

Article



<http://doi.org/10.52696/FCMN1154>

Reprints and permission:
The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association
Corresponding Author:
Binod Dhama bdhama@asu.edu

Nepali English Teachers' Perceptions Towards Global Englishes in ELT

Binod Dhama
Department of English
Arizona State University, USA

ABSTRACT

Traditional English language teaching (ELT) goals have been questioned by advocating Global Englishes language teaching (GELT). To execute GELT, understanding English language teachers' perceptions toward Global Englishes (GEs) is imperative as teachers' beliefs determine pedagogical practices. Although numerous studies have explored English language teachers' perceptions of GEs around the globe, there is a dearth of empirical research in Nepal. Thus, this study explores the perceptions of Nepali English language teachers towards GEs in ELT. Employing a purposive sampling method, 25 Nepali English language teachers in Nepal were interviewed, using semi-structured interviews. The interviews were transcribed verbatim, and transcriptions were coded using (van Manen, 2016) to generate themes and to interpret data. Results indicated that the teachers were aware of an emergence of GEs and considered the use of GEs in ELT beneficial. They also admitted that the exposure to GEs provides English language learners with exposure for communicating with the users of varieties of English in this multilingual and multicultural world. Furthermore, the participants anticipated attending GE-inclusive teacher professional development (TPD) such as conferences, workshops, and GE-aware online courses. Highlighting the necessity of GE-informed TPD programs for teachers, the participants also aspired to be involved in GE-inclusive deliberations on the topics such as the emergence of new Englishes, GE-oriented workshops, and talk shows on the use of GEs in ELT.

KEYWORDS: Global Englishes, GE-inclusive ELT, Nepali English language teachers' perceptions, Global Englishes language teaching, teacher professional development, South Asian Englishes

Introduction

Baraj Kachru and Larry Smith first introduced the concept of World Englishes (WEs) as the linguistic and sociolinguistic disciplines of investigation in the 1970s and 1980s (Galloway, 2017; Rose & Galloway, 2019). Since then, several other concepts have been proposed to define English with plurality, such as the varieties of English, international Englishes, new Englishes, English

languages, and GEs (Bolton, 2012). However, the horizon of WEs scholarship expanded from Kachru's (1985) work in which he proposed three circles of Englishes, by presenting WEs as the varieties of English used in different sociolinguistic circumstances with diverse forms and functions. The concept of WEs emphasizes how different Englishes are used around the globe, shaping multiple identities of its users (McArthur, 1993). Initially, English was spread (its spread was political and intentional, as Robert Phillipson often argues) almost all over the world, for example, through Anglophone colonization, and later the English language was established into multiple forms with unique functions as it encountered different L1s used around the globe (Schneider, 2011) resulting in varieties of English.

Englishes used in various geographical territories are categorized into three concentric circles: the Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle (Kachru, 1985). Kachru's Inner Circle refers to English-speaking countries such as the UK, USA, Canada, Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand where English is the primary language (Crystal, 2012). English remains the main language of politics and education in these nations (Nelson, 2012). Most of the people in these countries speak English as their mother tongue (Schneider, 2011). The Outer Circle includes the countries such as India, Singapore, Malawi, and fifty other regions in which English is used as a second language in the multilingual setting (Crystal, 2012) and in domains like education, legislature, and judiciary. In the South Asian educational landscape, for example, English is not only studied as a subject but also as a medium of curricular instruction (Lee & Jun, 2016; Nelson, 2012; Sah, 2020). Similarly, the Expanding Circle includes the countries in which English is used for international communication. China, and Japan, to name a few, fall under this Circle, in which English is taught and learned as a foreign language (Crystal, 2012; Schneider, 2011).

Over the years, different concepts such as WEs, English as a lingua franca (ELF), GEs, and English as an international language (EIL) have been used and explored to capture the spread of English as a global language in applied linguistics. Albeit these paradigms appeared with somewhat distinct emphasis from the research, they all share more common assumptions than differences about the use of the English language (Rose et al., 2020). For example, they all position English as a universally possessed language with plurality and diversity of its uses and users. All these notions also assume that learners should learn the English language to communicate with multilingual users of Englishes which embrace multiple sociolinguistic realities rather than following a so-called native speaker model (Matsuda, 2019). Thus, the GEs paradigm will be used throughout this article to encompass ELF, WEs, and EIL. The purpose of teaching and learning English according to GEs approach is to provide learners exposure to various Englishes and their users by making them aware of the differences those varieties and users bring. Moreover, it assumes learners accomplish communication strategies that can be applied for negotiating meaning while communicating with interlocutors of varieties of English (Galloway & Rose, 2021; Kirkpatrick, 2021; Matsuda, 2019; Rose & Galloway, 2019). GEs further believes that the learners succeed to express in English when they learn English in their context, culture, and community, not necessarily following a particular English. Moreover, native speaker or standard English models are irrelevant beyond their cultural foundation, instead, English of the territory where English language teaching and learning happens to be used by replacing the native speaker model (Saraceni, 2015). While GEs scholars advocate for GELT to prepare English learners for global use of English with diverse interlocutors, English language education is still dominated by traditional ELT ideologies which are mostly informed by the Western philosophy of ELT that

assumes English learners develop English like a native speaker (Jindapitak et al., 2022). The studies in different parts of the globe discover that providing teachers with exposure to GEs helps them to discard the rigid notion of standard English language teaching, interrogating a monolithic ideology of ELT (Rose & Galloway, 2019). However, no evident empirical research is available on understanding Nepali English teachers' perceptions about GEs in ELT due to a deficiency of investigation in the context of Nepal. Against this background, this study explores answers to the following questions:

- a) How do Nepali English language teachers perceive the use of GEs in ELT in Nepal?
- b) How might teachers' perceptions about GEs inform teacher professional development (TPD)?

Teachers' Perceptions Towards Global Englishes

Teachers' beliefs regulate their teaching and learning plans and decisions in the classroom (Galloway, 2017; Kirkpatrick, 2021; Rose & Galloway, 2019). Thus, this section showcases findings from some of the previous studies conducted to explore teachers' perceptions about GEs.

The research shows that English language teachers have ambivalent opinions about embracing GEs in their teaching of English (Ahn, 2015; Tarrayo et al., 2021). While teachers acknowledge the existence of new varieties of English, they seem reluctant to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Expanding Circle Englishes (Sadeghpour, & Sharifian, 2017). Research also shows that teachers don't accredit Asian Englishes such as Indian, Singaporean, Chinese, and Japanese. One of the main reasons to lead teachers towards intolerance and negative attitudes about GEs causing them to shut their ears to a variety of Englishes is a lack of awareness and exposure to different Englishes (Ahn, 2015). Similarly, the study conducted in Bangladesh reveals that the university teachers hesitate to use regional varieties such as South Asian Englishes (SAEs) in ELT considering that these varieties lack legitimacy in academia. Teachers also believe that international English language testing system such as IELTS does not test students' English language proficiency based on regional Englishes. That's why they prefer to use Inner Circle English in their ELT (Dhami, 2022). However, teachers in some contexts such as Thailand and Japan seem flexible to use GEs. Teachers in these contexts not only prefer to use GEs in their teaching of English but also emphasize that English language teaching and learning materials such as coursebooks should aim to introduce students to GEs (Takahashi, 2017; Tarrayo et al., 2021). This indicates that teachers expose ownership of the English that they use (Lee, et al., 2019; Widdowson, 1994) disregarding native speaker ideology (Holliday, 2006) which is an essential aspect of achieving proficiency in English. While developing and attaining English language competence, the learners create their 'own version of English in their minds, hearts, and behaviors whether they are aware of it or not' (Kohn, 2022, p. 3). Considering this reality, teachers' positive attitude towards the GEs certainly plays a crucial role in introducing English language learners to the diverse nature of English. Nevertheless, the research in different contexts reveals that even teachers seem reluctant to use regional Englishes or their own English in ELT, questioning the legitimacy of GEs in academia (Dhami, 2022; Sadeghpour, 2019; Tarrayo et al., 2021). Teachers' reluctance to include GEs in ELT demands their engagement in GE-informed teacher professional development (TPD), which comprises GE-oriented workshops, conferences, and seminars (Cecen

& Tuluce, 2019; Eslami et al., 2019). Teachers then can train learners of English based on how they can be mutually intelligible while communicating with interlocutors, rather than training English language learners on a particular model of English (Kang, 2015; Luo, 2017). This is because English embraces several varieties with diversity. Acknowledging the legitimacy and standardness of varieties of English in their contexts, people from different multicultural and multiethnic communities use them efficiently (Matsuda, 2018). Although teachers express ambivalent opinions about the inclusion of GEs in ELT, the GEs scholars (e. g., Galloway & Numajiri, 2020; Matsuda, 2020; Sharifan, 2013) suggest the benefits of GE-inclusive ELT. With this awareness teachers develop confidence in using the English language “avoiding judging others based on linguistic variation, redefining the language learning goal and reconceptualizing the ideal instructional model” (Jindapitak et al., 2022, p. 11).

Study Methodology

This qualitative study employed semi-structured individual interviews for data collection. Twenty-five Nepali English language teachers were interviewed online through Zoom. The interviews comprised of open-ended items. The first part of the interview items was used to extract demographic information of the participants such as teaching experience in years, languages they knew, highest educational qualification, schools, and level they taught. Likewise, the second part consisted of the items that aimed to obtain teachers' perceptions on relevancy of GEs in ELT including SAEs, standard English ideology, and GE-informed teacher professional development programs. The interviews lasted about 30 to 40 minutes depending on individual teachers' responses and follow-up discussions. The participants were recruited through Nepal English language teachers' association (NELTA). In so doing, a recruitment email with the consent form was sent to the president of NELTA, and the president forwarded it to the English teachers who participated in teacher professional development programs such as conferences, workshops, and seminars organized by NELTA. The recruitment email also shared the purpose of the study and requirements for participation. The recruitment email was sent to a total of 50 English language teachers, however, 25 of them participated in the interview process. At the time of data collection, the participants ranged from 22 to 46 years of age, and approximately 1 year to 23 years of ELT experience from elementary to university level. Nonetheless, all the teachers were teaching at high schools and universities at the time of the study.

Nepal is a linguistically diverse country with 130 living languages. This linguistic diversity facilitates Nepalese societies with multilingual resources (Poudel & Baral, 2021). It seems common in a multilingual country like Nepal where people are proficient in more than one language. Nepali is an official and most widely used language in Nepal whereas English is extensively employed in academics (Giri, 2020). Thus, Nepali and English languages were chosen as the languages of the interview. The participants used Nepali and English during the interview although participants spoke different first languages such as Nepali, Maithili, Magar, Gurung, Doteli, Newari, Tharu, and Chureti. Therefore, the interviews were conducted in Nepali and in English considering participants' comfortability with using languages. While most of the participants obtained their master's and bachelor's degrees in English language education, others

attained their M. Phil. and Ph.D. To maintain the confidentiality of the participants, pseudonyms were used to incorporate extracts from the interviews.

Data Analysis and Procedures

The interviews were conducted through Zoom and transcribed verbatim. The focus of the study was on the information the participants shared through interview content. Thus, suprasegmental features such as facial expression, intonation, and pause were not included in the transcription of the interviews. Then, all the transcriptions were read, re-read, and checked repeatedly including words, phrases, and sentences (van Manen, 2016). The transcriptions were then manually coded by reading them from beginning to the end on the Microsoft Word files. While developing codes, the reoccurring significant and salient ideas, and concepts, associated with research questions were highlighted with different colors in the transcriptions. After that, the highlighted ideas and concepts were assigned short and appropriate codes throughout the transcriptions. A deductive or bottom-up coding approach in which codes are derived from the information (Boonsuk & Ambele, 2020) or from the transcriptions after a series of readthroughs was used. The codes were sorted out into groups. These emerged groups of codes were combined to develop overarching themes by reading the transcripts over again and checking for their accuracy with the initial codes to examine their interrelationship. For example, many Englishes, varieties of English, regional varieties, global varieties of English, and phonological and grammatical differences, were the phrases found significant and reoccurring from the transcripts as participants defined GEs. Therefore, these phrases or codes were grouped under one theme called 'teachers' understanding of GEs' to discuss participants' perceptions about GEs2.

Research Findings

Findings of the study brought out through an analysis of the data are presented under four themes: (1) teachers' understanding of GEs; (2) teachers' perceptions about standard English; (3) teachers' perceptions about South Asian Englishes; and (4) teachers' perceptions about GE-informed teacher education.

A. Teachers' Understanding of GEs

The interview was initiated with the first guiding question, by asking the teacher participants what the GEs scholarship meant to them. The participants defined GEs as the varieties of English language developed around the globe. Nevertheless, the participants employed different terms such as many Englishes, regional varieties, global varieties of English, and varieties of English to define GEs. Riya, as stated in the interview, used the terms global varieties of English to define GEs:

In my conception, Global Englishes includes the global varieties of English. The English language is spoken and written differently by people in different regions of the world.

Similarly, highlighting the use of English that is situationally appropriate and intelligible to interlocuters, Manab makes the following remarks while asked to define GEs:

Getting ideas on different varieties of English and using English that best suits the context and that can be comprehensible is known as Global Englishes for me. There are so many varieties of English that can be used, not only American and British ones.

Furthermore, as Englishes develop in different parts of the world, they bring values and traditions of a particular community along with linguistic variations. Richa's statement on defining GEs illustrates this view:

There are different varieties of English language in the world, and they have their own cultural and sociolinguistic features based on the society they are used. There are regional varieties of English that are distinctive in terms of the phonological, grammatical, and other features of the language.

Providing examples of Chinese, Indian, British, and American Englishes to exemplify GEs, Sabin also discussed variations in pronunciation, graphics, and use of English while defining GEs. The participants also argued that the GEs are varieties of the English language with users' ownership. Rima articulated that:

English is not the language owned by some speakers of a specific region rather it is the language of the world having many varieties.

B. Teachers' Perceptions About Standard English

This section presents the concept of standardness of English associated with American and British English as perceived by the participants. Most of the participants (20 out of 25) rejected the notion of native speaker ideology. The participants reported that the English language needs to be learned as a tool for communication to be used for global communication, rather than learning a certain form of English. An instance of this opposition was observed with Raju during the interview:

English has been a global language and is modified based on the need of the people who are using it. So, learning its use as a means of communication is more important than its standard form.

Additionally, in the following passage, Janak attempted to describe English as an international language, not necessarily the language of an American and a British, emphasizing that the English language contains multiple varieties with multiple identities:

English is not the language spoken by American and British people and it is the international language. So, there are varieties of it. No one can copy and paste others' tongues rather they have their own identity on it.

Likewise, some of the participants also admitted that the English language is not confined to a particular nation, country, or group of people, it has gained several varieties around the world.

Hence, if learners are aware of all those varieties, then only they can have effective communication in English. In this context, the role of an English language teacher is to make learners aware of different varieties.

Furthermore, disregarding the notion of native-speaker English, Sarita, in the interview, expressed that if the learners are obliged to follow a certain variety of English, they get demotivated to learn English:

Asking English language learners to learn a certain variety of English language is not beneficial, because there are many varieties of English. If we force the learners to use a particular variety, they will be discouraged to learn the English language.

The responses to the follow-up questions showed that the learners do not learn English out of their contexts. The foremost shortcoming of abandoning learners from the opportunities to be exposed to many Englishes is that one English is not sufficient in all contexts and situations. For example, Sangam illuminated that:

When students attempt to learn a particular variety, they lose their own variety. Consequently, they neither master the new variety nor retain their own unique variety. Also, learning a particular variety does not function in all contexts.

On the other hand, two participants viewed American or British English as a model for the students to learn the English language. When asked for further explanation about why they considered American or British English appropriate models to employ in the classroom, Anand explained:

Learners feel easier if they learn only one English. Otherwise, exposure to many Englishes increases the probability of confusion among the learners about which English systems are to be followed.

C. Teachers' perceptions of South Asian Englishes

In the following section on using South Asian Englishes (SAEs) in ELT, teacher participants were asked to express their opinions about the use of SAEs such as Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and Sri Lankan Englishes, and Nepali English in the teaching of English. In the interviews, most of the participants (18 out of 25) admitted that the use of Asian Englishes in ELT is advantageous. This emerged in a response from Richa who expressed that:

Teaching in Asian Englishes facilitates students with a better understanding of the content delivered in the classroom. This is because Asian Englishes contain Asian English language systems (i.e., grammar, vocabularies, pronunciation), culture, and local identities. Thus, students learn effectively through the language that they are comfortable and familiar with.

Moreover, the participants in the interview revealed that the students acquire self-assurance, and develop self-esteem if regional Englishes or SAEs are used in the class. High self-esteem inspires

and motivates them to comprehend the content in English and develop English. For instance, Anil's statement on the advantages of using SAEs in the classroom demonstrates this interpretation:

When the students use their variety [South Asian Englishes] in their class, they feel natural and confident. Additionally, they feel that their variety is recognized by the teacher and their variety is not subordinate. This sort of classroom practice implicitly empowers the students in the class. When I use a regional variety of English, I find myself being able to make my learners understand the content well.

Furthermore, teachers expressed several reasons why regional Englishes, including English spoken in Nepal, are beneficial for the students in the class. First, teachers have Asian English since they were taught in the same English, which is easy to use. Second, students feel comfortable in regional Englishes since they embrace familiar contexts, tone, and vocabularies.

However, exhibiting an antipathy towards the use of SAEs in the classroom, some participants (7 out of 25) repudiated the legitimacy of SAEs. When asked why SAEs cannot be legitimate and used in the teaching of English, Prabin, advocating for one ideal or standard English in academia articulated:

There should be an ideal English that everyone follows. For communication, any variety will work but for academia, a standard variety must be chosen to bring uniformity.

Reiterating Prabin's opinion about the use of SAEs, Rajani noted:

I don't like to use local or regional English language because I have learned British and American English. Moreover, I have taught and practiced for two decades in a private boarding school.

Rajani was further asked to clarify where she studied British and American English. She mentioned that she learned them in her textbooks while she was pursuing her school and higher education in Nepal. Furthermore, Rajani expressed that she had been teaching in a private boarding school for a long time, where English serves as a medium of instruction, therefore; she disallowed the use of regional Englishes in her classroom.

D. Teachers' Perceptions About GE-informed Teacher Education

The participants were asked if they attended any GE-informed teacher professional development (TPD) programs. At multiple instances throughout the interviews, all the participants articulated that they did not attend any GE-informed TPD programs. However, they indicated a necessity of GE-informed TPD programs such as seminars, conferences, workshops, and training events to effectively conduct GE awareness activities in class. An example of such belief emerged in the interview with Prabin, who admitted that:

Teachers are the main advocates and ambassadors to employ any innovation successfully in their classroom. That's why teachers need to be provided with GE-related training first. Regular training and workshops should be available to them. For example, I do not

remember attending any training or conference session in Nepal on Global Englishes and their benefits although I know that Global Englishes pedagogy prepares my students to speak with different users of Englishes.

Similarly, shedding light on the importance of GE-informed TPD events for disseminating information about GEs and introducing GEs in the English classrooms, Diya also averred that:

Numerous professional development opportunities, for instance, training, workshops, online courses, webinars, seminars, conferences, and so forth may benefit the teachers to articulate the concept of Global Englishes in their classroom contexts.

Some participants discussed the topics that could be included in GE-informed teacher education programs such as the emergence of new Englishes, talk programs on GEs, workshops on the possibilities and use of GEs, and practical activity-based sessions on GELT.

Discussion

This study explored the perceptions of Nepali English language teachers about the use of GEs in ELT in Nepal. The study also explored how those perceptions of teachers informed TPD. Overall, it was found that teacher participants were aware of the GEs. Defining GEs as the varieties of English with phonological, linguistic, syntactic, and sociolinguistic variations, the participants reported that the one who uses English has ownership of the English language. This finding is consistent with prior research conducted by (Lee, et al., 2019) who found teachers' greater level of possession of the English they used. Moreover, most of the participants unveiled positive attitudes toward the use of GEs in ELT, echoing previous studies (Tarrayo et al., 2021; Takahashi, 2017) in which results reveal, that the teachers in Japan and Thailand preferred to afford exposure of GEs to the English language learners. Contrastively, this finding does not corroborate with the findings of previous research studies (Dhami, 2022; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017) where teachers repudiated the emergence and legitimacy of GEs.

Disclaiming an ideology of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006) in ELT, teachers were rather comfortable with using SAEs or regional Englishes. Teacher participants also reported that their students comprehended content better in SAEs because they contained familiar vocabularies, grammar, and learners' identity and culture. This result facilitates the call to embrace GELT, a paradigm shift in the global ELT, proposed by GE scholars Galloway and Rose (2015) and Galloway (2017). The objectives of GELT are (a) teaching English by considering reciprocal intelligibility and understanding among the English language users as opposed to teaching a dominant variety of English; (b) promoting 'plurilingual competencies, not a native speaker competence' (p. xiii). This sort of ELT curricula prepares English language learners for multilingual (Kirkpatrick, 2007), global (Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2015), and intercultural communication.

Drawing on the findings from data analysis, participants viewed teaching English as a global and international language (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011) in which learners are anticipated to learn to

communicate with the interlocutors of various Englishes than teaching standard English (i. e., British or American). If learners are obligated to follow a certain variety of English in the classroom, they get demotivated to learn English and they lose their identity and culture associated with language, as the participants reported. Thus, a wise move in this context is to allow learners to follow endonormative language norms to develop the English language. While many teachers get perplexed in selecting a variety of English for ELT, the best way to do so is to scrutinize if that meets educational and students' needs, based on teachers' expertise, and their perceptions about a certain variety of English (Matsuda, 2020). SAEs seem the best fit for ELT in Nepal, as students and teachers feel confident, depending on what data analysis informed. Additionally, the teachers should aim to make the English language learners aware of GEs for the negotiation of meaning in multilingual communities. This does not necessarily necessitate learners and teachers to develop productive skills in all varieties of English used around the world (Canagarajah, 2006), but it can be achieved by emphasizing respect for diverse cultures and identities in ELT (Galloway and Rose, 2015). The participants were found mindful of the fact that learning one variety of English does not work in all contexts supporting the argument made in a prior study by Eslami et al. (2019). Eslami et al. (2019) argue after implementing GE-informed activities and exploring pre-service teachers' perceptions about the relevancy of GE-informed activities that standard English does not even exist in the United States.

While exploring teachers' perceptions towards GEs is obvious to implement GE-oriented pedagogical practices, understanding how these observations impact TPD such as conferences, workshops, seminars, and training, remains significant as well. The participants in this study narrated that they did not get opportunities to participate in the GE-related TPD programs in Nepal. Only GE-inclusive introductory classes and courses are being offered in some teacher education programs in the universities (Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017), as participants expressed. These courses may help teachers understand some concepts of GEs and increase their awareness of the diversities of Englishes and challenge the notion of standard English ideology (Galloway, 2017). However, these teacher education courses offered in the universities and deliberations held at the conferences, training, and workshops on national and international platforms were not accessible for most of the teachers in the context of Nepal. Since GEs assumes to prepare English language learners to be able to use English in a multilingual and diverse setting, training teachers on how to implement GEs in the class is a prerequisite (Hamid et al., 2021). Therefore, it seems significant to organize teacher training locally for the teachers of all levels, not necessarily constraining them in the university courses only. Accessibility to TPD programs aids both teachers and students to broaden GE-awareness, resulting in positive reflections on their perceptions (Cecen & Tuluçe, 2019; Kang, 2015; Luo, 2017). Results in this study also unveiled that the participants demanded GE-informed teacher education such as conferences, workshops, seminars, and training events, which may include various talk shows on opportunities and possibilities of implementing GEs in ELT.

Conclusion

Exploring English language teachers' perceptions about the use of GEs in their teaching of English in Nepal, this study seeks how teachers' perceptions towards GEs inform teacher education and

TPD. The finding in the study discovered that English language teachers defined GEs as the diversities of English language used by different people around the world with linguistic, syntactic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic variations. Moreover, the results showed that the teachers repudiated an ideology of teaching and learning native-speaker English (Tarrayo et al., 2021). Teachers believed that the use of SAEs or regional Englishes in ELT helps English language learners understand subject matter better as regional Englishes incorporate familiar syntax, lexicons, phonology, and sociolinguistic features (Kohn, 2022) to learners that suit the context. Importantly, participants in the present study expressed that GE-inclusive TPD, and awareness programs were not accessible to them, although they desired to participate. To this end, GE-oriented programs need to be made available (Matsuda, 2017) to broader population of the teachers to implement GELT in Nepal. Moreover, delivering scholarly attention to GE-incorporated material development and introducing hands-on activities and tasks (Eslami et al., 2019; Galloway, 2017) in ELT curricula and TPD, GE integrated teaching of English (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020; Galloway & Rose, 2017) can be accomplished in Nepal.

References

- Ahn, H. (2015). Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: A study of English teachers in South Korea. *Asian Englishes*, 17(2), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.1036602>
- Bolton, K. (2012). World Englishes and Asian Englishes: A survey of the field. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 13–26). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4578-0_2
- 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/10.1080/13488678.2019.1669302>
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(3), 229–242. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15434311laq0303_1
- Cecen, S., & Tuluçe, H. (2019). An investigation of pre-service EFL teachers' attitudes towards speakers from three circles of English. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(1), 123–139. <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/891/450>
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139196970>
- Dhami, B. (2022). Global Englishes in ELT: Unpacking university English teachers' perceptions in Bangladesh. *THAITESOL Journal*, 35(1), 91–112.
- Eslami, Z., Moody, S., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2019). Educating pre-service teachers about world Englishes: Instructional activities and teachers' perceptions. *TESL-EJ*, 22(4), 1–17.
- Galloway, N. (2017). *Global Englishes and change in English language teaching: Attitudes and impact*. Taylor & Francis.
- Galloway, N. & Rose, H. (2021). The global spread of English and Global Englishes language teaching. In A. F. Selvi, & B. Yazan (Eds.), *Language teacher education for Global Englishes: A practical resource book* (pp.11–19). 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. (2017). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010>
- Giri, R. A. (2020). Nepali English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 318-336). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hamid, M. O., Hoang, N. T. H., & Nguyen, T. T. T. (2021). Changing teacher learners' language ideologies and pedagogical practices: An action research intervention in World Englishes. *Asian Englishes*, 24(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1914898>
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal* 60(4), 385-387.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students*. New York.
- Jindapitak, N., Teo, A., & Savski, K. (2022). Bringing Global Englishes to the ELT classroom: English language learners' reflections. *Asian Englishes*, 24(3), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2033910>
- 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.
- Kang, O. (2015). Learners' perceptions toward pronunciation instruction in three circles of world Englishes. *TESOL Journal*, 6(1), 59-80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.146>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2021). Teaching about World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. In A. Onysko (Ed.), *Research developments in World Englishes* (pp. 251-269). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kohn, K. (2022). Global Englishes and the pedagogical challenge of developing one's own voice. *Asian Englishes*, 24(2), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2056795>
- Lee, J. S., Lee, K., & Nur Arifah Drajadi. (2019). Preservice English teachers' perceptions of English as an international language in Indonesia and Korea. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(3), 230-243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1503669>
- Lee, Y. H., & Jun, K. S. (2016). The inner circle vs. the outer circle or British English vs. American English. *Proceedings of the 30th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 339-346.
- Luo, W. H. (2017). Teacher perceptions of teaching and learning English as a lingua franca in the expanding circle: A study of Taiwan. *English Today*, 33(1), 2-11. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078416000146>
- Matsuda, A. (2018). Is teaching English as an international language all about being politically correct? *RELC Journal*, 49(1), 24-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217753489>
- 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. (2020). World Englishes and Pedagogy. In C. L. Nelson, Z. G. Proshina, & D. R. Davis (Eds.). In *The handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 686-702). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 332-344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01717.x>

- McArthur, T. (1993). The English language or the English languages. *The English Language*, 10, 323-341.
- Nelson, C. L. (2012). *Intelligibility in World Englishes: Theory and application*. Routledge.
- Poudel, P. P. & Baral, M. P. (2021). Examining foreign language teaching and learning in Nepal: An ecological perspective. *Journal of World Languages* 7(1), 104–123. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2021-0006>
- Rose, H., & Galloway, F N. (2019). *Global Englishes for Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, H., Syrbe, M., Montakantiwong, A. & Funada, N., (2020). *Global TESOL for the 21st Century: Teaching English in a Changing World*. Multilingual Matters.
- Sadeghpour, M. (2019). *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>
- Sah, P. K. (2020). English medium instruction in South Asian's multilingual schools: Unpacking the dynamics of ideological orientations, policy/practices, and democratic questions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1718591>
- Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: A critical analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Schneider, E. W. (2011). *English around the world: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sharifian, F. (2013). Globalisation and developing metacultural competence in learning English as an international language. *Multilingual Education*, 3(1), 1-11.
- 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>
- 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*, 18(4), 374-397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2021.1919113>
- van Manen, M. (2016). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587438>