Global Englishes in ELT: Unpacking University English Teachers' Perceptions in Bangladesh

Binod Dhami

tesolbinod2@gmail.com

Department of English, Minnesota State University, USA

Abstract

In response to the calls to incorporate Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT), this study explores university English language teachers' perceptions towards Global Englishes (GEs) in Bangladesh. Despite being one of the biggest English learning populations on the globe, a dearth of attention has been paid to studying English language teaching (ELT) and learning in Bangladesh. In this regard, this study explores how university English teachers in Bangladesh perceive the use of GEs in ELT and how those perceptions inform teacher education. Ten university English teachers from two universities based in Dhaka, the capital city of Bangladesh, were recruited for the study. Thirty to fifty minutes semi-structured interview was conducted. After developing codes from the transcribed interview texts, themes were generated, and recursive content analysis was performed to derive results. Findings revealed that the teachers preferred to use Inner Circle English (i.e., American or British) in ELT. While participants seemed aware of the emergence of Global Englishes, they suspected a legitimacy of Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes in academia. Furthermore, aspiring to participate in GE-informed teacher professional programs (TPD), participants reported a prominence of inclusion of local culture in ELT.

Keywords: Global Englishes, Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT), ELT in Bangladesh, teachers' perceptions, South Asian Englishes, teacher professional development

Introduction

The application and impact of the English language in varied domains of human endeavors is undeniable and its spread is incomparable to other languages around the globe (Boonsuk et al., 2020). The increasing prominence of English as an international language (EIL) and the unprecedented spread of English (Sadeghpour, 2020) has questioned the concept of the English language, its speakers, and ecologies where it is spoken and used (Matsuda, 2017). As English extends to diverse sociolinguistic territories of the globe, it accommodates the features of other languages and evolves into various shapes and sizes resulting in different varieties. These varieties of English are termed as the World Englishes (WEs) (Jenkins, 2015;

Saraceni, 2015). In the 1970s and 1980s Braj Kachru and Larry Smith first introduced the concept of WEs, and since then, a spread of English has been discussed in multiple ways by scholars in applied linguistics such as WEs (Kachru, 1985, 1992), Global Englishes (GEs) (Jenkins, 2015; Pennycook, 2007), English as a lingua franca (ELF) (Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2001), and EIL (Jenkins, 1998; Matsuda, 2017). These scholarships share much in common in terms of expectations, goals, and practices of English language education that all of them aim at preparing English learners to use English with multilingual and diverse users of Englishes (Matsuda, 2019). Kachru's three Circles model: the Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle of WEs has been revolutionary development that established deliberation beyond native speakerism, and standard language ideology. In the Inner Circle contexts, consisting of the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and Ireland, the English language functions as the first language. English in the Outer Circle contexts such as India, Singapore, and Hong Kong serves as a second language. However, many people speak English as the first language in these contexts too. English in the Expanding Circle contexts consisting of Japan, China, and Russia, for example, is used as a foreign language (Crystal, 2012; Nelson, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011). Though the concept of WEs contributed extremely to question standard language ideology, it was later criticized for not being able to incorporate diversified expansion of English in and across the geographical territories (Galloway & Rose, 2015). While different L1 speakers spoke English, WEs discipline could not address the lingua franca nature of English usage. Transcending this limitation, Jenkins (1998) researched ELF context, examining linguistic aspects of the use of English language. Emphasizing more on implications of English language for society and language education, EIL discipline appeared in the North American contexts, which is often considered as a counterpart of lingua franca scholarship emerged first in Europe. Recently, GEs as an inclusive paradigm that explores linguistic, sociolinguistic, and sociocultural diversity and fluidity of English use and users in a globalized world has been in practice representing WEs, ELF, and EIL (Pennycook, 2007; Rose & Galloway, 2019) which expanded GEs scholarship more inclusively.

People speaking English as a second or foreign language surpass the population who speak English as a native language (Graddol, 2006). When it comes to the English teachers' populace globally, Braine (2010) estimates that 80% of English language teachers learned English as a second language or foreign language or are non-native speakers of English (p. x). Hence, English does not merely belong to the Inner Circle contexts but also to the speakers all over the globe, of course, resulting in varieties of English (Baratta, 2019). This raises the questions about ownership of English; who owns English? For Nelson (1992), every English language user is an owner of English. According to Halliday (1964) Americans and British no longer possess English. People use and adopt English, as an international language, to achieve different purposes. With the existence of Englishes, a notion of native speakerism has been challenged making an argument that English is no longer the asset of native speakers only (Galloway, 2017). A shifted

paradigm in English language education advocates for Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) with an extensive emphasis on plural realities of English usages. Most recently, acknowledging the advantages of multilingual learners' linguistic resources and knowledge, the scholars aver translanguaging as a new development in the use of language, which also implies for English language teaching and learning, and multilingual shift by opposing monolingual schooling (Fang & Liu, 2020; Rose & Galloway, 2019; Sah & Li, 2020). However, GELT being more inclusive (Pennycook, 2007) in nature, as discussed above, will be used throughout this paper as an umbrella term representing WEs, ELF, and EIL (Rose et al., 2021). Unfortunately, a substantial number of ELT materials English teachers use in their teaching of English are still developed following native speaker norms. These materials lack to provide English teachers and learners multiplicity of English use or awareness about GEs. Subjecting to follow native speakerism (Holliday, 2005), a belief of teaching and learning native speaker English or authentic English (Seidlhofer, 2012), learners neither can perform communication effectively in contexts where other varieties of English are used, nor can they negotiate for meaning in the multicultural and multilingual setting. Therefore, the purpose of ELT should be to train learners to use English in a diverse society.

To accomplish this objective, Galloway (2017) proposed GELT which promotes multilingual proficiencies, not the native speaker competency, offering learner-oriented, need-based, and context-appropriate norms to English language teaching. For its implementation in English language education, it necessitates innovation in the ELT curriculum (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020) and positive transformation in the perceptions of teachers, learners, and all the stakeholders. More importantly, English teachers' perceptions are imperative, because of their role at the implementation and practice level (Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017). Because they are the change-makers by employing and exposing learners with the concept of GEs in ELT. Teachers' perceptions are to be in due consideration as their direct knowhows and suppositions affect English language teaching and learners' success (Colmenero & Lasagabaster, 2020). While global mobility and international and intercultural communication in diverse multilingual sociolinguistic settings in English is evident for English learners, teachers require to expose their learners to the diverse nature of GEs with an appreciative mentality (Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017).

English in Bangladesh has a distinctive sociolinguistic status unlike its neighboring countries, Indian and Pakistan, since its separation from Pakistan in 1971. Though it was also a former colony of British, English does not function as it does in India and Pakistan, where English is used for intranational and interethnic communication in multilingual and multiethnic communities. A total of 170 million populace residing in Bangladesh, 98% of them speak Bangla making it a Bangla-dominated country. The English language plays a crucial role in education and has been taught and learned as a compulsory subject from 1st grade through 12th grade since 1991 (Hamid & Hasan, 2020). However, English language learning outcomes are not satisfactory. This is because the English language is not used for everyday interaction as

in the neighboring countries, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. Despite being one of the biggest English learning populations in the globe, a dearth of attention has been paid to researching English language teaching and learning in Bangladesh (Hamid & Hasan, 2020). Against this backdrop, this study, aiming to fill the void, seeks to address the following questions:

1. How do Bangladeshi university English teachers perceive the use of Global Englishes in ELT in Bangladesh?
2. How do perceptions of the teachers toward Global Englishes inform teacher professional development and teacher education?

Literature Review

English Language Education in Bangladesh

Bangladesh was a territory of the Indian subcontinent prior to 1947 constituting one of the colonies of British decree with Pakistan and India. Undivided India became independent in 1947; however, as mentioned above, Bangladesh remained under Pakistan before 1971 and received independence after the Liberation War in 1971 from Pakistan. Although Bangladesh appeared as a brand-new country in the early 70s, English existed in different domains of society since the British governed the Indian subcontinent, sharing the status of the second language in the Bangla speech community. While the status of the English language remained the same in India and Pakistan even after independence, the role of English altered in Bangladesh (Ara, 2020). Hence, the scholars (Hamid & Hasan, 2020) argue that it is uncertain to state where English in Bangladesh falls in the Kachruvian circles, Outer or Expanding. With the new emergence of Bangladesh, the one state one language policy was implemented despite the presence of myriad ethnic groups in the country (Rahman, 2010). In 1972, the constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh adopted Bangla as the language of the state. This move restricted the use of the English language in different domains of society, for instance, education, which dropped the English language proficiency of the learners (Hamid & Baldauf, 2014). Nevertheless, Bangla, at the present time, functions as an official language of the nation, and is used as a medium of curricular instruction, in media, daily communication, and almost everywhere as a major language in the country. The constitution of Bangladesh has no mention of the status of English and other indigenous languages even though English is considered as the language of socio-economic upliftment (Hossain & Tollefson, 2007). While Bangla overrode the English language as an indication of national identity, due to the consequence of globalization, privatization of education, and the need of English for international communication, the English language got prominent space in the national education policies (Rahman, et. al, 2019).

Presently, the English language is highly used in education; for example, people prefer to send their children to English medium schools rather than public schools and colleges run by the government of Bangladesh. The students learn English for 12 years from 1st grade to 12th grade at secondary and higher secondary schools, before pursuing the university education. However, the students cannot develop their English language proficiency required, mostly in speaking (Ara, 2020). As a result, in 1996, the Ministry of Education, transitioned the English language curriculum from grammar translation method (GTM) to communicative language teaching (CLT), advocating the necessity for English communication, but the scholars (Arafat & Mehnaaz, 2020) complain that CLT is not even successful and effective in bringing expected outcomes in developing students' English language competency. This is again a consequence of unplanned and unstable education policies in ELT in Bangladesh (Rahman & Pandian, 2018). In addition, Rahman and Pandian further admit and suggest that national curricula and the country's educational policies have an imperative responsibility to play to accomplish the nation's educational aims. Bangladesh like other developing countries in the region adopts the prescribed ELT methods and materials along with curriculum developed in the West, without contextualizing and appropriating them for the local context, learners, and country. To improvise ELT in Bangladesh, the curriculum innovation should be conducted considering what is appropriate for the Bangladeshi context.

English Teachers' Perceptions on GEs

Teachers' perceptions are significantly correlated with what teachers do in the classroom, for instance, their practices, which also determine their instructional plans and decisions. Given the significant role of teachers' perceptions about their teaching of English and use of GEs, this section draws on some recent empirical research on teachers' perceptions of GEs.

Exploring English teachers' perceptions from the Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles teaching in Australia about the place and relevance of WEs, Sadeghpour and Sharifian (2019) found that most of the participants perceived WEs necessary and relevant for their English language teaching in Australia to make English learners cognizant about the presence of different Englishes in the globe. Moreover, the results also suggest that to make about change by including the pluricentric dimension of the English language, the curriculum developers should incorporate the information about various Englishes in the English language curriculum. As teachers play a significant role in disseminating GE-informed classroom pedagogies and practices, they need to be educated on how their ELT practices can be more WE oriented. Similarly, interviewing 27 English language teachers of intensive language courses from 10 countries in Australia, Sadeghpour and Sharifian (2017) studied their attitudes and opinions about the legitimacy and existence of WEs. Results revealed that teachers were aware of the use of English for international communication and the spread of English. Their perceptions toward WE were determined by how they were educated.

Participants who were overtly informed about WE-scholarship during their formal education accepted the diverse nature of the English language and tolerated WEs. However, some participants denied the legitimacy of Expanding Circle Englishes and Asian Englishes although their emergence is obvious.

Unlike aforementioned studies, Tajeddin et al. (2018) investigated non-native English teachers' opinions about so-called standard English (i.e., American and/or British) linguistic and pragmatic norms in EIL setting. The findings indicated that the teachers preferred native speakers' norms over EIL norm, although they acknowledged the emergence of different Englishes and pronunciations. Researchers also suggested that instead of modeling a native speaker English to learners, they are required to be aware of various Englishes by achieving strategies and skills for effective intercultural and multicultural communication. Likewise, the attitudes of 246 Outer and Expanding Circle teachers towards WEs and international proficiency tests were explored by Monfared (2020). Corresponding with Tajeddin et al. (2018), the findings obtained in the study denoted that even though most of the teachers were positive to WEs in theory, they rejected the WEs norms in the international proficiency tests such as IELTS and TOEFL.

In addition, Solmaz (2020) studied 27 student teachers of English, who were admitted in the optional course entitled 'World Englishes and Culture', the objectives of the course were to make student teachers aware of WEs and functions WEs may serve in English as a foreign language practice. Results of the study suggested that course raised participants' awareness of WEs and WE-informed pedagogies, helping to develop positive opinions toward WE-inclusive ELT practices. Moreover, student teachers not only favored using WE-inclusive ELT pedagogies in their future teaching but also demanded the course as a compulsory subject in the curriculum at the department of ELT.

In Thailand, Tarrayo et al. (2021) investigated 60 university English language teachers' perceptions of Thai English. An analysis of the data indicated that although teachers approved the existence of WEs and Thai English in terms of accents, use of Thai English in media, and intranational and international communication, they still favored standard English (i.e., American and/or British) while writing, speaking, and teaching in the classroom, aligning the findings with Monfared (2020) and Tajeddin et al. (2018). By exploring the attitudes of Japanese learners and teachers of English towards the use of WEs in English language coursebooks, Takahashi (2017) parallel with the results of Solmaz (2020) found that the teachers of junior and high school were flexible to provide exposure to different varieties of English to the students. The students and teachers were also concerned about when, how, and to whom the forms of varieties of English can be introduced among teachers, material developers, publishers, and policymakers as all of them affect and play a significant role in ELT.

In China, based on the identity theory, Widodo et al. (2020) investigated how Chinese English language teachers develop their professional identity as the legitimate English language teacher from a GE

perspective. Drawing on the findings, researchers report that English language teachers should be exposed to new innovations and insights happening in the field of linguistics and English language education by offering pre-service education opportunities. To construct nonnative English-speaking teachers' professional identities and to encounter native speaker ideology, it is necessary to make their voices visible and heard by engaging them in research and publication, for the national and international audience. Similarly, Lee et al. (2019) explored Indonesian and Korean pre-service English teachers' perceptions about EIL. The results indicated ambivalent attitudes about EIL and non-native varieties of English. The Indonesian teachers showed more possession of their English pronunciation, whereas Korean preservice English teachers acknowledged the existence of WEs but were reluctant to include them as the listening materials in ELT. In Korea, Ahn (2015) studied the attitudes of 204 Korean and foreign English teachers from two metropolitan regions of South Korea toward Englishes used in India, China, Singapore, and Japan. Echoing the findings of Tajeddin et al. (2018) and Monfared (2020), the results in this study indicated that the teachers repudiated the existence of the four selected Asian Englishes. Perceiving Asian Englishes negatively, the teacher participants found them problematic and insignificant. The study also argues that teachers' positive attitudes and their acknowledgment of variations in the Englishes used around the globe are mandatory for involving in the diverse international communities.

Research Methodology

Participants

Employing a convenience sampling method on a voluntary basis, a total of 10 university English teachers were recruited from two universities located in Dhaka, Bangladesh for collecting data. The participants who were teaching English in the M.Ed. level were contacted through emails explaining the purpose and nature of the research study. The email requested participants' consent to participate in the research interview process. The participants also were consented to having their interviews recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. Although a consent email to participate was sent to 23 university teachers, only 10 of them could make it to the interview process. There were two reasons for selecting university English teachers from two universities located in Dhaka: a) teachers from those two universities attended my presentation on the role of Asian Englishes in education and society at one of the conferences organized by the university in Dhaka which was convenient for me to explain the research issue and purpose; b) it was accessible for me to get their contact emails from the conference organizing committee to communicate, as conference organizer collected all the participants' emails to confirm their participation at the conference.

The semi-structured individual interviews were conducted from June through August 2020, via Zoom and English language was used as a language of interviews. The interviews consisted of questions to

extract demographic information of the participants and open-ended items. The participants' English language teaching experience ranged from 2 to 20 years from high school to university level. Bangladesh being a Bangla dominant country, all teacher participants spoke Bangla as their first language with the English language being their second language. Although all the participants obtained master's degree in English, their majors varied. Most of them obtained master's degree in ELT, literature, and both. Some of them also received a Ph.D.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The individual semi-structured interview lasted for 30 to 50 minutes depending on follow-up discussion and individual teacher's responses, aiming at eliciting teacher participants': 1) understanding of the paradigm of GEs; 2) perceptions about the use of South Asian Englishes in their teaching of English; 3) opinions on the concept of standard English ; and 4) perceptions about GE-inclusive teacher professional development/teacher education. The interviews were scheduled and conducted at a mutually convenient time. After that, the interviews were transcribed verbatim and sent back to the participants for member checking and approval with a request to add or correct anything if participants realized so. To generate codes, the interview transcripts were read, re-read, and checked frequently in detail including words, phrases, and sentences (van Manen, 2016). The reoccurring substantial notions and concepts in the transcriptions accompanying to research questions were highlighted with colors to develop the codes. Then, appropriate codes were allocated to the highlighted notions and concepts. While several codes were derived initially from one set of data, they were later classified in different groups. These emerged groups of codes were combined to develop overarching themes by reading the transcripts again. And the data was thematically interpreted using recursive content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004). The analysis of the data sought to comprehend teachers' beliefs through the conversations they made about GEs in ELT. Furthermore, teachers' selection of the words and phrases was paid close consideration to situate their beliefs and perceptions towards GEs (Lim, 2020).

Findings

The findings documented from semi-structured interviews in response to research objectives and questions are presented under four themes: 1) Defining GEs; 2) Teachers' perceptions on Inner Circle Englishes; 3) Teachers' perceptions towards South Asian Englishes; 4) Teachers' perceptions on GE-inclusive teacher education. The names of research participants are replaced with T1–T10 (i.e., T1 being teacher 1 to T10 being teacher 10) to ensure teachers' anonymity for the extracts taken from the interviews.

1. **Defining GEs**

This section presents the concept of GEs as perceived by the participants. GEs refers to the Englishes employed by different people in different geographies of the globe as viewed by all the participants. While English spreads around the world, people use it for numerous purposes making it the language of intra and inter-national communication. Endorsing multiplicity on the usages of English to determine GEs, all the participants defined GEs as the varieties of English with phonological variations (Sadeghpour, 2020). For instance, T6, T8, and T9 in the following excerpts identified African Englishes, Singaporean English, Asian Englishes, European Englishes, and Australian English as varieties of English.

> *World Englishes are the varieties of Englishes, usages of English such as South Asian Englishes, African Englishes, Australian English, the middle east Englishes. So, I think the diversity in the usages of English is World Englishes. (T6)*

> *As far as I know, for example, the people of Singapore speak their own English variety. Australian pronunciation is totally different from British and American. I also have noticed that Singaporean people have different grammar than the dominant varieties of English. I have not tried to learn all those varieties as I always remain in Bangladeshi thinking, English, and culture. (T8)*

> *Global Englishes are varieties of English that has been used in different parts of the world. There are Asian Englishes, African Englishes. They have different accents. Of course, European people have another English. (T9)*

Moreover, as the follow-up question, the participants were asked where they were introduced to the GEs scholarship. Mostly, the participants (Eight out of 10) voiced that they were familiarized with the topics of GEs at the university. An example of such evidence emerged in the interview from T1, T3, and T5 who expressed that they learnt about GEs at the university in different courses.

> *We used to talk about Global Englishes in the course sociolinguistics whenever we talked about the relationship between language and society. We see that different society has different language patterns. In that course, there were the issues to talk about Global Englishes. (T1)*

> *When I was achieving my honors degree, in first year, we had a course of 100 marks on English language. In that course, the term World Englishes was discussed in one that single class. (T3)*

Well, at the university, I studied the sociolinguistic course, there was a chapter on World Englishes something like that. For the first time came to know it. (T5)

Acknowledging an imperative position of GEs for learners' English language development, participants also proclaimed that GEs need to be discussed in the courses offered by the universities.

Since English has many varieties like Australian English, American English, British English, Indian English, I think in the discipline of English language and literature, the WE should be included. Especially, for those who study English should be introduced to varieties of English. (T7)

2. **Teachers' Perceptions on Inner Circle Englishes**

The interview was initiated by asking respondents the first guiding question to understand their opinions about the use of Inner Circle Englishes in their teaching of English. As evidenced from the interview data, the respondents (nine out of 10) considered that the use of Inner Circle English is indispensable in ELT for learners' English language development. Admitting native speaker English as a source of English language learning, T1 expressed the significance of introducing English learners with Inner Circle English in the class in the following excerpt.

It is good if you could use or give students the source which has been used by the native speakers. Yes, it is not possible to give them the resource of British accent and American accent in ESL/EFL context but somehow, if we could arrange in this modern world where we have access to information, we have YouTube, we have so many materials that provide a feel of American English, British English, or Australian English. So, if we could arrange some sort of activities if we could give them the materials by which we can introduce them those accents [native speaker English] and language that also help them to improve the English. (T1)

Responding to the follow-up question, T1 further elaborated that the learners be taught Inner Circle English and transfer it to the new generation. In terms of pronunciation, it is not a problem to use non-Inner Circle Englishes; however, syntactic systems must be taught and learned according to Inner Circle English. Akin to T1, highlighting the prominence of Inner Circle English in ELT, T2 averred:

America is the most powerful country in the world, the superpower of the world. They are controlling the economy and power of all other world. American English has a different style of pronunciation, no problem. We should have a standard [English]. Of course, there are various

pronunciation; British pronunciation, Australian pronunciation, American English, African English, Indian English, even Bangladeshi English also. We should follow standard one otherwise which one is correct? Which one is incorrect? We cannot distinguish. (T2)

Even though teacher participants seemed aware of the emergence of the GEs, they wholeheartedly believed that American or British Englishes are the standard ones to be used in the classroom. For instance, the reasons to follow Inner Circle English for the teachers were 1) American supremacy over the global economy and 2) for getting rid of the confusion in choosing a legitimate English among GEs. These results revealed an omnipresence of the native speaker model for learning linguistic standards and norms. This is probably because of stereotypes that had been already established in the teachers' minds (Tajeddin et. al., 2018). Similarly, highlighting on the significant contribution of exposure in English language development, T3 expressed that his students were exposed to American English, as stated in the following excerpt.

Whatever the exposure they get, in that way, they can improve their English. I see much influence of American English among my students since there are the TV series, movies in American English. So, I think exposure is the main factor here. (T3)

Nevertheless, some other participants (Two out of 10) manifested during the interview that English language learners be exposed to the GEs and Bangladeshi English to develop their English language competency. Duplicating Inner Circle English speakers in terms of pronunciation, grammar, and different language expressions does not aid English language learners to improve English language. An instance of such belief was observed with T4 who expressed that:

It is practically impossible for someone to internalize a foreign language. I feel that the British language, structure, British way of expression has an intimate connection with British geography, British culture. So, if I try to teach those things in Bangladesh, what will happen is that the learners will just be mimicking things that do not come from their hearts. I do not want to pronounce like British English speakers. I want to pronounce like Bangladeshi people, the way I am talking now. I do not want to speak the way British or American people speak or pronounce. (T4)

Following the section on teachers' perceptions of Inner Circle Englishes in ELT, teacher participants were asked whether they thought local culture, context, and materials should be included in ELT rather than replicating native speaker norms. All participants acknowledged that incorporating local context, culture, and materials in ELT is important, but it had not happened in Bangladesh yet, as stated below:

Knowing the local context is very important and essential for the learners. I have heard from one of the prominent professors from Dhaka University. He said in the interview of BBC that the students at English medium schools in Bangladesh have no knowledge about their own country. He further said my son studies in English medium school, and he is well known about the river Thames in Britain. He has no knowledge about our own rivers like, Potma, Meghna, Jamuna though they are more beautiful than the river Thames. So, it's very harmful for Bangladesh. (T5)

Mostly, the textbooks we find here do not include our culture. It has been totally ignored there. We do not say 'good morning' in Bangoli. This type of greeting is not found in Bangoli culture. This kind of greeting presented in the textbooks are written by the native speakers of English. But I think, to teach a language effectively, the cultural background of the students' needs to be taken into consideration, so that teaching and learning would be more efficient. (T6)

Although teacher participants concurred that learners' local contexts play an important role in their English language development, the monolithic attitudes about English seemed predominant in them. The preference of using Inner Circle Englishes in ELT was still prevalent among teachers (Ahn, 2014; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017). While debate and discussion on the necessity of paradigm shift in ELT from native speaker model to GEs language teaching is obvious (Galloway, 2017), most of the participants (9 out of 10) desired to teach Inner Circle English in the class, as the data indicated.

3. Teachers' Perceptions towards South Asian Englishes

The results demonstrated that all the participants admitted the emergence of South Asian Englishes (SAEs) and found SAEs comfortable to use in the classroom. For instance, emphasizing the use of Bangladeshi English (i.e., Bangladeshi norms, values, and tradition) and disclaiming the use of exonormative English language norms, T7 stated that:

In class, I always emphasize on Bangladeshi variety. By Bangladeshi variety, I mean, the local materials and culture. You know, there are hundreds of thousands of British idioms and British ways of choosing words and expressions. Many teachers think of concentrating on all those things making students memorize things. I have seen some of the Bangladeshi people saying, 'it's not your cup of tea.' 'Cup of tea' is not a Bangladeshi expression. I avoid these kinds of things. (T7)

Also, some participants contended that English learners comprehended the content better if they used Bangladeshi English in the classroom since the students in their universities came from underdeveloped regions of the country who studied in the Bangla medium schools, not in the English medium schools and colleges.

> *I always follow my Bangladeshi English because learners understand it better. Because, you know, at tertiary level, the students are not from English medium schools or colleges. They came from Bangla medium schools. And most of them come from rural areas of our country. They are very poor in English. (T8)*

T8's opinion implies an insufficient understanding of the purpose of GELT. It seems that South Asian English, Bangladeshi English for this study, is used in the class due to students' inadequate competency of English, not because T8 aspired to make students aware of GEs. The purpose of GELT is to substantiate English learners' diversified nature of English (Rose & Galloway, 2019) and to demonstrate to learners that learning a particular English does not ease English communication because of the existence of the GEs. However, a few teachers argued that in the teaching of English, they used Inner Circle English without depreciating SAEs in the classroom.

> *In terms of teaching English, I prefer the standard one. But I don't ignore local varieties. I don't call them incorrect, and I accept them cordially. (T9)*

Questioning the legitimacy and acceptance of the use of SAEs in the standardized English language proficiency tests such as IELTS, the participants indented to use Inner Circle English-based resources in their ELT as to prepare English learners to score high in the standardized tests for obtaining opportunities in the international platforms, as expressed in the following excerpt:

> *Whenever you give an IELTS test, they do not consider you as an Asian. They have standard, they want you to maintain their standard, not your standard. Whenever our students are taking part in the IELTS examination, many of them are not doing well. If we could familiarize them with native English, they would have done well in the IELTS. I am not against using the local English, resources. You have to contextualize with your culture, with your language, society. So that students will be feeling interested to study, to read, to engage themselves with the activities but I am talking about the source that has to be used. (T10)*

4. Teachers' Perceptions on GE-inclusive Teacher Education

All the participants asserted in the interview that they did not attend and get opportunities to participate in any GE-informed teacher professional development (TPD) programs or teacher education such as seminars, workshops, training, and conferences either in national or in international platforms. Although many participants interrogated the legitimacy of GEs and preferred employing American or British English in their teaching of English, everyone aspired to participate in GE-inclusive teacher education proceedings if the chance was granted. Justifying why English teachers require to take part in such TPD programs, T10 remarked:

> *We [English teachers] need to know how does English language work in different parts of the world and how people speak, how do they communicate and how English is being used in different parts of the world. If we have knowledge about different dimensions of English language usage, we could be a better English teacher. (T10)*

Some participants who recognized a prominence of GE-awareness for their students desired to attend GE-informed TPD programs to disseminate information about Bangladeshi English:

> *If I get chance to join Global Englishes related teacher education programs, I will certainly attend them. I want to develop students' awareness about Bangladeshi English (T4).*

From the data presented, it appears that the participants advocated for GE-informed TPD events and desired to participate despite their unwillingness of including GEs in ELT. Moreover, it indicates that GE-informed TPD is not incorporated in participants' teacher education programs (Zhang, 2021).

Discussion

Given the paucity of investigation regarding how English language teachers perceive GEs, this study aimed at exploring the perceptions of university English language teachers toward the use of GEs in their English language teaching in Bangladesh, and how such perceptions inform teacher professional development or teacher education. To establish the premise of the study, the teacher participants were asked about their perceptions on the use of GEs in ELT in Bangladesh. Regarding teachers' perceptions toward GEs, it was revealed from data analysis that most of the teachers preferred using Inner Circle English (British or American English) in ELT advocating native speaker English as the source of English language, which corroborates with the findings in the previous studies (Monfared, 2020; Tajeddin et al., 2018; Tarrayo et al., 2021) in which teachers endorsed native speakers' norms over GEs and EIL norms. As observed, the

participants believed that the standardness of the English language was not associated with the intelligibility of communication as recognized by the GE paradigm (Tarrayo et al., 2021), instead, it was generally correlated to Inner Circle Englishes. This signifies that although the notion of native speakerism and ownership of English has been challenged (Seidlhofer, 2011), ELT in Bangladesh is still dominated by native speaker ideology. Hence, a transition from this ideology to GE-oriented pedagogy in ELT (Galloway, 2017; Jenkins, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019) that emphasizes training English learners to use English for intercultural communication and to develop an ability to negotiate for meaning with linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic flexibility is required. However, an awareness of GE is not exhibited in the application level of ELT (Fang & Ren, 2018).

Teachers also viewed that the learners succeed in learning the English language if only they attempt to follow native speaker English standards. However, this result is inconsistent with prior research conducted by Takahishi (2017) and Solmaz (2020), who found that teachers recognized a prominence of introducing GEs to the English learners. The other reason teachers favored using the native speaker model in ELT, particularly American English, was due to American domination over the global economy and other affairs. This ideology of teachers does not support learners' English language development to fulfill the sociolinguistic reality of real-life English usage in intercultural situations (Seidlhofer, 2011) since non-native English users with various Englishes outnumber the native English users (Galloway & Rose, 2017). Classroom instructions should contain the activities that prepare English learners to use English not only in monolingual settings but also in multilingual and intercultural contexts. To achieve this change, the proposal to implement the GELT ideology has been proposed, offering a novel perspective to ELT. Questioning the monolingual dogma of language learning and one set of ways of communicating, GELT admits that the learners should be competent to adjust the communication according to the contexts and interlocutors (Rose & Galloway, 2019).

Nevertheless, all the participants acknowledged that the inclusion of learners' local culture, context, materials, methods in ELT, and contextualization of "sociolinguistic realities" (Sadeghpour, 2020, p. 122) is imperative, but they were disappointed as it was not executed yet in Bangladesh. According to Kumaravadivelu (2003), ELT needs to be conducted based on the learners' local context for effective English language development. This context-sensitive teaching addresses the sociocultural reality of the learners by acknowledging their personalities and identities. While Kumaravadivelu's (2003) post-method pedagogy does not explicitly discuss the suitability of GELT, it challenges the exonormative norms of ELT (Fang & Ren, 2018), echoing one of the goals of GELT. The participants also reported that ELT instructional materials including textbooks exclude local culture and endorse the contexts of the UK and USA. This is one of the severe challenges to implement GELT in the context of Bangladesh, the other being a dearth of GELT-informed teacher education (Galloway, 2017).

This study likewise revealed that the teachers had ambivalent perceptions about SAEs. While all the participants stated that SAEs exist (Crystal, 2012; Jenkins, 2015), some doubted their legitimacy in myriad international platforms such as the international English language proficiency test IELTS. This result is in line with previous findings (Ahn, 2015; Lee et al., 2019; Monfared, 2020) in which teachers repudiated WE norms in ELT and English language proficiency tests, disbelieving their legitimacy. Similarly, teachers who admitted the legitimacy of SAEs felt comfortable using them in ELT as their students comprehended the content taught better. Specifically, teachers favored using Bangladeshi English (i.e., Bangladeshi culture, traditions, and values) in the teaching of English. Avoiding native speaker English expressions which are inappropriate for Bangladeshi English learners such as idioms while teaching English, the teachers contextualized materials and methods (Kumaravadivelu, 2003) in the classroom. For instance, one of the participants articulated; *'I have seen some of the Bangladeshi people saying, 'it's not your cup of tea.' 'Cup of tea' is not a Bangladeshi expression. I avoid these kinds of things.'* It suggests that if teachers initiate shifting from Inner Circle English language teaching norms to local and contextualized instructional plans (Boonsuk et al., 2021), it will assist to implement GELT in Bangladesh.

Without identifying the significance of introducing GEs to English learners, some teachers noted that they used Bangladeshi English or SAEs in the classroom on account of students' incompetence in the English language. This is because students came from rural areas of Bangladesh where they were not educated in the English medium schools and colleges. And they did not understand the content in the classroom delivered entirely in English. This suggests that teachers themselves should be facilitated with GE-informed teacher education (Matsuda, 2003) to make them aware and familiarize students with GE-oriented ELT. Tardy et al. (2021) argues after successfully designing and offering GELT-informed academic writing course to students at the university that although developing appropriate GELT-informed content is laborious, GELT-informed instruction helped students to recognize their multilingual identity as an asset for writing development and to reconsider their perceptions about English and Englishes.

The findings also illustrated that the participants defined GEs as the varieties of English used differently with linguistic and pragmatic variations around the globe for communication in multilingual and diverse contexts (Baratta, 2019; Jenkins, 2015; Rose & Galloway, 2019; Saraceni, 2015). They also exemplified English varieties as South Asian Englishes, African Englishes, Australian English, Englishes in the Middle East, and Singapore English. While participants recognized an emergence of GEs, most of them exposed prejudices about Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes preferring Inner Circle Englishes (Lim, 2020). Since teachers' attitudes toward the use of GEs in ELT influence overall ELT practices in the classroom, supporting teachers with GE-centered awareness programs and preparing them to design and deliver GE-specific English language materials and instruction seems worthwhile (Solmaz, 2020) in Bangladesh.

As a part of another finding regarding platforms the participants got to be introduced with the GE scholarship, they enunciated that the courses such as sociolinguistics, literature, and language they took at the universities provided exposure. Familiarizing teachers late (e.g., at the university level) with GE-scholarship is one of the challenges of GE-inclusive ELT implementation in the classroom. Teachers would have had positive attitudes toward GEs, if they were educated at least in one GE-specific course in the early level of their education, for example, high school.

Finally, the study demonstrated that teachers never had the opportunities to participate in the GE-oriented teacher professional development (TPD) programs such as workshops, conferences, seminars, and teacher training either at the national or international platforms. This dearth of GE-informed TPD opportunities might have brought negative attitudes in participants towards GEs. To fulfill this void, the ELT policymakers, teacher educators, and language professionals need to conduct GE-informed deliberations and proceedings in TESOL such as teacher education or teacher professional development programs (Matsuda, 2003; Sadeghpour, 2020; Widodo et al., 2020) to raise teachers' awareness to multiple identities of English in a multilingual world. The teachers then transfer it to the students. This helps students acquire strategies and skills to adapt themselves to various English language users from varied communities in the global contexts (Rose & Galloway, 2019). Regarding Bangladesh, mainstream teacher education needs to be addressed with altering realism of English and its use rather than relying on the rigid and conventional presumptions of English language teaching and learning (Hamid & Hasan, 2020). Moreover, to put GELT into implementation, the entire TESOL curriculum and its discussions are to be renovated providing suitable materials and techniques to the teachers to introduce and execute GEs in the classroom (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020). Studying teachers' pedagogical practices in their teaching contexts, a plethora of explorations need to be conducted in teacher education highlighting how teachers could incorporate GELT into the current curricula (Galloway & Rose, 2021).

Conclusion

Results of the study revealed that participants repudiated the use of GE-informed ELT. Preferring the use of the native speaker model in the classroom, participants doubted and questioned the legitimacy of SAEs (Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017) in academic contexts. As expressed, GEs are not permitted in the international English language testing system such as IELTS, so the participants made reservations toward introducing GE to their students. However, findings exposed that the participants favored inclusion of local culture, materials, and methodologies in ELT but English textbooks and curriculum in Bangladesh exclude them, as results showed. Teacher participants also articulated they never got opportunities to attend GE-specific teacher professional development events; nevertheless, they aspired to participate, if they got opportunities.

References

Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes, 33*(2), 195–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12081

Ahn, H. (2015). Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: A study of English teachers in South Korea. *Asian Englishes, 17*(2), 132–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.1036602

Ara, R. (2020). A foreign language or the second language: The future of English in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Language Education*, *4*(1), 81–95.

Arafat, S. M., & Mehnaaz, S. R. (2020). History of English Teaching in Bangladesh: From inception to present practice. *International Journal of Science and Business*, *4*(5), 50–56.

Baratta, A. (2019). *World Englishes in English language teaching.* Palgrave Macmillan.

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. https://doi-org.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/10.1080/13488678.2019.1669302

Boonsuk, Y., Ambele, E. A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Developing awareness of Global Englishes: Moving away from 'native standards' for Thai university ELT. *System,* 99, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102511

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

Colmenero, K., & Lasagabaster, D. (2020). Enclosing native speakerism: Students', parents' and teachers' perceptions of language teachers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1865384

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

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

Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). "Using all English is not always meaningful": Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua,* 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959

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

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

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

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2021). The global spread of English and global Englishes language teaching. In A. Fuad & B. Yazan (Eds.), *Language teacher education for lobal Englishes: A practical resource book,* (pp. 11–19). Routledge.

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next* (Vol. 62). British Council.

Halliday, M. A. K., McIntosh, A., & Strevens P. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching*. Longman.

Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf, R. B. (2014). Public-private domain distinction as an aspect of LPP frameworks: A case study of Bangladesh. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 38*(2), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.38.2.05ham

Hamid, M. O., & Hasan, M. M. (2020). Bangladeshi English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The Handbook of Asian Englishes*, (pp. 298–315). John Wiley & Sons, In.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

Hossain, T., & Tollefson, J.W. (2007). Language policy in education in Bangladesh. In A. B. Tsui & J. W. Tollefson (Eds.), *Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian Contexts*, (pp. 241–258). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jenkins, J. (1998). Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an international language? *ELT Journal, 52*(2), 119–126.

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

Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standard, 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. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). Reliability in content analysis: Some common misconceptions and recommendations. *Human Communication Research, 30*(3), 411–433. https://doi.org/10.1111/ j.1468-2958.2004.tb00738.x

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). A Postmethod Perspective on English Language Teaching. *World Englishes, 22*(4), 539–550. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00317.x

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

Lim, S. (2020). A critical analysis of Cambodian teachers' cognition about World Englishes and English language teaching. *Asian Englishes, 22*(1), 85–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2019. 1645994

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating World Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 719–729. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588220

Matsuda, A. (2019). World Englishes in English language teaching: Kachru's six fallacies and the TEIL paradigm. *World Englishes, 38*(1–2), 144–154. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12368

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

Monfared, A. (2020). Equity or equality: Outer and expanding circle teachers' awareness of and attitudes towards World Englishes and international proficiency tests. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1783542

Nelson, C. L. (1992). My language, your culture: Whose communicative competence? In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures*, (pp. 327–339). University of Illinois Press.

Nelson, C. L. (2012). *Intelligibility in World Englishes: Theory and application*. Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows.* Routledge.

Rahman, M., & Pandian, A. (2018). A Critical Investigation of English Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Unfulfilled expectations after two decades of Communicative Language Teaching. *English Today, 34*(3), 43–49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841700061X

Rahman, M., Islam, M., Karim, A., Chowdhury, T., Rahman, M., Seraj, P., & Singh, M. (2019). English language teaching in Bangladesh today: Issues, outcomes and implications. *Language Testing in Asia, 9*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0085-8

Rahman, T. (2010). A multilingual language-in-education policy for indigenous minorities in Bangladesh: Challenges and possibilities. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 11*(4), 37–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2010.537816

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

Rose, H., McKinley, J. and Galloway, N. (2021) Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching, 54*(2), 157-189. doi: 10.1017/S0261444820000518

Sadeghpour, M. (2020). *Englishes in English language teaching*. Routledge.

Sadeghpour, M., & Sharifian, F. (2017). English language teachers' perceptions of world Englishes: The elephants in the room. *Asian Englishes, 19(3), 242–258.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1362782

Sadeghpour, M., & Sharifian, F. (2019). World Englishes in English language teaching: Sadeghpour and Sharifian. World Englishes, 38(1–2), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12372

Sah, P., & Li, G. (2020). Translanguaging or unequal languaging? Unfolding the plurilingual discourse of English medium instruction policy in Nepal's public schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1849011

Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: A critical analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The Case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 133–158. https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00011

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

Seidlhofer, B. (2012). Anglophone-centric attitudes and the globalization of English. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1*(2), 393–407. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0026

Solmaz, O. (2020). World Englishes instruction in an ELT department in Turkey: Student teachers' reflections. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *12*(2), 474-493.

Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2018). Idealized native-speaker linguistic and pragmatic norms in English as an international language: Exploring the perceptions of nonnative English teachers. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 18*(3), 300–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2017.1413105

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

Tardy, C. M., Reed, K., Slinkard, J. R., & LaMance, R. (2021). Exploring Global Englishes content and language variation in an academic writing course. *TESOL Journal, 12*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.520

Tarrayo, V. N., Ulla, M. B., & Lekwilai, P. (2021). Perceptions toward Thai English: A study of university English language teachers in Thailand. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2021.1919113

van Manen, M. (2016). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Routledge.

Widodo, H. P., Fang, F., & Elyas, T. (2020). The construction of language teacher professional identity in the Global Englishes territory: "We are legitimate language teachers." *Asian Englishes, 22*(3), 309–316. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1732683

Zhang, X. (2021). Investigating student teachers' perceptions of English as a lingua franca and its teaching in Mainland China. *Asian Englishes,* 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1926647

About the Author

Binod Dhami is an adjunct faculty in the department of English at Minnesota State University, USA. He teaches writing composition courses. Global Englishes language teaching, L2 writing, TESOL methods, language and identity are his research interests. Currently, he is exploring Nepali English teachers' and students' perceptions toward the use of Global Englishes.