

## English Language Teaching in the Modern Globalized World: Thai L2 Learners' Views on Global Englishes

Apaporn Puchpan<sup>a</sup> and Krich Rajprasit<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>b</sup> Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand

\*Corresponding author: [krich@g.swu.ac.th](mailto:krich@g.swu.ac.th)

Article information	
<b>Abstract</b>	As a global language, English plays a dominant role in various fields such as international business, politics, diplomacy, and education. Even so, the ideology of native-speakerism remains prevalent in some ELT communities, especially in expanding-circle countries where native-speakers are treated as role models. To respond to calls for change in the current ELT community, the present study explored Thai university students' attitudes toward Global Englishes (GE) and compared these attitudes across sociocultural factors (i.e., gender, years of study, and fields of study) in order to inform the design and development of general English courses that promote the GE paradigm. The study utilized a quantitative research approach through an online survey distributed to 1,399 students enrolled in general English courses at 10 universities located in Bangkok and its surrounding areas. The study yielded insights into Thai university students' perceptions regarding the varieties and ownership of English, revealing significant factors influencing these perceptions, particularly their fields of study, and highlighting directions for developing GE-informed general English courses aligned with those perceptions.
<b>Keywords</b>	Varieties of English, ownership of English, Global Englishes, Global Englishes for Language Teaching, general English courses
<b>APA citation:</b>	Puchpan, A., & Rajprasit, K. (2025). English language teaching in the modern globalized world: Thai L2 learners' views on Global Englishes. <i>PASAA Journal</i> , 71, 22–51.

### 1. Introduction

The dominance of English at the international level is the result of several factors, including historical colonialism, today's increased global mobility and migration, economics, education, arts and culture, and modern media. The

language has become an integral part of wider communication globally and is inextricably linked to the concepts of culture-freeness, universality, and neutrality in a repertoire of sociolinguistic settings. In this regard, the language is no longer dominated by the communities of native or L1 users of English. However, it is shared with large numbers of non-native or L2 users of English who also belong to the English-speaking community (Colmenero & Lasagabaster, 2020). Still, many users of English believe that good English, as a vital tool for successful communication, can only be achieved by speaking and writing grammatically correct English and that educated L1 users of English are the model for good English. This belief is tied to the conventions of so-called standard English, such as the King's English or BBC English (Mauranen, 2012). However, it is also argued today that such a belief about good English may not be reasonable for the L2 users and that the use of good English (either speaking or writing) is ensured when the speakers can successfully exchange their communicative messages with each other, using plain and intelligible English (Karakaş, 2017).

In Thailand, there are increasing interactions between Thai users of English and L2 users of English from other countries, particularly in the ASEAN region, and especially connected to economic activities, such as international tourism, business, and academic linkages. However, among Thai users, an idealistic model persists in the belief that only L1 users of English are good users, leading to the misconception that only British and American English are correct. This perception is especially prevalent in the classroom, where the superiority of both Englishes is heavily promoted (Huttayavilaiphan, 2021; Meer et al., 2022). As a result, many students may not even realize that there is a diversity of Englishes used outside of their classrooms in the real world (Jindapitak et al., 2022). Several studies have been done on the perceptions among Thai undergraduate students on the ownership of English and the varieties of English (e.g., Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021; Boonsuk & Ambele, 2020); however, these have tended to involve only a small number of participants or a focus on specific research sites.

To address this gap, this study involved a larger sample size comprising students from various universities and university types, including autonomous, public, and private universities in Thailand. The aim was to explore students' perceptions of Global Englishes. Specifically, the study compared students' attitudes toward different varieties and ownership of English, as well as their perceptions of English language teaching, using the Global Englishes Language Teaching framework. This comparison was made across three factors which are gender, years of study, and fields of study. Chan (2018) emphasizes the importance of investigating gender differences in language attitudes within diverse multilingual settings and their implications for modern English language education.

In addition, Thienthong and Uthaikorn (2023) highlight that research comparing students' attitudes toward various English accents and varieties across different fields and stages of study remains underexplored, particularly in the context of ELT in Thailand. They note that students at various stages of learning English may develop varying language attitudes over time.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Global Englishes and the Global Englishes Language Teaching Framework**

#### **2.1.1 Global Englishes**

The worldwide proliferation of English has resulted in various language forms and interactions among users from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The established paradigms, thus, outline its functions, including World Englishes (WE) classifying English into three concentric circles (i.e., inner, outer, and expanding circles) (Kachru, 1982), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) emphasizing the communication techniques utilized by speakers from different backgrounds (Jenkins et al., 2011; Seidlhofer, 2011), English as an International Language (EIL) addressing its social and educational consequences (Matsuda, 2012), translanguaging exploring how speakers draw upon their full linguistic resources during communication (García, 2009; García & Li, 2014), and the multilingual turn in second language acquisition theory describing how English and other languages are used (Conteh & Meier, 2014). Due to the shared ideology among the established paradigms, the Global Englishes (GE) paradigm intends to unify them to promote research collaboration across related areas. This unification mainly aims to facilitate innovative curriculum development and create a link between theory and practical application (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020). Thus, this paradigm represents an inclusive perspective that acknowledges English users' linguistic and sociocultural diversity within a global context (Rose & Galloway, 2019). Additionally, it advocates for a transformation in ELT to encourage multilingualism and appreciate the diversity of English, emphasizing its significance in global communication.

Even though the GE paradigm is acknowledged globally in educational settings and teacher training programs (Galloway, 2025), some researchers argue that this paradigm competes with other paradigms, like World Englishes (WE) (Sadeghpour & D'Angelo, 2022; Widdowson, 2022). In Galloway's (2025) argument, the GE paradigm attempts to promote a shift in perspective within the ELT field, not to replace existing paradigms. That is, the dependence on "native" English standards should not be prioritized, yet the diverse linguistic contexts in which learners develop their language skills should be acknowledged. Thus, the paradigm

is comprehensive and supports English language acquisition in multilingual and multicultural environments.

### **2.1.2 The Global Englishes Language Teaching Framework**

Due to globalization and the concept of a borderless world, people from diverse linguacultural backgrounds are increasingly participating in interactions and communication with each other, with English commonly used as a lingua franca among them. This is highly relevant to the ELT community and raises the need for a more multilingual and multicultural approach to teaching English, rather than the current widespread monolingual approach based on traditional native English, mainly British or American English. That is, both students and teachers should be encouraged to use their existing cultural and linguistic experiences in English learning contexts when the language is used intra-nationally and internationally (Brittain, 2020; Holliday, 2017). Indeed, the goal of such learning should be to support the development of competent users of English whose cultural and linguistic identities are preserved in the learning process and in communicating in English (Nguyen et al., 2021).

In doing so, the need for the Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) framework has been proposed for years (Galloway & Rose, 2018; Rose & Galloway, 2019), with the aim of preparing and empowering language learners as L2 users to participate in communication within multilingual and multicultural settings. To apply the framework, language teachers and practitioners need to rethink and consider the key issues related to such changes that will challenge the traditional ELT paradigm, including for the people involved. These include the target interlocutor(s), owners of English, target culture(s), classroom teachers, norms, role model(s) of English users, instructional materials used in the classroom, roles of the first language and culture, and the overall ideology. Such issues need to be addressed in the GELT framework geared toward developing competent L2 users based on a multilingual and multicultural approach, rather than today's predominant monolingual and monocultural approach. However, when applying the framework, the classroom contexts and students' characteristics should also be considered. This is because such a framework would provide an approach for application only, not a method of teaching. It would thus require language teachers and practitioners to think critically and creatively about their locally designed and developed teaching practices, learning activities, courses, and, especially, their students' backgrounds (Galloway, 2017). In addition, teaching English to young L2 users should highlight the geopolitical context, linguistic landscape, cultural landscape, and social purposes of English learning and use in terms of the instructional materials used to widen their understanding of the realistic use of the language (Widodo et al., 2022). In this study, local students' attitudes to GE were

a key focus, as consideration of their attitudes is crucial for the further design and development of effective general English courses based on the GELT framework.

## **2.2 Varieties of English**

Like other languages, English gets modified when it is used in different speech communities. Such modifications are a common cause of language variation in terms of phonological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and other diachronic shifts (Ahn & Kang, 2017). However, standard English is still the most widely used in certain communities and across various domains, such as education, administration, and business, with the preservation of its identity, conventions, and values (Widdowson, 1994). Even so, the language itself is linguistically and culturally diverse and pluralistic. Kachru's three concentric circles model is used to describe the widespread use of English around the world based on three categories of countries: inner-circle countries, outer-circle countries, and expanding-circle countries (Kachru, 1982). This model considers how English naturally converges and becomes acculturated with local languages by linguistic, social, and cultural forces. The inner-circle countries, such as the UK and the USA, are seen as the norm-providing countries, while the outer-circle countries, such as Singapore and the Philippines, are norm-developing countries, and the expanding-circle countries are norm-dependent countries, such as Japan, Korea, and Thailand, as they had no or little historical or political relations with those inner-circle countries during the colonization period. Although there is debate about how valid and applicable the model is in a dynamic and multilingual reality, the model is still useful for the present study for considering the use of English by users with diverse linguacultural backgrounds. In today's globalized community, interactions and communication among people all around the world are increasingly carried out using English, such that L2 users of English now far outnumber L1 users. Indeed, it is estimated that L2 users account for over 80% of English users, and this is shaping and defining English itself, which is now used more within multilingual and multicultural contexts (Djuraeva, 2022). Therefore, the use of English by such diverse users can also reflect its users' identities, including their values, behaviors, and cultures (Saeki, 2015).

One of the expanding-circle countries where English is used as a foreign language is Thailand, which is the research setting of this study. In Thailand, there is no existence of "Thai English" as a recognized form of English, as it is not a common language used among Thais for intra-communication purposes. However, the English that many Thais use, when necessary, often referred to as Thai-accented English or even Thainess in English, has its own unique characteristics due to the influence of the Thai language in terms of lexicon, syntax, discourse, and phonology. For instance, some Thai users of English make the monophthongs

(/i/ and /ɪ/) distinctively shorter than L1 users do, or they equate the diphthongs /eɪ/ and /oʊ/ with the Thai long vowels /e:/ and /o:/. They also produce a substitute /v/ for /w/, and /z/ for /s/ (Trakulkasemsuk, 2012). Because some vowels and consonants do not exist in Thai, these characteristics of English used by Thai users are replaced with similar ones available in the native Thai language, leading to pronunciations that may deviate from those of L1 users of English. Nevertheless, Thai-accented English, influenced by the Thai language and identity, should not pose a significant barrier to international communication unless it becomes unintelligible and incomprehensible (Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021).

Recent studies on the attitudes toward varieties of English have reported different results among L2 users. Some students are more accepting of the English diversity as they have been exposed to different varieties of English, not limited to only British or American English. For instance, Kong and Kang (2022) reported that Korean students were more accepting of any variety of English as long as the pronunciation and accents of the users were intelligible and comprehensible. Indeed, proficient users of English do not have to use just native-like English. Wang (2019) compared Taiwanese students studying in international education and non-international education programs and found that the study program influenced how students expressed their attitudes toward different varieties of English. Those with an internationalized background were more likely to accept English varieties that differed from their own. In addition, some students accepted the English used by their own country's users as long as the English was intelligible and comprehensible. This was also evident in a study carried out by Ambele and Boonsuk (2021) with English-majoring Thai students, which reported that many students thought that Thai-accented English is not inferior to other Englishes providing its users have clear pronunciation and can be understood. However, other groups of students believed that the English used by L1 users should be the standard and most accepted because of their familiarity with some particular varieties. For example, Ahn and Kang (2017) discovered that Korean students had more positive attitudes toward American English compared to other varieties because of the perceived American socio-economic status, prestige, and power in Korea. Meer et al. (2022) found that German students perceived Standard American English as the reference norms for their language use, while the users of other varieties were perceived as less competent, professional, or intelligible. Overall, it can be concluded that L2 users of English have different attitudes toward various English varieties, with their exposure to and familiarity with particular varieties being key factors influencing their attitudes toward those varieties and their users.

### 2.3 Ownership of English

As English originated in England, the view that the English used there is the most correct and proper one and its L1 users are the model for other L2 users of English is widespread and has long existed. Traditionally, the inner-circle countries (where English is used as a national language) claim the ownership of English as English is learned from infancy or is associated with the ethnicity of the L1 users. At the same time, a sense of the ownership of English is sharpened among many L2 users because of the prestige and power of the ‘native speaker’ paradigm (Ahn et al., 2023). However, in today’s globalized world, the use of English is widespread across the globe as a result of historical, political, economic, and educational reasons. The language has evolved into an intra-national lingua franca in outer-circle countries (where English is used as a second language), where it has been shaped and evolved, with new features of phonology, morphology, and syntax being codified into the language. Because of these reasons, there is an increasing number of learners, speakers, and users of English; indeed, the number of L2 users of English is now much higher than that of L1 users. Unquestionably, English has gained a unique status as an international language (Liu, 2021; Tarrayo et al., 2021). Thus, the language is no longer the “possession” of L1 users “living in an offshore European island, or even of larger groups living in continents elsewhere” (Widdowson, 1994, p. 382). The notion of language ownership is now also open to L2 users who can develop and attain a high level of language competency (Ahn et al., 2023), use the language routinely in their daily lives, and develop an emotional connection to it. Even though such a notion is well-supported, Yoo (2014) argues that it is understandable for L2 users in outer-circle countries to claim ownership of English, as it functions as their additional language, but this is not the case for L2 users in the expanding-circle countries (where English is used as a foreign language). In the latter case, many L2 users do not use English daily in intra-communication. In addition, Seilhamer (2015) points out that the majority of L2 users around the world probably have no knowledge or recognition of the ownership of English if the native-speakerism paradigm still prevails in their country. Apart from that, the ownership of English leads to an assumption of “good English”. Many English users, particularly L2 users, believe that good English means using standard English, which they tend to define as the form of conventional English used by the educated L1 users (Karakaş, 2017). In other words, they believe that L2 users probably could not develop such English simply by attaining the same level as the so-called owners of the language. This assumes that their speaking and writing in English must be grammatically correct and that they should sound like L1 users. If so, this seems unrealistic for most L2 users who were not born in, and have not grown up in the speech communities where English is used in all domains of communication. In particular, it seems impossible for

English to be fully mastered in some expanding-circle countries, like Thailand, where it is mostly limited to learning and used only in the classroom context.

Recent studies have reported that there are different factors that can affect attitudes toward the ownership of English among L2 users of English. First, the ideologies of English have been reported to be deeply rooted in some L2 users' attitudes, even though their language proficiency may be academically high in an international environment. This situation is particularly found in the Australian university context. Ahn, Ohki, and Slaughter (2023) discovered that international students were unlikely to claim the ownership of English as they saw themselves as language learners, not as experts, even though they had reached an advanced level of language expertise and had studied in Australia for a certain period of time. Second, national policies also have a direct impact on L2 users and how they perceive the role of English and its ownership. For instance, Djuraeva (2022) compared the perceptions of non-linguistics majors in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan regarding the ideologies of English, revealing that the former group were more confident in their claim of ownership of the language, likely because their country's top-down policies promoted trilingualism, specifically Russian, Kazakh, and English. In contrast, the latter did not have such confidence as such policies did not exist in their country. Third, gender differences can be another factor in users claiming the ownership of English. Parmegiani (2017) conducted a study in rural areas of South Africa, comparing male and female students' attitudes toward English. The study revealed that the latter group saw English as one of their own languages and tended to claim ownership of it. To them, English is a language of wider opportunities that their L1 cannot provide, so claiming ownership of English made them feel more like modern African women and empowered them to challenge the cultural norms that promote gender inequality in Africa. Finally, individual factors, such as experience, knowledge, and beliefs, are also important and have been widely studied in relation to claims of language ownership. Saeki (2015) investigated how Japanese students majoring in linguistic and non-linguistic fields developed such ownership through five different stages: de-ownership, understanding of ownership, ambivalent ownership, substantive ownership, and supra-self-ownership. The study findings revealed that the development of these students largely depended on their individual factors, such as experience, knowledge, and beliefs. Boonsuk and Ambele (2020) studied English-majoring Thai students in several Southern provinces of Thailand. The students agreed that all users of English could claim ownership of the language, as it is global, and that the native-speaker norms should not be prioritized over successful communication. In summary, many factors can affect L2 users when claiming the ownership of English. However, unless these L2 users reject the

prevalent ideology or the myths of English belongs only to L1 users, they cannot realize their right to claim to the ownership.

Motivated by the GELT framework and previous research, this study aimed to explore and compare Thai university students' attitudes toward GE across gender, years of study, and fields of study, before informing the local design and development of general English courses aligned with the GE paradigm in an expanding-circle context. To achieve these research aims, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are Thai university students' attitudes toward the different varieties and ownership of English?
  - 1.1 Is there any difference in the attitudes toward the different varieties and ownership of English among the students based on gender, years of study, and fields of study?
2. What are Thai university students' perceptions of English language teaching based on the GELT framework?
  - 2.1 Is there any difference in the perceptions of English language teaching based on the GELT framework among the students based on gender, years of study, and fields of study?

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Research Design, Research Sites and Participants

This study was based on a quantitative research approach and was conducted using an online survey. After obtaining ethical approval, the focal universities were purposively selected based on the selection criteria. These universities had to offer general English courses to first- and second-year undergraduate students who were local and studying in any academic discipline. In addition, those courses had to be conducted by local instructors. Based on the authors' networks, ten universities were selected to participate in this study. These were located in Bangkok and its suburban areas, and comprised autonomous universities ( $n = 5$ ), Rajabhat universities ( $n = 2$ ), private universities ( $n = 2$ ) and Rajamangala University of Technology ( $n = 1$ ).

**Table 1**

*Participants' Demographic Information*

Demographic information		Number	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>			
-	Female	1,046	74.77
-	Male	353	25.23
<b>Year of study</b>			
-	Year 1	999	71.41
-	Year 2	400	28.59

<b>Program</b>		
- Thai program	1041	74.41
- Bilingual program (Thai-English)	332	23.73
- International program	26	1.86
<b>Field of study</b>		
- Humanities and social sciences	848	60.61
- Science and technology	430	30.74
- Health sciences	121	8.65
<b>University type</b>		
- Autonomous universities	672	48.03
- Rajabhat universities	665	47.53
- Rajamangala university of technology	50	3.57
- Private universities	12	0.86

A total of 1,399 students were recruited, with females making up 74.77% of the cohort and males comprising 25.23%. Approximately 70% of the students were first-year students, while the remaining 28.59% were second-year students. In terms of academic backgrounds, around 60% belonged to the field of humanities and social sciences, including the Faculties of Social Sciences, Humanities, Business Administration, Education, Management Sciences, Architecture, and Communication Arts. About 30.74% of the students were from the field of science and technology, encompassing the Faculties of Sciences, Engineering, and Agro-Industry. The remaining 8.65% were from the field of health sciences, specifically Nursing, Physical Therapy, and Physical Education. Additionally, most students were enrolled in autonomous universities (48.03%), while the rest attended Rajabhat universities (47.53%), Rajamangala university of technology (3.57%), and private universities (0.86%).

### 3.2 Research Instrument

An online questionnaire was developed and used for the data collection, comprising four parts covering (1) demographic information, (2) attitudes toward the English varieties, (3) the ownership of English, and (4) perceptions of English language teaching based on the GELT framework. To illustrate, the items in Part 1 included items on gender, years of study, program types, fields of study, and university types. Part 2 focused on an awareness of English diversity with 20 items which were adapted from the relevant previous studies (Galloway & Rose, 2018; Karakaş, 2017; Rose & Galloway, 2019). Then, Part 3 focused on ownership of English with five items, and Part 4 involved the perceptions of English language teaching based on the GELT framework with seven items. All items in Parts 3 and 4 were adapted from a questionnaire used in the second author's previous work (Rajprasit, 2024). To complete the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with the provided statements on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The questionnaire was administered in the Thai language to avoid any misunderstandings and

misinterpretations. It took about 15–20 minutes for the respondents to complete the questionnaire. The development steps of the questionnaire are outlined below.

After compiling all items from previous research (Galloway & Rose, 2018; Karakaş, 2017; Rajprasit, 2024; Rose & Galloway, 2019) and creating the first draft of the questionnaire, we conducted an initial pilot study involving 30 students from one of the ten focal universities that did not participate in the main study. This pilot study aimed to assess the feasibility of the questionnaire. As a result, five items in Part 2 were removed, reducing the total from 25 to 20 items. All items in Parts 3 and 4 remained unchanged (5 and 7 items, respectively). Subsequently, a second pilot study was conducted with a different group of students ( $n = 34$ ). The Cronbach's alpha value for this study was 0.94, which is considered highly acceptable (Cohen et al., 2018).

Then, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to examine the interrelationships among the items, identify patterns of correspondence, and group them into factors based on shared variance. First, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity were performed for all three analyses (Parts 2–4). In Part 2, the analysis of 20 items showed that Bartlett's test for the entire correlation matrix was significant ( $\chi^2 = 28344.605$ ,  $df = 300$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating a strong relationship among the variables (KMO = .93). In Parts 3 and 4, which analyzed items 5 and 7 items respectively, Bartlett's tests of sphericity were also significant ( $\chi^2 = 937.002$ ,  $df = 10$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $\chi^2 = 2439.075$ ,  $df = 21$ ,  $p < .001$ ), while the KMO values were .534 and .704, respectively. According to Kaiser and Rice (1974), the KMO value must be above 0.5 to be considered adequate. Specifically, values between 0.5 and 0.7 are classified as mediocre, values between 0.7 and 0.8 as good, values between 0.8 and 0.9 as great, and values above 0.9 as superb. Additionally, Bartlett's test of sphericity should show statistical significance ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Cohen et al., 2018). Therefore, the results from the three analyses confirm a sufficient correlation between variables and demonstrate that the data is acceptable for further analysis.

To further investigate the factor structure of attitudes towards various English varieties, perceptions of English ownership, and views on English language teaching based on the GELT framework, varimax rotations were utilized to simplify the factors. This method maximizes the variance in loadings for each factor across the variables. Following the varimax rotation, twenty variables were grouped into three factors (Part 2), five variables into two factors (Part 3), and seven variables into two factors (Part 4). A loading threshold of more than 0.5 was established to indicate a strong correlation within each factor (Woodrow, 2014). The results of the factor structures are presented in Tables 2-4.

**Table 2***Rotation Component Matrix of Attitudes Toward the English Varieties*

	<b>Factor 1 Standard English</b>	<b>Factor 2 Domains of using varieties of English</b>	<b>Factor 3 Varieties of English</b>
Thai-accented English is embarrassing.	.81		
Correct English must have one standard.	.79		
Other varieties of English are incorrect.	.78		
Correct English is American English only.	.77		
Correct English is British English only	.77		
Thai English is just wrong English.	.75		
Heavily Thai-accented English is undesirable.	.74		
You will choose to speak either British or American English.	.72		
Standard English is found only in writing.	.69		
Standard English has the same rules of grammar	.51		
Varieties of English can be found on social networks.		.89	
Varieties of English can be found in ads.		.89	
Varieties of English can be found in printed materials.		.87	
Varieties of English can be found in English novels.		.82	
Some mistakes in using English are fine if the messages are clear.		.77	
Using English differently by different L1 users should be accepted.		.61	
Canadian English should be counted as correct English			.87
New Zealand English should be counted as correct English.			.87
Australian English should be counted as correct English.			.87
Singaporean, Indian, and Philippine English are standard English			.55

**Table 3***Rotation Component Matrix of Attitudes Toward the Ownership of English*

	<b>Factor 1 Native speakers of English</b>	<b>Factor 2 International users of English</b>
British and Americans are the owners of English.	.89	
British and Americans are the owners of English because I learned English from the textbooks written by them.	.89	
Race, ethnicity, appearance cannot be an indicator of who is an English owner.		.80
English is now an international language.		.66
English belongs to those who use it regardless of mistakes.		.66

**Table 4**

*Rotation Component Matrix of Perceptions of English Language Teaching Based on the GELT Framework*

	<b>Factor 1 Exclusive and ethnocentric view of English</b>	<b>Factor 2 Inclusive Global Englishes perspective</b>
English taught at university must be British or American English only.	.85	
English instructors in a university should be native speakers only.	.77	
English exam items should be British or American English only.	.76	
Thai students should be encouraged to use English with their own identity (Thainess in English).	.67	
Other types of English should be taught.		.81
English exam items may include other Englishes		.73
Local teachers in a university are equally effective teachers.		.62

To sum up, Part 2 focuses on the awareness of English diversity, comprising 20 items organized under three components: Standard English, using varieties of English, and varieties of English. Part 3 addresses the ownership of English with five items divided into two components: native speakers of English and international users of English. Part 4 examines perceptions of English language teaching based on the GELT framework, with seven items categorized into two components: an exclusive and ethnocentric view of English, and an inclusive Global Englishes perspective.

### **3.3 Data Collection Procedure and Data Analysis**

The online questionnaire was distributed to the participants of the focal universities. It was completed within three months with assistance from the English instructors of general English courses who were contacted when designing this study. Then, the normality of the data distribution was assessed using skewness and kurtosis statistics. According to established criteria for normality, skewness values should fall within  $\pm 2.0$  and kurtosis values within  $\pm 7.0$  for acceptable deviation from normality (Curran et al., 1996; Kline, 2016). In this data set, skewness values ranged from  $-1.59$  to  $0.40$ , and kurtosis values ranged from  $-1.18$  to  $2.78$ , all of which fall within the recommended thresholds. These results suggest that the distributions of the observed variables do not significantly deviate from normality, and thus the data are suitable for parametric statistical analyses that assume a normal distribution. Afterward, the collected data were analyzed, using the IBM SPSS software (version 29.0.0.0) for descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (i.e., *t*-test for comparing gender and one-way ANOVA for comparing years of study, and fields of study).

## 4. Findings

### 4.1 Awareness of English Varieties

The use of English is diverse, just as there are wide varieties of English used in different countries and continents. However, the Thai students in this study had mixed opinions on the different varieties as shown in Table 5.

**Table 5**

*Overview on Students' Attitudes Toward English Varieties*

Awareness of English varieties	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Level
<b>Standard English</b>			
1. Thai-accented English is embarrassing.	3.43	1.33	A
2. Correct English must have one standard.	3.25	1.28	NS
3. Other varieties of English are incorrect.	3.50	1.28	A
4. Correct English is American English only.	3.19	1.16	NS
5. Correct English is British English only.	3.01	1.19	NS
6. Thai English is just wrong English.	3.18	1.19	NS
7. Heavily Thai-accented English is undesirable.	2.91	1.25	NS
8. Either British or American English should be used only.	3.20	1.13	NS
9. Standard English is found only in writing.	3.04	1.18	NS
10. Standard English has the same rules of grammar.	3.55	1.00	A
<b>Using varieties of English</b>			
11. Varieties of English can be found on social networks.	4.09	.85	A
12. Varieties of English can be found in ads.	4.04	.86	A
13. Varieties of English can be found in printed materials.	3.40	.88	NS
14. Varieties of English can be found in English novels.	3.96	.92	A
15. Some mistakes in using English are fine if the messages are clear.	4.14	.87	A
16. Using English differently by different L1 users should be accepted.	4.11	.87	A
<b>Varieties of English</b>			
17. Canadian English should be counted as correct English.	3.20	1.07	NS
18. New Zealand English should be counted as correct English.	3.19	1.08	NS
19. Australian English should be counted as correct English.	3.22	1.07	NS
20. Singaporean, Indian, and Philippine English are standard English.	2.86	1.10	NS

Note: Level of agreement: SA = Strongly agree, A = Agree, NS = Not sure, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree

The students showed moderate agreement with the “standard of English”. They agreed that Thai-accented English is embarrassing ( $M = 3.43$ ,  $SD = 1.33$ ), other varieties of English are incorrect ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 1.28$ ), and standard English has consistent grammar rules ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ). However, students were uncertain about whether correct English must have one standard ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 1.28$ ), whether American English ( $M = 3.19$ ,  $SD = 1.16$ ) or British English ( $M = 3.01$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ) constitutes correct English, and whether Thai English is inherently wrong ( $M = 3.18$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ).

When it comes to the “varieties of English”, students demonstrated strong agreement regarding the prevalence and acceptability of English varieties in various contexts. They agreed that varieties can be found on social networks ( $M = 4.09$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), in advertisements ( $M = 4.04$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ), and in English novels ( $M = 3.96$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ). Most importantly, students agreed that some mistakes in English usage are acceptable when messages remain clear ( $M = 4.14$ ,  $SD = 0.87$ ) and that different L1 users should be accepted when using English differently ( $M = 4.11$ ,  $SD = 0.87$ ). However, students showed uncertainty regarding the legitimacy of various national English varieties. They were unsure whether Canadian ( $M = 3.20$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ), New Zealand ( $M = 3.19$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ), or Australian English ( $M = 3.22$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ) should be considered correct English. Similarly, they were uncertain about recognizing Singaporean, Indian, and Philippine English as standard varieties ( $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ).

In order to determine whether the students’ attitudes toward English varieties are different, the sociocultural factors, including gender, years of study, and fields of study, were analyzed.

**Table 6**

*Students’ Attitudes Toward English Varieties Differentiated by Gender*

Item	Gender	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> -value
3. Other varieties of English are incorrect.	Female	3.20	1.04	-.90	563	.010
	Male	3.26	1.14			
5. Correct English is British English only.	Female	3.19	1.05	-.52	572	.042
	Male	3.22	1.13			
6. Thai English is just wrong English.	Female	2.46	1.26	-1.84	572	.034
	Male	2.61	1.35			
12. Varieties of English can be found in ads.	Female	3.12	1.08	-.92	575	.035
	Male	3.19	1.15			
16. Using English differently by different L1 users should be accepted.	Female	3.96	.98	.67	578	.040
	Male	3.92	1.04			
17. Canadian English should be counted as correct English.	Female	3.97	.90	.70	563	.023
	Male	3.93	.98			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

As presented in Table 6, significant gender differences emerged across several attitude dimensions. Male students showed significantly more agreement than females that other varieties of English are incorrect ( $M$ , male = 3.26,  $M$ , female = 3.20;  $t = -0.90$ ,  $p = .010$ ) and that correct English is British English only ( $M$ , male = 3.22,  $M$ , female = 3.19;  $t = -0.52$ ,  $p = .042$ ). Additionally, males were more likely to view Thai English as wrong English ( $M$ , male = 2.61,  $M$ , female = 2.46;  $t = -1.84$ ,  $p = .034$ ).

Conversely, females demonstrated greater acceptance of English varieties in certain contexts, showing higher agreement that varieties can be found in advertisements ( $M$ , female = 3.12,  $M$ , male = 3.19;  $t = -0.92$ ,  $p = .035$ ) and that using English differently by different L1 users should be accepted ( $M$ , female = 3.96,  $M$ , male = 3.92;  $t = 0.67$ ,  $p = .040$ ). Females also showed stronger support for recognizing Canadian English as correct ( $M$ , female = 3.97,  $M$ , male = 3.93;  $t = 0.70$ ,  $p = .023$ ).

**Table 7**

*Comparing Students' Attitudes Toward English Varieties Based on Years of Study*

Item	Year of study	$M$	$SD$	$t$	$df$	$p$ -value
2. Correct English must have one standard.	Year 1	2.68	1.15	-6.56	750	.037
	Year 2	3.12	1.13			
7. Heavily Thai-accented English is undesirable.	Year 1	2.60	1.27	-6.96	748	.037
	Year 2	3.12	1.24			
20. Singaporean, Indian, and Philippine English are standard English.	Year 1	4.12	.86	2.25	781	.006
	Year 2	4.01	.81			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

According to Table 7, the years of study revealed significant differences in student attitudes. Second-year students showed stronger agreement that correct English must have one standard ( $M$ , Year2 = 3.12,  $M$ , Year1 = 2.68;  $t = -6.56$ ,  $p = .037$ ) and that heavily Thai-accented English is undesirable ( $M$ , Year2 = 3.12,  $M$ , Year1 = 2.60;  $t = -6.96$ ,  $p = .037$ ). However, first-year students were more accepting of Asian English varieties, showing stronger agreement that Singaporean, Indian, and Philippine English are standard ( $M$ , Year1 = 4.12,  $M$ , Year2 = 4.01;  $t = 2.25$ ,  $p = .006$ ).

**Table 8**

*Comparing Students' Attitudes Toward English Varieties Based on Fields of the Study*

Item	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	$df$	Mean Square	$F$	Sig.
1. Thai-accented English is embarrassing.	Between Groups	9.884	2	4.942	3.53	.030
	Within Groups	1954.857	1395	1.401		
	Total	1964.742	1397			
6. Thai English is just wrong English.	Between Groups	11.803	2	5.901	3.60	.028
	Within Groups	2287.691	1395	1.640		
	Total	2299.494	1397			
7. Heavily Thai-accented English is undesirable.	Between Groups	13.449	2	6.725	4.11	.017
	Within Groups	2280.425	1395	1.635		
	Total	2293.875	1397			
8. Either British or American English should be used only.	Between Groups	6.230	2	3.115	3.11	.045
	Within Groups	1395.962	1395	1.001		
	Total	1402.192	1397			

11. Varieties of English can be found on social networks.	Between Groups	5.846	2	2.923	3.29	.038
	Within Groups	1240.174	1395	.889		
	Total	1246.021	1397			
13. Varieties of English can be found in printed materials.	Between Groups	10.576	2	5.288	3.75	.024
	Within Groups	1967.358	1395	1.410		
	Total	1977.935	1397			
14. Varieties of English can be found in English novels.	Between Groups	14.327	2	7.163	4.99	.007
	Within Groups	2004.366	1395	1.437		
	Total	2018.693	1397			
15. Some mistakes in using English are fine if the messages are clear.	Between Groups	14.595	2	7.297	5.12	.006
	Within Groups	1986.997	1395	1.424		
	Total	2001.592	1397			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

Analysis of variance revealed significant differences across the fields of study for multiple items. Students from different fields showed varying levels of embarrassment toward Thai-accented English ( $F = 3.53$ ,  $p = .030$ ) and different perceptions of whether Thai English constitutes wrong English ( $F = 3.60$ ,  $p = .028$ ). Across the fields of study, their views on the undesirability of heavily Thai-accented English ( $F = 4.11$ ,  $p = .017$ ) and preferences for exclusive use of British or American English ( $F = 3.11$ ,  $p = .045$ ) are different. Regarding English variety usage, the fields of study showed significant differences in recognizing varieties on social networks ( $F = 3.29$ ,  $p = .038$ ), in printed materials ( $F = 3.75$ ,  $p = .024$ ), in English novels ( $F = 4.99$ ,  $p = .007$ ), and in accepting mistakes when messages are clear ( $F = 5.12$ ,  $p = .006$ ) (see Table 8).

## 4.2 The Ownership of English

Attitudes on language (e.g., ownership of English) are among the key factors that can build users' confidence when faced with international communication situations. In this study, the Thai students tended to believe that anybody can be the owner of English, and they recognized the sociolinguistic reality of English in the globalized world.

**Table 9**

*Overview on Students' Attitudes Toward the Ownership of English*

The ownership of English	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Level
<b>Native speakers of English</b>			
1. British and Americans are the owners of English.	3.06	1.21	NS
2. British and Americans are the owners of English because I learned English from the textbooks written by them.	3.27	1.20	NS
<b>International users of English</b>			
3. Race, ethnicity, appearance cannot be an indicator of who is an English owner.	4.09	.97	A
4. English is now an international language.	4.54	.70	SA
5. English belongs to those who use it regardless of mistakes.	3.72	1.07	A

Note: Level of agreement: SA = Strongly agree, A = Agree, NS = Not sure, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree

Students demonstrated nuanced perspectives on English ownership. They were uncertain about whether British and Americans are the owners of English ( $M = 3.06$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ) or whether textbook authorship determines ownership ( $M = 3.27$ ,  $SD = 1.20$ ). However, students strongly agreed that race, ethnicity, and appearance cannot indicate English ownership ( $M = 4.09$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) and that English is now an international language ( $M = 4.54$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ). They also agreed that English belongs to those who use it regardless of mistakes ( $M = 3.72$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ) (see Table 9).

To confirm whether there were significant differences among the students based on gender, years of study, and fields of the study, their attitudes toward the ownership of English were compared.

**Table 10**

*Comparing Students' Attitudes Toward the Ownership of English Based on Gender*

Item	Gender	$M$	$SD$	$t$	$df$	$p$ -value
1. British and Americans are the owners of English.	Female	3.04	1.19	-1.30	569	.001
	Male	3.14	1.28			
2. British and Americans are the owners of English because I learned English from the textbooks written by them.	Female	3.66	1.07	-3.32	608	.043
	Male	3.88	1.07			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

According to Table 10, significant gender differences emerged in ownership perceptions. Male students more strongly believed that British and Americans own English ( $M$ , male = 3.14,  $M$ , female = 3.04;  $t = -1.30$ ,  $p = .001$ ) and that textbook authorship determines ownership ( $M$ , male = 3.88,  $M$ , female = 3.66;  $t = -3.32$ ,  $p = .043$ ).

**Table 11**

*Comparing Students' Attitudes Toward the Ownership of English Based on Years of Study*

Item	Year of study	$M$	$SD$	$t$	$df$	$p$ -value
2. British and Americans are the owners of English because I learned English from the textbooks written by them.	Year 1	3.67	1.08	-2.59	770	.026
	Year 2	3.83	1.03			
3. Race, ethnicity, appearance cannot be an indicator of who is an English owner.	Year 1	4.58	.68	3.50	681	<.001
	Year 2	4.43	.74			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

As shown in Table 11, the years of study also influenced ownership attitudes. Second-year students showed stronger agreement that textbook authorship determines English ownership ( $M$ , Year2 = 3.83,  $M$ , Year1 = 3.67;  $t = -2.59$ ,  $p = .026$ ). However, first-year students strongly agreed that race and ethnicity cannot determine ownership ( $M$ , Year1 = 4.58,  $M$ , Year2 = 4.43;  $t = 3.50$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

**Table 12**

*Comparing Students' Attitudes Toward the Ownership of English Based on Fields of Study*

Item	Sources of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. British and Americans are the owners of English.	Between Groups	11.154	2	5.577	3.81	.022
	Within Groups	2041.923	1395	1.464		
	Total	2053.077	1397			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

As presented in Table 12, when comparing the three fields of study, the result of ANOVA analysis revealed a statistically significant difference for item 1 ( $F = 3.81$ ,  $p = .022$ ). This finding suggests that the students have the similar tendency toward agreement on most items relating to the attitudes toward the ownership of English.

### 4.3 English Language Teaching Based on the GELT Framework

English language teaching in the present world needs to change in terms of the learning objectives, and attitudes toward non-native English speaking instructors. This is because the language is nowadays used more among L2 users of English and is taught by many English instructors who use it as a foreign language. In this study, the Thai students expressed opinions that seemed to recognize the role of English as a global language.

**Table 13**

*Overview on Students' Perception of ELT Based on the GELT Framework*

ELT based on the GELT framework	$M$	$SD$	Level
<b>Exclusive and ethnocentric view of English</b>			
1. English taught at university must be British or American English only.	3.25	1.08	NS
2. English instructors in a university should be native speakers only.	2.97	1.18	NS
3. English exam items should be British or American English only	3.44	1.05	A
<b>Inclusive Global Englishes perspective</b>			
4. Thai students should be encouraged to use English with their own identity (Thainess in English).	2.82	1.20	NS
5. Other types of English should be taught.	3.91	.89	A
6. English exam items may include other Englishes	3.45	1.00	A
7. Local teachers in a university are equally effective teachers.	3.95	.90	A

Note: Level of agreement: SA = Strongly agree, A = Agree, NS = Not sure, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree

According to Table 13, students showed uncertainty regarding exclusive approaches, being unsure whether English at universities must be British or American only ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ) or whether instructors should be native speakers only ( $M = 2.97$ ,  $SD = 1.18$ ). However, they agreed that exam items should focus on British or American English ( $M = 3.44$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ). Regarding inclusive Global Englishes perspectives, students were uncertain about encouraging Thai identity in English use ( $M = 2.82$ ,  $SD = 1.20$ ) but agreed that other types of English should be taught ( $M = 3.91$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ), exam items may include other Englishes ( $M = 3.45$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ), and local teachers are equally effective ( $M = 3.95$ ,  $SD = 0.90$ ).

Then, the students' perceptions of ELT based on the GELT Framework were compared to determine whether such perceptions were significantly different in relation to gender, years of study and fields of the study.

**Table 14**

*Comparing Students' Perception of ELT Based on Gender*

Item	Gender	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> -value
2. English instructors in a university should be native speakers only.	Female	3.92	.86	1.25	555	.003
	Male	3.85	.96			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

The results presented in Table 14 indicated a significant difference in responses to item 2, one of the seven items, as analyzed by the independent samples  $t$ -test. Notably, female students expressed a stronger agreement with item 2 compared to their male counterparts ( $M$ , female = 3.92,  $M$ , male = 3.85;  $t = 1.25$ ,  $p = .003$ ).

**Table 15**

*Comparing Students' Perception of ELT Based on Years of Study*

Item	Year of study	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> -value
2. English instructors in a university should be native speakers only.	Year 1	3.88	.910	-2.05	805	.003
	Year 2	3.98	.825			
5. Other types of English should be taught.	Year 1	2.67	1.192	-7.45	759	.025
	Year 2	3.19	1.151			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

An analysis of the two groups of first-year and second-year students revealed significant differences in their responses to the items. Specifically, second-year students more strongly believed instructors should be native speakers ( $M$ , Year2 = 3.98,  $M$ , Year1 = 3.88;  $t = -2.05$ ,  $p = .003$ ), while first-year

students showed greater support for teaching other types of English ( $M$ , Year1 = 2.67,  $M$ , Year2 = 3.19;  $t = -7.45$ ,  $p = .025$ ).

**Table 16**

*Comparing Students' Perception of ELT Based on Fields of the Study*

Item	Sources of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. English taught at university must be British or American English only.	Between Groups	7.725	2	3.862	3.30	.037
	Within Groups	1632.150	1395	1.170		
	Total	1639.875	1397			
2. English instructors in a university should be native speakers only.	Between Groups	6.583	2	3.291	4.20	.015
	Within Groups	1093.329	1395	.784		
	Total	1099.911	1397			
4. Thai students should be encouraged to use English with their own identity (Thainess in English).	Between Groups	9.559	2	4.779	4.87	.008
	Within Groups	1369.102	1395	.981		
	Total	1378.661	1397			
5. Other types of English should be taught.	Between Groups	11.843	2	5.922	4.12	.016
	Within Groups	2006.163	1395	1.438		
	Total	2018.006	1397			
6. English exam items may include other Englishes	Between Groups	28.433	2	14.216	10.39	<.001
	Within Groups	1908.558	1395	1.368		
	Total	1936.991	1397			

Note:  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , statistically significant

Table 16 presents the findings from the ANOVA analysis, which indicates that five out of the seven items exhibit significant differences across the three student groups. Specifically, the items demonstrating statistical significance include item 1 ( $F = 3.30$ ,  $p = .037$ ), item 2 ( $F = 4.20$ ,  $p = .015$ ), item 4 ( $F = 4.87$ ,  $p = .008$ ), item 5 ( $F = 4.12$ ,  $p = .016$ ), and item 6 ( $F = 10.39$ ,  $p < .001$ ). These outcomes suggest that the students' perceptions of ELT, as framed within the Global Englishes framework (i.e., exclusive, and ethnocentric view of English, and Inclusive Global Englishes perspective) vary among the groups.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 An Awareness of English Varieties Among Thai Students

Overall, the students in this study still believed that the English used in inner-circle countries was the only correct one, and that British and American accents were preferable and admired. Specifically, more significant differences in the awareness of English varieties were found across the students' fields of study than across gender or years of study. Notably, the awareness of various English varieties displayed more significant variation among students based on their fields of study, rather than differences attributable to gender or years of study. To discuss this point, it is undeniable that the ideology of native-speakerism exists in the Thai ELT community, as students were likely to adopt this ideology when they

were young, and to pass it on from generation to generation (Huttayavilaiphan, 2021). The students probably keep alive this myth about English because the UK was a powerful nation during the colonization period while the USA has played a vital role in the modern global economy. As a result, to them, both British and American English are seen as superior to other varieties of English. In addition, the government's educational policies and ELT materials are plausible reasons why such ideology is prevalent in the ELT community (Rose et al., 2020). This can explain the current situation for the Thai ELT community as well. For instance, the Thai government had the British Council improve the instructional methods and resources for Thai teachers (Methitham & Chamcharatsri, 2011). This clearly illustrates that Thai authorities place greater trust in native-English speaking organizations and professionals than in local ones, despite the latter not being inferior in terms of professional and educational background. Another reason is a heavy reliance on textbooks imported from British or American publishers, in which the cultural representations and references of L1 users of English are dominant (Juntanee et al., 2020). Learning English (or any other foreign languages) is undeniably connected to the transmission of culture and ideology. In essence, native-speakerism is an ideology in ELT which still generates beliefs and actions that aim to promote the voices, institutions, and pedagogical approaches of the Western "native speaker" (Lowe & Lawrence, 2018). Such an ideology is not rejected in educational policies and practices around the world today, including Thailand. If the ELT community wishes to obtain the benefits of promoting the GE paradigm, students, including the students of this study, should be educated under the paradigm and become more aware of differentiating between "correct English" and "good English". Correct English adheres to the conventions of standard English, whereas good English is likely to be appropriate for all English users at present as it focuses on how to use English effectively (Karakaş, 2017). Such a differentiation is significant for all users of English because they should focus on effective English communication to achieve their goals, such as business interactions and international education, not just attaining a native-like English communication. In addition, the global communities are now multilingual and multicultural, meaning that the chance of communicating among L2 users of English is greater than with L1 users (Seilhamer, 2015). Once students and other users of English are aware of these differences, they will not be caught in the trap of native-speakerism.

The other aspect to be highlighted in this study is Thai-style English or Thai-accented English. The respondent students did not seem proud of the existence of their English, which is influenced by their native language. Some Thai users tend to pronounce words differently from L1 users of English. This is because some vowels, such as the monophthongs (/i/ and /ɪ/) and the diphthongs /eɪ/ and /oʊ/,

and consonants, such as /v/ and /z/, do not exist in their L1 (Trakulkasemsuk, 2012). Thus, it is infeasible for all Thai users of English to have native-like accents (e.g., British or American accent) unless they have grown up in a native-English speaking environment and/or exposed to English in an international education system setting. For ordinary Thai people, particularly most Thai students, English is only a subject provided at school and university and the number of learning hours devoted to such a subject are usually not enough for them to develop such accents and native-like fluency. In this regard, L2 users of English, including Thai users, should face reality and aim instead for intelligibility and comprehensibility in English interactions and communications rather than attaining a native-like accent (Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021).

## **5.2 Thai Students' Views on the Ownership of English**

By and large, it was found that, even though the students studied at different universities with different teachers and teaching styles, they tended to mutually agree that all users of English can assume the language ownership regardless of their diverse linguacultural backgrounds. Additionally, when analyzing the three factors that influenced their perceptions, it became evident that there were more different differences related to gender and years of study compared to differences associated with their fields of study. Evidently, this positive attitude is consistent with some previous studies reporting the students' perceptions on rejecting the prevalent ideology of English belonging only to L1 users (e.g., Boonsuk & Ambele, 2020; Djuraeva, 2022; Parmegiani, 2017). From this point, it is of interest to further explore how the teaching practices of Thai instructors of English, and the learning materials they provide in their classrooms contribute to such positive attitudes. However, some other factors, such as exposure to different varieties of English outside of the classroom, may also play a role in learners adopting such a positive attitude as well. For instance, social networks (e.g., Instagram, Facebook, and X) and advertising media (e.g., cosmetics and entertainment) in English from other countries are readily available and easy to access in Thailand. Thus, these students are exposed to such varieties of English in real life. In addition, this attitude was identified among particular groups of Thai students and may not be generalizable. Similarly, other recent research reported results from specific participant groups in different settings, so those findings may also not be generalizable and can sometimes be contradictory. For instance, in an Austrian university context, some students did not dare to claim the ownership of English because they saw themselves as a learner even though they were in a multilingual environment (Ahn et al., 2023). On the hand, female Kazakhstan students claimed language ownership as they believed it gave them a higher social status (Djuraeva, 2022).

### **5.3 Possibility for ELT Based on the GELT Framework**

In general, the students' perceptions contrasted between the ownership and correctness of English; however, this does not seem to pose an obstacle to the promotion of the GE paradigm and the GELT framework in general English classrooms. In addition, there were more significant differences in such perceptions relating to their fields of study than gender and years of study. Furthermore, it was noted that the differences in these perceptions were more significant in relation to the students' fields of study than other factors (i.e., gender and years of study). To illustrate, there is a significant opportunity for ELT within the GELT framework as the students accepted the inclusion of different varieties of English in terms of the contents and language testing, such as listening skills, and more importantly had absolute trust in the local instructors. The GE paradigm has been introduced to the ELT community for almost a decade now. An increasing amount of research on GE is evident in the literature and many studies have been done in expanding-circle countries, including Thailand, with a focus on exploring students' attitudes toward English diversity (e.g., Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021; Kong & Kang, 2022; Meer et al., 2022; Olatoye, 2022; Wang, 2019). Still, research on developing learning activities and/or courses based on the GE paradigm to raise students' awareness of the present roles of English in global communities is still relatively scarce, particularly in the Thai context (e.g., Jindapitak et al., 2022). As there are calls for change from the traditional ELT to the GE paradigm (Galloway & Rose, 2018; Rose & Galloway, 2019), English instructors and practitioners have their own right to reflect on their teaching practices and choose the paradigm that will best benefit their students. That is, the ELT community should aim to enable students to use English across different varieties of English and cultures (Saeki, 2015), and students should be familiar with these varieties in the classroom as a prerequisite for successful English communication (Liu, 2021). In doing so, the GELT framework can promote some changes in the ELT community as it is an innovative approach that can guide English instructors and practitioners to rethink and redesign their teaching practices. As emphasized by Galloway (2024), the GE paradigm is not intended to replace existing paradigms but aims to promote a shift in perspective within the ELT field. Even though there are some challenges to face in implementing the framework, such as native-norm testing, and a lack of materials (Galloway & Rose, 2015), the possibility of such implementation is still open for all those instructors and practitioners who dare to change.

## **6. Implications of the Findings**

One way the findings can be implemented in the classroom context is by using the students' attitudes toward the ownership and varieties of English as the basis for the design and development of GE-aware general English courses, which are still rare in a Thai university context. Notably, the students' fields of study (i.e.,

humanities and social sciences, science and technology, and health sciences) exhibit more significant differences than the factors like gender or years of study. Therefore, it is essential that GE-aware general English courses are tailored to these three distinct fields. The overarching goals of these courses should remain consistent while effectively integrating the GE paradigm. This involves not only enhancing students' general English language proficiency and expanding their vocabulary but also fostering an awareness of GE, coupled with a strong respect for multilingualism, culture and identity. Importantly, while some content and learning activities should be adapted to meet the specific needs of each field, the learning outcomes should unify the experience for all students.

Take “attitudes toward English varieties” as an example. Students from different fields hold distinct views on Thai-style English or Thai-accented English (see Table 5). While some may embrace it, others might find it embarrassing or undesirable. To support a positive view of Thai-style English or Thai-accented English, the tailor-made activities, such as listening exercises that feature Thai professionals delivering interviews or speeches to international audiences, can be used. For science and technology students, a successful Thai scientist engaging in an English podcast interview can be a highlight that allows students to practice listening for the main idea, details, as well as attitudes and opinions. In addition to this practice, a speaking activity that involves group discussions or presentations on the acceptance or rejection of Thai-style English or Thai-accented English can be integrated. Similarly, for students in the humanities, social sciences, and health sciences, other renowned professionals from their respective fields can be selected to ensure relevance and engagement. The inclusion of English diversity, including the students' own English as in the example, into the learning content and learning activities would be beneficial for raising learners' awareness of the current role of English in a global context. The more students are exposed to such diversity, the more they will understand the different varieties of English. As a result, students will be well-prepared and ready to participate in realistic communication situations without bias and with greater self-confidence.

## 7. Limitations and Future Research

Methodologically, a quantitative research approach was employed to gain the Thai students' perceptions through self-reporting (i.e., measuring non-cognitive constructs) so as to generate results that can be generalized across larger populations ( $N = 1,399$ ). While the data collection was effectively facilitated through the authors' connections and met the necessary criteria for statistical analysis, the population size could not initially be identified, and then the responses rates could not be calculated. In addition, the student distribution across the three fields of study was unequal (see Table 1). However, it is still

considered acceptable that a minimum of 100 cases per major group is sufficient for conducting inferential statistics, thus affirming the robustness of the research (Cohen et al., 2018). For future research in this area, it is essential to consider the distribution of participants across various fields of study or any other relevant factors under examination.

## **8. Conclusion**

The originality of this study lies in its exploration of how Thai students perceive the varieties and ownership of English and how possibly GE-aware courses could be developed based on their perceptions. Additionally, it seeks to identify potential developments for GE-aware general English courses informed by these perceptions. The insights gained from this study can serve as a foundation for designing GE-aware courses that are aligned with the local context, ensuring that the learning content and instructional materials are pertinent to the specific needs of learners and their sociocultural factors, particularly within their fields of study. This study contributes to the ELT community by emphasizing the importance of students' backgrounds as a critical factor in the design and development of innovative general English courses. Additionally, it encourages a paradigm shift from an exclusive focus on native speaker norms to the GE paradigm that fosters a mutual understanding of using English in diverse multilingual and multicultural settings. In this context, it is important to note that teaching general English, as it currently stands, is not outdated. However, an adaptation of this teaching approach, which is more relevant to the realistic use of English beyond the classroom, would provide real benefits for students.

## **9. About the Authors**

Apaporn Puchpan is a lecturer at the International College for Sustainability Studies, Srinakharinwirot University. She holds an M.A. in Language and Communication, and her research interests focus on ELT and Global Englishes.

Krich Rajprasit is an Assistant Professor at the International College for Sustainability Studies, Srinakharinwirot University. His main interests include Global Englishes, English medium education and English as a business lingua franca.

## **10. Acknowledgement**

The authors received financial support from International College for Sustainability Studies, Srinakharinwirot University.

## 11. References

- Ahn, H., Ohki, S. & Slaughter, Y. (2023). Ownership of English: Insights from Australian tertiary education contexts, changing English. *Studies in Culture and Education*, 30(3), 263–274.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2023.2212365>
- Ahn, S., & Kang, H. (2017). South Korean university students' perceptions of different English varieties and their contribution to the learning of English as a foreign language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(8), 712–725.  
<http://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1242595>
- Ambele, E. A., & Boonsuk, Y. (2021). Thai tertiary learners' attitudes towards their Thai English accent. *PASAA*, 61(1), 87–110.  
<http://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.61.1.4>
- 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>
- Brittain, E. (2020). Reinforcement of white native-speakerism: An analysis of English language teacher training materials. *GATESOL Journal*, 30(1), 16–31. <https://doi.org/10.52242/gatesol.105>
- Chan, J. Y. H. (2018). Gender and attitudes towards English varieties: Implications for teaching English as a global language. *System*, 76, 62–79.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.04.010>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Colmenero, K., & Lasagabaster, D. (2020). Enclosing native speakerism: Students', parents' and teachers' perceptions of language teachers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(2), 85–100.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1865384>
- Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Multilingual Matters.
- Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 1(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.1.16>
- Djuraeva, M. (2022). Multilingualism, nation branding, and the ownership of English. *World Englishes*, 41(1), 92–103.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12557>
- Galloway, N. (2017). *Global Englishes and change in English language teaching: Attitudes and impact* (1st ed.). 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., & 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. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010>
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holliday, A. (2017). Native-speakerism. In John Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). Wiley Blackwell
- Huttayavilaiphan, R. (2021). Revisiting effects of native speakerism on Thai teachers and students in the age of English as a lingua franca. *English Language Teaching*, 4(12), 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n12p8>
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281–315. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115>
- Jindapitak, N., Teo, A., & Savski, K. (2022). Bringing Global Englishes to the ELT classroom: English language learners' reflections. *Asian Englishes*, 24(3), 279–293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2033910>
- Juntanee, J., Kewara, P., & Prabjandee, D. (2020). Global Englishes orientation in English textbooks in Thailand. *Journal of Education*, 31(2), 151–161. <https://buuir.buu.ac.th/xmlui/handle/1234567890/4156>
- Kachru, B. B. (1982). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.
- Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little Jiffy, Mark Iv. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34(1), 111–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447403400115>.
- Karakaş, A. (2017). Students' perceptions of good English and the underlying ideologies behind their perceptions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 487–509. <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/729/326>
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.
- Kong, M. L. F., & Kang, H. (2022). Identity and accents: Do students really want to speak like native speakers of English? *RELJ Journal*, 53(3), 505–518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939246>

- Liu, J. (2021). Disinventing native speakerism in English language teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 14(11), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n11p97>
- Lowe, R. J., & Lawrence, L. (2018). Native-speakerism and ‘hidden curricula’ in ELT training. *Journal of Language and Discrimination*, 2(2), 162–187. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jld.36409>
- Matsuda, A. (Ed.). (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language. New perspectives on language and education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. (Cambridge applied linguistics series). Cambridge University Press.
- Meer, P., Hartmann, J., & Rumlich, D. (2022). Attitudes of German high school students toward different varieties of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 43(3), 538–562. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amab046>
- Methitham, P., & Chamcharatsri, P. B. (2011). Critiquing ELT in Thailand: A reflection from history to practice. *Journal of Humanities, Naresuan University*, 8(2), 57–68.
- Nguyen, T. T. M., Marlina, R., & Cao, T. H. P. (2021). How well do ELT textbooks prepare students to use English in global contexts? An evaluation of the Vietnamese English textbooks from an English as an international language (EIL) perspective. *Asian Englishes*, 23(2), 184–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1717794>
- Olatoye, T. (2022). Attitudes of educated Nigerians towards varieties of English. *Language Matters*, 53(1), 81–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2022.2067216>
- Parmegiani, A. (2017). Gender and the ownership of English in South Africa. *World Englishes*, 36(1), 42–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12214>
- Rajprasit, K. (2024) MOOC-ing around ‘Englishes’ by Thai students: applying the GELT framework. *Asian Englishes*, 26(2), 428–443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2023.2251739>
- Rose, H. & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2020). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching*, 54(2), 157–189. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518>
- Sadeghpour, M., & D’Angelo, J. (2022). World Englishes and ‘Global Englishes’: competing or complementary paradigms? *Asian Englishes*, 24(2), 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2076368>

- Saeki, T. (2015). Exploring the development of ownership of English through the voice of Japanese EIL users. *Asian Englishes*, 17(1), 43–58.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.998360>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Seilhamer, M. F. (2015). The ownership of English in Taiwan. *World Englishes*, 34(3), 370–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12147>
- 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>
- Thienthong, A., & Uthakorn, K. (2023). Thai learners' attitudes toward English accents: Fields and stages of study. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 16(1), 676–702. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/263461>
- Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2012). Thai English. In Ee-Ling, Low & Azirah, Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language in use* (pp. 101–112). John Benjamins.
- Wang, C. (2019). Attitudes towards English diversity of students in the international college and the non-IC programmes at a university in Taiwan. *RELC Journal*, 50(2), 300–313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217716509>
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587438>
- Widdowson, H. (2022). Plural Englishes and English as language resource. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*, 26(3). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a27>
- Widodo, H. P., Fang, F., & Elyas, T. (2022). Designing English language materials from the perspective of Global Englishes. *Asian Englishes*, 24(2), 186–198.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2062540>
- Woodrow, L. (2014). *Writing about quantitative research in applied linguistics*. Springer.
- Yoo, I. W. (2014). Nonnative teachers in the expanding circle and the ownership of English. *Applied linguistics*, 35(1), 82–86.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt043>