduced, abolished, and then re-introduced, it may be considered impractical. Alternatively, individuals may circumvent this issue by adopting a common 'Anglicised Starbucks name.' For example, 'Ayumi' becomes 'Amy,' or 'Xiao' becomes 'Jane' in the United States. Thus, a teacher may use these instances as a springboard for discussions around microaggressions and imposed/ascribed erasure of identity at the nexus of language, race, and culture, such as claiming the personal identity, acculturation, assimilation, and using names/pronouns. It also has the potential to spur deeper conversations around the Anglicisation of names as a coercive form of 'raciolinguistic ideologies' (Flores & Rosa, 2015), underscoring the critical role and importance of language in the embodiment of normative assumptions about individuals based on race, gender, sexual orientation, and (dis)ability, among other categories of identity. Ultimately, this activity will promote an understanding of linguistic multiplicity, hybridity, and fluidity in practice.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Another typical lesson on India may start with what students know about the country but also has the potential to open a window to the country's both past and present, its sociocultural fabric, demographic patterns, and political issues (e.g., rural–urban divide, the caste system, gender issues, linguistic diversity, call centres, and Bollywood). Such a lesson could be supported by a range of multimodal resources (e.g., texts, photos, films, maps, statistics, and graphs) as well as segments from popular examples from the entertainment industry (e.g., *Bombay Calling*, *Mississippi Masala*, and *Monsoon Wedding*) to provide insights about how the English language is linked to glocal identity. Learners could then break into several groups of their choice and work on their posters about the role of languages in different aspects of linguacultural identity. Learners are also expected to make connections to broader issues such as globalisation, Englishisation, and their glocal ramifications. These artefacts may also be used as stepping stones to portray varieties of English use, debunk cultural stereotypes, and clarify any mis-/under-/over-representations of cultural and linguistic identities. Furthermore, examinations of critical incidents in hypothetical scenarios or movies could give language users a chance to discuss what caused communication breakdown, analyse various cultural beliefs and attitudes embedded in the conversation, discuss different ways to avoid cultural conflict, and simulate different scenarios to promote mutual intercultural understanding. Furthermore, interactive online activities (e.g., blogging, videoconferencing, and interacting on social media), study abroad programmes, and school partnership projects at national and international levels may offer creative co-construction of learning communities that lead to opportunities for language development while fostering transcultural exchanges.

6.4 Dimension 4: Linguistic Norms

The global spread of English has served as a prime motivation to destabilise language standards and norms traditionally associated with idealised 'native speakers'. Therefore, practical applications focusing on the pluralisation of linguistic norms can take different forms and influence norms that teachers (a) provide, (b) use, (c) prepare for, and (d) expect from the students in ELT classrooms (see Table 4).

6.5 Dimension 5: Teachers

Innovative practices in ELT necessitate language educators with heightened levels of 'commitment, involvement, and engagement to move beyond essentialised and idealised binaries of being, becoming, and doing' (Selvi, 2019b, p. 191). Therefore,

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4 Principles and practices in pluralising linguistic norms

Foci	Principles for Educators	Practical Applications
Norms provided	Increasing exposure to (a) diverse forms of English, (b) situation- and usage-based uses of English that demonstrate flexible use of norms	- Mainstreaming of textual and audiovisual materials that reflect diversity in English usage and transcultural uses of ELF - Comparing and contrasting communication using idealised 'native speaker' norms versus EIL constructs of intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability, and flexible and creative use of the language where speakers draw on their entire multilingual repertoire to engage in successful communication - Using examples from different aspects of the language (e.g., pronunciation, grammar, and lexis) to demonstrate variation
Norms used	Modelling pluralisation of linguistic norms through instructional choices, practices as well as interactions with students	- Sharing personal negotiations of language norms as a language user and teacher - Videotaping classes to focus on enactments of linguistic norms through teacher talk

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4 (cont.)

Foci	Principles for Educators	Practical Applications
Norms prepared for	Equipping language users with communication and accommodation strategies necessary in/for ELF interactions	- Promoting communicative skills such as 'extralinguistic cues, identifying and building on shared knowledge, gauging and adjusting to interlocutors' linguistic repertoires, supportive listening, signalling (non)comprehension in a face-saving way, asking for repetition, paraphrasing, and the like' (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 227)) - Recognising and building upon students' multilingual repertoire (e.g., using home languages, making dual/multi-language resources, multimodality as a literacy practice)
Norms expected	Redefining norms and aligning instruction in the light of broader constructs of intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability from EIL Strategic designing that promotes the utilisation of all resources in one's multilingual repertoire	- Critically evaluating tools used to provide feedback and assess student learning - Redefining existing idealised 'native speaker' norms with intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability and communicating them to students - Videotaping classes to focus on enactments of linguistic norms embedded in classroom discourse - Allowing translingual practices (e.g., home languages, dual/multi-language resources, and multimodality as a literacy practice) as an integral part of instruction

practical applications focusing on the dichotomously juxtaposed constructs of teacher identity may include the following strategies:

- Utilisation of pre- and in-service teacher education activities (e.g., coursework, class discussions, activities, and assignments) as a gateway to introduce models beyond categorical binaries (e.g., Pasternak & Bailey's (2004) *Continua of Target Language Proficiency and Professional Preparation*), problematise uniform NEST/NNEST experiences (e.g., Rudolph et al., 2015), and scrutinise the fluidity of privilege and marginalisation beyond categorical binaries (Rudolph, 2018) (see Appendix C for a sample activity to externalize and problematize the juxtaposed orientation to ELT professionals through a raciolinguistic lens),
- A broader conversation involving various stakeholders in ELT and concerted efforts for innovation and change
- A reconceptualisation of teachers' language proficiency not as 'general English proficiency' but as 'a specialised subset of language skills' necessary for language teaching, known as *English-for-Teaching* by Freeman et al. (2015)
- Reflection on sociohistorical negotiations of subjectivities, linguistic and professional legitimacy through narrative inquiry
- Participation in professional associations (e.g., TESOL International Association, and IATEFL) and online professional networks (e.g., NNEST Interest Section and ELINET (Education, Language and Internationalisation Network, https://elinet.org.uk)) to promote equity and professionalism for all in the ELT profession (Selvi, 2019b)
- Focusing on sample job advertisements from different contexts to construct intersectional constructions of privilege, marginalisation, and discrimination (see Figure 3).

Figure 3 Sources of discrimination in ELT: An intersectional approach.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6.6 Dimension 6: Role Models

Practical applications focusing on role models as users of English need to reflect this diversity. For instance, externalising students' stances through retrospective linguistic biographies and prospective narratives will give teachers a sense of their L2 self in their immediate or imagined global community of English speakers. Teachers may also make use of successful multilingual figures (e.g., themselves, other expert language users, successful famous examples from their context, or famous figures such as South African comedian Trevor Noah), their language uses, and lived experiences affording deeper understandings of the intersectionality of race, class, gender, and language as they inform their linguistic identities. Material designers can utilise these public figures, personal insights, or guest appearances to inform students' aspirations about more attainable role models (i.e., the ideal L2 self) and communicate a much more realistic language use in the world and more meaningful learning goals in the classroom. Learning more about the students (their immediate and future realities, aspirations, needs, and motivation) will give teachers leverage in designing tasks simulating their future lives and possible encounters. Teachers, then, can use these as input to design communicative tasks (e.g., role plays), identify appropriate communicative skills, and focus on ways to promote users' strategic competence skills for different types of communicative settings.

6.7 Dimension 7: The Sources of Instructional Materials

As powerful artefacts forming and informing the teaching–learning process, instructional materials embody, normalise, and perpetuate discourses, ideologies, and worldviews about English uses, users, functions and contexts, and power relations therein. Since the current instructional materials predominantly perpetuate the Anglocentric ideology of 'native speakerism' originating from the West, practical applications focusing on instructional materials should equip teachers with a critical mindset, innovative approach, and transformative skills to:

(1) **Be critical consumers of existing materials –** Teacher educators may work with teachers, both at pre- and in-service levels, and collectively develop their checklist for materials evaluation through the EIL lens. Seeking answers to such questions (e.g., What norms are prioritised? Whose norms? Who is (mis-/under/over-)represented in the materials? Who is ignored, silenced or eased in the materials? What counts as communicative success? What determines authenticity? Which communicative skills are promoted? Which cultures are represented and how? Who is portrayed as a legitimate English speaker?) will sensitise teachers'/teacher

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

candidates' critical perspectives. Once developed, the checklist may be utilised in a side-by-side comparison of instructional materials from different *levels* (e.g., beginner versus advanced), *contexts* (e.g., English for specific purposes class for health professionals in Germany versus academic English class for pre-undergraduate students in Japan), *settings* (e.g., Inner versus Outer versus Expanding Circles), and *times* (e.g., published in 2000 versus in 2020).

(2) **Diversify the source of instructional materials –** Materials designers are charged with the task of creating materials that recognise and promote the notion of diversity in various forms. When this goal fails, teachers should either replace these materials or adapt materials that showcase successful multilingual users of English as speakers of the language in various intercultural settings. Using materials that represent the diversity of Englishes, speakers, accents, cultures, contexts, norms, and functions in which English is used alongside other languages from local and global origins will eventually enable learners to recognise EIL in action.

(3) **Develop their contextually relevant and contextually sensitive materials for diversity –** The process of developing locally produced materials involves taking deliberate steps and decisions and enacting epistemological and ideological views and commitments related to being a local speaker of a global language in a multilingual world. Teachers may be encouraged to develop their contextually relevant and contextually sensitive materials, and when they do that, they may *teach about* diversity (i.e., raising awareness and developing positive attitudes towards uses, users, functions, and contexts of English through YouTube videos, TED/TEDx Talks, AI-generated texts) or *teach for* diversity (i.e., developing skills for EIL encounters, such as strategies for meaning-making). Therefore, resources such as TED/TEDx Talks, Speech Accent Archive, ChatGPT, and role-plays based on communication breakdowns in EMI classes through the lens of various individuals; successful and failed attempts of localisation of multinational brands at the nexus of language and culture; and telecollaboration projects to develop a translingual children's book are all among plausible alternatives.

(4) **Teacher talk around the text –** At times when teachers are not in a position to *choose* or influence the *choice* of materials (based on the idealised 'native speaker' ideology), they still can resist, disrupt, and deconstruct power relations conveyed through these materials using 'teacher talk around the text' (Sunderland et al., 2000). This mediation of the text refers to the strategic utilisation and 'consumption' of the text as a discursive practice to uncover ideological connections within a wider sociocultural/sociopolitical practice. Enacted by questions that

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

problematise the manifestations of ideology represented in the materials, this strategy affords dialogic spaces to create new meanings and understandings about the uses, users, contexts, and functions of English in a multilingual/multicultural world. To develop this critical reflexive skill, teachers and teacher candidates may observe other colleagues' treatment of the text or video record (and transcribe) their attempts in actual teaching. This approach focusing on materials *use* is a useful complement to the extant research on materials per se.

6.8 Dimension 8: Positioning of Other Languages and Cultures

A multilingual orientation to ELT necessitates an ideological repositioning of deficit-oriented ideologies related to 'other' languages and practices related to 'them' (e.g., translanguaging and translingual practices). Practical applications focusing on the notion of multilingualism need to focus on students' linguistic repertoires to support learning in the classroom and lingua franca interactions in multilingual encounters. To that end, the strategic recognition and utilisation of other languages and cultures can be applied to at least three major domains: *interactions*, *instruction*, and *assessment*.

Since understanding is a prerequisite for transformation, teachers have the responsibility to connect with their students at deeper linguacultural levels. To facilitate this, teachers can conduct a survey on languages represented in the classroom, establish mutual and collaborative relationships with families to promote multilingual practices beyond the classroom, carry out instructional conversations with students about their goals, and invest in learning some useful expressions (e.g., greetings/farewell, praising, encouraging, classroom management, and instructions) from various languages represented in the classroom. However, limiting multilingual practices to interactions would inadvertently lead to a series of problems, including a superficial orientation to multilingualism, unequal power relations through minoritisation/majorisation of languages, and the unnecessary demarcation between them and what they offer for learning and interaction. Therefore, teachers are encouraged to tap into the multilingual repertoire of the classroom community to promote cross-linguistic awareness, known as 'pedagogical translanguaging' (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022), which is ideally to be supported by material designers, curriculum developers, and test writers.

Recognising and drawing upon students' linguacultural repertoires during instruction have multiple benefits, such as promoting the effectiveness and authenticity of language use, recognising academic identity, and fostering educational success. Translanguaging and translingual practices take different forms, including but not limited to the utilisation of multimodal communication

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(e.g., gesturing and drawing) by using relevant artefacts in the immediate environment (e.g., puppets, notepads, and software/applications) to support comprehension and engagement through various pedagogical functions (e.g., translating between languages, strategic use of other languages in various aspects of an activity, note-taking in multiple languages, and reviewing learning in other languages).

In addition to interactions and instructions, translanguaging and translingual practices also have powerful implications and applications for language assessment contexts. The translanguaging ideology could be leveraged for both formative and summative forms of assessment through a fresh perspective on instructions (e.g., multilingual instructions), input (e.g., culturally relevant connections and elicitation through multilingual content), responses (e.g., access to multilingual resources in constructing and providing a response), feedback (e.g., individualised forms of appraisals), and benchmarks (e.g., assessment of translanguaging multicompetence).

6.9 Dimension 9: Needs

The sociolinguistic needs of English learners in today's classrooms and other lingua franca contexts exhibit remarkable diversity and complexity in terms of scope, time, and space. To better accommodate this diversity, practical applications focus on learners' needs to follow three significant steps:*understanding*, *assessment*, and *reconciliation*.

The first stage (understanding) involves the externalisation of students' needs, necessities, and goals through needs analysis conducted formally (by the educational institution) and informally (by the classroom teacher or individual learners). Needs analyses focusing on language and language use can be conducted using a wide variety of tools, including surveys, inventories (can-do lists for self-assessment), learner interviews, language logs, personal reflections, language learning timelines/projections, and blogs/vlogs.

In the next stage (assessment), the understanding gleaned from needs analysis could be used as a lens to assess curricular goals and objectives and ultimately identify points of convergences and divergences between curricular approaches (e.g., objectives, materials, instructional practices, and language variety) and learners' context-dependent needs related to current and/or future English language use. For example, if a monolingual English user from the United States in a business programme expresses a need to use English as a business lingua franca, their proficiency limited to 'standard' American English variety may not be sufficient to maintain communicative and situational needs embedded in such encounters.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The last stage (reconciliation) involves taking deliberate steps to address the dissonances identified in needs analysis by creating spaces and opportunities for users to negotiate their needs in the local teaching context. In the example mentioned in the previous paragraph, the person needs to go through a specialised training programme that fosters (1) sociolinguistic awareness and sensitivity towards intercultural communication through reading passages about the diversity of English as a business lingua franca uses, and users; (2) redefined expectations based on intelligibility, credibility, and adaptability; (3) domain-specific communicative skills (e.g., familiarity with different accents, the ability to negotiate English alongside other languages and non-linguistic elements (e.g., body language), and multimodal resources (e.g., drawings, contracts, and visuals)) and sociocultural parameters (e.g., negotiation of intercultural norms and issues of power) through textual and audiovisual samples, case studies, simulations, and real-life practices.

6.10 Dimension 10: The Goals of Learning

Different from traditional ELT in which the goal of learning is to emulate an idealised 'native speaker' competence, teaching EIL has a more practical, appropriate, and fair ideal (Smolder, 2009) – multicompetent users (Cook, 2007) who can successfully negotiate a range of intercultural communicative encounters with individuals from diverse linguacultural backgrounds with different needs. Practical applications focusing on the notion of goals of learning need to instigate a shift from the dichotomous 'native' versus 'non-native' orientation to a multilingual paradigm. For example, the needs analysis process mentioned in the previous section may certainly involve questions germane to individuals' perceived goals of learning. Identifying learners' goals of learning will be intricately connected to their needs and inform decisions undergirding different aspects of ELT, anything from instructional variety to representations of cultures (See Rose & Galloway, 2019 about the creation of gaols of learning based on needs). Since the goals of learning are also an integral part of learners' identity (or their actual or ideal senses of Self across time and space), discussions or narrative inquiries may offer insights into their negotiations of proficiency and legitimacy in local and global communities of practices. Teachers will soon realise that their learners may position their Ideal Self at a different point on the communities of practices continuum. While some feel connected to the global EIL community, others may envision becoming a part of the community of speakers of privileged 'standard' Anglo-American varieties of English (i.e., British or American English). It should be noted that this is a matter of personal choice, and educators need to respect learners' decisions. In either

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

case, instructional practices should always be grounded in the realities of the glocal context of English while respecting learners' individual choices (while hoping that it will positively influence learners' goals of learning). Specific practical applications may include participating in intercultural communicative encounters through projects, brainstorming on the qualities of an effective language user, developing personal descriptions of current and future L2 self through narrative inquiry or multimodal, and having critical conversations around what it means to be and become a 'native speaker' and 'non-native speaker' in the English language.

6.11 Dimension 11: Assessment Criterion

Translating ideas into viable assessment practices is a challenging task, especially in international and standardised testing environments due to a lack of autonomy (Hu, 2012). Whether a *strong* (complete reconceptualisation of testing practices) or *weak* (accommodative adaptations through modifications) approach is adopted, the common goal is to move beyond the construct of proficiency traditionally defined in a linguistic term using idealised 'native' speaker as the norm (Rose et al., 2021). Change and innovation in testing practices – albeit small and gradual – are evident. For example, still operating around the theoretical principles of idealised 'native' speaker norms, commercial proficiency tests such as IELTS exhibit tokenistic recognition and representation of the plurality of Englishes by including greater variation among L1 speakers, recruiting test developers from diverse backgrounds, and replacing the term 'native speaker' with 'expert user' as a descriptor (Rampton, 1990). Considering that a great majority of assessment takes place in classrooms, teachers and local test designers have an important role and responsibility in developing tests that are meaningful and relevant for their students, and their immediate and future realities (e.g., varieties, accents, interlocutors, and situational and communicative parameters). This usage-based approach will bring about more relevant and glocal approximations in determining the test specification (e.g., topics, task types, language skills, and language samples). Thus, a glocal proficiency test of English for Asian learners should be designed in such a way to include relevant language samples, varieties, skills, and users that test-takers may potentially encounter in their current and future interactions through the target and present situation analyses. Teachers, material writers, and test designers should also move away from decontextualised, selected, and discrete-point items focusing on *language usage* towards contextualised, constructed, and performance-based tasks focusing on *language use* and simulating real-life encounters. Furthermore, some other strategies may include but are not

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

limited to using different accents and expert speakers in listening comprehension tasks, eliminating culturally loaded references and biased texts, involving multilingual raters in the process, and testing strategic competence, especially in group settings (e.g., asking for clarification and repetition, rephrasing, confirming/checking for comprehension, expressing (dis)agreement, managing conversational turns, and negotiation of pragmatic norms (McKay, 2011)).

6.12 Dimensions 12 and 13: Ideology and Theoretical Orientation

EIL stands out as a powerful sociolinguistic and political ideology aiming to destabilise and reconceptualise widely entrenched normative principles and practices in ELT shaped by the adherence to 'standard' language ideology through an idealised 'native speaker' notion and embodied through a racialised subject. Therefore, practical applications focusing on language ideologies and orientation need to instil a critical global perspective of English among multilingual users. Critical self-reflection through auto/duo/trio-ethnographic narratives, interviews, and surveys, including items focusing on the current role, status, functions, and importance of the English language at sociolinguistic, instructional, and educational levels (see Appendix D), may serve as a springboard for small- and large-group discussions about being and becoming a critical multilingual user of English. Furthermore, focusing on various social, political, educational, and raciolinguistic issues (through readings, discussions, debates, blog/vlog entries, social media posts, essays, and projects) will sensitise their criticality, subjectivity, and positionality as multilingual English users and sharpen their stance on issues around them as well as the role of English (and other languages) therein. The themes may include but are not limited to language and raciolinguistic policies (e.g., English-only and Black Lives Matter Movement in the United States, Speak Good English Movement in Singapore, and EMI policies around the world) and practices (e.g., English-medium instruction, mother tongue-based schooling), critically oriented and 'anti-racist pedagogies' (Kubota, 2021; Matsuda, 2023; Motha, 2014), linguistic landscape, language death and maintenance, grassroots activism and language policing, raciolinguistic ideologies, language and the internet, the nexus of linguistic diversity and social justice, and sociolinguistic perspectives in contemporary social and political issues (e.g., linguistic challenges during the ongoing global COVID-19 pandemic, Brexit and its political ramifications). As teacher educators and ELT practitioners wrestle with the 'entanglements and assemblages' (Pennycook, 2020b, p. 231) of theoretical orientation and ideology undergirding EIL with a critical lens (Kubota & Miller, 2017), they will cultivate ideological stances, intellectual spaces, and antiracist

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pedagogies (Kubota, 2021; Matsuda, 2023; Motha, 2014) that challenge deeply entrenched invisibilities and normativities (e.g., White normativity, Anglonormativity, coloniality, LGBT invisibility, heteronormativity, and Islamophobia), raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015), and epistemic racism (Kubota, 2020; Von Esch et al., 2020) propagated by the Global North (Piller & Cho, 2013) in ELT.

6.13 Achieving a Meaningful Shift in ELT

Our contemporary understanding of the global spread of English and the present-day global sociolinguistic landscape in which English functions alongside other languages laid out a compelling case and strong rationale for innovation in ELT principles and practices. Distilled from a growing body of both theoretical and empirical literature and encapsulated by such phrases as 'paradigm shift', 'innovation/innovative practices' (Rose et al., 2021), and 'moving beyond traditional ELT', critical praxisation within ELT, as a discursive field, activity, and area of scholarly inquiry, has contributed new hopes and directions for the future. At this critical juncture, supporting various communities of practice as agents of change in ELT (e.g., students, teachers, teacher educators/researchers, test agencies, and governments, among others) through practical applications is more pivotal and relevant than ever. Thus, practical applications presented in this section and elsewhere in the literature should encourage various stakeholders to take that first small step towards pedagogical practices conducive to both the global sociolinguistic dynamics and local needs and realities within their teaching contexts. More importantly, it should serve as a stepping stone towards establishing innovation as a core value and competency among ELT professionals who dynamically (re)assess their principles and practices with a motivation to better cater to the current and future pedagogical needs of the individuals they serve.

7 Conclusion: Implementing and Documenting Innovation

This Element has shown how English has emerged from its fairly unremarkable historical foundations to becoming the world's foremost global lingua franca. Its rise had as much to do with British colonialism as it did with American economic supremacy during an era of rapid globalisation. The spread of English has been spurred via a myriad of push factors such as political and commercial policymaking and language educational planning, as well as pull factors, whereby speakers are drawn to English for the perceived benefits afforded to its speakers, the linguistic capital that has been attached to it. Today, the most common use of English is as a global lingua franca, which represents a drastic

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

shift in the profile of the average English language user. It is no longer a language spoken by a small minority of 'native speakers'. It is a global language, one with global ownership, and one where the majority of speakers are adding the language to their multilingual repertoire to use as a lingua franca with other L1 and L2 speakers.

Aligned with the spread and diversification of the English language and the ever-growing number of its speakers, GE research has also continued to expand. As this Element has demonstrated, GE is informed by various interrelated conceptualisations of EIL, WE, and ELF, and aligns with similar movements in the field of SLA, such as translanguaging and the multilingual turn. Together these fields explore the use of English globally and shed light on how English manifests in global, local, and glocal contexts. Scholars in these diverse, but overlapping, paradigms explore the linguistic, sociolinguistic, and sociocultural diversity in English. Most importantly, these explorations of English use in the twenty-first century inform us as to how it should be taught and learned.

In recent decades, we have seen scholarship within ELT raise concerns regarding the pedagogical relevance of 'traditional' ELT curricula, which have been criticised for being based on static 'native' norms. This growing body of work showcases how English is used outside of the classroom in very different ways from how it is presented inside the classroom. In essence, it highlights a mismatch between the ELT curricula and how the language is used in today's globalised world. Global Englishes as a paradigm has, therefore, been instrumental not only in showcasing diversity in the use of English as a global language, but also in challenging traditional assumptions about language, language learning, and language teaching. Despite the brightening spotlight on the questionable relevance of 'native speaker' norms in ELT, these traditional practices continue to dominate. Just as a paradigm shift was needed in the past in ELT to move away from the focus on grammar-based teaching, which was seen as unconducive to the communicative needs of learners, we conclude that there remains an urgent need for another shift in response to the sociolinguistic landscape of English in the twenty-first century.

7.1 Areas of Innovation

In light of the changed needs of English learners, we have provided an overview of calls for curriculum innovation. The dominance of 'native speakerism' (Holliday, 2006) has, of course, been critiqued for decades, but growing work in this area brings new perspectives and strengthens the case for meaningful change. Our overview of the various dimensions of GE highlights a need to conceptualise how we view English, and languages in general. Language is

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

constantly in a state of flux and there are no hard boundaries between languages and varieties used in multilingual settings, especially those in which English is used alongside others as a (multi)lingua franca. Successful users of ELF use languaging and navigate multilingual encounters, focusing on communication strategies, as opposed to striving to sound like a 'native speaker', even though this 'native' model continues to be taught and used as an assessment criterion in the majority of curricula. In essence, learners will be using the language in very different ways to how it is presented and assessed in the 'traditional' ELT curricula. Our aim in this Element has been to highlight the need for a new orientation to English in the ELT curriculum.

Our overview of the thirteen GELT dimensions aims to further exemplify how the ELT curriculum should and can be innovated. Our outline of practical activities for each of these dimensions also aims to help practitioners achieve successful and sustainable curricular innovation. As noted, our aim is not to prescribe a model for ELT, and we recognise the need for a detailed needs analysis and context-specific curriculum. Nevertheless, it is clear that to adequately prepare learners for the use of English in a globalised twenty-first century, we need to promote a more flexible view of language, which emancipates 'non-native speakers'.

Specifically, we need to change the views of target interlocutors (Dimension 1), promote global ownership of the English language (Dimension 2), change depictions of the target culture (Dimension 3), promote a more flexible approach to linguistic norms that recognises that multilingualism is the norm and reduce the focus on the 'native speaker' model (Dimension 4), value teachers' professional and multilingual identities in hiring practices (Dimension 5), expose students to the diversity of English and successful role models (Dimension 6), utilise instructional materials that highlight the diversity of English (Dimension 7), positively position other languages and cultures (Dimension 8), ensure curricula meet the new and changing communicative needs of our students (Dimension 9), revise the goals of the curriculum (Dimension 10), revise assessment criterion (Dimension 11), and ensure our practices are informed by relevant ideologies and theoretical orientations (Dimensions 12 and 13).

As noted, the pedagogical implications of research on EIL are certainly gathering momentum and various frameworks have been put forward to help instigate curriculum innovation. *WE-informed ELT*, TEIL; ELF-aware pedagogy (including the post-normative approach), and GELT share a central endeavour to challenge the status quo in language education. While such frameworks are promising and helpful, and while scholarship on the need for pedagogical change is certainly on the rise, much more groundwork is needed to

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bring such ideas into the realities of the classroom. The previous section aimed to address this need by exploring each dimension in terms of how theoretical discussions for change can be accompanied by practical suggestions to guide practitioners in achieving such change. Indeed, the lack of concrete pedagogical guides at the classroom level may explain why GE research has made little headway into mainstream ELT. While recognition of TEIL in teacher training texts is increasing, this remains largely at a superficial level and a lack of TEIL materials persists as a major barrier to innovation.

When the GELT proposals were first identified, various ‘barriers’ to change were also identified (Galloway, 2011; Galloway and Rose, 2015). These barriers included a lack of materials, attachments to standard language ideology, assessment washback, traditional perspectives in teacher education, and hiring practices that favour ‘native English-speaking teachers’. Because of such barriers to innovation, we acknowledge that curriculum innovation is a complex process, and the introduction of any innovation should be based on a detailed needs analysis of the context.

7.2 Innovation Models

In a similar vein to earlier work by Brown (1993), Rose and Galloway (2019) drew on Rogers’ (1983) diffusion of innovation model to conceptualise the processes to innovate ELT curricula based on GE research. Drawing on Rogers’ examination of variables that influence the *perceived attributes* of innovation (that is, aspects that make it more appealing), we highlighted the importance of *compatibility*, *relative advantage*, *complexity*, *trialability*, and *observability* in ensuring success in innovation. We outlined a diffusion model to explore how GELT innovation may succeed or fail in any given context. This model borrows from Rogers’ (2003) later work where adopters are categorised as innovators, early adopters, the early majority, the late majority, and laggards. To implement TEIL (or GELT, ELF-aware pedagogy, *WE-informed ELT*, or whatever paradigm we chose to operate within), we still require innovators and early adopters as agents of change. In most educational settings, with exceptions, we are still a long way from TEIL becoming the mainstream practice of even an early majority of teachers at any given institution.

This innovation model helps to highlight TEIL as a grassroots effort, which is carried out by curriculum designers and teachers who lobby for change within their institutions. Teacher education has been identified as one of the main barriers to innovation, and it is here that we can transform prior expectations. We hope that books such as this one will be of help not only in teacher education programmes but also to speak directly to the teachers considering TEIL

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

innovations in their classroom practices. We aim to inform and empower innovators and early adopters of TEIL so that they can try what works best in their classrooms for their students. Teachers and curriculum developers can then use these trials to inform the next group of adopters working in the institution or those working in compatible institutional settings. To convince others to take on TEIL innovation, the *relative advantage* of curricular changes (i.e., its benefits over existing traditional curricula) needs to be observable. To increase the *observability* of TEIL innovation, we thus need greater reporting and discussion at a professional level. Many have noted teachers are important agents of change, yet their voices remain largely unheard in the TEIL scholarly literature (Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018). We note, with interest, however, that scholars in regions such as Thailand are increasing the visibility of such reporting in recent years through an active agenda at the crossroads of research and practice (see, for example, Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021; Boonsuk & Ambele, 2020; Boonsuk et al., 2021), which has amplified the voices of local lecturers (Boonsuk, 2021), and has done much to inform the *compatibility* of TEIL in the Thai higher education context. We hope this work inspires researcher-practitioners elsewhere to do the same in their contexts.

7.3 Researching and Reporting Innovation

To increase the perceived attributes of TEIL, Rose and Galloway's (2019) innovation model aims to inform research on, and encourage reporting of, curricular innovation. A growing body of research has emerged since the 2010s, which explores classroom-based innovations and innovations in teacher education. A systematic review of research on EIL, WE, ELF, and GE innovations in classrooms and teacher education revealed several studies that have explored the impact of TEIL through retrospective, introspective, and reflective methods (e.g., Fang & Ren, 2018; Marlina, 2013; Tardy et al., 2020). The review also highlighted studies that have explored reflections in teacher education (e.g., Biricik Deniz et al., 2020; Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015) as well as teachers' attitudes towards the proposals (and barriers) to innovation (e.g., Cameron & Galloway, 2019; Galloway & Numajiri, 2020; Vettorel & Corrizzato, 2016).

While this reporting of innovation is highly useful, the review concluded that such practice-oriented publications need to be accompanied by an increased volume of research into the direct effects of curriculum interventions. Such research, which can inform the *relative advantage* of TEIL, remains scarce. Previous research has been criticised for an overabundance of one-shot, cross-sectional data collection methods in classroom research, usually at the end of a course or task (Rose et al., 2021). In short, more research is needed to

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

showcase how an EIL approach is beneficial to learners in terms of their educational, linguistic, or identity development, by adopting more action research or quasi-experimental designs, where changes in outcomes of interest are measured before, during, and after an intervention. The thirteen dimensions outlined in the previous section could constitute a framework to inform the creation of such interventions.

Similarly, the review also calls for more research in the field of teacher education that explores the long-term effects of GE or TEIL awareness on future classroom practices. As stated throughout the Element, teachers are important agents of change in the curriculum innovation process, so we need to explore how new ideas received in teacher education are implemented after graduation when they enter their classrooms. This will not only help researchers and teacher educators to check the *trialability* of proposed curricular changes in real classroom settings but will also create a better understanding of the *compatibility* of proposed innovations in diverse educational contexts.

Despite our calls for more research rigour, reporting on TEIL innovations should not be restricted to research publications. It has been observed that English language teachers often lack the time and access to read research papers (Sato & Loewen, 2019), with ELT research being written for primarily a researcher audience (McKinley, 2019). Much ELT research is hidden behind expensive publisher paywalls and thus excludes teachers who do not have access to journal subscriptions. Thus, it is pertinent that reporting on innovations, and the sharing of TEIL practices, occurs via additional avenues. These could include practitioner newsletters, websites, professional conferences, or professional networks (see, for example, https://elinet.org.uk/). It is hoped that if such reporting on innovations is made more accessible to practitioners and policymakers, it will increase the *observability* of TEIL to a range of ELT stakeholders.

7.3.1 Network Activities to Promote Future TEIL Innovation

A lack of materials, professional guidance, and policy on TEIL implementation remains an issue. Without such materials, the *complexity* associated with adopting new practices can seem insurmountable for teachers, even if they desire to instigate change. One way we have attempted to combat this problem is via the establishment of a researcher–practitioner network, which brings together GE researchers and ELT practitioners to share research, practices, and materials (see https://elinet.org.uk/). The network aims to showcase research and practice to help teachers globalise their curriculum. The network website hosts teaching resources, online seminars, blogs, [a] student section, and a forum to foster

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

collaborative projects, [and encourages] networking and information exchange between students, researchers, and practitioners, as well as form research partnerships. It also aims to make materials accessible to a wide range of ELT stakeholders, inclusive of English language teachers and ELT professionals. The network also aims to help with action research by promoting ongoing interventions in real classrooms by matching up with practitioners and researchers. By pooling and sharing resources, research, and professional knowledge, networks such as this can help to dismantle some of the barriers to achieving innovation.

7.3.2 Final Thoughts: Moving Beyond Labels to Shared Ideas

This Element has outlined several frameworks for TEIL. In doing so, we have placed particular emphasis on our visions for TEIL within a GELT framework, as we see GE as a comprehensive and inclusive paradigm. Nevertheless, other frameworks exist that are more specifically focused on WE, ELF, and EIL scholarship, and these offer a similar agenda for change in ELT practices. Whatever the label attached to these calls for innovations in ELT, the underlying message is the same: language teaching needs to adapt to meet the evolving needs of students who are learning to use English as a global language.

Importantly, TEIL should not be seen as a new teaching method to replace those used in classrooms around the world. It is not a method, but a framework to rethink current practices and inform curricular change to better meet the needs of English learners. TEIL does not require that teachers and schools throw away their current curricula and pedagogical practices, but to think critically about what outcomes and assumptions underpin them.

TEIL as we have described it in this Element, should not be perceived as dogmatic in its implementation. It is a grassroots movement that is intended to empower teachers. It places the students and the educational context at the centre of all decision-making. It does not advocate for an ‘all-or-nothing’ approach to curriculum innovation. Some of the dimensions for change discussed in this Element may be more applicable and salient to some students and educational contexts than others. Change might, at times, be small or incremental, and carried out within the confines of several contextual constraints. What is more important than the speed of innovation is that it is well-informed and contextually appropriate.

Matsuda (2019) envisions a future where ideas about TEIL ‘become so widespread and well-accepted that it is no longer a novel idea, and they become part of the shared knowledge and assumptions of the field’ (p. 153). It took

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

decades for the last major paradigm shift (communicative language teaching) to enter the mainstream of ELT practices, and this was despite substantial support from top-down policymakers in certain regions of the world. The professional ELT community in the twenty-first century, however, is much more connected, more mobile, more professionalised, and more educated. The growing prevalence of professional and research networks, virtual and physical conferences, and online sources of information make the sharing of new ideas about teaching more efficient. Thus, we too are optimistic that the phenomena of TEIL, and the shared perspectives of WE, ELF, EIL, and GE, will continue to make inroads into mainstream ELT in the foreseeable future.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix A: Checklist to Evaluate Quantitative and Qualitative Representations of Target Interlocutors in Instructional Materials

Quantitative Representation	Qualitative Representation
1. Which 'circles' are represented in the text?	1. Who are portrayed as 'interlocutors' in the text?
2. Which 'sociolinguistic features' (e.g., accents and varieties) are represented in the text?	2. What 'social/professional roles' (e.g., occupations) do interlocutors have?
3. Which 'cultures' are represented in the text?	3. How are interlocutors portrayed in the text (e.g., physical appearance, intellect/education, social status, emotional/psychological state, personality traits, and ability)?
4. Which 'communities' are represented in the text?	4. What 'stereotypes' and 'counterstereotypes' about interlocutors are portrayed in the text?
5. Which 'social settings' are represented in the text?	5. How do interlocutors 'control' (e.g., initiation, response, change, and follow-up) the conversation?
6. Which interlocutor(s) 'speak(s) more'?	

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix B: The Ownership of English Continuum

Possible Discussion Questions:

1. Where would you position yourself on the continuum? Why?
2. What factors contribute to your decision?
3. Think about your language learning/using trajectory. Where would you position yourself at different points in time? Has your perception of the ownership changed in any way? What contributed to your perception?
4. To what extent do others (e.g., interlocutors and materials) recognise and value your position?

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix C: Identifying English Language Teachers: Raciolinguistic Perspectives

1. Ask students to identify the 'native English-speaking teachers' in the image the link https://media.istockphoto.com/photos/headshot-portraits-of-diverse-smiling-people-picture-id949582374.
2. Ask them to provide their rationalisations for their choices.
3. Probe students to engage in a critical discussion problematising the racio-linguistic underpinnings of racial, linguistic, and professional identity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix D: Popular Opinions about Global Englishes

Instructions

Indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement by marking an X at the appropriate point on the line between ‘Strongly Disagree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’.

1. English is a global language.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

2. English is the most widely spoken language in the world.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

3. The number of speakers who speak English as a second language is higher than those who speak it as a first language.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

4. English is the language of (owned by) the British and Americans.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

5. The English language is used to communicate with the British and Americans.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

6. English is a global language because of its aesthetic qualities (beauty and clarity of expression).

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

7. English is a global language because of its strong literary power and tradition.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

8. English is a global language because it is easy to learn as compared to other languages.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

9. English language teaching should teach the cultures of English-speaking societies (British and American cultures).

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

10. English is best taught monolingually.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

11. English is best learned by 'native English-speaking teachers'.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

12. The ultimate goal of learning English is to become a 'native speaker' of English.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

13. The ultimate goal of learning English is to become proficient in British/American English.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

14. The teaching of English should be based on authentic materials from the United Kingdom and the United States.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

15. The emergence of English as a global language hastens the disappearance of local languages.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

16. The speakers who speak English as a first language are in a more prestigious position than those who learn it as a second language.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

17. The speakers who speak English as a first language are lazy or arrogant when it comes to learning an additional language.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

18. Too much emphasis on English as a global language will eventually devalue the importance of multilingualism.

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

19. [Your statement comes here].

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

20. [Your statement comes here].

Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

References

Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. A. (2012). *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203819159.

Ambele, E. A., & Boonsuk, Y. (2021). Voices of learners in Thai ELT classrooms: A wake up call towards teaching English as a lingua franca. *Asian Englishes*, *23*(2), 201–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1759248.

Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. (2015). 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.

Benería, L., Berik, G., & Floro, M. S. (2016). *Gender, Development and Globalization: Economics as if All People Mattered*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315822099.

Bhatt, R. M. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *30*, 527–50. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.527.

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), 270–84. https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2019055867.

Bolander, B. W. R. (2020). World Englishes and transnationalism. In D. Schreier, M. Hundt, & E. W. Schneider (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 676–701). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108349406.029.

Bolton, K., & De Costa, P. (2018). World Englishes and second language acquisition: Introduction. *World Englishes*, *37*(1), 2–4. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12298.

Boonsuk, Y. (2021). Which English should we stand for? Voices from lecturers in Thai multicultural universities. *Regional Language Centre Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211054650.

Boonsuk, Y., & Ambele, E. A. (2020). Who 'owns' English in our changing world? Exploring the perceptions of Thai university students in Thailand. *Asian Englishes*, *22*(3), 297–308. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2019.1669302.

Boonsuk, Y., Ambele, E. A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Developing awareness of Global Englishes: Moving away from 'native standards' for Thai university ELT. *System*, *99*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102511.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Brown, K. (1993). World Englishes in TESOL programs: An infusion model of curricular innovation. *World Englishes*, *12*(1), 59–73. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1993.tb00007.x.

Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 159–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00042.

Buschfeld, S. (2020). Language acquisition and World Englishes. In D. Schreier, M. Hundt, & E. W. Schneider (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 559–84). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108349406.024.

Buschfeld, S., & Kautzsch, A. (2020). Theoretical models of English as a world language. In D. Schreier, M. Hundt, & E. W. Schneider (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 51–71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108349406.003.

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. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, *50*(1), 149–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218822853.

Canagarajah, S. (2005). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611840.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073889.

Canagarajah, S. (2016). TESOL as a professional community: A half-century of pedagogy, research, and theory. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(1), 7–41. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.275.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). *Pedagogical Translanguaging* (Elements in Language Teaching). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384.

Chan, K. L. (2016). *Power Language Index*. http://www.kailchan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Kai-Chan_Power-Language-Index-full-report_2016_v2.pdf.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(2), 185–209. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587717.

Cook, V. (2007). The goals of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multi-competence among second language users? In J. Cummins & C. Davison (eds.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 237–48). New York: Springer.

Cook, V. (2016). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315883113.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. X. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 196–219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? *English Today*, *24*(1), 3–6. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266078408000023.

Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139196970.

Crystal, D. (2018). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108528931.

Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596247.

D'Angelo, J. (2018). The status of ELF in Japan. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 165–75). Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173-14.

Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *1*(1), 141–70. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0007.

Dewey, M., & Jenkins, J. (2010). English as a Lingua Franca in the global context: Interconnectedness, variation and change. In M. Saxena & T. Omoniyi (eds.), *Contending with Globalization in World Englishes* (pp. 72–92). Bristol: Multilingual Matters https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692764-007.

Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2023). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (26th ed.). Dallas, TX: SIL International. https://www.ethnologue.com.

Eurostat. (2018). *Pupils by Education Level and Number of Modern Foreign Languages Studied: Absolute Numbers and % of Pupils by Number of Languages Studied*. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/bookmark/3bffd764-f938-49e7-a8b8-8079271bd539?lang=en.

Fang, F., & Ren, W. (2018). Developing students' awareness of Global Englishes. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *72*(4), 384–94. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy012.

Fennell, B. A. (2001). *A History of English: A Sociolinguistic Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language Planning and Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Filppula, M., Klemola, J., & Sharma, D. (2017). *The Oxford Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199777716.001.0001.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On conversation analysis and 'lingua franca' English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 237–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149–71. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149.

Flowers, S. (2015). Developing intercultural communication in an ELF program through digital pen pal exchange. *The Center for ELF Journal*, *1*(1), 25–39.

Freeman, D., Katz, A., Gomez, P. G., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *69*(2), 129–39. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074.

Friedrich, P., & Matsuda, A. (2010). When five words are not enough: A conceptual and terminological discussion of English as a Lingua Franca. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *4*(1), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313150903500978.

Galloway, N. (2011). *An Investigation of Japanese University Students' Attitudes Towards English* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Southampton. https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/345128/.

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. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158983.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2014). Using listening journals to raise awareness of Global Englishes in ELT. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *68*(4), 386–96. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu021.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734347.

Galloway, N., & Numajiri, T. (2020). Global Englishes language teaching: Bottom-up curriculum implementation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(1), 118–45. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.547.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765.

Gass, S., & Varonis, M. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of non-native speech. *Language Learning*, *34*(1), 65–89. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1984.tb00996.x.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Görlach, M. (1988). The development of Standard English. In M. Görlach (ed.), *Studies in the History of the English Language* (pp. 9–64). Heidlberg: Carl Winter.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The Future of English*. London: British Council.

Gramley, S. (2012). *The History of English: An Introduction*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429460272.

Grazzi, E. (2016). Network-based language teaching and ELF. In N. Tsantila, J. Mandalios, & M. Ilkos (eds.), *ELF: Pedagogical and Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 16–24). Athens: Deree – The American College of Greece.

Hassall, P. J. (1996). Conference review: The 2nd International Conference on World Englishes, Nagoya, Japan, May 1995: Where do we go from here? TEIL: A methodology. *World Englishes*, *15*(3), 419–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1996.tb00131.x.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, *60*(4), 385–7. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030.

Horner, B. (2017). Written academic English as a Lingua Franca. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 413–26). Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173-34.

Hu, G. (2012). Assessing English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. McKay, G. Hu, & W. Renandya (eds.), *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language* (pp. 123–43). New York: Routledge.

Hultgren, A. K. (2020). Global English: From 'Tyrannosaurus Rex' to 'Red Herring'. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *19*(3), 10–34. https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.574.

Hundt, M. (2020). Corpus-based approaches to World Englishes. In D. Schreier, M. Hundt, & E. W. Schneider (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 506–33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108349406.022.

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

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(2), 137–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2006.00111.x.

Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *66*(4), 486–94. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs040.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jenkins, J. (2014). *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315761596.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, *2*(3), 49–85. https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003.

Jenkins, J., Baker, W., & Dewey, M. (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173.

Jenks, C. (2012). Getting acquainted in Skypecasts: Aspects of social organization in online chat rooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(1), 26–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00211.x.

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. (1986). *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions, and Models of Non-Native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *Teaching World Englishes: The Other Tongue*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1996). World Englishes: Agony and ectacsy. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *30*(2), 135.155. www.jstor.org/stable/3333196.

Kamhi-Stein, L. (2016). The non-native English speaker teachers in TESOL movement. *ELT Journal*, *70*(2), 180–89. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv076.

Kankaanranta, A., & Louhiala-Salminen, L. (2018). ELF in the domain of business – BELF: What does the B stand for? In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 309–20). Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173-26.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010a). *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203849323.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010b). *English as a Lingua Franca in ASEAN: A Multilingual Model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. https://academic.oup.com/hong-kong-scholarship-online/book/44561.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2021). *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes* (2nd ed.). Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003128755.

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), 351–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1304966.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kramsch, C. (2009). Discourse, the symbolic dimension of Intercultural Competence. In A. Hu & M. Byram (eds.), *Interkulturelle kompetenz und fremdsprachliches lernen. Modelle, empirie, evaluation [Intercultural competence and foreign language learning: Models, empiricism, assessment]* (pp. 107–22). Tübingen: Gunter Narra Verlag.

Kramsch, C. (2015). Applied linguistics: A theory of the practice. *Applied Linguistics*, *36*(4), 454–65. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv039.

Krauss, M. (2007). *Native Peoples and Languages of Alaska*. Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Press.

Kubota, R. (2003). Critical teaching of Japanese culture. *Japanese Language and Literature*, *37*(1), 67–87. https://doi.org/10.2307/3594876.

Kubota, R. (2020). Confronting epistemological racism, decolonizing scholarly knowledge: Race and gender in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, *41*(5), 712–32. www.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz033.

Kubota, R. (2021). Critical antiracist pedagogy of English as an additional language. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *75*(3), 237–46. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab015.

Kubota, R., & Miller, E. R. (2017). Reexamining and reenvisioning criticality in language studies: Theories and praxis. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *14*(2–3), 129–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2017.1290500.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. New Haven, CT: 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.

Leung, C. (2014). Communication and participatory involvement in linguistically diverse classrooms. In S. May (ed.), *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual* Education (pp. 123–46). New York: Routledge.

Liang, M.-Y. (2012). Reimagining communicative context: ELF interaction in second life to learn EFL. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *11*(1), 16–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2012.644118.

Mair, C. (2019). World Englishes in cyberspace. In D. Schreier, M. Hundt, & E. W. Schneider (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 360–83). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marlina, R. (2013). Learning about English as an international language in Australia from three students' perspectives. *Asian EFL Journal*, *15*(3), 201–28.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Marlina, R. (2014). The pedagogy of English as an international language (EIL): More reflections and dialogues. In R. Marlina & A. R. Giri (eds.), *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language: Perspectives from Scholars, Teachers, and Students* (pp. 1–22). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06127-6_1.

Marlina, R. (2018). *Teaching English as an International Language: Implementing, Reviewing, and Re-Envisioning World Englishes in Language Education*. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315315768.

Marshall, S., & Moore, D. (2018). Plurilingualism amid the panoply of lingualisms: Addressing critiques and misconceptions in education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *15*(1), 19–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1253699.

Martin, E. A. (2020). World Englishes in the media. In C. L. Nelson, Z. G. Proshina, & D. R. Davis (eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes* (2nd ed.) (pp. 595–615). Malden, MA: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119147282.ch33.

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847697042.

Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing Teachers to Teach English as an International Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783097036.

Matsuda, A. (2019). World Englishes in English language teaching: Kachru's six fallacies and the TEIL paradigm. *World Englishes*, *38*(1–2), 144–54. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12368.

Matsuda, A. (2020). World Englishes and pedagogy. In C. L. Nelson, Z. G. Proshina, & D. R. Davis (eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes* (2nd ed.) (pp. 686–702). Malden, MA: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119147282.ch38.

Matsuda, A. (2023). TEIL as a tool for anti-racist pedagogy: Exploring its potential. In P. Friedrich (ed.), *The Anti-racism Linguist: A Book of Readings* (pp. 26–43). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes*, *30*(3), 332–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01717.x.

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* (pp. 17–27). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847697042-003.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Matsuda, A., & Matsuda, P. K. (2018). Teaching English as an International Language: A WE-informed paradigm for English language teaching. In E. L. Low & A. Pakir (eds.), *World Englishes: Rethinking Paradigms* (pp. 64–77). Abingdon: Routledge.

May, S. (2014). *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203113493.

McArthur, T. (1987). The English languages? *English Today*, *11*(2), 9–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400013511.

McArthur, T. (1998). *The English Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McArthur, T. (2003). World English, Euro-English, Nordic English? *English Today*, *19*(1), 54–8. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607840300107X.

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

McKay, S. L. (2011). English as an international lingua franca pedagogy. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 122–39). New York: Routledge.

McKay, S. L. (2018). English as an international language: What it is and what it means for pedagogy. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, *49*(1), 9–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217738817.

McKay, S. L., & Brown, J. D. (2016). *Teaching and Assessing EIL in Local Contexts around the World*. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315769097.

McKinley, J. (2019). Evolving the TESOL teaching–research nexus. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(3), 875–84. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.509.

Meier, G. (2017). The multilingual turn as a critical movement in education: Assumptions, challenges and a need for reflection. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *8*(1), 131–61. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-2010.

Melchers, G., & Shaw, P. (2011). *World Englishes* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203785416.

Melchers, G., Shaw, P., & Sundkvist, P. (2019). *World Englishes* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351042581.

Modiano, M. (1999). International English in the global village. *English Today*, *15*(2), 22–8. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607840001083X.

Modiano, M. (2003). Euro-English: A Swedish perspective. *English Today*, *19*(2), 9–15. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078403002074.

Moody, A. (2020). World Englishes in the media. In D. Schreier, M. Hundt, & E. Schneider (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes*

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(pp. 652–75). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108349406.028.

Motha, S. (2014). *Race and Empire in English Language Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Mufwene, S. S. (2007). How languages die. In J. Fernández-Vest (ed.). *Combatpour les Langues du Monde—Fighting for the World's Languages: Hommage à Claude Hagège* (pp. 377–88). Paris: L'Harmattan.

Mustafa, R., & Hamdan Alghamdi, A. K. (2020). Push-pull factors influencing Saudi women's investment in English-language learning. *Journal of Women and Gender in Higher Education*, *13*(1), 93–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/26379112.2020.1732428.

Nelson, C. L., Proshina, Z. G., & Davis, D. R. (2020a). Introduction: The world of World Englishes. In C. L. Nelson, Z. G. Proshina, & D. R. Davis (eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes* (2nd ed.) (pp. xxvi–xxx). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/9781119147282.fmatter.

Nelson, C. L., Proshina, Z. G., & Davis, D. R. (2020b). *The Handbook of World Englishes* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119147282.

Nero, S. (2012). Languages without borders: TESOL in a transient world. *TESL Canada Journal*, *29*(2), 143–54. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v29i2.1106.

Paikeday, T. (1985). *The Native Speaker Is Dead!* Toronto: Paikeday.

Pasternak, M., & Bailey, K. M. (2004). Preparing nonnative and native English-speaking teachers: Issues of professionalism and proficiency. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (ed.), *Learning and Teaching from Experience: Perspectives on Nonnative English-Speaking Professionals* (pp. 155–75). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203088807.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203846223.

Pennycook, A. (2016). Politics, power relationships and ELT. In G. Hall (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 26–37). Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676203-4.

Pennycook, A. (2020a). Pushing the ontological boundaries of English. In C. J. Hall & R. Wicaksono (eds.), *Ontologies of English: Conceptualising the Language for Learning, Teaching, and Assessment* (pp. 355–67). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108685153.018.

Pennycook, A. (2020b). Translingual entanglements of English. *World Englishes*, *39*(2), 222–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12456.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203857175.

Phillipson, R. (2012). Linguistic imperialism. In C. Chapelle (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1–7). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0718.pub2.

Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1999). Englishization: One dimension of globalization. In D. Graddol & U. H. Meinhof (eds.), *English in a Changing World* (pp. 19–36). Oxford: Catchline.

Piller, I., & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society*, *42*(1), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404512000887.

Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *44*(2), 97–101.

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

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316678343.

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.

Rose, H., Syrbe, M., Montakantiwong, A., & Funada, N. (2020). *Global TESOL for the 21st Century: Teaching English in a Changing Context*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788928199.

Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2021). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching*, *54*(2), 157–89. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518.

Rudolph, N. (2018). Essentialization, idealization, and apprehensions of local language practice in the classroom. In B. Yazan & N. Rudolph (eds.), *Criticality, Teacher Identity, and (In)equity in English Language* Teaching (pp. 275–302). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72920-6_15.

Rudolph, N., Selvi, A. F., & Yazan, B. (2015). Conceptualizing and confronting inequity: Approaches within and new directions for the 'NNEST movement'. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *12*(1), 27–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2015.997650.

Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: A Critical Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474249232.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2019). Do teachers care about research? The research–pedagogy dialogue. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *73*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy048.

Schneider, E. W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511618901.

Schoorl, J. L., Heering, I., Esveldt, G., et al. (2000). *Push and Pull Factors of International Migration: A Comparative Report*. *Eurostat*. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/90913700-dbbb-40b8-8f85-bec0a6e29e83.

Schreier, D., Hundt, M., & Schneider, E. W. (2020). *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108349406.

Schreier, D., Schneider, E. W., & Hundt, M. (2019). *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seargeant, P. (2016). World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca: A changing context for ELT. In G. Hall (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 13–25). Abingdon: Routledge.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*, 200–39. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190504000145.

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

Selvi, A. F. (2014). Myths and misconceptions about the non-native English speakers in TESOL (NNEST) Movement. *TESOL Journal*, *5*(3), 573–611. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.158.

Selvi, A. F. (2019a). Incorporating World Englishes in K-12 classrooms. In L. de Oliveira (ed.), *The Handbook of TESOL in K-12* (pp. 83–99). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119421702.ch7.

Selvi, A. F. (2019b). The 'non-native' teacher. In S. Mann & S. Walsh (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teacher Education* (pp. 184–98). Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315659824-16.

Selvi, A. F., & Yazan, B. (2013). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL Press.

Selvi, A. F., & Yazan, B. (2021). *Language Teacher Education for Global Englishes: A Practical Resource Book*. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003082712.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Selvi, A. F., Yazan, B., & Mahboob, A. (2023). Research on 'native' and 'non-native' English-speaking teachers: Past developments, current status, and future directions. *Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000137

Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an International Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691231.

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. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2014-0019.

Sifakis, N. C. (2019). ELF awareness in English language teaching: Principles and processes. *Applied Linguistics*, *40*(2), 288–306. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx034.

Sifakis, N. C., & Bayyurt, Y. (2015). Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes*, *34*(3), 471–84. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12150.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic Genocide in Education–or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605191.

Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, *4*(3), 333–42.

Smolder, C. (2009). ELT and the native speaker ideal: Some food for thought. *International House Journal of Education and Development*, *22*(26), 45–62.

Spolsky, B. (2006). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Starbucks. (n.d.). *Company Information*. www.starbucks.com/about-us/.

Statista. (2023). *The Most Spoken Languages Worldwide in 2023*. www.statista.com/statistics/266808/the-most-spoken-languages-worldwide/.

Strevens, P. (1980). *Teaching English as an International Language: From Practice to Principle*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Sunderland, J., Rahim, F. A., Leontzakou, C., & Shattuck, J. (2000). From bias 'in the text' to 'teacher talk around the text': An exploration of teacher discourse and gendered foreign language textbook texts. *Linguistics and Education*, *11*(3), 251–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0898-5898(00)00034-6.

Swan, A., Aboshiha, P., & Holliday, A. (2015). *(En)countering Native-Speakerism: Global Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137463500.

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.

Thumboo, E. (2020). The literary dimension of World Englishes. In C. L. Nelson, Z. G. Proshina, & D. R. Davis (eds.), *The Handbook of*

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

World Englishes (2nd ed.) (pp. 383–406). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119147282.ch22.

Tollefson, J. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. K. Hall & W. Eggington (eds.), *The Sociopolitics of English Language Teaching* (pp. 7–21). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Townend, M. (2006). Contacts and conflicts: Latin, Norse, and French. In L. Mugglestone (ed.), *The Oxford History of English* (pp. 61–85). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vavrus, F. K. (1991). When paradigms clash: The role of institutionalized varieties in language teacher education. *World Englishes*, *10*(2), 181–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1991.tb00150.x.

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.

Von Esch, K. S., Motha, S., & Kubota, R. (2020). Race and language teaching. *Language Teaching*, *53*(4), 391–421. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000269.

W3Techs. (2023). *Usage Statistics of Content Languages for Websites*. https://w3techs.com/technologies/overview/content_language.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cambridge Elements

Language Teaching

Heath Rose

University of Oxford

Heath Rose is an Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of Oxford. At Oxford, he is the course director of the MSc in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching. Before moving into academia, Heath worked as a language teacher in Australia and Japan in both school and university contexts. He is author of numerous books, such as Introducing Global Englishes, The Japanese Writing System, Data Collection Research Methods in Applied Linguistics, and Global Englishes for Language Teaching. Heath's research interests are firmly situated within the field of second language teaching, and includes work on Global Englishes, teaching English as an international language, and English Medium Instruction.

Jim McKinley

University College London

Jim McKinley is an Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics and TESOL at UCL, Institute of Education, where he serves as Academic Head of Learning and Teaching. His major research areas are second language writing in global contexts, the internationalisation of higher education, and the relationship between teaching and research. Jim has edited or authored numerous books including the Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics, Data Collection Research Methods in Applied Linguistics, and Doing Research in Applied Linguistics. He is also an editor of the journal, System. Before moving into academia, Jim taught in a range of diverse contexts including the US, Australia, Japan and Uganda.

Advisory Board

Brian Paltridge, *University of Sydney*

Gary Barkhuizen, *University of Auckland*

Marta Gonzalez-Lloret, *University of Hawaii*

Li Wei, *UCL Institute of Education*

Victoria Murphy, *University of Oxford*

Diane Pecorari, *City University of Hong Kong*

Christa Van der *Walt*, *Stellenbosch University*

About the Series

This Elements series aims to close the gap between researchers and practitioners by allying research with language teaching practices, in its exploration of research-informed teaching, and teaching-informed research. The series builds upon a rich history of pedagogical research in its exploration of new insights within the field of language teaching.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cambridge Elements

Language Teaching

Elements in the Series

Language Teacher Educator Identity
Gary Barkhuizen

Language Teacher Agency
Jian Tao and Xuesong Gao

Pedagogical Translanguaging
Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter

Intercultural and Transcultural Awareness in Language Teaching
Will Baker

Technology and Language Teaching
Ursula Stickler

Reflective Practice in Language Teaching
Thomas S.C. Farrell

English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education
David Lasagabaster

Task-Based Language Teaching
Daniel O. Jackson

Mediating Innovation through Language Teacher Education
Martin East

Teaching Young Multilingual Learners: Key Issues and New Insights
Luciana C. de Oliveira and Loren Jones

Teaching English as an International Language
Ali Fuad Selvi, Nicola Galloway, and Heath Rose

A full series listing is available at: www.cambridge.org/ELAT.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108902755 Published online by Cambridge University Press