Global Englishes Language Teaching: Beliefs and Practices of Materials Designers at an English Language School in Thailand

NATTAPAT SUEJAM

Research Unit in Linguistics, Literature and Language Education for Sustainability (LLLES), School of Liberal Arts, Mae Fah Luang University, Thailand

IAN WALKINSHAW*

School of Humanities, Languages and Social Science, Griffith University, Australia

Corresponding author email: **i.walkinshaw@griffith.edu.au**

Article information	Abstract
	This study compares the self-reported attitudes and beliefs of materials designers at a private English language school in Thailand regarding Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) with their practice of materials design for speaking and listening classes. Twenty sets of previously-created English teaching materials were submitted for documentary analysis, and the attitudes of seven materials designers toward GELT-related notions were surveyed. In principle, participants appear positive about GELT-associated concepts, such as prioritising communicative function over linguistic form, selective use of learners' first languages (L1) as resources for second language learning, and positioning advanced users of English (rather than 'native' speakers) as a model of success. Yet their submitted teaching materials bear little trace of GELT-informed decision-making. All presented language norms and pronunciation models are Inner-Circle varieties. No other languages – even Thai – are referenced in any of the sample materials. The broadest range of cultural representations are from the Inner Circle. We draw on relevant literature to identify factors underlying this misalignment between the sample's reported attitudes toward GELT and their actual materials design practice.

INTRODUCTION

Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) (Rose & Galloway, 2019) is an approach to English language pedagogy which critiques current teaching practices in light of shifting sociolinguistic uses of English globally. GELT draws conceptually on multilingualism in language teaching, the emergence of English as a lingua franca (ELF), the pluricentricity of English (Kramsch & Hua, 2016), and the legitimacy of all English varieties. It prioritises communicative competence over formal accuracy.

Yet ELT teaching materials (defined by Tomlinson (2011, p. 1) as 'anything which is used by teachers or learners to facilitate the learning of a language [or] to increase the learners' knowledge and/or experience of the language') often adhere to traditional ELT paradigms, even though these fail to prepare English learners for interactions with multilingual, culturally-

diverse English users (Tomlinson, 2008). Even in Thailand, where GELT has considerable currency (see Boonsuk et al., 2024; Jindapitak et al., 2022; Prabjandee, 2020; Prabjandee & Fang, 2022), many teaching materials still reflect traditional ELT ideologies (Galloway, 2017; Saemee & Nomnian, 2021).

We therefore examine materials design practices at one private English language school in Thailand (hereafter the School). The School is distinctive in creating all its teaching materials in-house, rather than using commercial ELT materials. This unconventional milieu offers an opportunity to explore the pedagogical ideologies held by the School's materials designers and how these translate into materials design practice. The study explores two research questions:

1) What are the reported beliefs and attitudes toward GELT among materials designers at the School?
2) To what extent and in what ways are GELT principles incorporated into teaching materials created by materials designers at the School?

Why have we undertaken the current study? One reason is that Thailand-focused studies of ELT classroom materials (e.g., Chimmarak et al., 2023; Juntanee et al., 2021; Saemee & Nomnian, 2021) have largely evaluated published textbooks, not locally-created teaching materials, as the current study does. Also, there have been few GELT-related investigations of Thailand's commercial ELT industry. This is why we examine a commercial ELT context where materials are locally created by practitioners, whose practice we compare with their reported beliefs about GELT.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section defines Global Englishes (GE) and the GELT framework, mentioning factors that have hampered their implementation. It then reviews studies of TESOL materials through a GELT lens, and presents studies of GELT in Thailand's English language education.

An initial note: To differentiate among English varieties, we refer to Kachru's (1985) 'three circles' model of English use worldwide: the Inner Circle (e.g., Britain, Canada, or Australia), where English is the primary language of communication; the Outer Circle (e.g., India or Nigeria), where English is a commonly-used official language alongside local languages; and the Expanding Circle (e.g., Thailand), where English has no official status but is taught extensively. Acknowledging that increased global mobility has blurred the boundaries between the Circles (Jenkins, 2014; Park & Wee, 2009), we employ Kachru's (1985) model only for broadly classifying English varieties, without claiming for its immutability. Also, we note that both the GELT framework and the survey instrument adopted for this study (from Dewey & Pineda, 2020) use the contentious (Braine, 2010; Phillipson, 2016) term '(non-) native speaker', rather than Kachru's terms. For external consistency we have not altered this in the apparatus themselves, but our own discussion employs Kachru's terminology.

Defining GE and GELT

GE as a paradigm for conceptualising English language use in worldwide contexts emerges from increased global mobility and commerce, commonly conducted in ELF, such that most interactions occur between bi- or multilinguals using English as their shared language (Floris & Renandya, 2020; Jenkins, 2014). Consequently, the norms and structures of traditionally Inner-Circle Englishes are much less prominent among the world's English users. The Englishes used outside the Inner Circle are being reconceptualised as legitimate varieties and modes of communication, rather than deviations from a standard (Chan, 2014; Crystal, 2012).

GELT, which is the theoretical framework for analysing the current data, applies a GE lens to ELT curriculum, materials, and assessment (Galloway & Rose, 2017; Rose & Galloway, 2019). The framework aims to increase GE exposure, multilingualism, cultural diversity, and awareness of English as a lingua franca in English language teaching, as well as change teacher hiring practices. While traditional ELT usually draws on Inner-Circle contexts for cultural and linguistic norms, and frames other languages as hindering target language acquisition, GELT advocates a wider range of sources that represent the current global ownership of English (Rose & Galloway, 2019). It frames appropriate use of other languages (including students' L1) as a pedagogical resource to support English language acquisition. In Table 1, Rose and Galloway (2019) present thirteen dimensions comparing traditional ELT with GELT:

Table 1
Conceptualisations: Traditional ELT and GELT (Rose & Galloway, 2019)

	Dimensions	Traditional ELT	GELT
D1	Target interlocutors	Native English speakers	All English users
D2	Ownership	Inner Circle	Global
D3	Target culture	Static native English cultures	Fluid cultures
D4	Norms	Standard English	Diverse, flexible, and multiple forms
D5	Teachers	Non-NE-speaking teachers (same L1) and NE-speaking teachers	Qualified, competent teachers (same and different L1s)
D6	Role model	Native English speakers	Expert users
D7	Source of materials	Native English speakers	Salient English-speaking communities and contexts
D8	Other languages and cultures	Seen as hindrance and source of interference	Seen as a resource along with other languages in their linguistic repertoire
D9	Needs	Inner Circle defined	Globally defined
D10	Assessment criterion	Accuracy according to prescriptive standards	Communicative competence
D11	Goals of learning	Native-like proficiency	Multicompetent user
D12	Ideology	Underpinned by an exclusive and ethnocentric view of English	Underpinned by an inclusive GE perspective
D13	Orientation	Monolingual	Multilingual/translingual

The dimensions primarily explored in the current study are: *norms of language use* that are being presented in the teaching materials; *target interlocutors*, i.e., how the materials depict whom students are likely to interact with in English; *ownership of English*, i.e., whether English

is depicted as belonging exclusively to Inner-Circle countries or as a shared global commodity; and *language orientation* - is it monolingual, i.e., English only, or are other languages represented in the materials? These four dimensions also underpin two previous studies of Thai secondary school English textbooks (Chimmarak et al., 2023; Juntanee et al., 2021), so there is methodological alignment with these earlier studies.

Impediments to GELT implementation

Although GE is becoming widely recognised as a language teaching paradigm, Galloway and Rose (2015) identify several issues impeding its broad implementation: lack of available GE-informed materials (Prabjandee & Fang, 2022); recruiting practices that favour Inner-Circle English speakers (Galloway, 2017); and entrenched standard language ideologies in ELT (Galloway, 2017; He & Li, 2009; Kuo, 2006), including in language teacher education programs (Grau, 2005). Another issue is the uneven spread of GELT-based research. Rose et al.'s (2021) review notes that relatively few studies have explored Southeast Asian contexts; pre-tertiary educational domains such as K-12 schools or commercial ELT providers are under-explored; and large-scale studies of GE classroom innovations, technology as a GE learning tool, or GE-informed teacher education remain uncommon.

Studies of TESOL materials analysis

Studies have examined TESOL materials design, but overwhelmingly concentrate on commercial textbooks rather than locally-created classroom materials, the current study's focus. Bell and Gower (2011) outline the commercial strictures of creating textbooks for the global market, e.g., short timeframes and the requirement to publish several textbooks and associated reference materials simultaneously. Gray (2010) and Yildiz and Harwood (2024) outline topics that are proscribed for policy or ideological reasons (see Li et al., 2023 for commentary on creating textbooks for China's national market), while Timmis (2014) describes how textbook design is hindered by the 'arbitrary' (p. 252) dictates of ministries of education. Ulla and Perales Jr (2021), examining textbook design at a Thai university, point to practical constraints – unclear requirements, inexperienced designers, and short timeframes precluding piloting (see also Amrani, 2011).

Additionally, some studies consider textbook design through a GELT lens. Nishizaki (2024) looked at how English language and communication have been conceptualised in German secondary school curricula and textbooks over 50 years, concluding that although curricula have latterly acknowledged English's myriad varieties and role as a global communication tool, textbooks have retained much the same standard English ideology throughout. In a similar vein, Vo and Tran (2025) applied a GELT-focused analysis to three textbooks used in an undergraduate English program at a university in Vietnam. They reported that some content did relate to countries and cultures outside the Inner Circle, including target interlocutors from beyond the Anglosphere. But in most other respects the materials presented a traditional, Anglocentric ELT orientation. More encouragingly, Marlina's (2025) study of ELT textbooks produced for Cambodian secondary schools found a marked departure from traditional Anglophone linguistic norms and cultural references, portraying a range of English accents and users from beyond the Inner Circle, including Cambodian English users.

Studies of GELT in Thai English language education

We first outline studies examining the beliefs and attitudes of Thai TESOL practitioners regarding GE, and then turn to studies of materials design practice in Thailand. In terms of practitioner attitudes, small-scale studies have been carried out in various learning contexts (Boonsuk et al., 2021; Boonsuk et al., 2024; Passakornkarn & Vibulphol, 2020; Rajani Na Ayuthaya & Sitthitikul, 2016; Sangpetch et al., 2023). These broadly report constructive learner attitudes toward GE, positive student feedback about initiatives, and reduced learner anxiety. But entrenched ideologies die hard: studies have documented Thai English learners' preference for Inner-Circle English forms and models, along with a negative attitude to their own Thai variety of English (Boonsuk & Ambele, 2020; Buripakdi, 2012; Phongsirikul, 2017; Snodin & Young, 2015; Tananuraksakul, 2017). Teachers' attitudes were similar. Montakantiwong (2020) found that teachers in Thailand found GE conceptually attractive, but they still adhered to a standard language ideology of Inner-Circle English users as ideal teachers and models for emulation. Investigations of GELT-informed teacher professional development by Prabjandee (2020) and Prabjandee and Fang (2022) found that teachers' knowledge of GE increased, but attitudes remained conservative.

Turning to studies of practice: Saemee and Nomnian's (2021) analysis of cultural diversity in Thai primary school textbooks found that the textbooks' cultural content was slanted towards Inner-Circle countries and Englishes, ignoring the students' own culture entirely. Two studies of lower-secondary level EFL textbooks by Chimmarak et al. (2023) and Panyang and Phusawisot (2023) found that the target interlocutors, depicted ownership of English, and English language norms all derived from Inner-Circle Englishes, though cultural diversity was somewhat broader. A similar study by Juntanee et al. (2021) of upper-secondary school English textbooks identified a greater overall focus on GE, though the language norms presented still reflected Inner-Circle varieties.

METHODOLOGY

We now turn to the methods used to collect data responding to the research questions, starting with the setting, the participants and procedure, and moving on to the data-collection instruments deployed.

Setting

The School is a multi-campus private English language school in Thailand. Nearly 4,000 students are enrolled across eight campuses; all but 115 are school students under 18 years old. The School departs from traditional ELT practices in several respects. Firstly, all teaching materials are sourced and adapted by the School's materials designers from online information and audio or video content, and are typically based on content topics (e.g., cloud formations) rather than linguistic forms. This policy sidesteps commercial ELT textbooks, which are often created in Inner-Circle countries for international distribution, and slanted toward Inner-Circle language forms and cultural representations (Keles & Yazan, 2023; Tajeddin & Pakzadian, 2020).

Secondly, all teachers and materials designers are employed from Outer- or Expanding Circle countries, diverging from traditional ELT's preference for Inner-Circle English users. Our focus is on listening and speaking materials used in advanced-level courses in the School's Listening and Speaking (LS) Department, since the critical linguistic and cultural content that characterises GE-informed language learning is most evident in these areas (Fang & Ren, 2018). A caveat: although the School's materials designers have some autonomy to draw on their own pedagogical beliefs in creating and teaching course materials, the School maintains oversight of content taught, inevitably constraining materials designers' autonomy. The School also mandates that all content in the LS department is taught solely through English.

Participants and procedure

After obtaining ethical clearance (GU Ref No: 2023/005) and permission from the School's director, the survey was emailed to 10 potential participants in the LS department with relevant information and consent protocols. They could decline by simply ignoring the email message. Seven agreed to participate: six materials designers with additional classroom teaching duties, and one dedicated non-teaching materials designer (see Table 2). (Though most participants also teach, their primary remit is materials design, so they are termed materials designers for the purpose of this study.) Names are replaced with letters.

Table 2
Research participants' demographic information

Participants	Nationality	Education		Years of TESOL* Experience	English Proficiency**
		Level	Major		
A	Thai	MA	Integrated Marketing Communication	10	B2
B	Thai	BA	Business	1	B2
C	Filipino	BA	Secondary Education, English Major	5	C1
D	Thai	BA	International Development	1.2	B2
E	Thai	BA	Education	3	C1
F	Thai	BA	Arts, English	2.5	C1
G	Vietnamese	MA	Applied Linguistics in ELT	2.5	C1

*TESOL here encompasses any ELT-related work, including teaching, materials design, training or management.

**Participants self-reported their English proficiency. Some submitted test results which were converted into CEFR equivalents.

Those who agreed to participate were asked to complete an online survey (outlined ahead), and provide two to three previously-used sets of teaching materials which they had created. To obtain a maximally random sample of materials in terms of topics, language foci, and pronunciation models, materials were solicited in a neutrally-phrased message, omitting specific suggestions or examples. Twenty sets of materials were submitted for analysis. All the participating materials designers submitted power point slides projected onto a screen and short audio/video clips, sourced from internet platforms such as YouTube. Received materials

are listed in Table 6. All 20 lessons were used by all eight campuses in rotation. Their School-wide usage makes them indicative of the School's pedagogical orientation vis-à-vis English varieties.

Data collection methods

Two data-collection methods are employed. The first is a rating survey to elicit materials designers' attitudes and beliefs about GE in language teaching (per Research Question 1). The survey was drawn from Dewey and Pineda's (2020) study of how pre-service language teachers in Spain and the UK perceive the changing uses and functions of English globally. Our study addresses a similar aim to theirs, except that we investigate how the attitudes and beliefs of in-service materials designers manifest in the teaching materials they produce.

The survey comprises three sections. The first section elicits participants' demographic information (see Table 2). The second investigates their understanding of and familiarity with three types or conceptualisations of English: standard English; good English; and English as a lingua franca. Participants first rate their familiarity with each term using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all familiar, 5 = very familiar), and are then prompted to provide their own definitions of each term. Why these terms? Dewey and Pineda (2020) used them to gauge whether their teacher-trainee participants conceptualised them from a traditional, normative perspective or from one reflecting the global usage of English. *Standard English* is included because it is an established term in traditional ELT discourse (Dewey & Pineda, 2020), but respondents' beliefs about language pedagogy may colour how they interpret it. *Good English* is included for its subjectivity: participants' interpretations of what constitutes 'good' English may offer clues about the ideologies underlying their decision-making as materials designers. *English as a lingua franca* is included to gauge participants' attitude and depth of understanding of the term, which is aligned with GE rather than traditional ELT.

In the third section, participants rate their agreement with the following statements using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). This instrument is also from Dewey and Pineda (2020), who used it to explore how participants' perceptions of the three key terms above potentially shaped their priorities as ELT practitioners. Items which they adapted from existing tools are referenced below.

> P1: Non-native English-speaking teachers should adopt a native English variety as their target model
>
> P2: The main target in teaching English should be for learners to become successful users of English: able to use multiple language skills in different contexts but still maintain their own sociocultural identity (Grazzi, 2015)
>
> P3: Students' L1 and sociocultural identity are resources that can enrich their English language learning (Grazzi, 2015)
>
> P4: It is important for learners to use correct language forms when speaking English
>
> P5: Teachers should encourage students to experiment with new language forms to communicate meaning
>
> P6: Teachers should correct learners' errors in class because these errors tend to cause a breakdown in communication

P7: The students' L1 and sociocultural identity could have a negative influence on how they learn English

P8: Developing communicative strategies is more important than learning to use correct grammar

P9: English language learners prefer to have non-native English-speaking teachers (Snow et al., 2006)

Some items are intended to present a broadly conventional viewpoint (P1, P4, P6, P7), others a broadly transformative, global perspective (P2, P3, P5, P8, P9). The order is randomised. Rating survey responses are analysed using descriptive statistics: means (x̄) and standard deviations (SD) (see Table 4).

The second method of investigation is document analysis. The selected teaching materials submitted by the materials designer sample were mapped against the GELT domains (see Table 3), following Rose and Galloway's (2019) model, to investigate whether and how these incorporate or are informed by GELT (per Research Question 2). These findings can then be compared or contrasted with the reported beliefs from the rating survey.

Table 3
GELT constructs for evaluating teaching materials

GELT Domains	Guiding Questions
Linguistic Norms	What English varieties are presented as norms in the materials?
Target Interlocutors	Who do the materials present as target interlocuters – Inner Circle, Outer Circle, or Expanding Circle English users?
Ownership of English	How is ownership of English depicted in the materials?
Language Orientation	What linguistic orientation (monolingual – multilingual) is promoted in the materials?

The submitted teaching materials were initially coded to highlight salient or recurring themes, and then mapped against the four guiding questions presented in Table 3. To increase reliability, all content data were coded by the two researchers separately and the results compared. In line with Cofie et al.'s (2022) guidelines for inter-rater reliability in qualitative analysis, one coder had expertise and experience in qualitative coding and was uninvolved in the data collection; both coders used the same analytical framework; and items were agreed on by dialogue and consensus among the coders. Disputed items were removed from the analysis.

RESULTS

This section presents findings from the rating survey, emphasising (per Research Question 1) participants' familiarity with and interpretations of types or conceptualisations of English, and pedagogical paradigms the survey data suggest would be prioritised in materials design practice. It then turns to an analysis of the submitted teaching materials, specifically what language models/norms and target interlocutors are presented, how ownership of English is depicted, and whether the linguistic orientation is monolingual or multilingual (per Research Question 2).

Respondent ratings about types and conceptualisations of English

We first examine the sample's familiarity with and attitudes toward three types/conceptualisations of English (Table 4).

Table 4
Respondent ratings of types or conceptualisations of Englishes

Term	Participants							x̄	SD
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
Standard English	3	5	4	4	4	5	5	4.29	0.76
Good English	2	4	5	3	2	5	4	3.57	1.27
English as a lingua franca	1	5	5	1	5	5	5	3.86	1.95

Standard English is a familiar concept to the sample, with the highest mean rating and the lowest standard deviation (x̄ = 4.29, *SD* = 0.76). Respondents define it as "standardised basic knowledge of English skills" (B), and "the English that is commonly accepted as the correct form" (D). Their descriptions dovetail with Trudgill and Hannah's (2017) definition of standard English as a variety which "has undergone standardisation, […] a process through which it has been selected, codified and stabilised" (p. 1). Featuring in grammar books and dictionaries, the norms of standard English are "widely considered to be 'correct' and constituting 'good usage'" (p. 2). The sample's professed familiarity with the term reflects the profile of standard English as a benchmark in language education and standardised testing. It may also hint at a conservative outlook, since standard English aligns with normative ELT conventions such as grammatical accuracy rather than GELT's fluency-oriented ethos. Yet the subject omission in the sample's comments ("commonly accepted as") suggests that they are citing general views not their own beliefs.

Conversely, participants' ratings of the good English prompt vary widely (x̄ = 3.57, *SD* = 1.27), perhaps reflecting the subjectivity of what constitutes 'good.' Significantly though, their written responses describe good English as "English that *can be understood* by native speakers and English users in general" (A), "the ability to listen, read, write, and speak *effectively*" (B), and "non-formal, wherein the words used in a conversation are *understandable* without considering the complex grammar rules" (C) (emphasis added). So a shared perception emerges of good English connoting mutual comprehension and communicative efficacy, concepts linked to the GELT framework (Rose & Galloway, 2019).

As to English as a lingua franca (x̄ = 3.86, *SD* = 1.95), all but two participants were confident (offering ratings of 5) and accurate in their definition: "Communication among people with different mother tongues" (C); "preferred to use by most part of the world" (B); and "a tool for communication, which stresses meaning rather than forms" (F). So overall these findings tally with a GELT-informed ideology of 'good' English as intelligible discourse which accomplishes situated communicative goals, regardless of users' linguistic backgrounds.

What paradigms do the rating data suggest would be prioritised in materials design?

The sample's attitudes toward different aspects of ELT potentially impact their priorities as materials developers. Table 5 presents findings about their reported attitudes, based on their ratings on a 5-point Likert scale to Dewey and Pineda's (2020) statements about priorities for English language teaching presented above:

Table 5
Priorities for language teaching

Statement of priorities	x̄	SD
P1: Non-native Ts should adopt a native English variety	3.86	0.90
P2: Ss should become successful English users with own sociocultural identity	4.71	0.49
P3: L1 and sociocultural identity are English language learning resources	4.00	0.82
P4: Ss should use correct language forms when speaking English	4.14	1.07
P5: Ts should correct Ss' errors – these cause communication breakdown	3.71	0.76
P6: Ts should encourage Ss to experiment with new language forms	4.14	1.07
P7: Ss' L1 and sociocultural identity are negative influence on English learning	3.00	1.29
P8: Communicative strategies more important than correct grammar	4.14	0.90
P9: Ss prefer non-native Ts	2.43	1.51

The three statements with the highest mean respondent ratings are also those inclined towards GELT: P2 (the main target in teaching English should be for learners to become successful users of English, able to use multiple language skills in different contexts but still maintain their own sociocultural identity) (x̄ = 4.71, SD = 0.49), P6 (teachers should encourage students to experiment with new language forms to communicate meaning) (x̄ = 4.14, SD = 1.07), and P8 (developing communicative strategies is more important than learning to use correct grammar) (x̄ = 4.14, SD = 0.90). The implication is that the sample would prioritise successful communication over accurate use of standardised English forms (Ke & Cahyani, 2014; Phyak, 2016; Sumaryono & Ortiz, 2004). A statement reflecting traditional ELT ideology, P7 (the students' L1 and sociocultural identity could have a negative influence on how to learn English) receives a low rating (x̄ = 3.00, SD = 1.29), suggesting that respondents value the linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds of English learners.

However, a contradiction emerges: statement P4 (it is important for learners to use correct language forms when speaking English) is highly rated by participants (x̄ = 4.14, SD = 1.07), yet aligns with the traditional ELT ideology of formal accuracy. So the same sample who report valuing communicative competence over grammatical correctness also emphasise correct English forms. P9 (English language learners prefer to have non-native English-speaking teachers) receives a low mean rating and a relatively high standard deviation (x̄ = 2.43, SD = 1.51), suggesting a perception among the sample that learners prefer to study with teachers from Inner-Circle English-using countries. These findings point to a traditional Inner-Circle focused ELT ideology, at odds with a GELT-informed view of English as a dynamic and flexible mode of communication (Rose et al., 2021). We explore these issues further in the Discussion after considering the findings from analysis of the submitted teaching materials.

Findings from submitted teaching materials

The submitted materials – power point files and audio or video clips from twenty previously-taught lesson plans (Table 6) – were coded against the four strands from Rose and Galloway's (2019) analytical framework (Table 3) to illuminate the ideologies underlying participants' actual materials design practice.

Table 6
List of participants and their lesson plans

Participants	Plans			
	Theme		**Content**	**Materials**
A	1.	Migration	Bird migration and migration pattern of Canadian geese	2 videos (1 & 6 mins)
	2.	Travelling	Asking tourists or travellers about their vacation	-
	3.	Future Job	Potential changes in the job markets and skills needed in future jobs	2.30 mins video
B	4.	Dixit's Adventure	Describing a variety of pictures	-
	5.	Conspiracy Theory	Conspiracy theories and logical thinking	8 short reading passages (on PPT)
	6.	What are NFTs?	Basic principles, functions, and economics of Non-Fungible Tokens	5 mins video
C	7.	Big Hero	Interpreting music lyrics	4 mins video
	8.	Chicken	Paper folding craft and describing chicken breeds	2 mins video
D	9.	Animal Welfare	Defining animal rights and animal welfare	-
	10.	Smartphones	Describing evolution of smartphones and their applications	2 mins video
	11.	Stigma	Expressing opinions toward social stigmas	-
E	12.	Animal Totems	Analysing personalities based on an animal totem test	Online animal totem test
	13.	Shapes and Patterns	Describing and identifying shapes and patterns of national flags	Set of national flag pictures (on PPT)
	14.	Body Language	Noticing unspoken communication and nonverbal cues	2 x 30 sec videos
F	15.	Describing Products and Services	Analysing factors affecting purchasing decisions	1 min video
	16.	Dilemmas and Consequences	Critically discussing ethical dilemmas to enhance students' critical thinking and decision-making skills	10 short extracts of situational dilemmas (on PPT)
	17.	World Languages	The roles of foreign languages in students' lives	5 x 30 sec extracts of foreign music and 5 mins video
G	18.	Art Bots	Practicing creative thinking through building a model robot	2 x 10 sec video and 2 mins video
	19.	Math in Fashion	Applying math to fashion design	1.30 min video
	20.	Types of Family	Advantages and disadvantages of different types of family	2.30 min video

What English language models/norms are presented in the materials and who are the target interlocutors?

We first explore (1) the models/norms of English presented in the sample teaching materials, and (2) whether these materials prime learners to communicate with Inner, Outer, or Expanding Circle English users. To shed light on these things we identify and code the different English accents that feature in the audio/video content (see Table 7). Accents are the focus because the materials designers, selecting audio/video materials from existing online content, would have listened to the English accent/s presented before making a decision about the clip's suitability for the materials being constructed. This action positions the materials designers as arbiters of acceptable language accent models for their learners.

Table 7
Accents identified in audio/video teaching materials

Lessons*	Accents		
	American English	British English	Other
1	2		
3		1	
6	1		
7	1		
8	1		
10	1	1	
14	2		
15			1 (Korean English)
17	1		
18	1		
19	1		
Total	**11**	**2**	**1**

*Lessons where audio/video materials were not utilised are not listed here.

Table 7 shows that American English is by far the most prevalent model represented in the audio content, with British English a distant second. These two accents account for 92.9% of all listening content submitted. Only one video presented an Expanding-Circle variety, Korean English. So despite the sample's reported inclusive beliefs about legitimate English varieties, the language models/norms presented in their audio content are overwhelmingly Inner-Circle varieties, and the learners' modelled target interlocutors are almost entirely users of Inner-Circle (particularly American) English.

How is ownership depicted in English teaching materials?

We now turn to how ownership of English is depicted, as realised through nation-based cultural representations that appear in the sample's submitted materials. The materials were scrutinised for cultural representations: people, locations, static written texts, references to or images that reflect a national culture, and historical figures from a given nation. Such artefacts represent 'who and what [are] being associated with English language use' in learning materials (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 152, emphasis in original). Table 8 below shows the number of cultural representations in the analysed materials, categorised by whether these referenced Inner-, Outer-, or Expanding-Circle countries.

Table 8

Cultural representations in submitted teaching materials, categorised by Circle

Inner Circle:

Lesson #:	Number of CultReps	Description
1	1	Canada geese found in US and Canada
5	4	Facebook, Prince Charles (British royal), The Matrix (American movie), Bram Stoker (Irish author)
6	5	US dollar bills, bitcoin symbols, Jack Dorsey (American Twitter founder), Bad Luck Brian (American internet meme), Success Kid (American internet meme)
7	1	Big Hero (American animated film character)
11	3	Sarah Grey (Australian doctor), Jonathan Cahill (British criminal), Erving Goffman quote (American sociologist)
12	3	Native American totem pole, native Americans, William James quote (American philosopher)
13	4	Flags of US, UK, Canada, Australia
14	1	Dr Albert Mehrabian (American psychologist)
16	1	Canadian dollar bills
19	1	Yard (measurement unit used only in UK and US)
Total:	24 (in 10 lessons)	

Outer Circle:

Lesson #:	Number of CultReps	Description
2	3	Places in India - Chilika, Puri, Kilinga
6	2	Euro symbols, Vignesh Sundaresan (Indian entrepreneur)
13	4	Flags of India, Singapore, Jamaica, Brunei
Total:	9 (in 3 lessons)	

Expanding Circle:

Lesson #:	Number of CultReps	Description
5	1	LINE (social media platform popular throughout Asia)
8	1	Japanese paper folding craft
10	1	Video clip from France 24 TV news
13	12	Flags of Norway, France, Vietnam, China, Turkey, Myanmar, Pakistan, Brazil, Switzerland, Germany, Thailand, Costa Rica
Total:	15 (in 4 lessons)	

*Lessons where no cultural representations appeared are not listed.

Of the identified cultural representations, 24 represented Inner-Circle countries. The same number represented Outer- and Expanding-Circle countries (9 from Outer-Circle countries and 15 from Expanding-Circle countries). Yet the spread of cultural representations is less balanced than it appears. The cultural representations signifying the Inner Circle were spread across ten lessons, while those signifying Outer- or Expanding-Circle cultures were confined to three and four lessons respectively. The type of cultural representation is also salient: Inner-Circle representations included fauna, indigenous statuary, films, internet memes, writers, units of currency and measurement, whereas 16 of the 24 representations from the Outer and Expanding Circles are national flags, all placed in one lesson (#13). Although the submitted materials do present some symbols and images that situate English beyond the Anglosphere, there is a clear Inner-Circle slant.

What linguistic orientation is depicted?

Lastly, we report on whether the submitted materials emphasise an English-only approach to English learning, or conversely encourage multiple languages to be selectively used as learning resources (García, 2009). The sample's teaching materials clearly reflect a monolingual approach to language pedagogy. Only one of the twenty sets of materials mentioned multilingualism: #17 (World Languages). That lesson outlines the different types of language user (monolingual, bilingual, multilingual) and the value of multilingualism. It presents the most commonly-used languages worldwide. Yet here too, English is positioned as dominant. One slide (Figure 1) asks students to respond to five questions about languages around the world; all five include English as one – or the only – possible answer.

What do you have to find out?

- What is the world's most spoken language? How many speakers of the language are there?
- What languages do people learn for expanding their career opportunities?
- What languages do people learn for international relations and business?
- What languages have over 1 billion speakers?
- What language is a lingua franca for international business and tourism?

Figure 1 Slide from lesson #17 – World Languages

In sum, the bilingual or multilingual pedagogies which characterise GELT are barely in evidence in the submitted materials, suggesting that in practice the sample adhere to monolingual ELT ideologies.

DISCUSSION

Having examined the attitudes of a sample of materials designers at a private language school in Thailand concerning GELT, and analysed a selection of the sample's language teaching materials against a framework of GELT-based prompts, we now explore three salient points of contrast between the two strands of data.

The most salient survey finding ($\bar{x}$ = 4.71) is P2: 'The main target in teaching English should be for learners to become successful English users: able to use multiple language skills in different contexts, but still maintain their own sociocultural identity.' But the collected materials lack any content that might support Thai learners' sociocultural identity. The target interlocutors and cultural representations which potentially signal sociocultural orientation are nearly always reflective of Inner-Circle Englishes, rather than projecting successful multilingual English as an additional language or dialect (EALD) users with their own local sociocultural identity. A total

of 92.9% of target interlocutors presented in the materials are either American or British, while the broadest range of cultural representations depict Inner-Circle English speaking countries. This finding echoes several other Thailand-focused studies: Saemee and Nomnian's (2021) study of Thai primary school textbooks, which entirely omitted Thai culture in favour of Inner-Circle cultures; Chimmarak et al.'s (2023) study of Inner-Circle slant in English textbooks at lower-secondary level; and a similar (though less pronounced) finding about upper-secondary textbooks (Juntanee et al., 2021). Studies by Montakantiwong (2020), Prabjandee (2020), and Prabjandee and Fang (2022) report similar conservatism in other aspects of English education in Thailand.

Another salient survey finding ($\bar{x}$ = 4.00) is P3: 'Students' L1 and sociocultural identity are resources that can enrich their English language learning.' Depiction of sociocultural identity in the collected materials is addressed above. As to the students' L1, neither Thai nor any language besides English are mentioned anywhere in the materials. Far from embracing multilingualism, the collected materials are entirely monolingual. We found no other studies on multilingualism in teaching materials in Thailand, but studies of locally-produced English textbooks in Vietnam (Dang & Seals, 2018; Nguyen et al., 2021) suggest a similar trend there: multilingual content was confined to occasional non-English words and place names, with the greater focus being monolingual English communication with Inner-Circle English users. Hu and McKay (2014) found a similar monolingual pattern in a junior secondary school English textbook in China, as did Syrbe and Rose (2018) in high school English textbooks in Germany.

The third conspicuous survey item ($\bar{x}$ = 4.14) is P8 'Developing communicative strategies is more important than learning to use correct grammar'. Communicative strategies refers to pragmatic strategies used by EALD users in lingua-culturally diverse contexts to prevent or resolve non-understandings (Cogo, 2009; Mauranen, 2012; Vettorel, 2017, 2018), such as self-repair, meaning negotiation, or code-switching (Björkman, 2014). None of the collected materials mentioned communicative strategies, despite being designed for oral communication classes, the ideal locus for teaching strategies to facilitate comprehension in spoken talk. Oddly though, several studies of other Thai educational contexts have reported communicative strategies being taught and used successfully: at high schools (e.g., Boonkongsaen, 2018), universities (e.g., Kongsom, 2009; Somsai & Intaraprasert, 2011), and graduate schools (e.g., Prinyajarn & Wannaruk, 2008), suggesting some awareness of teaching communicative strategies in Thailand's ELT. It is difficult to speculate why these are entirely absent from the sample's submitted materials, and unfortunately, we found no relevant studies of commercial ELT centres in Thailand for comparison.

These outcomes point to the impact of entrenched standard language ideologies in ELT (Galloway, 2017; Grau, 2005; He & Li, 2009; Kuo, 2006), which in numerous other studies (Chimmarak et al., 2023; Nishizaki, 2024; Panyang & Phusawisot, 2023; Saemee & Nomnian, 2021; Vo & Tran, 2025) have led to conservative, traditional materials being created and disseminated. We posit that such ideologies have also constrained the current materials designers' decision-making, despite their self-reported progressive beliefs. As with Montakantiwong's (2020) study, the current sample may view GELT as theoretically sound but less feasible in practice.

Several issues may hinder progress in this area. One is the deficit of GE-oriented materials (Galloway, 2017; Rose et al, 2021), limiting the examples or templates that materials designers have to work from. Another is the lack of GELT-informed professional development. GELT is uncommon in pre-service training or professional development workshops in Thailand (Montakantiwong, 2023; Prabjandee, 2020), as in other Asian teacher-training contexts (Doan, 2014; Sung, 2018; Suzuki, 2011). Materials designers untrained in GELT would be at a loss to incorporate its principles in their materials.

Previous studies of ELT textbook design (though not from a GELT perspective) point to other practical constraints: short timeframes to complete the materials (Amrani, 2011; Bell & Gower, 2011; Ulla & Perales Jr, 2021); strict institutional requirements (Yildiz & Harwood, 2024); and designers' limited experience of materials design (Ulla & Perales Jr, 2021). Some of these factors may have impacted the current sample also, though the current research design precludes investigation of this.

Limitations and extensions

Like many other studies of GELT-informed practice in Thailand, the current study is limited in size and generalisability. A future study might comprise a larger sample, compare several ELT centres, and/or examine a range of pedagogical contexts to identify variations among these. A second limitation is data collection: the current study is confined to written or recorded classroom materials, yet GELT-informed pedagogy can also be conveyed ad hoc through in-class teacher talk or teacher-student interaction. A future study might record or observe ELT classes as well as carrying out document analysis and surveys. Relatedly, interviews – omitted in the current study – would further illuminate the marked difference between participants' professed attitudes and their practice.

CONCLUSION

This study has explored how the attitudes of a sample of materials designers at a private language school in Thailand toward GELT align with their materials design practice. The survey findings demonstrate their awareness of and conceptual alignment with key GELT constructs, such as prioritising communicative function over linguistic form, selective use of learners' L1s as language learning resources, and positioning advanced users of English as models of success rather than Inner-Circle English users. Paradoxically though, conventional ELT notions such as formal accuracy are also prioritised in the survey data. This hinted conflict appears in sharp focus in the analysis of submitted teaching materials. Only Inner-Circle English language norms are presented to learners. Monolingualism is near-total. Cultural representations in the materials appear to reflect a diversity of Englishes, but the greatest variety and range of representations depict Inner-Circle varieties. Overall, the participants' self-reported familiarity with and favourable attitudes toward GELT is at odds with their materials design practice, which remains grounded in traditional ELT ideology.

Given the above findings, some practical recommendations may be insightful to various stakeholders. (1) Conservative parental attitudes could be ameliorated by framing GE as part of a linguistic skill-set that fits learners for careers in the ELF-dominant global marketplace (Galloway, 2017). (2) Community and educational stakeholders alike could be reassured that GELT complements rather than displaces established ELT curricula; it is 'the ideology that underpins curricula' that changes (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 27). (3) Educators and students could be encouraged to recognise the motivational advantage of being a successful user of an international lingua franca, rather than being positioned as variably deficient approximations of Inner-Circle speakers (Boonsuk et al., 2023; Cook, 1999). (4) More research into ground-level GELT pedagogies and their learning outcomes would increase consciousness and familiarity with GELT among the various strata of Thailand's commercial ELT industry.

THE AUTHORS

Nattapat Suejam is a lecturer in the Research Unit in Linguistics, Literature and Language Education for Sustainability (LLLES) at the School of Liberal Arts, Mae Fah Luang University, Thailand. He holds a Master of TESOL from Griffith University, Australia. His areas of interest include Global Englishes and multilingualism.
nattapat.sue@mfu.ac.th

Ian Walkinshaw is a senior lecturer in applied linguistics at Griffith University in Australia, where he teaches in the Master of TESOL program. His research has appeared in journals such as *Studies in Higher Education, Teaching and Teacher Education*, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, and *RELC Journal*.
i.walkinshaw@griffith.edu.au

REFERENCES

Amrani, F. (2011). The process of evaluation: A publisher's view. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in second language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 267–295). Cambridge University Press.

Bell, J., & Gower, R. (2011). Writing course materials for the world: A great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 135–150). Cambridge University Press.

Björkman, B. (2014). An analysis of polyadic English as a lingua franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework. *Journal of Pragmatics, 66*, 122–138.

Boonkongsaen, N. (2018). Communication strategies used by Thai EFL teachers. *The New English Teacher, 12*(1), 63–76.

Boonsuk, Y., & Ambele, E. A. (2020). Who 'owns English' in our changing world? Exploring the perception of Thai university students in Thailand. *Asian Englishes, 22*(3), 297–308.

Boonsuk, Y., Ambele, E. A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Developing awareness of Global Englishes: Moving away from 'native standards' for Thai university ELT. *System, 99*, Article 102511.

Boonsuk, Y., Wasoh, F., & Ambele, E. A. (2024). Global Englishes pedagogical activities for English-as-a-foreign language settings and beyond: Understanding Thai teachers' practices. *RELC Journal, 55*(2), 379–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221112193

Boonsuk, Y., Wasoh, F., & Waelateh, B. (2023). Whose English should be talked and taught? Views from international English teachers in Thai higher education. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231152194

Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. Routledge.

Buripakdi, A. (2012). The marginalized positions of Thai professional writers on the global hegemony of English. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 22*(1), 41–60.

Chan, J. (2014). An evaluation of the pronunciation target in Hong Kong's ELT curriculum and materials: Influences from WE and ELF? *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 3*(1), 145–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2014-0006

Chimmarak, U., Prabjandee, D., & Namfah, N. (2023). Global Englishes: Textbook analysis and teachers' perception. *English Language Teaching, 16*(9), 1–64.

Cofie, N., Braund, H., & Dalgarno, N. (2022). Eight ways to get a grip on intercoder reliability using qualitative-based measures. *Canadian Medical Education Journal, 13*(2), 73–76. https://doi.org/10.36834/cmej.72504

Cogo, A. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 254–273). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

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

Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139196970

Dang, T. C. T., & Seals, C. (2018). An evaluation of primary English textbooks in Vietnam: A sociolinguistic perspective. *TESOL Journal, 9*(1), 93–113.

Dewey, M., & Pineda, I. (2020). ELF and teacher education: Attitudes and beliefs. *ELT Journal, 74*(4), 428–441. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa047

Doan, N. B. (2014). Teaching the target culture in English teacher education programs: Issues of EIL in Vietnam. In R. Marlina & R. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language* (pp. 79–93). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06127-6_6

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

Floris, F. D., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Promoting the value of non-native English-speaking teachers. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, 59*, 1–19.

Galloway, N. (2017). *Global Englishes and change in English language teaching: Attitudes and impact*. Taylor & Francis.

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

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2017). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal, 72*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010

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

Grau, M. (2005). English as a global language: What do future teachers have to say? In C. Gnutzmann & F. Intemann (Eds.), *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom* (pp. 261–274). Gunter Narr Verlag.

Gray, J. (2010). *The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT global coursebook*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Grazzi, E. (2015). Linking ELF and ELT in secondary school through web-mediation: The case of fanfiction. In H. Bowles & A. Cogo (Eds.), *International perspectives on English as a lingua franca* (pp. 55–71). Springer.

He, D., & Li, D. C. (2009). Language attitudes and linguistic features in the 'China English' debate. *World Englishes, 28*(1), 70–89.

Hu, G., & McKay, S. L. (2014). Multilingualism as portrayed in a Chinese English textbook. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges* (pp. 64–88). De Gruyter.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

Jindapitak, N., Teo, A., & Savski, K. (2022). Bringing Global Englishes to the ELT classroom: English language learners' reflections. *Asian Englishes, 24*(3), 279–293.

Juntanee, J., Kewara, P., & Prabjandee, D. (2020). Global Englishes orientation in English textbooks in Thailand. *วารสารศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยบูรพา [Burapha University Journal of Education], 31*(2), 151–161. https://so02. tci-thaijo.org/index.php/edubuu/article/view/244371

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–36). Cambridge University Press.

Ke, I. C., & Cahyani, H. (2014). Learning to become users of English as a lingua franca (ELF): How ELF online communication affects Taiwanese learners' beliefs of English. *System, 46*, 28–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. system.2014.07.008

Keles, U., & Yazan, B. (2023). Representation of cultures and communities in a global ELT textbook: A diachronic content analysis. *Language Teaching Research, 27*(5), 1325–1346.

Kongsom, T. (2009). *The effects of teaching communication strategies on Thai learners of English* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southampton]. University of Southampton Institutional Repository. http:// eprints.soton.ac.uk/id/eprint/69653

Kramsch, C., & Hua, Z. (2016). Language and culture in ELT. In G. Hall (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 38–50). Routledge.

Kuo, I. C. (2006). Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 60*(3), 213–221.

Li, J., Wu, Y., & Gao, X. (2023). Language teachers' engagement with ideological representations as materials designers. *System, 117,* Article 103121.

Marlina, R. (2025). Evaluating the international and intercultural orientation of an ELT textbook in Cambodia through the lens of Global Englishes Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 59*(1), 344–358.

Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers.* Cambridge University Press.

Montakantiwong, A. (2020). *EFL teachers' cognition of English as a global language: Ideologies, identities, and practices* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford]. Oxford University Research Archive. https://ora. ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:c95f6335-b68e-414d-b92f-2e2e1617a5f9

Montakantiwong, A. (2023). Bridging conceptual gaps in Global Englishes Language Teaching: Ethnographic insights from Thai higher education. *Asian Englishes, 26*(2), 391–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678. 2023.2251736

Nguyen, T. T. M., Marlina, R., & Cao, T. H. P. (2021). How well do ELT textbooks prepare students to use English in global contexts? An evaluation of the Vietnamese English textbooks from an English as an international language (EIL) perspective. *Asian Englishes, 23*(2), 184–200.

Nishizaki, M. (2025). Charting the globe. A qualitative longitudinal analysis of the Englishes in German curricula and textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly, 59*(1), 256–280.

Panyang, K., & Phusawisot, P. (2023). An analysis of Global Englishes aspects in English textbooks at the lower secondary level in Thai EFL context. *English Language Teaching, 16*, 93–111. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt. v16n8p93

Park, J. S. Y., & Wee, L. (2009). The three circles redux: A market–theoretic perspective on world Englishes. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(3), 389–406.

Passakornkarn, S., & Vibulphol, J. (2020). Development of world Englishes-based listening materials to raise the awareness of the varieties of English for Thai EFL upper secondary school students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 13*(1), 225–246.

Phillipson, R. (2016). Native speakers in linguistic imperialism. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 14*(3), 80–96.

Phongsirikul, M. (2017). A learner of the 20th century becoming a teacher of the 21st century: A perspective on the goals of ELT in Thailand. *rEFLections, 24*, 81–94. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v24i0.112295

Phyak, P. (2016). Local-global tension in the ideological construction of English language education policy in Nepal. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 199-217). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_9

Prabjandee, D. (2020). Teacher professional development to implement Global Englishes language teaching. *Asian Englishes, 22*(1), 52–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2019.1624931

Prabjandee, D., & Fang, F. (2022). 'I was like, just wow!': Insights from Global Englishes teacher professional development. *Asian Englishes, 24*(3), 294–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1989546

Prinyajarn, G., & Wannaruk, A. (2008). Communication strategies training for science and technology graduate students. *Suranaree Journal of Social Science, 2*(1), 17–32.

Rajani Na Ayuthaya, J., & Sitthitikul, P. (2016). World Englishes-based lessons: Their effects on anxiety and language achievement of Thai tertiary students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 7*(2), 201–223.

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

Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2021). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching, 54*(2), 157–189.

Saemee, K., & Nomnian, S. (2021). Cultural representations in ELT textbooks used in a multicultural school. *rEFLections, 28*(1), 107–120. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v28i1.251027

Sangpetch, S., Kewara, P., & Prabjandee, D. (2023). Integrating Global Englishes activities in a regular English classroom. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 6*(1), 44–56.

Snodin, N. S., & Young, T. J. (2015). 'Native-speaker' varieties of English: Thai perceptions and attitudes. *Asian Englishes, 17*(3), 248–260.

Snow, M. A., Kahmi-Stein, L. D., & Brinton, D. M. (2006). Teacher training for English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26*, 261–281.

Somsai, S., & Intaraprasert, C. (2011). Strategies for coping with face-to-face oral communication problems employed by Thai university students majoring in English. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 11*(3), 83–96.

Sumaryono, K., & Ortiz, F. W. (2004). Preserving the cultural identity of the English language learner. *Voices from the Middle, 11*(4), 16–19.

Sung, K. (2018). Secondary pre-service English teachers' perceptions of learning and use of diverse English and willingness to teach World Englishes. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 34*(3), 267–301.

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

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

Tajeddin, Z., & Pakzadian, M. (2020). Representation of inner, outer and expanding circle varieties and cultures in global ELT textbooks. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 5*(10). 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00089-9

Tananuraksakul, N. (2017). Building up Thai EFL students' positive attitudes toward their non-native English accented speech with the use of phonetics website. *Teaching English with Technology, 17*(4), 52–63.

Timmis, I. (2014). Writing materials for publication: Questions raised and lessons learned. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production* (pp. 241–261). Palgrave Macmillan.

Tomlinson, B. (2008). *English language learning materials: A critical review*. Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2011). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 143–179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528

Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2017). *International English: A guide to the varieties of standard English* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Ulla, M. B., & Perales Jr, W. F. (2021). Developing an English language teaching textbook in a Thai university: Classroom language teachers as writers. *English Teaching & Learning, 45*(4), 461–476.

Vettorel, P. (2017). Communication strategies, ELF and ELT materials. *A Cor das Letras, 18*, 74–98. https://doi.org/10.13102/cl.v18iEspecial.2608

Vettorel, P. (2018). ELF and communication strategies: Are they taken into account in ELT materials? *RELC Journal, 49*(1), 58–73.

Vo, N. A., & Tran, T. N. (2025). Global Englishes in English language teaching: Evaluating coursebooks used in an undergraduate program in Vietnam. *TESOL Journal, 16*(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.70039

Yıldız, A., & Harwood, N. (2024). Why TESOL textbooks are the way they are: The constraints of writing for a global audience. *TESOL Quarterly, 58*(2), 909–931.