Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research 14(3), (Nov. 2026)

EDITORIAL

Advancing Global Englishes in the Global South: Classroom Practice, Curriculum Innovation, and Teacher Education

Fan Fang, The Education University of Hong Kong, China

Anas Hajar, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan

Vincent Greenier, American University of Sharjah, UAE

1. Rethinking English education in multilingual settings

English language education takes place within multilingual societies, yet its goals, materials, and assessment practices often continue to imagine learners as aspiring monolingual native speakers (Romanowski, 2025). This mismatch concerns more than the accents represented in a listening exercise. It affects whose knowledge enters the curriculum, which linguistic resources students may use, and how teachers and learners understand their legitimacy as English users. For communities across the Global South, where English intersects with colonial histories, local languages, and unequal educational opportunities, these questions have immediate pedagogical and social consequences. Recognising linguistic diversity requires attention to the conditions under which that diversity becomes educationally meaningful.

The Global Englishes (GE) paradigm offers a basis for reconsidering these conditions. Bringing related scholarship on World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and English as an international language into dialogue with multilingualism and translanguaging, GE questions the exclusive authority of native-speaker norms in English language education (Rose & Galloway, 2019). The GE paradigm is particularly important as it lies in preparing learners to negotiate meaning with diverse interlocutors, recognise their own communicative resources, and critically examine linguistic hierarchies. Classroom research has illustrated possibilities for developing this awareness through student inquiry, diverse materials, and reflection on language ownership (Fang & Ren, 2018; Galloway & Rose, 2018). The task now includes understanding how such possibilities become sustained educational practice.

From the perspective of the 'multilingual turn', GE-informed English language education (ELE) should move beyond English-only instructional practices and recognise learners' full linguistic repertoires as legitimate resources for communication, knowledge construction, and learning (Anderson, 2024; Galloway, 2025). Expanding the range of English variations in teaching materials is valuable, but it does not, by itself, address the exclusion of indigenous, heritage, or minoritised repertoires from learning. The relationship between GE and translanguaging directs attention to how learners mobilise linguistic and semiotic resources to participate and make knowledge, while questioning and challenging the hierarchies that determine their legitimacy (Fang & Xu, 2022). English education must therefore consider how English operates alongside other languages and whose experiences remain marginal even within apparently inclusive classrooms.

10.30466/ijltr.2026.122106

These concerns connect classroom practice, curriculum design, and teacher education. Learners cannot readily act on inclusive classroom messages if textbooks and examinations consistently reward a narrower model. Teachers likewise need preparation and institutional support to make principled choices about language variation, disciplinary conventions, and communicative appropriateness. Therefore, GE-informed ELE should examine how these educational arrangements work together. The question concerns both what learners encounter and how linguistic and cultural diversity is valued when they participate, learn, and demonstrate understanding.

The Global South provides an essential perspective on these questions. Following Pennycook and Makoni (2020), we understand it as a position from which to interrogate unequal relations of knowledge and authority, rather than a homogeneous geographical category. Fang and Dovchin (2024) already put forward several questions of inquiry regarding the issue of language and inequality in the Global South: 'Should English be considered either hegemonic-dominating or liberating-empowering from a Global South perspective? How do language educators or users in a Global South respond to the complexity of English against the backdrop of mono/bi/multilingualism?' (p. 1225). Educational contexts across the South differ substantially, and inequalities also operate within them. Locally grounded GE research can illuminate these differences while stimulating and facilitating dialogue across settings. Such work positions teachers and learners as interpreters and producers of knowledge whose experiences can inform the development of the field.

This special issue, with the theme "Advancing Global Englishes in the Global South: Classroom Practice, Curriculum Innovation, and Teacher Education," brings together nine papers situated in Colombia, Thailand, China, Tunisia, Mexico, and Vietnam. The papers provide classroom inquiries, mixed-methods studies, textbook analysis, qualitative syntheses, and conceptual work examine how GE can inform educational change. We organise them around three intersecting themes. Across these themes, a recurring concern connects individual awareness with the curricular and institutional conditions needed to sustain multilingual and equitable education.

2. Classroom practice curriculum innovation and teacher education from the Global Englishes perspective

The first three papers focus on classroom practice and ideological negotiation from the GE perspective. Jhon Eduardo Mosquera Pérez and Maria Alejandra Valencia Rueda examined six GE-informed sessions with 17 tenth-grade students in a Colombian public secondary school (Mosquera Pérez & Valencia Rueda, 2026). Drawing on an entry survey, reflections, and focus groups, they traced expanding recognition of English diversity and shared ownership. Students began to question the equation of correctness with native-speaker conformity, although established preferences remained. The study extends GE inquiry into secondary education and demonstrates the value of carefully scaffolded engagement with diverse Englishes. Its account of partial, contradictory change cautions against assuming that a short intervention can displace entrenched language ideologies established through years of schooling.

Yang (2026) approached classroom change through a translingual poetic autoethnography of a "Culture and Englishes" course in a Thai private university. Drawing on teaching documents, field notes, discussions, and students' essays, Yang develops a locally articulated understanding of GE that connects global communication with personal language ownership. Storytelling, critical theory, and translanguaging enable learners to interpret their multilingual experiences as resources for knowledge and identity. The article makes the teacher's own curricular choices and positioning visible within decolonial praxis. The ethnographic methodological experimentation also broadens

how classroom experience can be represented, foregrounding the voices and subjectivities through which educational change becomes personally meaningful.

Boonsuk (2026) widened the lens to secondary education stakeholders in Thailand's multilingual Deep South. The study considers questionnaires from students and teachers alongside student and teacher focus groups and administrator interviews. Participants expressed support for intelligibility, diverse accents, professionally competent teachers, and locally relevant cultural materials, while native-speaker preferences and institutional constraints persisted. Bringing these stakeholder perspectives together shows why classroom innovation requires engagement with assessment, curricular expectations, and school leadership. The study connects pedagogical possibilities to the multilingual circumstances of Pattani-Malay, Thai, and English, highlighting the importance of reform that responds to local cultural experiences.

These papers locate ideological negotiation within situated educational relationships. Exposure to diversity creates openings, but teachers must also provide interpretive resources through which learners can understand why particular ways of speaking gain authority. However, such ideological shifts are often gradual and uneven, as deeply rooted native-speaker norms continue to shape learners' perceptions of linguistic legitimacy. Therefore, sustained pedagogical engagement is essential to translate growing awareness of linguistic diversity into more inclusive attitudes and classroom practices.

Following classroom practices and ideological negotiation, another two papers address curriculum representation and multilingual disciplinary learning from the GE paradigm. Huang, Zhu, Pan, and Cui examined the global orientation of three compulsory textbooks in the 2019 New Senior English for China series (Huang et al., 2026). Their adapted GELT analysis addresses English users and communication, language models, cultural representation, and explicit GE concepts. Cultural diversity and some communicative perspectives receive attention, yet non-Chinese additional-language users remain less visible and native-speaker pronunciation models retain authority. GE content is also unevenly distributed, including in supplementary sections. The analysis underlines why broad cultural coverage cannot alone establish curricular transformation and invites teachers to critically mediate the relationship between textbook diversity and normative learning expectations.

Li and Fang extended the curricular discussion to English-medium instruction (EMI) in mainland Chinese higher education (Li & Fang, 2026). Their GELT-guided meta-synthesis of 25 qualitative studies examines the relationships among language ideology, assessment, teacher positioning, learner identity, and knowledge legitimacy. It develops an analytical progression from systemic misalignment, through multilingual reconceptualisation, to the embedding of multilingualism across institutions, curricula, and pedagogy. This progression is an interpretive account, rather than evidence of uniform institutional development. The paper reframes EMI quality around the alignment of educational purposes and practices, including which languages can mediate disciplinary knowledge and whose voices receive recognition.

These two papers expose a shared curricular problem: acknowledging diversity can coexist with maintaining restrictive benchmarks. Sustained innovation requires connections among representation, communicative goals, classroom participation, and evaluation. It also calls for examining how teachers interpret and enact curricula, since materials and policy statements cannot fully reveal classroom experience.

10.30466/ijltr.2026.122106

Teacher education is another key aspect when addressing GE for pedagogical enactment. Four papers in this issue focus on this theme. Abdeljaoued (2026) developed a conceptual response to EMI teacher preparation through the Global Englishes-informed Multilingual Framework. Grounded in a theory-driven qualitative synthesis and illustrated through Tunisia's multilingual higher education context, the framework connects disciplinary communication, intelligibility-oriented communication, multilingual pedagogy, critical language awareness, and assessment reorientation. It brings GE into dialogue with English for Specific Purposes and Academic Purposes, treating content teachers' work as mediating disciplinary understanding across linguistic resources. The framework offers directions for integrated professional learning, while its practical value remains to be examined empirically. Its inclusion highlights how curriculum innovation and teacher education depend on one another.

Mora-Pablo (2026) examined nine pre-service and novice in-service teachers in a Mexican sociolinguistics classroom. Online forums, linguistic landscape photo essays, observation reports, and a focus group articulate how participants negotiated GE through local and transnational experience. Linking GE with critical language awareness helped participants reconsider linguistic legitimacy and imagine more inclusive teaching. Their perspectives nevertheless retained pragmatic commitments to dominant norms. The study demonstrates the pedagogical value of investigating language in communities, families, and public spaces. It also identifies the need to extend inquiry beyond Spanish–English repertoires to engage more fully with Mexico's indigenous multilingual landscape.

Liu (2026) examined a ten-week intervention embedded in an existing Chinese teacher education course, combining readings on GE with readings on accentism. The analysis drew on 52 voluntary reflections and eight interviews. Participants reported greater acceptance of diverse Englishes, increased recognition of accent-based discrimination, and intentions to adopt GE-aligned pedagogy. The study connects cognitive awareness with ethical responsibility towards English users. Its embedded design offers a practical response to crowded curricula, while its reliance on retrospective self-reports leaves open how reported changes will translate into classroom decisions and relationships.

Tran, Van and Nguyen investigated informal exposure to English diversity among Vietnamese pre-service teachers (Tran et al., 2026). Their sequential explanatory study combines questionnaires across seven universities with interviews. Greater exposure was associated with acceptance of local and other Englishes, communicative confidence, and willingness to incorporate GELT, but showed no significant association with reduced native-speakerism. Their account of "bounded pluralism" clarifies how communicative openness can coexist with established hierarchies. Teacher education consequently needs to connect informal encounters with guided reflection and practical preparation for negotiating institutional expectations.

Across these studies, professional learning involves more than adding GE content to a syllabus. Teachers need opportunities to interpret linguistic inequality, develop pedagogical alternatives, and examine how institutional arrangements enable or constrain their enactment. Awareness, ethical commitments, and classroom practice remain related but analytically distinct. Therefore, sustained professional development, opportunities for critical reflection, and institutional support are essential to help teachers negotiate the tensions between GE principles and conventional language teaching expectations.

3. Future directions for multilingual and critical perspectives of Global Englishes in language education

The nine papers collectively position GE as a continuing educational negotiation across classroom activity, curriculum, and professional learning. Their findings caution against treating diversity awareness as a completed transformation. Learners and teachers may recognise multiple Englishes while retaining preferences shaped by examinations, employment expectations, and institutional authority. These tensions provide a productive starting point for further inquiry into how multilingual commitments become consequential in everyday educational decisions.

Longitudinal research should follow learners and teachers beyond interventions, tracing how beliefs interact with lesson planning, feedback, assessment, and participation. Observations, teaching artefacts, interactional records, and stimulated recall can complement questionnaires and interviews. Comparative and participatory studies could examine how similar GE principles are adapted across settings without assuming equivalent histories or needs. Such work would address the methodological agenda identified by Rose et al. (2021), while enabling teachers and communities to help define meaningful outcomes. Assessment research is especially needed to develop and examine criteria for intelligibility, accommodation, pragmatic appropriateness, and multilingual meaning-making.

A critical multilingual agenda must also investigate inequalities within the Global South. Recognising local English does not automatically secure recognition for indigenous or minoritised languages, and multilingual classroom practices can still privilege socially dominant repertoires. Future research should ask whose resources become useful for learning, whose knowledge is authorised, and who gains access to educational opportunities. Curriculum co-design with teachers, learners, and communities can connect these questions to practical decisions about materials, language use, and assessment. Success should include meaningful participation and epistemic recognition alongside changes in attitudes.

Collaboration across Southern contexts could further diversify the sources of pedagogical knowledge. Joint materials development, teacher inquiry networks, and comparative classroom projects can support exchanges grounded in shared questions without overlooking local differences. Researchers should also consider whose languages are used to disseminate findings and whether participating communities can access and contest the interpretations made about them. Such commitments connect multilingual research practice with its educational aspirations.

Artificial intelligence (AI) adds urgency to this agenda. Although the issue is not primarily a collection of AI studies, its concerns about linguistic authority and representation offer a basis for examining AI-mediated education. Multilingual output should not be assumed to provide equally meaningful support across languages, varieties, or knowledge domains. GE-oriented inquiry can investigate how systems respond to diverse accents, evaluate locally situated English, represent cultural knowledge, and mediate interaction across repertoires. This direction connects GE pragmatic competence with critical AI literacy (Fang, 2026) and with calls to protect human agency and linguistic diversity in educational AI use (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

Pedagogically, multilingual literacy in the AI era should include the capacity to compare outputs across languages, question omissions and stereotypes, and justify communicative choices for particular audiences. Students might examine AI explanations of local practices, consult

10.30466/ijltr.2026.122106

community knowledge, and revise the outputs with a rationale. Teacher education can similarly involve evaluating automated feedback for the assumptions it makes about legitimate English. These proposals warrant empirical investigation, including attention to participation, access, and teachers' professional judgement. GE research should help establish when AI supports multilingual agency and when its apparent convenience narrows available meanings.

The issue invites sustained collaboration among researchers, educators, curriculum designers, and communities. Advancing GE in the Global South requires educational structures that support teachers' informed decisions and recognise learners as legitimate multilingual participants. Classroom practice, curriculum innovation, and teacher education offer interconnected means of pursuing that work, including as digital technologies reshape the conditions of language learning and use. Importantly, the integration of AI into GE-informed education should not reproduce existing linguistic hierarchies under the appearance of technological innovation. Rather, AI technologies should be critically examined regarding the extent to which they privilege standardised English varieties, marginalise less dominant languages and accents, or reinforce native-speaker ideologies through automated feedback and assessment. This is particularly important in Global South contexts, where unequal access to technological resources and the underrepresentation of local linguistic and cultural knowledge may further exacerbate existing educational inequalities.

References

Abdeljaoued, M. (2026). Preparing EMI content teachers for Global Englishes in Tunisia: Implications for Global South higher education. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 73–90. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57671.3492

Anderson, J. (2024). Translanguaging: A paradigm shift for ELT theory and practice. *ELT Journal*, *78*(1), 72–81. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad057

Boonsuk, Y. (2026). Decolonizing English education in Thailand's multilingual Deep South: Secondary education stakeholders' perspectives on Global Englishes. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 91–109. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57663.3485

Fang, F. (2026). Forging Global Englishes pragmatic competence in the era of artificial intelligence. *RELC Journal.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882261468465

Fang, F., & Dovchin, S. (2024). Editorial: Reflection and reform of applied linguistics from the Global South: Power and inequality in English users from the Global South. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *15*(4), 1223-1230. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2022-0072

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

Fang, F., & Xu, Y. (2022). Commonalities and conflation of Global Englishes and translanguaging for equitable English language education. *TESL-EJ, 26*(3). https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a9

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. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal, 72*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010

Huang, J., Zhu, J., Pan, L., & Cui, R. (2026). Evaluating the global orientation of Chinese senior secondary English textbooks: A Global Englishes perspective. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 151–168. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57735.3510

Li, H. T., & Fang, F. (2026). Reconceptualising English medium instruction in higher education: Insights from a Global Englishes meta-synthesis in the Chinese context. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 49–71. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57672.3490

Liu, J. (2026). Embedded intervention for ideological change: Global Englishes and anti-accentism readings in a Chinese English teacher education course. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 131–149. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57665.3486

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535

Mora-Pablo, I. (2026). "It is not just one English": Negotiating Global Englishes through critical sociolinguistic inquiry in a Mexican teacher education classroom. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 111–130. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57716.3503

Mosquera Pérez, J. E., & Valencia Rueda, M. A. (2026). "I didn't know there were so many ways to speak English": Developing Global Englishes awareness among Colombian secondary school students. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57670.3489

Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2020). *Innovations and Challenges in Applied Linguistics from the Global South*. Routledge.

Romanowski, P. (2025). (Eds.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Multilingual Education*. Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Tran, T. T., Van, N. T. M., & Do, N. D. K. (2026). Informal exposure and Global Englishes awareness: A sequential mixed-methods study of Vietnamese pre-service teachers. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 169–193. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57673.3493

10.30466/ijltr.2026.122106

EDITORIAL

Yang, S. (2026). Teaching Global Englishes in the Global South: A translingual poetic autoethnography of decolonial pedagogical design and praxis in a Thai private university. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 23–47. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2026.57650.3487