

Language Ideologies Through a Global Englishes Lens: Perspectives from Discipline-Specific Lecturers at a Regional Thai University

ORATHAI CHAIYA JARUNTHAWATCHAI¹

WISUT JARUNTHAWATCHAI^{1*}

WILL BAKER²

¹*Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Kasetsart University, Thailand*

²*Centre for Global Englishes, University of Southampton, United Kingdom*

*Corresponding author email: faaswsj@ku.ac.th

Article information	Abstract
Article history: Received: 17 Oct 2025 Last revised: 3 Jul 2026 Accepted: 3 Jul 2026 Available online: 6 Jul 2026	<i>This study explores English language ideologies among discipline-specific lecturers at a regional campus of a public university in central Thailand. Through semi-structured interviews with 24 lecturers from various fields, including science and technology, engineering, agricultural sciences, business, and social sciences, this research examines how these lecturers perceive English in their teaching and professional practices. The findings reveal that lecturers engage in patterned but uneven negotiation of English use across different contexts. In high-stakes situations shaped by institutional constraints—proficiency requirements, graduation benchmarks, and employment demands—they adhere to native-speaker standards, reflecting both neoliberal commodification of English as measurable human capital and native-speakerism ideologies. Conversely, in professional communication among colleagues, they adopt flexible practices of English as a lingua franca where mutual understanding is prioritized and institutional native-speaker ideologies are irrelevant. This study also demonstrates that awareness of English diversity is more likely to emerge from real-life exposure to multilingual communication than formal training. However, this awareness is insufficient to challenge institutional constraints that privilege native-speaker standards. This research sheds light on how lecturers negotiate between institutional constraints and communicative realities in uneven ways, offering implications for Global Englishes implementation within and beyond English language classrooms.</i>
Keywords: English language ideologies Native-speakerism Neoliberalism Global Englishes Discipline-specific lecturers	

INTRODUCTION

Global Englishes (GE) described as “an inclusive paradigm” (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 4), focuses on investigating the linguistic and sociocultural diversity of English use in global contexts. There has been a massive growth in the use of English as an international lingua franca among people from different first language backgrounds, particularly among non-native speakers. This development has led to the recognition that English no longer belongs only

to native speakers in the Inner Circle; rather, ownership of English extends to all its users. Consequently, researchers have challenged the relevance of traditional English language teaching, testing, and materials aligned with native-speaker norms, regardless of learners' diverse contexts (e.g., Jenkins, 2012).

This paradigm shift is particularly relevant for Thailand, where English has evolved from a foreign language to a lingua franca essential for international communication (e.g., Snodin et al., 2024). Several studies have investigated how different stakeholders view the English language in Thailand. Students' perspectives were examined by Ambele and Boonsuk (2021), Boonsuk et al. (2021), Nomnian et al. (2023), and Thienthong and Uthakorn (2023). Meanwhile, researchers have investigated Thai English teachers' views (Boonsuk, 2023; Montakantiwong, 2024; Prabjandee, 2020; Prabjandee & Fang, 2022; Puchpan & Rajprasit, 2025) as well as foreign English teachers' perspectives (Ambele, 2022; Boonsuk et al., 2026). These studies have revealed that despite growing awareness of GE perspectives, native-speakerism still persists among students, Thai English teachers, and foreign lecturers, highlighting tensions between ideological acceptance of English diversity and limited changes in classroom contexts. Beyond the Thai context, this tension between standard language ideology and growing GE awareness has been documented across diverse contexts, including in-service EFL teachers in Türkiye (Karakaş & Boonsuk, 2025), university students in Japan (Funada & Rose, 2026), and teacher educators in Chile (Andrade, 2024), suggesting that the tension between GE ideological awareness and native-speakerism orientations persists as a broader phenomenon across institutional contexts.

However, research on English language ideologies has primarily focused on students and teachers in English language education. Little attention has been given to discipline-specific lecturers—university faculty members who teach academic content in their specialized fields, use English in their professional practice and research-related communication, and provide guidance on English competency requirements within their discipline—whose perspectives are crucial for understanding how English ideologies operate beyond English language classrooms (see Baker & Hüttner, 2019, for an exception). Yet, that study focused on lecturers in English Medium Instruction (EMI) contexts where English use was already institutionally required and showed that content teachers' positioning as subject experts rather than language instructors shape how they conceptualize English. In non-EMI contexts, whether this positioning similarly shapes how discipline-specific lecturers conceptualize English remains underexplored. In the Thai context, while national policy sets ambitious proficiency targets for university graduates (Savski & Rukthong, 2025), how discipline-specific lecturers interpret and implement these requirements at the departmental level may depend significantly on their own ideological orientations toward English. As Malmström and Zhou (2025) demonstrate, differing language ideologies between subject teachers and language teachers create one of the most persistent barriers to language-content integration in higher education—subject teachers who view their responsibility as academic content expect all language issues to be handled by language teachers, limiting effective collaboration between discipline-specific and language experts. Therefore, understanding how these discipline-specific lecturers perceive and use English is essential not only for English language teachers in preparing students for discipline-specific communicative contexts, but also for understanding whether GE-informed reforms can extend beyond the language classroom into the wider university context.

Based on this identified research gap, this study explores how discipline-specific lecturers in fields such as science and technology, engineering, agricultural sciences, business, and social sciences view the role of English in their professional communication and in preparing students to use English in the communicative contexts specific to their disciplines. It also examines what these perceptions collectively reveal about how institutional constraints and communicative realities shape English language ideologies among discipline-specific lecturers in Thai higher education. To address this gap, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How do discipline-specific lecturers at a regional campus of a public university in central Thailand view English proficiency and its legitimate forms in their academic and professional roles?
2. How do discipline-specific lecturers perceive linguistic diversity in English teaching and professional communication?

LITERATURE REVIEW

English language policy and practice in Thai education

Thailand is a diverse and multilingual country, despite its official status as monolingual. English has been the most important foreign language for centuries. In the current context, English serves as a lingua franca across multiple communicative functions, particularly in business, tourism, and international relations, and ASEAN multilingual interactions. English also serves as a symbolic marker of cosmopolitan identity and modernity (Snodin et al., 2024). The government has attempted to develop the English language competence of Thai students through successive educational policies, each shaped by distinct ideological orientations toward English (Nitsaisook et al., 2025). Language ideologies—socially shared belief systems about language that operate as common sense, shaping what is considered normal, legitimate, or desirable in language use and teaching (Liddicoat & Han, 2025) — are central to understanding how English has been positioned, taught, and valued. In the Thai context, neoliberalism and native-speakerism ideologies are particularly important in shaping how English proficiency is defined, measured, and taught in classroom practice.

The adoption of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) represents the latest policy reform aimed at raising proficiency at all levels in Thai education. Specific CEFR targets are set for different educational levels, with university graduates expected to reach B2 level (Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation, 2024). This standardized assessment reflects neoliberal ideology in language education, which commodifies English proficiency as measurable human capital essential for economic competitiveness (Piller & Cho, 2013). These policies drive universities to invest more resources in English language education and encourage individuals to upgrade their competence for economic utility (Liddicoat & Han, 2025). Moreover, the CEFR's European origins and reliance on native-speaker benchmarks also reveal native-speakerism, an ideology that privileges Inner Circle varieties as superior models while marginalizing non-native varieties. It also

creates unrealistic goals by making native-like proficiency the primary achievement target (Holliday, 2005).

CEFR serves as the foundation for curriculum design, teaching practices, materials development, and assessment. Within this framework, CEFR-based Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is positioned as a significant approach for developing English language competence (Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024). Even though CLT focuses on using the language for communicative purposes (East & Wang, 2025), its implementation in Thai institutional contexts has been influenced by native-speakerist materials and assessment practices (Franz & Teo, 2018; Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024). This implementation represents native-like proficiency targets while marginalizing non-native English teachers and learners and overlooking the complexity of language learning and use in diverse contexts (Liddicoat & Han, 2025). In Thai classrooms, these ideological contradictions are clearly seen. CLT implementation is problematic because native-speakerist implementation practices create psychological barriers that hinder communication. Teachers and students who recognize their English differs from native-speaker models experience reduced confidence, leading them to avoid using English altogether—directly contradicting the communicative goals of CLT (Franz & Teo, 2018).

In practice, the CEFR framework is used as a reference for textbook selection and assessment, rather than fully implemented for curriculum design, teaching practices and materials development (Franz & Teo, 2018; Kanchai, 2019). CEFR-based assessment also faces criticism for its relevance to English users in Thailand and ASEAN, as the framework is grounded in European contexts with different linguistic and cultural traditions (Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024). Although recent scholarship has highlighted the CEFR's movement toward a more plurilingual orientation and away from explicit native-speaker references (Savski & Prabjandee, 2022), Thai educational institutions have adopted CEFR as a fixed benchmark for measuring English proficiency, without incorporating the framework's more recent moves toward linguistic and cultural plurality (Pattaraworathum & Baker, 2025). Thus, the implementation of CEFR and the dominant form of CLT practices in Thai classrooms demonstrate how neoliberal and native-speakerism ideologies continue to shape ELT practices in the Thai context. These approaches fail to account for multilingual realities and create psychological barriers that undermine their own communicative objectives.

In summary, English holds a central role in Thai education. However, the current policy framework, shaped by neoliberal commodification and native-speakerism ideologies, reveals persistent contradictions with the multilingual reality of English usage in Thailand and ASEAN (Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024). In response to these tensions, scholars have proposed alternative pedagogical frameworks that better align with the roles of English as a global lingua franca used primarily among non-native speakers.

Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT)

As English has become the world's lingua franca, scholars have called for ELT curricula to be reformed to reflect how English functions multilingually (e.g., Montakantiwong, 2024; Prabjandee, 2020). Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) is "an approach to English

language education that addresses the implications of Global Englishes” (Galloway & Rose, 2015, p. 254) and this concept is used as an “umbrella term” for pedagogical developments in ELT informed by World Englishes (WE), English as a lingua franca (ELF), and translanguaging research (Galloway & Rose, 2018, p. 4). The framework offers a robust foundation to reconceptualize ELT to reflect the changing realities of English used in multilingual contexts (e.g., Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019). The GELT framework embraces English diversity and its function as a lingua franca in multicultural contexts, rather than adhering to traditional ELT, which is based on native speaker norms. In this regard, GELT is not only a pedagogical alternative but also an ideological orientation which directly challenges the native-speakerism that shapes how English has been taught, assessed, and legitimized in language education. This framework is likely to provide a critical lens through which language ideologies in ELT can be examined and questioned.

The GELT framework integrates several key areas. First, the dimensions of ideologies, ownership & culture call for changes in target interlocutors and global ownership of English and moving away from fixed target cultural portrayals and the native-speaker model. Recognition of multilingual ideologies and more flexible approaches to linguistic variations are crucial for facilitating effective communication in multilingual contexts. Second, the areas of teachers, learners, and materials emphasize valuing teachers’ multilingual identities and using material resources that expose learners to diverse English users as role models. Third, assessment, learners’ needs and goals need to shift from assessment practices focusing on native-like proficiency to those focusing on communicative competence and intelligibility. Learner goals should focus on developing multicompetence for multicultural contexts (see Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019).

The GELT framework provides guidance for educators to transform traditional teaching to global-oriented practices. This framework represents an attempt to resist the dominant ideologies that have traditionally shaped ELT practices. However, researchers (e.g., Montakantiwong, 2024; Prabjandee, 2020; Prabjandee & Fang, 2022) have identified discrepancies between teachers’ favorable perceptions of GELT and their reservations in full implementation in actual classrooms due to entrenched native-speaker biases, exam-oriented assessments, inadequate pedagogical resources, and institutional constraints. Therefore, these challenges highlight the need to investigate stakeholders’ perceptions of English ideologies and GELT to understand barriers to implementation and inform more effective pedagogical transformation.

Stakeholder perspectives on English varieties and Global Englishes in Thai higher education

Given the evolving status of English in Thailand, understanding stakeholders’ perspectives on English becomes crucial for English language education. Studies of language attitudes, revealing conscious and individually expressed evaluations of English varieties and their speakers, are valuable in reflecting deeper language ideologies that shape what is seen as normal, acceptable, or legitimate in language use and teaching. Research in the Thai context, and across diverse international EFL settings, has documented complex attitudes toward English varieties alongside persistent attachment to native-speaker norms, despite growing awareness of GE among learners, English language teachers, and foreign lecturers, suggesting

that the tension between GE ideological awareness and native-speakerism orientations is not confined to any single national context.

Recent studies suggest that Thai students demonstrated awareness of English varieties in multilingual contexts while maintaining adherence to inner-circle varieties. Ambele and Boonsuk (2021) found that despite learners' recognition of ELF in multicultural ASEAN contexts and intercultural communication, American English (AmE) and British English (BrE) remained "the preferred English accents of most learners" (p. 210). Students recognized the global spread and changing status of English, yet inner-circle norms still heavily influenced practice. Similarly, Thienthong and Uthakorn (2023) found that, among variations of English accents from inner, outer, and expanding circles, learners rated Thai English as the most intelligible variety. However, AmE and BrE ranked highest in social prestige, with native-speaker varieties viewed as "the standard and proper models" (p. 695). These findings demonstrate the persistence of native-speakerism hierarchies in ELT.

This tension between awareness of English diversity and persistent attachment to inner-circle norms has also been documented among learners in other EFL settings. Funada and Rose's (2026) study of 531 Japanese university students' attitudes toward GE and GELT, found that students showed overall openness to ELF communication and GELT. However, in their domestic "at home" (Funada & Rose, 2026, p. 4) EFL context, students' experiences communicating through English as a global lingua franca paradoxically reinforced their adherence to native-speaker norms, given the limited opportunities for authentic ELF communication and the ongoing dominance of "native" speaker models in materials, testing, and hiring practices, which undermined students' openness to GELT despite their positive attitudes toward linguistic diversity.

Research investigating Thai English teachers reveals similar tensions. Boonsuk's (2023) research into Thai English lecturers' perspectives at multicultural Thai universities revealed mixed responses. While some lecturers accepted the legitimacy of Thai English as it reflects local identity and diversity, others favored BrE and AmE varieties. Some dismissed Thai English and other non-native varieties as "inferior, marginalized, left out and devalued compared to the standard ones" (p. 600) and denied the legitimacy of other non-standard English varieties in classroom teaching. In one of the few studies investigating content teachers, Baker and Hüttner (2019) found similarly mixed responses with teachers valuing communicative effectiveness over nativeness but still rating Anglophone varieties as the most prestigious.

These mixed perceptions suggest that native-speakerism among teachers reflects deeper ideological orientations that are difficult to shift in practice. Such orientations persist because standard language ideology and native-speakerism are reproduced through institutional structures in ways that often override individual awareness. Andrade (2024), in a multiple case study of Chilean ELT teacher education programs, found that institutional reproduction of native-speakerism resulted in teachers' implicit adherence to native-speaker standards as markers of professionalism, even among those who intellectually challenged these norms. These theory-practice tensions are further illustrated by studies of Prabjandee (2020) and Prabjandee and Fang (2022), which demonstrated the persistence of native-speakerism despite professional development. Although teachers were introduced to GE concepts

and gained GELT knowledge, their fundamental attitudes changed only slightly, and they remained reluctant to implement these approaches, citing institutional and curricular constraints. Montakantiwong's (2024) ethnographic study found that Thai teachers were aware of English varieties but their understanding as a pedagogical framework was limited and fragmented. Implementation of GELT practices was hindered by similar constraints, i.e., a lack of institutional support and entrenched native-speaker ideologies, and a mismatch between teachers' self-perceptions and required expertise. Similarly, Puchpan and Rajprasit's (2025) study revealed positive attitudes toward GE and GELT among general English teachers at Thai universities. However, institutional constraints hindered innovative implementation, including exam-oriented curricula, prescribed syllabi, and the selection of standard-oriented textbooks. Their findings showed that teachers' positive attitudes did not automatically translate into classroom practices when institutional structures continued to privilege native-speaker norms.

Foreign English teachers also demonstrated contradictory attitudes toward English varieties. Ambele (2022) and Boonsuk et al. (2026) found that while international lecturers acknowledged Thai English as legitimate, they simultaneously labeled it as "broken English" (Ambele, 2022, p. 737) and maintained that "BrE and AmE are the only models to follow when it comes to real-life usage ... because they are the official versions used in textbooks, academic articles, and English dictionaries and accepted by global scholars" (Boonsuk et al., 2026, p. 874). These findings showed persistent native-speakerism despite theoretical acceptance of WE.

However, several studies demonstrated that these deep-rooted ideologies can be overcome. Boonsuk et al. (2021) revealed that a GE-oriented course could challenge these entrenched perspectives. Their findings indicated that students became more critical in questioning the assumed supremacy of standard language ideology and showed flexibility in embracing linguistic diversity. Some explicitly valued Thai English as a legitimate variety. Additionally, Nomnian et al. (2023) revealed that Thai students favored Filipino lecturers due to their classroom practices and cultural adaptability, rather than accent models. They appreciated the lecturers' intercultural practices and emphasized that "Filipino teachers focus on communication rather than correct grammar" (Nomnian et al., 2023, p. 539). This suggested that pedagogical competence was more important than native status. Similarly, Rose and Montakantiwong's (2018) duoethnography demonstrated that attitudinal shifts from native-speaker preference to acceptance of English varieties were possible through sustained exposure to diverse varieties, reflective practice, collaborative institutional support, and flexibility to modify curricula. Comparable possibilities for change have also been documented internationally. Andreani and McKinley (2025) found that even a short GE-oriented module in Italy produced statistically significant reductions in learners' traditional attitudes toward native-speaker norms, suggesting that GE pedagogical intervention can initiate meaningful ideological change even when broader institutional constraints have not yet shifted from native-speaker standards. Karakaş and Boonsuk (2025) further found that even though a GE-based module dramatically increased teachers' GE awareness through reflective thinking and practice in Türkiye, sustaining such change requires curriculum renewal, redesigned teaching materials, and communication-oriented strategy teaching aligned with GE pedagogies. Nevertheless, most of these studies have focused on students and English language teachers rather than content teachers. Research examining the language ideologies of discipline-specific lecturers

remains limited (see Baker & Hüttner, 2019), highlighting the need for further research into how content teachers conceptualize English in their professional practice.

METHODOLOGY

Research context and participants

This qualitative study was conducted at a regional campus of a public university. Located in Thailand's central region, this campus specializes in agricultural sciences and offers a wide range of disciplines to both undergraduate and postgraduate students. This diversity provides opportunities to engage with lecturers across multiple disciplines and to investigate ideologies in English language education within the higher education context.

Purposeful sampling was adopted in this study, as it allows the researcher to select individuals who can purposefully inform an understanding of the research purposes under investigation (Creswell, 2007). The participants were selected based on their ability to provide discipline-specific insights into English language use and ideologies at a regional university context. A set of criteria was applied, including: (a) willingness to participate in interviews about English language use in their professional context, and (b) representing different disciplines. To maximize disciplinary diversity, participants were drawn from a range of fields including science and technology, engineering, agricultural sciences, business, and social sciences. To achieve the purposes of this research project and for investigating ideologies in English language education within higher education context, a total of 24 discipline-specific lecturers across 18 disciplines from this campus participated in this study. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the university's Committee on Ethics under reference COE66/013. All data were anonymized; participants were identified with alphabet and number codes (i.e., T01–T24). Participation was voluntary, and they could withdraw at any time. The demographic information of the participants is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Demographic information of the participants

Participants	Discipline	Degree	Gender	Years of Teaching
T01	Accounting	PhD	Female	12
T02	Accounting	Master's degree	Male	6
T03	Management	Master's degree	Male	7
T04	Management	PhD	Female	20
T05	Logistics	Master's degree	Male	15
T06	Biological Science	PhD	Female	31
T07	Physics	PhD	Male	12
T08	Physics	PhD	Female	15+
T09	Physics	PhD	Male	15
T10	Chemistry	PhD	Female	25
T11	Plant Science	PhD	Female	15+
T12	Botany	PhD	Male	10
T13	Computer Science	PhD	Female	10

Participants	Discipline	Degree	Gender	Years of Teaching
T14	Information Technology	PhD	Male	12
T15	Mathematics	PhD	Female	12
T16	Agricultural Engineering	PhD	Male	3
T17	Entomology	PhD	Female	17
T18	Entomology	PhD	Female	4
T19	Soil Science	PhD	Male	5
T20	Physical and Health Education	PhD	Female	10
T21	Sports Science	PhD	Male	11
T22	Hospitality	PhD	Female	10
T23	Hospitality	PhD	Male	13
T24	Civil Engineering	PhD	Female	10

The group comprised 13 female and 11 male lecturers, ranging in age from their early 30s to their 50s. Twenty-one held doctoral degrees, while three held master's degrees. Teaching experience ranged from 3 to 31 years. The majority of participants ($n = 20$) had international experience relevant to English use. Four lecturers had completed their doctoral degrees abroad: in the United Kingdom (T06), Taiwan (T07), and Japan (T11, T19). Six lecturers had overseas work or research experience, including the United States (T02), Hong Kong (T04), France (T16, T18), Portugal (T21), and Australia (T24). Ten lecturers had participated in international academic conferences outside Thailand: T01, T03, T08, T09, T10, T12, T15, T17, T20, and T22. These varied forms of international experience suggested that the participants had meaningful exposure to different English varieties and diverse interlocutors. The remaining four participants (T05, T13, T14, T23) reported no international experience in terms of study, work, research, or conference participation.

Participants' professional use of English varied considerably across disciplines. Those lecturers in the science disciplines, e.g., physics, chemistry, and biological science ($n = 15$) primarily used English for academic reading, writing, and preparing teaching materials such as slides and scientific texts, with classroom instruction conducted predominantly in Thai. Participants in the social sciences and humanities, e.g., management, hospitality, and sports science ($n = 9$) reported using English for professional communication with international colleagues, conference participation, and in some cases content-based instruction. This range of English use contexts across disciplines provides a substantive basis for investigating language ideological variation in a non-EMI university setting.

Data collection and analysis

In this study, qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews, as the guiding questions with open-ended responses allowed the researcher to investigate participants' ideas and thoughts regarding their personal perspectives on English and English language education. This type of interview encourages participants to elaborate on issues raised from guiding questions (Dörnyei, 2007).

The interview questions were developed by drawing on the GELT framework (Rose & Galloway, 2019). The questions were refined through discussion among the research team to

ensure contextual relevance to the Thai regional university setting. The interview questions comprised two parts (see Appendix A). Part 1 focused on participants' personal experiences of learning and using English, including the varieties they encountered, their interlocutors in professional and workplace contexts, and their views on English use in ASEAN. Part 2 elicited their opinions on English language teaching at the university level, including proficiency models, curriculum and policy, teacher identity, and students' English preparedness for real-world communication.

Before each interview, participants provided informed consent and agreed to audio recordings. The researcher informed participants about the study's purposes and their right to withdraw. Interviews were conducted in Thai and lasted approximately 30–40 minutes. Recordings were transcribed verbatim after the interview sessions were completed. The first and second researchers validated the transcriptions to ensure accuracy. The transcripts were then translated into English.

The transcripts were analyzed using NVivo. The researchers employed qualitative content analysis, combining prefigured and emergent categories (Creswell, 2007, p. 152). In the first round of coding, categories and codes were developed from the 13 dimensions of the GELT Framework (Rose & Galloway, 2019) and applied to parts of the transcripts representing each category. NVivo was then used to sort the initial codes, generating summaries of who said what under each code. The researchers printed out all initial coding documents and reread them to identify patterns across participants. Based on this review, a second round of coding was conducted in NVivo, grouping related codes into broader categories. As new rounds of coding progressed, new codes were inductively generated to capture meanings and perspectives not fully accounted for by the initial codes. This iterative process—moving between coded data, printed documents, and re-coding—was repeated until the data were reduced to four main themes. The coding process was conducted by the first and second authors, with emerging categories continuously refined throughout the analysis. The focus was on uncovering the discipline-specific lecturers' perspectives of English language ideologies in language education.

FINDINGS

This study identified four key themes that reveal the discipline-specific lecturers' views on the multifaceted role of English in Thai higher education. Themes 1 and 2 address Research Question 1 by examining how lecturers conceptualize English proficiency and its legitimate forms in their academic and professional roles. Theme 1 demonstrates the significance of English as a gatekeeper to educational and professional advancement. Theme 2 highlights native-speakerism across disciplines, with lecturers privileging AmE and BrE as ideal models for teaching and materials development purposes.

Themes 3 and 4 address Research Question 2 by examining how lecturers perceive linguistic diversity in English teaching and professional communication. Theme 3 shows the lecturers' conditional acceptance of non-native English teachers; it shows that while pedagogical competence is valued, acceptance remains shaped by proximity to native-speaker norms.

Theme 4 illustrates lecturers' perspectives of English in real-world professional contexts, highlighting contradictions between idealized native-speaker standards and actual multilingual English use in Asian and ASEAN communication settings.

Research Question 1: How do discipline-specific lecturers at a regional campus of a public university in central Thailand view English proficiency and its legitimate forms in their academic and professional roles?

Theme 1: English proficiency as institutional gatekeeper in academic and professional contexts

Standardized assessment and English proficiency functioned as institutional gatekeepers in Thai professional and higher education contexts, a perspective expressed by nearly all lecturers ($n = 23$). English language competence functioned as a key determinant of access to employment and educational opportunities. These requirements created advantages for those who met standardized requirements but restricted those who did not. Analysis of the data yielded two categories: standardized assessment as a barrier to academic progression and employment, and English proficiency as a pathway to higher income and career opportunities.

Standardized assessment as barrier to academic progression and employment

Across disciplines, standardized English tests functioned as gatekeepers for both professional employment and academic progression. Many lecturers often cited TOEIC targets for employment and the university's English proficiency requirements for graduation.

In professional contexts, several lecturers described test scores as essential employment conditions, particularly in accounting, management, and engineering. These requirements also extended to application for public-sector positions. Excerpts from accounting and physical and health education lecturers illustrated this point:

Chances of getting into Big 4 [the 4 largest global accounting firms] are very slim ... if their TOEIC scores don't reach 550. (T02)

For teacher recruitment exams or civil service appointments, there are now English language criteria as well. (T20)

In academic contexts, English proficiency requirements created barriers at multiple levels. At the undergraduate level, some lecturers pointed out that test-based requirements affected progression, degree completion, and scholarships. When reflecting on the impact of English proficiency requirements on student progression, a soil science lecturer expressed concern that students who struggle to meet these requirements may not continue their studies:

I think morale and encouragement in Year 1 is important for whether students will continue to Year 2 or seek new admission. (T19)

English proficiency became the decisive factor in scholarship allocation, especially in science programs where candidates had comparable abilities. As a physics lecturer observed:

Because for science students, at some point the deciding factor for scholarships is English. When it comes to English exams, it's very clear that those who score well in English will get more opportunities. (T08)

At the postgraduate level, these requirements were uncompromising. An engineering lecturer affirmed that passing the English language requirement was necessary for graduation at the postgraduate level:

Bring me the English score report or you won't graduate. (T24)

For doctoral students, such requirements were often extended to international publication as it was necessary for graduation:

At doctoral level, if you can't publish internationally, you can't graduate. (T21)

English proficiency as a pathway to higher income and career opportunities

English proficiency directly affected graduates' income and career paths. Lecturers across disciplines reported that employers link English proficiency to higher income. For example, plant science and computer science lecturers emphasized this point:

Large private companies now require English proficiency and provide language allowances averaging 1,000–2,000 baht monthly above basic salary. (T11)

Those with English proficiency will receive special consideration or special-level salaries, which increases their income. (T13)

English proficiency also created advantages in international work opportunities across disciplines. A sports science lecturer, reflecting on graduates training foreign clients, noted that English ability directly translated into higher earnings:

Being able to speak English will give them opportunities to train foreign customers. ... which improves the students' sales, and their salaries increase. (T21)

English proficiency also created advantages in companies with international connections as entomology lecturers explained:

Being good at English is a huge advantage because companies need foreign connections and require email communication, training, and reading papers. (T17)

Nowadays almost every field has foreign [connections]. If they have English skills, they can go much further. (T18)

Theme 2: Native-speaker norms as legitimate models across disciplines

Across disciplines, all 24 lecturers positioned AmE and BrE as the most legitimate and prestigious varieties. These varieties were regarded as models of language learning and materials, as well as the preferred standards for international communication. Three categories emerged within this theme: native English as the benchmark for correctness and teaching standards, native English speakers for materials development, and standard English for international and professional contexts.

Native English as the benchmark for correctness and teaching standards

Across disciplines, lecturers positioned native English as the benchmark for correctness and teaching standards. Native-speaker English represented accuracy and standardization. It was the established norm for professional and academic contexts. Lecturers viewed these varieties as the best models for pronunciation and structure. A biological science lecturer emphasized this point directly:

If we talk about correct usage, definitely native is more correct. (T06)

Beyond correctness, lecturers described native English as the fixed standard and used it as a benchmark against which all other varieties were measured. A logistics lecturer, when asked whether native or non-native English should be used in listening and speaking instruction, expressed a clear preference for native-speaker models:

But if I can choose, I'd like native speakers... It's the standard. (T05)

Others identified native English as the foundation for university education, arguing that instruction should begin from the “most correct” form, as a botany lecturer explained:

Since we're a university, we should start with what is most correct, most accurate... teaching materials should probably be speech or accents from native speakers. (T12)

Across disciplines, AmE and BrE were regarded as the most accepted standards. AmE was often favored for its simplicity, ease of communication, and being easier to understand. An entomology lecturer explained:

I've preferred American English all along, and I feel it's good because it's easy to communicate, easy to use in terms of grammar. (T17)

British English, on the other hand, was associated with correctness and professional presentation. A logistics lecturer highlighted British English as the variety that captured these qualities:

But if you want correctness, beauty, perfection, to look professional, then it's British English. (T05)

Native English speakers for materials development

Lecturers held divided views on materials development. Thai teachers were recognized as competent authors, but native speakers were required to check accuracy for international acceptability, ensuring quality and standardization. A soil science lecturer commented:

For textbooks, I think if we want to upgrade, I want Thai teachers to be the writers, then use native speakers to check before printing the book. (T19)

However, native-speaker materials were viewed as more reliable, particularly for students in international contexts. An accounting lecturer, when asked about preferred sources for teaching materials, explained:

Foreign teachers because I want students to see the perspective of native speakers. Native speakers are better. (T01)

A physics lecturer reinforced this perspective, emphasizing standard English as the foundation for the development of the four skills:

I think they should be materials from native speakers who use English correctly, with really correct pronunciation. These materials serve as examples or standards for listening, speaking, reading and writing. (T07)

Standard English for international and professional contexts

Many lecturers emphasized that using English close to native standards in international and professional contexts is required. Native-like accents and pronunciation were necessary for clear communication and trust in global settings. A physical and health education lecturer emphasized this expectation:

One should try to develop oneself to be closer to native speakers. (T20)

Some lecturers emphasized that native-speaker standards were necessary for international communication. A management lecturer highlighted this point:

I think it should be the native speakers' version... If they're students who need to go international, then they should use international English, which means Native [English]. (T03)

An information technology lecturer, when reflecting on the role of English in ASEAN professional communication within his field, noted that presenting in English was essential for achieving results:

You have to present in English. If you want results, you have to present in English—it's the standard. (T14)

An engineering lecturer explained that professional acceptance and credibility required approximating native-speaker pronunciation in practice:

From my experience, when we go speak and use a [native-like] accent, their acceptance of us is higher, but if we speak in broken English, they believe in us less. (T24)

Research Question 2: How do discipline-specific lecturers perceive linguistic diversity in English teaching and professional communication?

Theme 3: Conditional acceptance of linguistic diversity in English teaching

Despite strong preferences for native-speaker teachers, in practice, the vast majority of lecturers ($n = 22$) accepted Thai teachers and other non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) as competent and effective instructors. Most lecturers considered communicative effectiveness, pedagogical skills, and the ability to facilitate student learning to outweigh native-speaker status. Within this theme, three categories were identified: acceptance of Thai teachers, acceptance of other NNESTs, and preparing students for diverse communication contexts.

Acceptance of Thai teachers

Almost all lecturers accepted Thai English teachers' abilities and competence, recognizing their professional qualifications outweighed native-speaker status. Lecturers in chemistry and soil science reflected this view:

Teachers have studied phonetics and such things. So they should be able to. It doesn't have to be foreigners. (T10)

What we have learned until now has been from Thai teachers, not from native speakers. (T19)

Cultural and linguistic familiarity were valued as pragmatic advantages. Entomology and hospitality lecturers emphasized this shared understanding:

Thai teachers ... can access the content and learning, as well as understand the behaviors and characteristics of Thai students better. (T17)

Thais understand Thais; they know what Thai students lack and can provide what they need. (T23)

Acceptance of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs)

Most lecturers demonstrated varying degrees of acceptance of NNESTs from other countries, with preferences influenced by perceived accent clarity and cultural familiarity. Filipino teachers were the most favored among non-Anglophone English-speaking teachers due to their accent accessibility. A sports science lecturer explained:

Thai students find it easier to understand Filipino or Singaporean English because it's more Asian in nature. (T21)

Beyond accent accessibility, lecturers recognized that NNESTs from similar Asian contexts could better facilitate Thai student learning by understanding their learning challenges. A botany lecturer emphasized this pedagogical advantage:

These people understand the basics of our Asian nature—that we have problems with listening, that we focus on grammar, are afraid of speaking incorrectly and don't dare to speak. They should understand us in that regard. (T12)

Some lecturers viewed interaction with NNESTs as preparation for global communication. An information technology lecturer, when asked about hiring Filipino teachers, noted:

It's an advantage that students can listen to Filipino style. ... They'll encounter various accents. But what's important is how to speak to be understood. (T14)

However, this acceptance was conditional, and it reflected native-speaker bias. Strong regional accents were problematic as lecturers expressed comprehension and pedagogical concerns. A botany lecturer, when reflecting on the challenges of non-native accents for Thai students, singled out Indian English:

Indian English... I'm confident that Thai students won't understand 50 percent of it. They can't pronounce certain sounds in English. (T12)

An entomology lecturer reinforced this view:

When pronunciation is wrong like this, if students don't have [other exposure], it might make students remember incorrectly. (T18)

This perspective strongly reflected native-speakerism ideology that views certain varieties as “incorrect” rather than recognizing Indian English as a legitimate variety with its own phonological features.

Preparing students for diverse communication contexts

Many lecturers recognized that exposure to diverse English accents prepared students for practical workplace realities. A hospitality lecturer emphasized that:

I wanted students to adjust their ears to all kinds of accents, because at work they'd encounter Russian, Arabic, and other accents. (T22)

Beyond accent diversity, some lecturers supported incorporating non-native cultural perspectives into English instruction. A management lecturer argued that exposing students to diverse cultural views would broaden their understanding, while a botany lecturer emphasized:

Besides getting the language, we must also open students' minds, that is, open their mindset and open their worldview for them. (T12)

Some lecturers used the presence of NNESTs to reduce anxiety and create an English-speaking environment. An engineering lecturer explained:

We hired a Filipino to create an environment for us. They perform the function of breaking down behavior barriers for both staff and students, so they won't be afraid to speak English. (T24)

Theme 4: Embracing linguistic diversity in professional communication

In professional and academic settings, most lecturers ($n = 21$) reported using English primarily with other non-native speakers. In these contexts, English functioned as a lingua franca with mutual understanding prioritized across Asia and ASEAN contexts. Many found regional Asian varieties more accessible than native-speaker accents. They embraced local features in English usage and applied various strategies for communication. The data yielded three categories within this theme: misalignment between standardized assessment and real-world multilingual communication, non-native English for communication, and embracing local varieties and flexible language use.

Misalignment between standardized assessment and real-world multilingual communication

While most lecturers accepted standardized testing as necessary, some criticized these tests for being too general, ignoring field-specific needs, and failing to reflect non-native workplace communication in Asia.

Several lecturers expressed frustration that standardized tests used a one-size-fits-all approach that ignores the technical English needed in their specific disciplines. For example, a physics lecturer observed:

General English is usable to some extent, but it is too middle ground, not specifically targeted like English for social sciences, mathematics, or science tracks. (T09)

Some lecturers called for assessment reform to reflect the multilingual nature of communication and argued that tests should prepare students to be able to understand various accents. Hospitality lecturers, drawing on the communicative realities of the service industry, argued that tests should expose students to diverse accents rather than limiting to native-speaker models:

Non-native speakers are much more numerous in various places like airports or hotels. How many Americans or British people do you think there will be? We receive international guests... whatever accent it is, they have to tune their ears to understand. Various tests don't reflect reality and still cling to native speakers. (T22)

Current basic exams still use native speakers. The ultimate goal is for graduates to understand various accents, so we must teach and test diverse varieties, not just native speakers. (T23)

Non-native English for communication

Lecturers across disciplines reported that most workplace and professional communication occurred with other non-native speakers, particularly within Asian and ASEAN contexts, with minimal native-speaker interaction. English served as the primary medium for multilingual professional contexts where intelligibility was more important than native-speaker conformity. Interactions similarly involved non-native speaker interlocutors. For example, botany and soil science lecturers noted:

If they work in factories or labs, they'll communicate with business partners from India, Malaysia, Singapore, Japan, China. The communication will be in English, but non-native English. (T12)

In the lab where I was, we used English with people from the Philippines, Indonesia, Hungary, and Brazil—about 4–5 countries that used English. (T19)

Most lecturers reported that Asian English varieties were more comprehensible than native English accents. This was seen as facilitating easier communication, as a physics lecturer noted:

Taiwanese people speak in a way that's easy to understand. Taiwanese accent or Asian accents together are quite easy to understand. (T07)

When lecturers encountered challenges, they developed strategies to enhance communication. For example, a mathematics lecturer described using repetition and accommodation to emphasize mutual intelligibility in spoken communication:

When we communicate, we may repeat several times, I think it's ok ... just understanding each other is sufficient. (T15)

Embracing local varieties and flexible language use

The findings revealed that lecturers viewed ownership of English as shared among its users. Most emphasized communication effectiveness over conformity to native-speaker norms, showing a greater value in intelligibility than in accent or grammatical correctness. This perspective led them to question native speakers' authority as language owners and to view local Thai-style English as a legitimate variety. For example, physics and botany lecturers challenged the idea of native speakers as language owners:

Even native speakers do not use grammar correctly. The main thing is that they understand what we're saying. (T07)

It's not something to be ashamed of. It's sufficient for daily communication. (T12)

Several lecturers embraced Thai English as a legitimate variety with distinctive features expressing cultural identity. A hospitality lecturer, reflecting on the distinctive features of Thai-style English, explained that Thai discourse particles could add cultural value and identity:

There are certain words like 'ka', 'na', 'krub' at the end of sentences. When added to English, they add value to Thai-style English characteristics, like Thai accent. (T23)

Many lecturers described using flexible language strategies, including code-switching between English and Thai and the use of technical terminology, to ensure communicative effectiveness. They prioritized mutual understanding over formal correctness. Lecturers employed code-switching strategies, using English technical terms during Thai instruction. For example, a physics lecturer explained his strategy:

Most teaching will be in Thai but English will be inserted periodically for terms related and necessary in physics. (T07)

Technical terminology in English was also required despite Thai being the primary medium of instruction. As a soil science lecturer emphasized,

We use English in the classroom because we have technical terms related to agricultural fields. I always tell students that these are words we need to know because when we talk to anyone, these are specialized terms we must use. (T19)

Other lecturers explained usage of simplified keywords and repair strategies to ensure understanding. A plant science lecturer described:

We tried to use short and easy [words]... at least there must be important keywords... to make them understand. (T11)

When difficulties arose, lecturers used various strategies to enhance communication. For example, entomology and physics lecturers noted:

If I didn't understand, I just asked them to speak slowly, and then I would try to catch the main points. We always managed to communicate. (T17)

Even if it's not grammatically correct or the pronunciation isn't right, I think we can communicate because it's not just speaking—there are also gestures. (T08)

DISCUSSION

This study used the GELT framework (Rose & Galloway, 2019) as a critical lens to examine English language ideologies among discipline-specific lecturers at a Thai public university,

revealing tensions that correspond with research on stakeholder views in the Thai educational context. The findings also extend our understanding of the way they developed their awareness of English diversity and their systemic perceptions of appropriateness of English use across different contexts. Through this lens, the findings reveal an underlying mechanism—patterned ideological accommodation—that explains why such tensions persist across stakeholder groups at a regional campus of a public university in a non-EMI higher education context. Prior studies have documented these ideological contradictions; this study advances understanding by identifying what underlies them and why they are stable. Unlike prior studies, our concept of patterned ideological accommodation reveals how and why lecturers negotiate between native-speaker norms and ELF practices depending on institutional constraints and communicative demands.

Lecturers' perceptions of English proficiency as a pathway to academic and career advancement, presented in Theme 1, align with neoliberal commodification of English as measurable human capital essential for economic competitiveness (Piller & Cho, 2013), where native-speaker standards function as an institutional requirement. Their preferences for AmE and BrE as superior models, shown in Theme 2, reveal deeply rooted native-speakerism—an established ideology that values Inner Circle varieties as the primary achievement target, but marginalizes non-native varieties (Holliday, 2005). Importantly, native-speakerism persists even in a non-EMI context where English is not obligatory as the medium of instruction, in contrast to the EMI settings examined by Baker and Hüttner (2019). This suggests that native-speakerism does not depend on medium-of-instruction policy; it is reproduced through external constraints such as graduation requirements based on CEFR-referenced proficiency level, TOEIC employment benchmarks, and international publishing demands.

Unlike Prabjandee (2020) and Prabjandee and Fang (2022), but similar to Baker and Hüttner (2019), these discipline-specific lecturers developed awareness of English diversity through real-life professional experiences and engagement in communication among non-native speaker colleagues, rather than formal GE training, as demonstrated in Themes 3 and 4 of the Finding section. Their openness can also be seen in their views on teaching practices. Many lecturers accepted NNESTs, particularly Thai teachers, as competent due to their effective pedagogy and familiarity with students' learning culture over native status. This suggests that experience with effective non-native English instruction has shaped their acceptance of NNESTs as legitimate teachers. Their engagement with non-native speakers in authentic professional contexts provided direct exposure to multilingual communication. This real-life communication experience becomes an important pathway for raising awareness of ELF realities, corresponding with Rose and Montakantiwong's (2018) observation that exposure to diverse varieties through real-world engagements can effectively shift attitudes toward English varieties.

However, discipline-specific lecturers still showed contradictions between ideological views and real-world interactions. While privileging native-speaker models ideologically, they employed flexible ELF in their professional communication. These tensions align with contradictory views found among students (Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021; Thienthong & Uthakorn, 2023), Thai teachers (Prabjandee, 2020; Prabjandee & Fang, 2022; Puchpan & Rajprasit, 2025), foreign teachers (Ambele, 2022; Boonsuk et al., 2026), and content teachers

(Baker & Hüttner, 2019), suggesting that ideological tensions remain across diverse stakeholder groups in Thai ELT contexts. It is worth noting that such tensions across diverse groups were not merely individual inconsistencies or a lack of awareness of GE but rather reflected more profound structural contradictions and constraints within the Thai educational context. These ideological tensions emerged from native-speakerism entrenched in established educational policies and language education over decades, as well as the realities of multilingual English language usage in diverse contexts, particularly in Asian communities. Viewing these ideological contradictions as structurally and institutionally constrained rather than individual divergent views is crucial for initiating effective responses to the difficulties in implementing innovative GE pedagogies.

Such structural constraints also explain why GE awareness alone is unable to change practice. Karakaş and Boonsuk (2025) found that even though a GE-based course significantly raised teachers' awareness in Türkiye, sustaining such change required contextual and structural support—curriculum renewal and redesigned materials. The present study extends this point further. Even when awareness is developed through professional experience without any formal GE intervention, discipline-specific lecturers still adhere to native-speaker models in high-stakes institutional contexts where native-speaker standards continue to be privileged. This structural constraint is further supported by Andrade (2024), who found that Chilean ELT teacher educators adhered to native-speaker standards as markers of professional legitimacy while intellectually challenging those norms, suggesting that institutional reproduction of native-speakerism operates independently of individual ideological orientation. Funada and Rose (2026) similarly found that despite students' openness to ELF communication and GELT, their domestic "at home" EFL context paradoxically reinforced their adherence to native-speaker norms through materials, testing, and employment that still privileged native-speaker standards.

Understanding these contradictions as institutional constraints rather than individual differences offers new analytical perspectives. At first glance, our findings appear to replicate these contradictions found in prior studies. Yet closer analysis reveals a more patterned but uneven negotiation in how lecturers conceptualize English across different contexts. The evidence suggests what can be described as patterned ideological accommodation, shaped by institutional power and communicative necessity. Within this pattern, lecturers apply different linguistic standards depending on perceived appropriateness, distinguishing between contexts where gatekeeping authority is present and contexts of professional communication among colleagues.

In contexts governed by institutional constraints, lecturers consistently prefer native-speaker models. These contexts are heavily constrained by external factors, including government policies mandating CEFR standards, university requirements for graduation, market pressures reflected in high employer demand for English proficiency, and requirements for international academic publishing. Within these institutional domains, the lecturers position AmE and BrE as necessary models, advocate for "correct pronunciation," and view native-like proficiency as essential for students' success (Themes 1 and 2). This native-speaker preference also extends to materials development and acceptance of NNESTs. Native speakers are required to verify "accuracy" even when Thai teachers author content. Acceptance of NNESTs is conditional

on accent closeness to native norms (Theme 3). These practices highlight that acceptance of non-native varieties remains conditional and hierarchical, with legitimacy tied to closeness to AmE/BrE rather than communicative effectiveness. Within institutional contexts where native-speaker standards are externally mandated and linked to consequential outcomes—denied graduation, lost employment opportunities, or rejected scholarship applications, lecturers have limited scope to challenge these norms. Instead, they reinforce them through the application of native-speaker standards in teaching and materials development.

Conversely, in contexts where institutional pressures are absent, lecturers embrace ELF for professional communication among non-native speakers. These contexts lack the institutional pressures that advocate for native-speaker models in high-stakes situations. In these contexts, lecturers communicate directly with international colleagues from diverse backgrounds, engage in collaborative laboratory work with non-native speakers, and participate in professional exchanges that prioritize mutual understanding over formal accuracy. Here, lecturers employ various techniques, such as code-switching, simplified vocabulary, and repair strategies, to ensure successful interaction with Indian, Malaysian, Chinese, and Filipino colleagues (Theme 4). The emphasis in these situations is intelligibility and communicative effectiveness, rather than adherence to prescribed native standards. This pattern demonstrates that without institutional authority, lecturers employ ELF practices to achieve effective communication.

The findings suggest that a negotiated, context-dependent accommodation strategy is driven by power imbalance. In institutionally constrained contexts, lecturers adhere to native-speaker standards. In contexts where such constraints are irrelevant, they embrace ELF practices for communication among non-native speakers without following AmE or BrE standards. The discipline-specific lecturers employ ELF practices to achieve successful communication in peer-to-peer professional contexts, but they continue to follow native-speaker norms in institutionally constrained domains, revealing how they simultaneously reproduce native-speakerism ideologies and draw on ELF practices to accommodate communicative realities. The concept of patterned ideological accommodation therefore contributes to our understanding of why GE implementation faces persistent challenges. This suggests that the gap between GE-informed orientations and institutional practice is not about teachers' unwillingness or insufficient awareness, but about institutional constraints that continue to privilege native-speaker standards. Effective GE implementation will therefore require changes not only in classroom practice and teacher awareness, but in the assessment frameworks, graduation policies, and employment benchmarks that still prioritize native-speaker norms (Andrade, 2024; Funada & Rose, 2026; Karakaş & Boonsuk, 2025).

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings showed that lecturers employ a contextual framework for viewing the English language rather than showing contradictory attitudes. They systematically adhere to native-speaker standards in high-stakes situations where institutional constraints are present (CEFR requirements, graduation benchmarks, employment demands). Conversely, they embrace flexible usage of ELF in professional contexts where mutual understanding

is prioritized, and institutional native-speaker ideologies are irrelevant. We refer to this strategic negotiation as patterned ideological accommodation, shaped by institutional constraints and communicative realities rather than individuals' acceptance or rejection of native-speakerism. This pattern reveals that lecturers strategically negotiate constraints in various contexts. They do not simply resist or accept native-speakerism. The study also shows that real-life exposure to multilingual communication fosters awareness of English diversity. However, this awareness alone is insufficient to challenge institutional constraints that privilege native-speaker standards, suggesting the need for coordinated efforts at policy, pedagogical, institutional, and disciplinary levels.

Our findings offer significant implications for GE implementation and ELT. The findings suggest that policy makers should reconsider the use of potentially disempowering external benchmarks, such as the CEFR, and take greater account of how English is used in multilingual scenarios. As English predominantly functioned as a lingua franca in professional contexts, policy frameworks should move toward context-informed assessment criteria and competencies that reflect these multilingual communicative realities, rather than positioning native-speaker English varieties as the sole benchmark for proficiency.

Classroom activities should be redesigned to reflect authentic multilingual communication, where English is used as a lingua franca among diverse non-native speakers, emphasizing mutual intelligibility over accuracy. For example, teachers could design activities where students engage in communication with speakers from diverse English backgrounds through collaborative online projects or simulated role-play activities. Teachers could also train students to use communication strategies, such as repair techniques and accommodation strategies, when engaging in interactions with an emphasis on effective communication rather than native-like proficiency. Students should be encouraged to reflect on factors contributing to successful communication across different contexts. These activities are expected to prepare students to utilize flexible communicative strategies in communication, especially among non-native speakers, in diverse communication contexts where intelligibility is prioritized over conformity to native-speaker standards.

Beyond the classroom, discipline-specific lecturers play a crucial role in developing students' language competence and raising GE awareness. As they have firsthand experience in using English in authentic and multilingual settings in their disciplines, they are well positioned to model and incorporate ELF-oriented strategies in their content teaching and professional communication. Through such practices, they help students recognize and accept the diversity of English use in authentic disciplinary communication. In doing so, they contribute not only to students' language development but also to shaping more GE-informed language ideologies within their specific fields of study.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study was conducted with a small sample at a regional campus of a public university, enabling in-depth investigation of disciplinary perspectives in a specific institutional context. The study provided valuable insights into tensions between native-speakerism and

multilingual English among discipline-specific lecturers, illustrating how context-specific factors shape ideological tensions. However, findings from this specific context may not be generalizable to other settings. Therefore, future research should extend to multiple sites and include lecturers from more diverse disciplines. This expansion would provide more comprehensive insights into multilingual English communication in professional contexts and enable comparative analysis that examines how different institutional contexts shape English language ideologies.

THE AUTHORS

Orathai Chaiya Jarunthawatchai is a lecturer in the Department of English, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Kasetsart University, Kamphaeng Saen Campus, Thailand.

orathaichaiya.j@ku.th

Wisut Jarunthawatchai is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Kasetsart University, Kamphaeng Saen Campus, Thailand. His research interests include second language writing and Global Englishes.

faaswsj@ku.ac.th

Will Baker is the Director of the Centre for Global Englishes and an Associate Professor in Applied Linguistics, University of Southampton, United Kingdom. His research interests include Global Englishes, English as a lingua franca, intercultural and transcultural communication, English medium education, intercultural education, intercultural citizenship, and ELT.

w.baker@soton.ac.uk

REFERENCES

- Ambele, E. A. (2022). Thai English? Non-Thai English lecturers' perceptions of Thai English and World Englishes. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(2), 724–750. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/259949>
- 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), 201–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1759248>
- Andrade, G. (2024). Chapter 3 “British English is much more prestigious, everybody knows that!”: Reproducing and resisting hegemonic language ideologies in Chilean English teacher education. In S. Morán Panero, M. Martínez-Sánchez, & G. Ronzón-Montiel (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca in Latin American education* (pp. 41–66). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110750966-003>
- Andreani, C., & McKinley, J. (2025). Global Englishes teaching in secondary schools in Italy. *ELT Journal*, 79(3), 452–463. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaf010>
- Baker, W., & Hüttner, J. (2019). “We are not the language police”: Comparing multilingual EMI programmes in Europe and Asia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 78–94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12246>
- Boonsuk, Y. (2023). Which English should we stand for? Voices from lecturers in Thai multicultural universities. *RELC Journal*, 54(3), 588–602. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211054650>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102511>
- Boonsuk, Y., Wasoh, F., & Waelateh, B. (2026). Whose English should be talked and taught? Views from international English teachers in Thai higher education. *Language Teaching Research*, 30(2), 864–884. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231152194>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- East, M., & Wang, D. (2025). Advancing the communicative language teaching agenda: What place for translanguaging in task-based language teaching? *The Language Learning Journal*, 53(6), 702–714. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2380278>
- Franz, J., & Teo, A. (2018). 'A2 is normal' – Thai secondary school English teachers' encounters with the CEFR. *RELC Journal*, 49(3), 322–338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217738816>
- Funada, N., & Rose, H. (2026). Investigation of English language learners' attitudes toward Global Englishes and Global Englishes Language Teaching in relation to their academic interests and experiences with English as a global lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.70117>
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734347>
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010>
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.
- Jarunthawatchai, W., & Baker, W. (2024). English language education and educational policy in Thailand. In A. J. Moody (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Southeast Asian Englishes* (pp. 557–574). Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 486–494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs040>
- Kanchai, T. (2019). Thai EFL university lecturers' viewpoints towards impacts of the CEFR on their English language curricular and teaching practice. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication*, 24(35), 23–47.
- Karakaş, A., & Boonsuk, Y. (2025). 'After reading Widdowson's paper, ...Why should I teach native English?' Boosting in-service teachers' Global Englishes (GE) awareness in a GE-based MA course. *English Teaching & Learning*, 49(2), 235–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-024-00180-1>
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Han, Y. (2025). Politics, ideologies, values, and power in ELT. In A. F. Selvi & N. Galloway (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 34–48). Routledge.
- Malmström, H., & Zhou, S. (2025). Language–subject teacher collaboration in English-medium higher education: Current practices and future possibilities. *RELC Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882241313234>
- Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation. (2024, January 23). *Announcement of the higher education standards committee on the policy for upgrading English language standards in higher education institutions*, B.E. 2567 (No. ๓ 0204.2/๓ 1646). <https://bit.ly/48Uu8nm>
- Montakantiwong, A. (2024). 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>

- Nitsaisook, N., Prabjandee, D., & Kewara, P. (2025). Language ideologies and English education policies in Thailand. *World Englishes*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12739>
- Nomnian, S., Perez-Amurao, A. L., Rido, A., & Magno, F. A. (2023). Thai pre-service science teachers' perceptions of their Filipino ESL/EFL lecturers' intercultural communicative practices in science teacher education. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 16(2), 533–547. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/266970>
- Pattaraworathum, N., & Baker, W. (2025). The impact of native-speakerism on culture teaching practices of secondary ELT teachers in Thailand. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Dismantling the native speaker construct in English language teaching* (pp. 118–139). Routledge.
- Piller, I., & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society*, 42(1), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404512000887>
- 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>
- Puchpan, A., & Rajprasit, K. (2025). Accept or reject it? Thai L2 teachers' perceptions of the Global Englishes paradigm and teaching possibility. *rEFlections*, 32(1), 415–435. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v32i1.280231>
- Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, H., & Montakantiwong, A. (2018). A tale of two teachers: A duoethnography of the realistic and idealistic successes and failures of teaching English as an international language. *RELC Journal*, 49(1), 88–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217746206>
- Savski, K., & Prabjandee, D. (2022). CEFR: A global framework for Global Englishes? *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*, 26(3), Article ej103a1. <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a1>
- Savski, K., & Rukthong, A. (2025). 'Failed'? Under-performing learners' perspectives on Thailand's English language policies. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2025.2493996>
- Snodin, N., Savski, K., & Sameephet, B. (2024). English in Thailand. In A. J. Moody (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Southeast Asian Englishes* (pp. 311–326). Oxford University Press.
- Thienthong, A., & Uthai Korn, K. (2023). Thai learners' attitudes toward English accents: Fields and stages of study. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 16(1), 676–702. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/263461>

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Part 1: Participants' experiences of learning and using English

1. When did you start learning English?
2. How many years have you been teaching at this university?
3. Have you ever been abroad?
4. Was English important for your Master's or Doctoral studies?
5. Which varieties of English were used as models for your learning?
6. Which language do you mainly use in teaching (e.g., Thai, English)? If English, do you experience any challenges in using it in your teaching?
7. Do you use English in your workplace? Do you have opportunities to use English outside your classroom? If so, do you experience any challenges in using English for communication?
8. Who do you use English to communicate with?
9. What do you consider the most important skills for effective communication?
10. Which varieties of English do you use in your communication?
11. What are your views on the use of English in ASEAN?

Part 2: Participants' opinions on English language teaching at the university level

1. What are your views on English? Do you think it is important for Thailand?
2. What do you think about the English language proficiency of first-year students at this university?
3. What do you think about teaching English to students at this university, particularly across different majors and levels of study?
4. What do you think about the English language policy and curriculum at this university?
5. In your opinion, what would be the most effective approach to teaching English to students in Thailand, and at this university in particular?
6. As Thailand is a member of ASEAN, what do you think should be prioritized in English language teaching for our students?
7. What should be the focus of English language teaching for students in the Faculty of ... at this university?
8. Which model of English should be used for teaching in classrooms? Why?
9. Which model of English would be most appropriate for effective communication in ASEAN? Why?
10. Regarding English language teachers from abroad, where do you think they should come from — for example, the UK, the US, the Philippines, India, Singapore, or other countries?
11. What are your thoughts on the university employing English teachers from countries such as the Philippines or Bangladesh?
12. After completing the 9-credit English course requirement, do you think students are able to communicate effectively in English?
13. Do you think the standardized English test helps improve students' English proficiency?
14. What more could teachers or the university do to improve students' English proficiency?
15. Do you use English in your discipline-specific classes? Why or why not? Do you think this contributes to the development of students' English language skills?



16. After graduation, do you think your students are well-prepared to communicate effectively in English?
17. Who do you think your students will use English to communicate with after graduation?
18. Which varieties of English do you think your students should use in communication?
19. What do you consider the most important skills for your students' effective communication?
Do you think your students currently have these skills?