



Content list available at <http://ijltr.urmia.ac.ir>

*Iranian Journal
of
Language Teaching Research*
ORIGINAL ARTICLE



Urmia University

Teaching Global Englishes in the Global South: A Translingual Poetic Autoethnography of Decolonial Pedagogical Design and Praxis in a Thai Private University

Shizhou Yang ^{a,*}

^a *Payap University, Thailand*

ABSTRACT

Despite extensive theorization of Global Englishes (GE), its pedagogical implementation in Global South contexts remains underexplored. This translingual poetic autoethnographic study traces an EFL writing teacher's journey of embracing decolonial design and praxis while teaching a "Culture and Englishes" course at an international college in Thailand. Positioning "G 语," a localized and translanguaging-oriented rearticulation of Global Englishes, as an overarching concept that brings together critical perspectives on Global South, identity, language ideologies, contact zones, bilingual creativity, and translanguaging, the study examines a story-based, theory-driven, translanguaging-oriented decolonial praxis and its influence on learners' evolving subjectivities. Data comprise teaching documents, teacher field notes, online discussions, and students' essays. The findings illustrate how GE-informed pedagogical innovations can disrupt dominant monolingual ideologies and foster shifts in participants' linguistic and cultural subjectivities. The study also foregrounds the tensions and possibilities of pursuing decolonial praxis in an English-medium environment. It concludes with practical implications for teachers seeking context-sensitive, theoretically grounded approaches to GE pedagogy.

Keywords: Global Englishes; EMI; translanguaging; poetic autoethnography; decolonization

© Urmia University Press

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 31 May 2026

Revised version received: 4 Sep. 2026

Accepted: 23 Sep. 2026

Available online: 31 Oct. 2026

* Corresponding author: 313 Pentecost Building, Payap University (Mae Khao Campus), Super Highway Chiang Mai-Lampang Road, Mueang District, Chiang Mai 50000, Thailand

Email address: yangshizhou@hotmail.com

© Urmia University Press

doi 10.30466/ijltr.2026.57650.3487

Introduction

英语为 G 语，

故事凿新渠。

理论驱反思，

师生共去殖。

Although Thailand has never been militarily colonized by any western powers, like other postcolonial contexts, coloniality still dominates its education system and public discourse (Jackson, 2004; Maitrarat, 2025; Rush, 2014). Colonial ideologies such as monolingualism and native-speakerism influence not only the English-related curriculum design and textbook content in Thailand, but also hiring and teaching practices (Boonsuk, 2026; Nitsaisook et al., 2026; Sameephet, 2025; Savski, 2021). So far, engaging in Global Englishes (GE) practices in the Thai education system involves more ground-up efforts than top-down policy change (Boonsuk & Waelatch, 2026). Yet to date, little research is available in this Global South context to document and analyze instructors' classroom-based decolonization effort. Addressing this gap, this translingual poetic autoethnography draws on classroom-based data from January to May 2026 to provide an insider view of GE practices and reflections in an English medium instruction (EMI) program in a Thai private university. The main purpose of the study is to artistically inquire about my decolonial pedagogical design and praxis to inspire similar effort in other Global South contexts. Through this poetic autoethnography, I seek to answer three main questions:

1. How did I design and teach a Global Englishes-informed class in an EMI program of a Thai private university?
2. What was my main decolonial praxis in teaching the course?
3. What were the influences of the decolonial praxis on my students' linguistic identities?

The three questions are answered by different parts of a four-line translingual poem included in the poetic autoethnography, which follows a brief description of the method. More specifically, Line 1 addresses RQ1, Lines 2 and 3 address RQ2, and Line 4 addresses RQ3.

Global Englishes Language Teaching

In the past decade, the GE paradigm has increasingly influenced the language teaching profession. According to Galloway (2025), GE is an umbrella term to unite adjacent scholarship such as World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and translanguaging. The naming is intended to innovate the English language curriculum and practice that have been dominated by “native-speakerism” and norms. As Galloway concluded in her paper:

Ontologically and epistemologically, WE, ELF, EIL, translanguaging and multilingualism scholars may have different positions. What I do hope for, however, particularly with regards to TESOL, is for greater collaboration, not only between the different fields, but also with teachers to create more opportunities for joined-up thinking to inform policy and practice. Silos are organized and safe. They are perfect to store grain on a farm, but if we want to innovate TESOL then we need to collaborate and work together [...] Ultimately, we are all working toward achieving a more equitable English language education. (Galloway, 2025, p. 43)

Therefore, GE-informed language teaching (GELT) is less concerned about using the right terminology than achieving justice.

Motivated by justice for multilingual learners of English, GELT requires systematic change, which can be summarized into six proposals (Galloway & Rose, 2015; Rose et al., 2020; Rose & Galloway, 2019). These include: exposing students to diverse Englishes; honoring students' language backgrounds; deepening students' understanding about GE; cultivating respect for diversity; developing strategies to communicate across differences; and adopting fairer hiring practices. Developing GE-orientation learning materials should consider ecological factors such as learners' linguistic and cultural realities to raise learners' awareness and appreciation of diverse accents and cultures (Widodo et al., 2022). Its main purpose is to free learners from native-speaker ways of thinking about and using English. Teaching practices also matter. Activities—such as students' presentation of world Englishes (Galloway & Rose, 2014, 2018)—can be used to cultivate openness toward diversity (Galloway, 2017). Similarly, assessment practice needs to be revamped to evaluate not only students' awareness of diverse Englishes, but also their strategies to communicate with users of GE (Baker et al., 2026; Hu, 2021). Small-scale studies illustrate that curriculum innovation at large is possible but not without challenges, including the perennial influences of native-speakerism (Cargos, 2022; Lin et al., 2026). The same ideology also persists in German ELT curriculum and textbooks despite a gradual recognition of the global usage of English (Nishizaki, 2025). A shift toward GELT thus requires systematic thinking and ongoing innovation.

Despite growing interest in GELT, substantial gaps remain in the literature. Baker et al. (2026) identified at least nine areas requiring urgent attention, two of which are particularly relevant to the current study. First, they call for stronger connections between GELT and decolonization, particularly in Global South contexts, as a means of challenging the persistent problem of native-speakerism in ELT (p. 8). Second, they highlight the need to examine the tension between “English-only” policies and translanguaging as a communication strategy for multilingual learners (p. 11). In Thailand, existing GELT research has begun to engage with decolonial perspectives (e.g., Boonsuk, 2026; Sameephet, 2025); however, no known study has investigated these issues through autoethnography. By addressing this methodological gap, the present study offers an experiential, reflexive, and artful account of how these broader tensions are negotiated in a specific Global South educational context.

Teaching Context

The focal course “Culture and Englishes” is a major required course for English Communication (EC) major students in a Thai EMI program. Originally titled “Culture of the English-speaking World” in the 2017 curriculum, this major required course was offered to sophomore students, with the goal of exploring “Culture of English speaking countries and [enhancing] cultural awareness [of the students]” (Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education 2 or TQF2, 2017). In 2022, during curriculum revision, the course was changed to its current title and offered to all EC freshmen instead. It remains a 3-credit major-required course, which has 45 contact hours during the semester. The goal has broadened to:

Investigation of concepts, relationship, and roles of cultures and language, especially, English in communication; examination of major dialects and varieties of English around the world including classification and variation of Englishes, diversity and a survey of dynamic views of cultures and Englishes that feature contemporary English-mediate communication. (TQF2, 2022)

The new course thus emphasizes both the plural and dynamic nature of “cultures and Englishes.”

The course assignments and assessment details are as follows:

Component (Weight)	Frequency Format	Core Academic Focus & Scope
Presentations (10%)	Weekly Group	Spread of English & culture in a specific continent or country (e.g., Asia/Africa or Thailand), drawing on local knowledge
Discussions (15%)	7x Biweekly	Online peer interactions regarding a specific theory (e.g., translanguaging)
Quizzes (15%)	3x Online	Conceptual mastery checks of class-introduced theories
Hybrid (30%)	Essay ~300 Words	A critical analysis of a video/literary text applying theory mixed with personal reflection
Final (30%)	Exam Summative ~150 words	Terminology definitions (textbook/class) (12%) + reflection essay “on culture and Englishes in contemporary times by relating to one or more of the theories presented in the class” (18%)

Students’ backgrounds were diverse as the course was open to both EC and non-EC majors in the International College and high school students through a credit bank system. In the course I taught from January to May 2026, a total of 29 students enrolled. Among them, 18 majored in EC, 5 in International Business and Management (IBM), and 6 were credit bank students. In terms of passport countries, they were from China (13), Myanmar (10), USA (3), Thailand (2), and Malaysia (1). The ethnic and linguistic situations were much more complex though. For instance, one Chinese student is a Tibetan, who is fluent in speaking, reading, and writing in Tibetan. Several Myanmar students were Mon, an ethnic group who mainly live in the Mon State of Myanmar.

Method: Translingual Poetic Autoethnography

I used translingual poetic autoethnography to study my decolonial design and praxis in teaching the Culture and Englishes course. Translingual poetic autoethnography legitimizes researcher experience as a critical site for creating new knowledge artistically and reflectively while drawing on their multilingual resources. It joins two reflexive practices—poetic inquiry and autoethnography—with a critical practice theory of translanguaging to provide evocative descriptions and emic understandings about the cultural dynamic shaping researcher identity and agency (Chang, 2008; Ellis & Bochner, 2024; Faulkner, 2020; Hanauer, 2021; Li, 2018, 2022).

A wide range of data was utilized to provide a holistic understanding of my teaching practices and their influences. The primary data sources include teacher field notes, course documents, and selected classroom artifacts. The teacher field notes, coded as F, document my observations and reflections from January to March 2026, capturing insights into classroom teaching practices, dynamics, and student engagement.

The course documents prescribe the course content and structure. TQF2 serves as a curriculum outline that details the program design, while TQF3 functions similarly to a syllabus, outlining course objectives, teaching plans, and evaluation criteria. Additionally, the self-compiled textbook

approaches the themes of culture and Englishes through narrative and a critical theories perspective, specifically tailored for this course.

Selected classroom artifacts provide triangulation for understanding students' evolving subjectivities. Essay 1 from week 13, coded as E1, was completed outside of class and showcases students' independent engagement with the course material and Englishes in their daily lives. Essay 2, coded as E2, was completed during the final exam and offers an overall evaluation of students' understanding at the end of the course. Furthermore, seven online discussion entries, coded as D, were spread throughout the semester, documenting students' real-time engagement and reflections on the course content. Through this comprehensive array of data, this translingual poetic autoethnography aims to illuminate the main features of my teaching practices and their influence on student learning and subjectivity.

Students' data were collected after the submission of course grades and after obtaining informed consent to ensure voluntary participation. 11 students gave their full or partial consent to use their class artifacts as data. All students' data was anonymized using S1-S11 and saved in a password-secured folder. A code of S1-D1 refers to S1's discussion entry 1, and the like. I selected excerpts in accordance with the students' written consent and where their quotes are cited, I kept the original wording to reflect their GE in use.

The following analytical steps were taken in my research. First, I drafted a Chinese-English translingual poem to provide an overview of my pedagogical design and praxis. Second, I drafted a total of 73 poems based on my collection of autoethnographic data, retaining imagery, metaphors, and words that approximate authentic classroom voices. These include 34 poems based on discussion board entries, 10 from each of the two essays, 16 from field notes, and 3 from teaching documents. Finally, I selected relevant poems and interpreted them in relation to my aforementioned translingual poem and scholarly literature, offering insights into the tensions and opportunities present in GE-oriented courses in this Global South context.

Results and Discussion

英语为G语 (*Englishes, or Global Englishes?*)

I translated the line “英语为G语” as “Englishes, O, Global Englishes!” to capture my evolving ideology toward English as well as my decolonial pedagogical stance. A literary translation would be something like “English(es) as G语.” In Chinese—a language without inflection—“英语” (English) is ambiguous in its singularity or plurality. The translingual term “G语” combines G, keeping the grammar of English to use abbreviations for “Global,” and “语” (language, pronounced as yǔ). Another meaning is also added to 语 by analyzing its two constituting radicals and classic meanings (言 for *speech* and 吾 for *my*)—G语, meaning a global language as my language. “G语” thus summarizes my decolonial pedagogical design, which pluralizes the English language and associated cultures and epistemologies.

In 2020, when I started my new teaching career in an international college in Thailand, I was assigned to teach a major elective course for sophomores: “*Culture of the English-speaking World*.” The original syllabus emphasized pop culture. An important cultural and linguistic resource that learners bring into our classrooms (Pennycook, 2010; Sharma, 2023), pop culture should be integrated in ELT in Thailand. Nonetheless, I found the syllabus too Western-oriented in its

theories and sources of information, while neglecting non-standard English varieties and cultures in the Global South context. This imbalance can be shown through the following found poem informed by the reading list in the syllabus.

The Old Reading List

McFarland & Co

Crown

Broadview

...

Routledge

Routledge again

Sage

Sage

Sage again

Asian publisher: 0

Betts, Raymond F. & Lyz Bly

Bolling, Ben

Brummet, Barry

Danesi, Marcel

Fiske, John

Goldberg, Harold

Grazian, David

Kidd, Dustin

Otter, Jennifer B.

Silverman, Jonathan

Storey, John

Szeman, Imre & Susie O'Brien

Asian author: 0

You tell us about "*A History of Popular Culture*"

"*It Happens at Comic-Con*"

You teach us ABCs and "*Rhetoric*" about popular culture

You give us "*Popular Culture: A User's Guide*"

"*Understanding Popular Culture*" is now easy

As if there were only one culture and one English

But you too used bad English:

“All Your Base Are Belong to Us”

Yet your world is not pure either:

“Mix It Up: Popular Culture, Mass Media, and Society”

“Pop Culture Freaks: Identity, Mass Media, and Society”

“The Secular Religion of Fandom”

“The World Is a Text: Writing About Visual and Popular Culture”

Asian stories: 0 (poem 71 based on old TQF3)

Cultural imbalance is common in Thai ELT. As Boonsuk's (2026) study reveals, even in the deep south of Thailand, where cultures are diverse, ELT textbooks still tend to perpetuate monolingual native-speakerism while neglecting local multilingual realities and lived experiences. A similar favor toward native-speakers and their cultures was observed in another study, which analyzed the Basic Education Core Curriculum 2008 by the Ministry of Education (MoE) (2008), cultural contents in textbooks, and hiring practices in Thailand. Through my poem, I critique the imbalanced cultural representation in ELT in Thailand. Yet I also acknowledge a hidden diversity. Pop culture, as other studies have shown, is teemed with non-mainstream cultures and non-standard Englishes through which youth construct their global identities (Moody, 2010; Pennycook, 2010). My two lines “But you too used bad English/‘All Your Base Are Belong to Us’” acknowledged this plurality. Despite this, I wanted the course to be more G 语-oriented by expanding its reading list.

The Expanded Guest List

“Welcome Andy Kirkpatrick!”

“Please guide us through your *Handbook of World Englishes*!”

“Welcome M. L. King, Jr.!”

“Please break our silence with your dream!”

“Welcome the blind Ved Mehta from India!”

“Please show us how to see God *Face to Face*!”

“Welcome Forest Gump!”

“Please speak again about life is like a box of chocolate!”

“Welcome *Crazy Rich Asians*!”

“Please let your Englishes quake the earth!” (Poem 72 based on revised TQF3)

Reflecting on my revised syllabus, although I did not mention “Global Englishes,” in spirit, I was motivated by the same “critical paradigm that explores the evolving use of English as a global language by a diverse community of users, who are using English in varied and ever-changing contexts” (Rose & McKinley, 2024). These communities include World Englishes scholars such as Andy Kirkpatrick who challenged the dominance of native speaker varieties; African Americans such as Martin Luther King Jr., who communicated a just social world through their accented

English; Asians such as Ved Mehta from India who represented a different life and cultural reality through their Englishes. Featuring its global contexts and users, I see GE or G 语 as a dynamic process of the English language being localized and personalized in diverse social spaces, including classrooms.

Taking one step further, an important question to ask is perhaps not “Englishes, or Global Englishes?” but how we recognize and respond pedagogically to the “global” presence and transformation of Englishes in Global South classrooms. As Rose and McKinley (2025) explained: The term Global Englishes builds on the foundation laid by World Englishes with a new focus on the processes of globalization. It also considers how globalization continues to influence contemporary English and the teaching and learning of English across diverse educational contexts.

My adoption of English as a “G 语” and an expanded reading list indicate a subtle shift in my decolonial pedagogical stance and design. To make the shift impactful, I also created a narrative space for multilingual learners in my Global South context to contribute as epistemological subjects (Bojsen, 2023; Yang, 2023, 2025). Being in the Global South can serve as a vantage point for them to speak against injustices rooted in colonial histories and practices (Canagarajah, 2021; Pennycook & Makoni, 2020). Through storytelling, multilingual students may practice “G 语” in the classroom, recount and reflect on their language experiences collectively. Personal, dialogical, and reflective, such knowledge provides counter examples that elevate southern experiences and voices for decolonizing purposes (Makoni et al., 2022; Pennycook & Makoni, 2020; Yang, 2023).

故事□新渠 (*Stories enter classrooms*)

Stories, especially personal stories, play an important epistemological role in creating new knowledge about G 语 from a decolonizing perspective. As Li Wei (2022) suggested,

The rich and diverse and social experiences and practices of the English language learners should be mobilized to provide alternative points of reference, horizons, and perspective for knowledge production and at the same time to transform the subjectivities of the learners. (p. 179)

Li’s call should be understood in reference to the larger context of both GE scholars and translinguaging scholars resisting the lasting and detrimental colonial influences in ELT (García, 2019; Kubota, 2022; Li, 2022; Phyak et al., 2023). Like these scholars, I celebrated the epistemological potential of personal stories in my teaching of “G 语.” Students’ experiences and practices, shared through stories, are—

Tales That Matter in My Class

No one can tell my stories

For me—

Stories that matter

Bear carvings of my pain and shame

Inflicted by the 40+ lashes

That make me a less-than

In this poem, which was informed by both my experience as an EFL learner and my self-compiled textbook, I draw on Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogism, which emphasizes individuals’ unique vantage points for voicing and storytelling. I also evoke the image of lashing or scourging that hurt and

shame the condemned. Whereas the Jewish law forbids “more than forty lashes would publicly humiliate your neighbor” (*Holy Bible: New Living Translation*, 1996, Deuteronomy 25:3), the Romans in colonial times had no such limits and often resorted to cruel scourging before crucifying their non-Roman criminals (Nicolotti, 2017). Through the poem, I problematize the “less-than” image that many learners and ELT professionals form through native-speakerism-infused ELT practice (Fang, 2018; Hiratsuka, 2025; Holliday et al., 2015). Yet how such a “less-than” life was lived by my multilingual students remained vaguely known without their personal stories. As I try to capture through the following poem, based on a Myanmar student’s discussion board entry:

Mixing languages feels normal

I am a Myanmar student in Thailand

Speaking Burmese, English, and sometimes Thai every day

I don’t separate them but mix them like Burmese tea salad

when I see the word “inequality,”

I tell myself, “ဒါက မညီမျှမှု ဆိုလိုတာပဲ,”

and connect it to real experiences in my community.

With friends, I might say, “ဒီ assignment က so stressful ။”

Mixing languages feels normal because they are all part of my life.

In class discussions, I notice that English-only rules make some students silent.

But when we allow Burmese explanations,

students gain confidence and then try again in English.

This shows creativity, not weakness. (Poem 6-S6-D3)

The knowledge that my students created through their stories was personal, local, and cultural, as through the metaphor of “Burmese tea salad.” Although such knowledge may not challenge the global epistemic system directly, it validates my multilingual students as knowing subjects, who can share their life experiences and understandings through stories.

Similarly, reflection essays provided yet another opportunity for multilingual students to rethink their languages and cultures in relation to English(es). My students’ essays were filled with personal experiences and rich cultural insights. For instance, a student from Malaysia wrote in her essay to illustrate her understanding about translanguaging:

Growing up in a multi-cultural country like Malaysia, it's not [un]common to find someone who doesn't speak more than 1 language as we would communicate with each other through different languages and dialects in our daily lives. Even go so far as to combine these different languages and dialects to create our own way of communication, Manglish or Malaysian English as it is properly known. With terms like, “Can meh?” and “Where got?”, a combination of English with Cantonese and Mandarin in their respective places, it is a primary example of how translanguaging is used in Malaysia. Take a situation that would often happen to me when I was younger. By taking advantage of the privilege I received as an older sister, I would always annoy my little sister by taking away her toys or randomly pressing buttons on her iPad when she was watching videos as a way to entertain myself, and every time that I would do so, my aunt would say, “Don't always kacau your sister, later she kacau you back then don't cry ah”. Rather than saying the sentence in full English, she would use the Malay term for “Disturb” in her sentences, even though we are ethnically Chinese. Another example of how translanguaging is used is a sentence we would say when the weather is being unbearably hot, “Walao, I beh taban the weather already, it's so hot”, which the term, “Beh taban”, uses both the Hokkien “Beh”, which means cannot and the Malay word “Taban”, which means handle (Verb), together and

creates the meaning of “Can’t take it anymore”. As you can see, Manglish is a beautiful form of communication where using multiple languages and dialects in a term or sentence became second nature to us and turned into a form of communication where everyone would be able to understand what you are saying without being fluent in that language. (S10-E1)

Stories like this validate learners’ lived experiences. They complement those of language teachers (Ng et al., 2023; Rifiyani et al., 2025) in providing a more complete picture of decolonizing English and EMI in higher education (Baker et al., 2025; Bojsen, 2023).

理论反思(Theories-driven reflection)

Once a week, I introduced a critical theory related to G 语. The following table of contents from my self-compiled textbook provides an overview of the theories informing the class (Figure 1):

Figure 1

Table of Contents

Week 2. Culture: The small stories of English teachers and learners
Week 3. Culture: The Global South perspective on self and other
Week 4. Culture: Naming and literacy practices
Week 5. Culture: The moving people, objects, and practices
Week 6. Culture: The language regime and game
Week 7. Culture: The politics of personal narrative and self-writing
Week 8. Culture: Modes and technologies of networking
Week 9. Culture: Arts in the contact zone
Week10. Culture: Neoliberalism and transnationalism
Week 11. Culture: Critiquing stereotypes and biases
Week 12. Culture: Critiquing romanticized traditions and othering
Week 13. Culture: Little men and women speaking back to the empire

At a glance, each chapter only features culture. In reality, a GE logic runs through my coursebook to approach culture and English from a critical historical perspective (Holliday, 2005; Kramsch & Zhu, 2016; Pennycook, 2021). More specifically, I wanted my students to see the gradual ascension of the English language from a regional to a global language, a process intertwined with colonial expansion, empire-building, and ideological control by former colonizers. Eventually, my students should become what I call “little men and women speaking back to the empire” without being constrained by “colonial matrix of power” (Mignolo, 2023, p. 45).

My students’ learning of critical theories was partially facilitated by online discussion. Using a Microsoft Teams channel, I instructed that my students should contribute a paragraph-length writing to diverse topics once every two weeks, drawing on their personal experiences. Translanguaging was allowed (IQF3). These discussions provided rich opportunities for my students to explore the given topics from diverse perspectives while examining their relevance in their personal contexts. Take the concept of “language game” as an example. I explained it in relation to bilingual creativity and translanguaging. My students’ discussion entries real their understanding.

Translanguaging as a Mon

As a Mon student studying in Thailand,

I use Mon, Burmese, Thai, and English in my daily life.

One example of translanguaging is when I explain business concepts
to my friends from Myanmar—

For example, “sustainable development ကို businessနဲ့ ပေါင်းပြီးတွေးရတဲ့ conceptမျိုး” !

In class, I learn terms in English.

But when I explain them to my friends,

I mix languages.

I may keep important terms in English,

explain the meaning in Burmese for clarity,

and use Mon expressions to make it more personal and emotional.

I choose the language

depending on who I am talking to and the situation.

This shows bilingual creativity

because I use all my languages as resources

to communicate clearly and effectively.

Instead of seeing one language as more important,

I combine them to express my ideas better.

It makes me feel confident

and connected to my identity as a multilingual speaker. (Poem 10-S3-D3)

S3's example showcases multilingual students' sociolinguistic awareness (“I choose the language/depending on who I am talking to and the situation). It also illustrates the synergistic benefits of translanguaging, as in “I combine them [Mon, Burmese, Thai, and English] to express my ideas better.”

Partially assisted by online discussion, my students gradually deepened their understandings about the critical theories and began to apply them to reexamine their own lived experiences. The influence is perhaps most evident in their AI-free reflection essay during the final exam. One poem informed by a student's final reflection paper features—

Culture & English in Contemporary Times

Is America really the cultural melting pot?

Is it not also the land of stereotypes?

People used to ask me [a Chinese studying in America]

“Do you eat dogs or cats?”

I was speechless during the first few interactions,
 but I came to realize that people stereotype most of the time unintentionally.
 They did not mean to offend anyone.
 This is why transnationalism and translingual is important. (Poem 48-S2-E2)

Interestingly, the student continued to use a singular “English.” At the same time, the glaring imagery of America as “the cultural melting pot” is challenged through a story about stereotypes in their life in America by using “transnationalism and translingual[ism]”—two theories introduced in the class. There is thus subtle change in the student’s understanding. Another student reflected on the influence of the concepts of language regime and orientalism:

Discoveries I have made by studying culture and English

One concept that challenged my thinking is language regime—
 when one language (English) is [regarded as] better than others.
 Language regime has formed stereotypes and orientalism.
 Since the British had colonized several countries,
 English has now been symbolized as a standard system of communication.
 Nonetheless, some Englishes, like British and American,
 are considered higher than others.

As a result, individuals often fail to recognize the uniqueness of their mother’s tongue. Additionally, people without standard accents are stereotyped as weak English users due to the romanticization of English accents.

Another topic that I am interested in is orientalism, which is the perspective of powerful countries on other lands. It somehow reminded me of the current political situation in Myanmar,

which is also a developing country.
 Thus, many Myanmar individuals have no choice
 but to work in other developed countries to make a living.
 Consequently, they are often looked down and faced inequalities.
 Therefore, weak countries usually face unfair treatment.
 In conclusion, studying Cultural and English subject has broaden my horizons
 and helped me acknowledge the root causes of contemporary times. (Poem 52-S9-E2)

If stories only reveal lived experiences where non-native speakers and their backgrounds are undervalued, critical theories such as language regime helped my students to contextualize their experiences and critique the colonial logic.

Similar to GE programs that focus on raising learners’ awareness (Boonsuk & Fang, 2026; Galloway & Rose, 2018; Jindapitak et al., 2022), lived experiences reexamined through critical theories paved the way for my students to decolonize their own minds to mitigate the negative influence of native-speakerism and monolingualism. As a Mon student from Myanmar reflected in his final essay:

Beyond the Mother Tongue: Personal Reflection on Culture and Englishes

One of the most valuable things about this course
 was learning and discussing the concepts such as decolonization,
 global south, imperialism, and hegemony.
 These concepts show me how
 people from different backgrounds
 experience the world differently.

As an international student studying in diverse environment,
 I could strongly relate to some concepts
 like stereotypes, and translanguaging.
 Coming from an indigenous community
 like Mon community,
 that is under Myanmar military control,
 these concepts made me realize
 how I can stand for myself and community
 around powerful communities.
 Moreover, Culture and Englishes help me
 see the world more open-minded
 and respectful towards others.
 Eventually, this course also helps me
 build confident to speak English in my own way
 because I realize that a language
 does not belong to any group.
 People from different backgrounds speak it differently.

Overall, this course, Culture and Englishes
 provides both academic knowledge and personal growth.
 I believe that the lessons I learned
 help me understand culture,
 and improve my communication skills
 as well as future career. (Poem 55-S3-E2)

The incorporation of critical theories thus heightened my students' critical language awareness by validating their lived experience of marginalization. Equipped with these critical theories, some of

them have become co-agents, feeling more empowered to “stand for myself and community around powerful communities.”

□ 生共去殖 (*Decolonization, a shared mission*)

G 语 and decolonization go hand in hand (Majumder, 2025; Molina, 2026; Xie & Sun, 2024) as stakeholders take concrete steps to disrupt colonial ideologies and seek more just alternatives. As a teacher, besides using stories and critical theories, I also engaged in decolonial praxis by creating translanguaging spaces in the *Culture and Englishes* class. Translanguaging as a theory of practice challenges the default monolingual language policy in EMI, advocating instead that there does not need to be strict adherence to the separation of named languages (Li, 2018). This theory motivates me to mobilize typically unused languages in EMI settings as resources to facilitate participation and learning. For instance, I have used multiple non-English languages in my class (e.g., Spanish, Tibetan, Mon, Burmese, Sichuan dialect, Cantonese) for group work activities. I do not know how to speak these languages; I simply invited speakers of these languages in my class to teach the rest of us how to say a few numbers in their native tongues. I have also frequently integrated two translations—Chinese and Burmese—in my slides and handouts, with the help of ChatGPT. My handout for week 13, for instance, includes the following trilingual instruction:

Personal Experience

English: In what ways, if any, has native speakerism affected your learning, confidence, or opportunities?

Burmese (မြန်မာ): မိခင်ဘာသာစကားပြောသူအဖြစ် အမြင်ထားခြင်း (native speakerism) က သင်၏ သင်ယူမှု၊ ယုံကြည်မှု၊ သို့မဟုတ် အခွင့်အလမ်းများအပေါ် ဘယ်လို သက်ရောက်မှုရှိခဲ့ပါသလဲ။

Chinese (中文): “以英语为母语者为标准”的观念在多大程度上影响了你的学习、自信或机会?

AI translation can contain errors. In my class, I encouraged my students to give feedback to me when they identified mistranslations, creating an additional opportunity for them to leverage their linguistic backgrounds as resources. The translanguaging-oriented classroom contributed to a learning environment similar to multilingual students’ lived experience. As S6 cited above said, “Mixing languages feels normal because they are all part of my life” (D6). A classroom translanguaging space thus showcases teachers’ agency in facilitating multilingual students’ participation by connecting with their worlds, as also observed in ethnographic studies (Thongwichit et al., 2026; Tyler, 2023; Weerachairattana & Buripakdi, 2025).

On my students’ side, decolonization occurs when they shifted from native speakerism and monolingualism to a more self-enabling ideology to guide their language use. One student shared her transformation:

What is English?

In the past, I thought English was only for school—

Grammar, vocabulary, and exams

All there is.

My most important goal: Speak perfect English.

I was often afraid of making mistakes.

In my classroom in Thailand

I studied with students from different countries.

Who used English in different ways:

Some had strong accents,

Some mixed English with their own language.

As I spent more time in class, I began to understand something important:

Even though our English was not perfect, we could still communicate.

We could share ideas, ask questions, and work together.

I realized that communication is more important than speaking perfectly.

Like my professor and other scholars, I began to see English as a global language

Not only for native speakers.

It is not owned by one country;

It belongs to everyone who uses it.

Now, I focus more on meaning and understanding.

I also feel more confident to speak, even if I make mistakes.

I see my background as a student from Myanmar is not a weakness.

I can also share my own culture when I speak English.

English is to me a shared language.

I will continue to learn

and use it in my own way to connect with others.

(Poem 38-S1-E1)

S1's story invites a more holistic understanding about students' transformation. Sometimes, it can be triggered by transnational movement; for instance, "After I came to study in Thailand, my thinking started to change." Sustained interactions with other international students in class also contributed to a changed mind: "as I spent more time in class, I began to understand..." Practice-based learning in class can thus challenge deeply deep-rooted notions of native-speakerism. Even so, the classroom is still a critical social space to expose multilingual learners to G 语 and to mitigate the constraints of native-speakerism on them. Through both concrete practice and critical theories, they can form new linguistic identities with an enlarged vision, recognizing English as "a global language...not only for native speakers." They can emphasize comprehension and communication strategies in real life instead of unrealistic expectations of "speaking perfectly."

A Mon student shared a similar change of perspective, moving away from viewing English just as an “academic subject” to seeing it through the lenses of “Englishes” and ELF.”

Not Perfection, But Effective Communication

When I interacted with students and peers from different linguistic backgrounds
 I became more aware of how English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)
 functions in real-life communication
 as a common language among people with different first languages
 Culture and Englishes class has helped me understand
 English is not a single, fixed system
 but a dynamic and diverse language connected to culture and identity
 meaning and understanding are more important than strict correctness.
 In class, we used simple English, gestures, and shared understanding
 to connect with one another.
 I agree, as British Council says,
 English exists in many different forms influenced by culture.
 there are many “Englishes” around the world
 They can be equally valid rather than one single correct standard.

This perspective has personally influenced me as a learner.
 In the past, I often felt pressure to speak English accurately and avoid mistakes.
 However, through both class discussions and real interactions
 I now see that my English,
 shaped by my background and experiences,
 is meaningful.
 It represents my identity rather than limiting it.
 This shift has helped me become more confident in expressing myself.
 (Poem 40-S3-E1)

It is one thing to recognize nation-state associated varieties of Englishes such as Singlish. It is quite another for minoritized learners such as Mon students to “see that my English, shaped by my background and experiences, is meaningful.” The line “through both class discussions and real interactions” again emphasizes the critical role of the classroom activities in transforming multilingual students into confident users of G 语 to engage in global communication. Their “background and experiences” now function as an integral part of their resources to speak back to the once dominating and intimidating shadows of the colonial empire.

Fighting native-speakerism through multilingual music

Like said by a friend
 We can use music to fight native-speakerism
 A song in a non-English language
 Can be as popular as those sung in English
 Take BTS's song "Life Goes On", as an example
 [It mixes English and Korean]
 And has more than 1 billion streams on Spotify
 This shows that music isn't only meant to be in one language
 As long as it fits the listeners' preferences (Poem 32-S10-D7)

The personal knowledge that S10 brings is transnational pop music, BTS from South Korea, which she frequently mentioned in class. It was through her that I began to read about BTS. Another student related to his American classroom experience.

Speaking back in a US classroom

Once in a U.S. university
 My professor told a student of Mexican descent
 "Speak only English, even in group work;
 You will be talking to an international student."
 Monolingualism at work—only the most dominant language rules.

A few weeks later, this student explained in Spanish
 To two other Spanish-speaking members—a complicated concept
 Which they instantly comprehended.

"Professor," he said,
 "Had it not been that just now I spoke Spanish,
 we should have lost twenty more minutes.
 Is it not the purpose to study the material,
 not merely to practice English?"

This was his silent way of speaking back.
 The professor appeared shocked,
 but conceded and ceased policing the use of casual language within groups
 and many international students felt more free to express themselves in class

That is a just point.
 It was a little, yet mighty moment to me
 --it taught me that it doesn't take a big speech
 to fight an ideology. (Poem 37-S2-D7)

Thus, it is not to be attributed to the Culture and Englishes course, or any one course, to teach G 语. What these courses can do, through decolonial designs and praxis, is to awaken or continue the self-liberation journeys of multilingual students by linking with that they already know or have experienced or are seeking.

As a teacher, I am most encouraged to see my students, such as this Burmese student—

Speaking back on social media

In many countries, people think
 that only native speakers speak “real” English.
 This idea is called native-speakerism.
 I saw this online when people said that
 “If your accent is not American or British,
 your English is not good.”
 One day, I decided to post a video
 speaking English with my own accent.
 Some people still criticized me,
 but many others supported me, saying
 “We understood you well.”
 This was my way of “speaking back” to native-speakerism.
 I showed that
 English is for communication,
 not only for perfect accent.
 After that, I felt more confident,
 and I think it also helped others
 feel brave to use English
 in their own way. (Poem 36-S1-D7)

Reflecting on my journey of teaching G 语 in a Thai EMI context, I am increasingly convinced that neither culture, nor G 语 should be taken as singular or neutral. As a teacher, I am either silencing or supporting multilingual voices in the global contact zones (Pratt, 1991) infused by “colonial matrix of power” (Mignolo, 2023, p. 45). To mobilize the already diverse realities and dynamic subjectivities of multilingual students for decolonization purposes, both my pedagogical designs and practices must transcend colonial legacies of native-speakerism and monolingualism. Through

translanguaging practice, multilingual professionals and learners alike can find more self-enabling and epistemologically just ways of participating in global interactions as knowing subjects, as documented in other studies as well (Canagarajah, 2020; Godwin-Jones, 2025).

A Critical Reflection

Across my dataset, I have seen my students develop an increased awareness and embrace of GE or what I call “G 语.” This study thus provides new evidence for how decolonial design and praxis may have shaped multilingual speakers’ attitudes toward G 语 in a Global South context. Nonetheless, my pedagogical praxis of G 语 has been accompanied by ideological tensions rooted in native-speakerism. As I try to show through the following poems based on my field note at the beginning of the semester:

I: “When did you first hear ‘Englishes?’”

Students: “In this class.”

I: “What did you think when you heard it?”

One student: “It’s a mistake. Do you mean the English people?”

[Again, the same student said]

“Only recently did I notice that there are two ways of spelling color.”

“I think the British way is correct

because they were conquered by the French.”

“Americans just stole the language.” (Poem 59-S11-F)

On one hand, I was glad to challenge all my students to think from an “G 语” perspective. On the other hand, I realized that, due to the entanglement of the English language with global histories and politics and neoliberal discourses, decolonization remains a complex and unfinished project for both my students and myself. I, a “non-native speaker,” must continue to reflect on the sources of my authority as an ELT professional when teaching “native” speakers of English. I must continue to problematize the colonial premise that certain English varieties are more “correct” than others. Embracing G 语, personal stories, and critical theories, my multilingual students and I have pursued new identity options not confined to monolingual and monologic story grids, thus answering the urgent call to decolonize ELT (Baker et al., 2025; Boonsuk, 2026; Sameephet, 2025) in our own Global South classroom. In contrast, there seems little change in the minds of my “native speaker” students. This difference makes me wonder whether a “G 语” approach is more liberating for multilingual speakers than monolingual speakers. I wish that I could interview my students to know how they really think. Maybe in my future effort to decolonize ELT, I will need to integrate love for the whole person into my critical praxis as well (Molina, 2026).

Another tension concerns assessment. To this day, I am baffled—

By blank test papers

of my Chinese credit bank students

(Despite my translanguaging instructions in English, Chinese, and Burmese)

And by a translanguaging response by another Chinese student—

“I’m so sorry that use Chinese make the exam,
 English can’t express myself totally,
 and I really don’t know the words how to spell.
 希望得到您的谅解[hope that you understand].” (Poem 59-S6-E2)

“They have limited English proficiency and poor study habits”
 I justified myself [in my teaching report why they failed].
 “They frequently missed assignments even after multiple reminders.

...

Am I blaming the victim? (Poem 73-TQF-5)

These instances prompt me to search for fair assessment praxis beyond monolingual norms. How can I know what my students know but do not have the ability to write their thoughts in English? Should I allow translanguaging responses? Should I drop out essay writing in the final exam? Without ready answers to these important questions, I must continue searching for solutions with like-minded colleagues.

Conclusion

This translingual poetic autoethnography reflected on my decolonial design and praxis of a Culture and Englishes course in an EMI program in a Thai private university. It starts with a shift toward Global Englishes or “G 语” in my conceptualization of English as a globally shared language, to be used and enriched by users from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. It then explored poetically my critique of the original course syllabus and innovation to transcend its Western-centric content and English. My decolonial praxis emphasized learner stories, critical theories, and decolonization as a collaborative effort between teacher and learners. As a teacher, I used pedagogical translanguaging to leverage students’ linguistic backgrounds as resources for participation and learning. My students also contributed actively—through their personal stories—emergent knowledge about how they gradually broke away from native-speakerism to appreciate and embrace their accented Englishes. Despite this overall positive change, issues related to deep-seated native-speakerism and provision of fair assessment in GE-oriented courses remain important for future explorations in the Global South, both by myself and like-minded colleagues.

Acknowledgements

I thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors for their constructive feedback on an earlier version of my paper. All remaining inconsistencies are mine alone.

References

- Baker, W., Fang, F., & Gimenez, T. (2026). Global Englishes: Research agendas and tasks in English as a Lingua Franca. *Language Teaching*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444826101281>
- Baker, W., Morán Panero, S., Álvarez Valencia, J. A., Alhasnawi, S., Boonsuk, Y., Ngo, P. L. H., Martínez-Sánchez, M. M., Miranda, N., & Ronzón-Montiel, G. J. (2025). Decolonizing English in higher education: Global Englishes and TESOL as opportunities or barriers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 59(1), 281–309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3317>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bojsen, H. (2023). Translanguaging, epistemological decentring and power: A study of students' perspectives and learning. In H. Bojsen, P. Daryai-Hansen, & A. Holmen (Eds.), *Translanguaging and epistemological decentring in higher education and research* (pp. 24–48). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800410909>
- Boonsuk, Y. (2026). 'Is our culture not good enough to be included in English lessons?' Decolonizing English textbooks in Thailand's deep south: A global Englishes-informed pedagogical innovation. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2025.2612524>
- Boonsuk, Y., & Fang, F. (2026). "The hegemony still persists": Is Global Englishes-informed pedagogy a turning point in English language education? *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13, Article 779. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-026-06836-6>
- Boonsuk, Y., & Waelatch, B. (2026). Unequal Englishes and linguistic justice: Global Englishes and ideological transformation in Thai higher education. *TESOL Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.70134>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2020). *Transnational literacy autobiographies as translanguaging writing*. Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2021). Rethinking mobility and language: From the Global South. *The Modern Language Journal*, 105(2), 570–582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12726>
- Cargos, K. (2022). From ELT to GELT: The feasibility of Global Englishes language teaching curricular innovation. *JALT Journal*, 44(1), 7–32. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ44.1-1>
- Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Left Coast Press.
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2024). *Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject*.
- Fang, F. (Gabriel). (2018). Native-speakerism revisited: Global Englishes, ELT and intercultural communication. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(2), 115–129. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v13i2.1453>

- Faulkner, S. L. (2020). *Poetic inquiry: Craft, method and practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Galloway, N. (2017). *Global Englishes and change in English language teaching: Attitudes and impact*. Routledge.
- Galloway, N. (2025). What's in a name? Global Englishes—an umbrella term to address silo mentality or a misunderstood paradigm reinforcing silos? *TESOL Quarterly*, 59(1), 24–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3337>
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2014). Using listening journals to raise awareness of Global Englishes in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 68, 386–396. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu021>
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing global Englishes*. Routledge.
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010>
- García, O. (2019). Decolonizing foreign, second, heritage, and first languages: Implications for education. In D. Macedo (Ed.), *Decolonizing foreign language education* (pp. 152–168). Routledge.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2025). Technology integration for less commonly taught languages: AI and pedagogical translanguaging. *Language Learning & Technology*, 29(2), 11–34. <https://hdl.handle.net/10125/73609>
- Hanauer, D. (2021). Poetic writing research: The history, methods, and outcomes of poetic (auto) ethnography. In *Poetic writing research: The history, methods, and outcomes of poetic (auto) ethnography* (pp. 421–448). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110645958-017>
- Hiratsuka, T. (2025). Native-speakerism and trans-speakerism in ELT: Interpretations, manifestations, and ramifications. *System*, 128, Article 103543. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103543>
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A., Aboshiha, P., & Swan, A. (2015). *(En)countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives*. Springer.
- Hu, G. (2021). Language assessment in Global Englishes. In A. F. Selvi & B. Yazan (Eds.), *Language Teacher Education for Global Englishes* (pp. 199–206). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003082712-33>
- Jackson, P. (2004). The performative state: Semi-coloniality and the tyranny of images in modern Thailand. *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 19, 219–253. <https://doi.org/10.1353/soj.2004.0016>

- Jindapitak, N., Teo, A., & Savski, K. (2022). Bringing Global Englishes to the ELT classroom: English language learners' reflections. *Asian Englishes*, 24, 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2033910>
- Kramsch, C., & Zhu, H. (2016). Language, culture and language teaching. In G. Hall (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 38–50).
- Kubota, R. (2022). Decolonizing second language writing: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, Article 100946. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100946>
- Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Li, W. (2022). Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083>
- Lin, H.-Y., Galloway, N., & Tsou, W. (2026). Incorporating a Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) perspective in Taiwanese elementary classrooms: Teachers' perceptions under the Bilingual 2030 Policy. *TESOL Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.70181>
- Maitrarat, P. (2025). Influences of coloniality on a non-colonized country: The historical trajectory of Thai higher education. *Manusya: Journal of Humanities*, 28(1), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-20252815>
- Majumder, R. (2025). Global Englishes and linguistic imperialism: Decolonizing English and reclaiming identity in the 21st century. *Research Journal of English (RJOE)*, 10(2), 408–425.
<https://doi.org/10.36993/RJOE.2025.10.2.425>
- Makoni, S., Severo, C. G., Abdelhay, A., & Kaiper-Marquez, A. (Eds.). (2022). *The languaging of higher education in the global South: De-colonizing the language of scholarship and pedagogy*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003138433>
- Mignolo, W. (2023). The colonial matrix of power. In C. O. Christiansen, M. L. Machado-Guichon, S. Mercader, O. B. Hunt, & P. Jha (Eds.), *Talking about global inequality: Personal experiences and historical perspectives* (pp. 39–46). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08042-5_5
- Molina, S. C. (2026). *Decolonizing English language education: Becoming a critically conscious educator through a humanizing pedagogy of love*. Routledge.
- Moody, A. (2010). The Englishes of popular cultures. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 535–549). Routledge.
- Ng, P. C. L., Matikainen, T., & Glasgow, G. P. (2023). Multilingualism in Global Englishes language teaching: Narrative insights from three TESOL practitioners in Japan. In K. Raza,

- D. Reynolds, & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Handbook of Multilingual TESOL in Practice* (pp. 147–161). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-9350-3_10
- Nicolotti, A. (2017). The scourge of Jesus and the Roman scourge. *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 15(1), 1–59. <https://doi.org/10.1163/17455197-01501006>
- Nishizaki, M. (2025). Charting the globe: A qualitative longitudinal analysis of the Englishes in German curricula and textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 59(1), 256–280. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3327>
- Nitsaisook, N., Prabjandee, D., & Kewara, P. (2026). Language ideologies and English education policies in Thailand. *World Englishes*, 45(3), 554–573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12739>
- Pennycook, A. (2010). Popular cultures, popular languages, and global identities. In *The Handbook of Language and Globalization* (pp. 592–607). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444324068.ch27>
- Pennycook, A. (2021). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical re-introduction* (2nd edition). Routledge.
- Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2020). *Innovations and challenges in applied linguistics from the Global South*. Routledge.
- Phyak, P., Sánchez, M. T., Makalela, L., & García, O. (2023). Decolonizing multilingual pedagogies. In C. McKinney, P. Makoe, & V. Zavala, *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (2nd ed., pp. 223–239). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003214908-18>
- Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 91, 33–40. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/378727>
- Rifiyani, A. J., Namaziandost, E., Ubaidillah, M. F., & Langgeng, B. (2025). How do senior English teachers experience Global Englishes in language teaching? Narratives from within. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 12(1), 251–267. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v12i1.38114>
- Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316678343>
- Rose, H., & McKinley, J. (2025). Global Englishes and TESOL: An editorial introduction to innovating research and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 59(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3373>
- Rose, H., Mckinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2020). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching*, 54, 157–189. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518>

- Rush, E. (2014). Colonization by stealth: The case of Thailand. In C. Joseph & J. Matthews (Eds.), *Equity, Opportunity and Education in Postcolonial Southeast Asia* (pp. 124–143). Routledge.
- Sameephet, B. (2025). Decolonising the TESOL curriculum in Thailand through global Englishes: A wake-up call. *LEARN Journal*, 18(2), 594–632. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1479901>
- Savski, K. (2021). Dialogicality and racialized discourse in TESOL recruitment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(3), 795–816. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3013>
- Sharma, B. (2023). Translingual Englishes, participatory hip-hop and social media in Nepal. *World Englishes*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12636>
- Thongwicht, N., Ulla, M. B., & Parba, J. (2026). Translanguaging for social justice in Thailand's language classrooms: A classroom ethnography. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 23(1), 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2517334>
- Tyler, R. (2023). *Translanguaging, coloniality and decolonial cracks: Bilingual science learning in South Africa*. Multilingual Matters.
- Weerachairattana, R., & Buripakdi, A. (2025). Translanguaging as legitimate pedagogy in ELT in Thailand: An ethnographic case study in Thai higher education. *Asian Englishes*, 27(3), 749–765. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2025.2544252>
- Widodo, H., Fang, F., & Elyas, T. (2022). Designing English language materials from the perspective of Global Englishes. *Asian Englishes*, 24, 186–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2062540>
- Xie, D., & Sun, Y. (2024). Decolonizing English academic writing education through translingual practices. *Linguistics and Education*, 81, Article 101307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101307>
- Yang, S. (2023). *Literacy autobiographies from the Global South: An autoethnographic study of English literacy in China*. Routledge.
- Yang, S. (2025). *Decolonizing EFL writing education: An L2 writing teacher's poetic autoethnography*. Routledge.

Shizhou Yang, PhD, assistant professor, is an applied linguist, second language writer, writing teacher, and researcher. His research centers on translanguaging, Global South epistemologies, autoethnography, and decolonization in language education. His publications include three Routledge volumes and multiple articles in journals such as *System* and *Journal of Second Language Writing*.