The Impact of a Global Englishes Course on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Teaching English as a Global Language

Shahinaz Abdullah Bukhari

English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT: *In this study I aimed to investigate the impact of a Global Englishes for Language Teaching course on teachers' attitudes towards teaching English as a global language. I employed an intervention research design to make a comparison between a control group and an intervention group. Forty-four Saudi preservice and inservice teachers participated in the study. The findings of the pre-questionnaire for both groups showed positive attitudes towards global perspectives on English language teaching and a slight attachment to traditional perspectives on English language teaching. The statistically significant difference between the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire of the intervention group showed the Global Englishes course could raise the intervention group's appreciation of global perspectives on English language teaching and encourage a willingness to detach from traditional perspectives on English language teaching.*

KEYWORDS: attitude, English language teaching, Global Englishes, teacher education

INTRODUCTION

The paradigm of Global Englishes covers research in fields of interest moving beyond conformity to native English norms (Galloway & Rose, 2015). Rose and Galloway (2019) referred to Global Englishes as 'an inclusive paradigm looking at the linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural diversity and fluidity of English use and English users in a globalised world' (p. 4). It encompasses all fields of study in the dynamism of English such as World Englishes, English as a lingua franca (ELF) and English as an international language. The field of World Englishes research has sought to raise the legitimacy of Englishes of Kachru's (1992) Outer Circle (e.g. Indian English, Singaporean English), and its emphasis lies on the language characteristics of different English forms and their sociolinguistic implications (Rose & Galloway, 2019, p. 11). The field of ELF furthers its interest in multilingualism, translanguaging and plurilingualism to explore the complexity, fluidity and diversity of communications in dynamic contexts among non-native English users with or without the presence of native English users (Bukhari, 2019). Some scholars view the field of English as

an international language as the North American counterparty to ELF, but the former focuses on implications for society and language pedagogy (Rose & Galloway, 2019).

The multidisciplinary nature of Global Englishes–informed research has affected English language teaching (ELT) practices because current sociolinguistic changes necessitate preparing learners for how English functions in today's globalised world. 'New needs require new goals; multilingualism is now the norm and, if a learner's goal is to learn how to function in multilingual contexts, then [. . . an English language] curriculum focusing on target language structures and fixed native norms is not aligned with such a goal' (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020, p. 119). To bridge the gap between what teachers do teach and should teach in English classrooms, ELT needs a global dimension. Global Englishes language teaching (GELT) is an umbrella concept that encompasses Global Englishes–informed fields aimed at challenging monolingual and monocultural ELT (Galloway & Rose, 2015, 2018).

Although Global Englishes research is well established in European and Asian regions, it is limited in the Middle East and North Africa, especially in Saudi Arabia (Bukhari, 2021a, 2021b; Elyas & Mahboob, 2020; Elyas et al., 2021). Furthermore, research on GELT for teacher education is still developing (Selvi & Yazan, 2021). Few publications have reported on how GELT is being included in teacher education, and even fewer have provided practical examples of how to implement GELT in teacher education, especially in the Middle East (Calvo et al., 2016; Rose et al., 2021). As Galloway and Rose (2021) noted, more research on the impact of GELT-informed teacher education on teachers' cognition is necessary. In Saudi Arabia, Bukhari (2021a, 2021b) called for incorporating GELT within teacher education to overcome the mismatch between how teachers traditionally teach English and how people use English globally. To explore the feasibility of GELT in teacher education, research on attitudes towards GELT is necessary (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020).

Some researchers have suggested exploring the possibility of incorporating GELT into teachers' professional development and education programmes in Saudi Arabia (e.g. Al Asmari, 2014; Al-Asmari & Khan, 2014; Alharbi, 2016; Bukhari, 2021a, 2021b). To investigate Saudi ELT teachers' perspectives of ELF and World Englishes, Bukhari (2021a) carried out semi-structured interviews with a group of 10 ELT instructors from various universities in Saudi Arabia. Her findings showed that, although participants welcomed the idea of including a global dimension in their classrooms, they were confused about how ELF research had an actual bearing on their own teaching practices.

Bearing this in mind, my main aim in this study is to link GELT research with teacher education, empower ELT teachers to think from a new perspective and inspire them to generate innovative teaching practices far from monolingual and monocultural ELT. To achieve this aim, I explored teachers' attitudes towards traditional ELT perspectives and GELT perspectives. I also investigated how a GELT course covering both theoretical foundations and practical implementations influenced these attitudes. Ryan et al. (1982, p. 7, as cited in Kallstrom & Lindberg, 2011, p. 11) defined language attitude as any affective (e.g. emotions and motives), cognitive (e.g. beliefs and opinions) or behavioural (e.g. conscious actions and

unconscious reactions) index of evaluative reactions towards different language varieties or their speakers. Following Bukhari's (2019) approach, I view attitude as a contextual(ised) process overlapping in disguise with other interrelated parts (e.g. assumptions, ideologies, beliefs) of an individual's perception. This framework suggests any change in any interrelated part results in a change in attitude.

LITERATURE REVIEW

From ELT to GELT

Monolingual and monocultural ELT approaches are ill-suited to teaching a global language (Rose & Galloway, 2019). In the field of English as an international language, McKay (2002) confirmed 'the teaching and learning of an international language must be based on an entirely different set of assumptions than the teaching and learning of any other second or foreign language' (p. 1). In the field of ELF, Jenkins (2006a), Seidlhofer (2013) and Cavalheiro (2015) discussed the differences between the ELF approach and English as a foreign language approach to ELT and criticised the monolingual bias present in the latter. Inspired by Global Englishes–oriented calls, scholars developed different pedagogical frameworks such as ELF-informed ELT (e.g. Seidlhofer, 2013), World Englishes–informed ELT (e.g. Matsuda, 2020) and English as an international language pedagogy (e.g. Selvi & Yazan, 2013). GELT unites the shared orientations of these fields, which question the centrality of native English norms in ELT curricula, lay stress on how English is actually used today, increase exposure to different Englishes in the curricula, raise tolerance to otherness in ELT, emphasise respect for multilingualism in ELT, focus on international communication skills and raise transcultural awareness in language curricula (Baker, 2015a, Baker, 2015b; Galloway & Rose, 2021).

GELT has changed the foundation of how to teach English, calling for a paradigm shift in the field of ELT and developing a translingual and transcultural ELT that promotes linguistic, cultural, contextual and functional diversities associated with English because of today's sociolinguistic realities of global ecology (Rose & Galloway, 2019). Similar calls for multilingualism in ELT have been emerging in parallel with second language acquisition (May, 2014; Ortega 2013). As adapted from Galloway and Rose (2018, p. 4) and Rose and Galloway (2019, pp. 19–21), Table 1 summarises the main differences between GELT and traditional ELT perspectives in a reader-friendly format.

Table 1. Differences Between GELT and Traditional ELT Perspectives

	Traditional ELT	GELT
Target interlocutor	Native English users	All English users
Target culture	Native English culture	Diverse and multiple cultures
Norms	Standard English models (especially standard British and American models)	Diverse and multiple usages
Benchmark	Native English users	Expert users all over the world
Source of materials	Native English users	Salient English-using contexts around the world
One's own first language and culture	Seen as a source of negative interference	Seen as a positive resource
Goals of learning	Native-like proficiency	Multicompetent user and global mediator
Language proficiency or competency	Communicative competence	International communication skills, intercultural communicative competence and transcultural awareness
Ideal teacher	Native English teachers	Professional multilingual teachers of English all over the world
Orientation	Monolingual and monocultural	Multilingual and multicultural
Paradigm	Belongs to second and foreign language paradigms	Belongs to the Global Englishes paradigm
Nature	Sometimes multidisciplinary	Always richly multidisciplinary

As shown in Table 1, traditional ELT promotes communicative competence approaches through exposing students to authentic language that native English speakers use. Today, as we witness further growth of the English language, there is a need for a paradigm shift towards exposing students to authentic language that professional user of English use around the world. In global contexts, users of English exploit hybrid language practices. Thus, learners of English need to familiarise themselves with such fluidity and flexibility. GELT encourages learners to be creative and adapt the language in a way that suits their purposes of communication and encounters. GELT fosters transcultural awareness rather than the acquisition of native-like competence. As seen in Table 1, GELT promotes plurality and diversity and emphasises respect for multilingualism and tolerance of others, which, in turn, equip learners with the skills they need to adapt successfully to different interlocutors and situations.

The Role of GELT in Teacher Education
ELT teacher education is the most crucial place for any innovative educational reform, and it is the perfect place for reconstructing the knowledge and perceptions of major future agents for change. Thus, it is the best place for leading a paradigm shift and encouraging changes in both mindset and practice. A GELT-informed shift requires a pedagogical space within the curricula of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). Therefore, some scholars (e.g. Rose & Galloway, 2019; Selvi & Yazan, 2021) have dedicated their work to GELT, suggesting

understanding GELT and its implications is crucial for ELT professionals. For that reason, ELF scholars suggest 'acquainting oneself with ELF in terms of both knowledge and skill base requires more of a "teacher development" focus rather than a training one' (Deniz et al., 2020, p. 272). This explains the reason behind designing a full GELT course for the present project rather than just simple training.

When it comes to linking Global Englishes research with ELT teacher education, it is necessary to revisit 'normative mindsets', that is, deeply rooted assumptions about language and traditional approaches to language teaching, learning, using and communication. A GELT course inspires ELT professionals to reconstruct English as a teachable subject (Jenkins, 2006a, 2006b, 2014, 2018), reevaluate the prescriptive assumptions on ELT (Seidlhofer, 2013), reexamine the unquestioned pedagogical decisions about ELT practices (Galloway & Rose, 2015, 2018), go beyond variationist perspectives (Baird et al., 2014; Ishikawa, 2020) and replace the notion of 'communicative competence' with the notions of 'transcultural awareness' (Baker, 2015a, 2015b), situated 'contextual performativity' (Baird et al., 2014) and 'contextual coadaptation' (Bukhari, 2019). In addition, a GELT course highlights the dynamic concepts of languaging, lingua franca, multilingualism, plurilingualism, translanguaging, translingualism and polylanguaging, which decrease the focus on native English norms and promote the language as being in a state of flux (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020; Rose & Galloway, 2019).

A good GELT course does not only introduce these theoretical foundations, but it also develops practical implementations of GELT practices because the default option will remain traditional in the absence of knowing how to practice the new options (Doan, 2014; Selvi & Yazan, 2021). In the field of English as an international language, Selvi and Yazan (2013) offered changing pedagogical practices for teachers. Some publications have showcased activities and lesson plans (e.g. Galloway, 2017a; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Matsuda, 2017). Matsuda (2017) showcased GELT-informed programmes for teachers. Furthermore, a good GELT course draws attention to the advantage of GELT because potential adapters need to understand why the new orientation is better than the existing practice. Such an understanding encourages teachers to adapt to the new orientation (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020).

Replacing Transformative Approaches with Critical Awareness and Reflective Practices
In response to Global Englishes–informed perspectives, different scholars have introduced a variety of Global Englishes–oriented proposals for teacher education. There have been fruitful attempts at delineating General Englishes–informed implications for preservice and inservice ELT teachers. For instance, in his 'Six fallacies about the users and uses of English', Kachru (1992) criticised the theoretical underpinnings of teacher education and proposed World Englishes–informed ideas for teacher education. Dewey (2012) proposed his post-normative approach, and Sifakis (2007, 2009, 2014) proposed his ELF-informed transformative approach. However, in the following subsections I explain why my study avoids GELT-informed transformative models and instead adapts GELT-informed critical awareness and reflective practices.

Transformative Approaches

Based on Mezirow's (1991, 1994, 1997, 1998, 2000) theorisation of transformative approaches, some scholars implement three progressive steps of critical reflection to promote a complete transformative experience: 'content reflection', 'process reflection' and 'premise reflection'. 'Content reflection' is the first step to make participants conscious of their feelings and thoughts regarding a specific issue so they can establish their assumptions and beliefs. Participants then undergo a process of self-examination through 'process reflection', which deals with the way a particular experience affects people's minds and actions. In the last step, 'premise reflection' incorporates reexamining, reconsidering and reassessing long-held assumptions and beliefs so that participants search for options to produce new perspectives. They follow this by reflecting on the new concepts and incorporating the new perspectives into their lives and routines.

Based on Mezirow's frameworks, Sifakis (2007) proposed an ELF-informed transformative model for teacher professional development and teacher education, a model that Sifakis (2009, 2014) and Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015) developed. Based on Sifakis and Bayyurt's works, Cavalheiro (2015) proposed a five-stage model: preparation, identification, awareness, transformation and planning. Similarly, Pitzl's (2012) transformative model consisted of five phases: familiarising participants with core concepts, introducing descriptive ELF findings to the participants and linking them to ELT local contexts, raising awareness of ELF perspectives on ELT practices, giving the participants the opportunity to examine and practice different cooperative teaching methods and triggering reflective processes on ELF perspectives related to ELT.

However, scholars have questioned transformative approaches for their intention to bring a change in favour of ELF, potential emotional upheavals, troubling effects on some participants and inadequacy in some contexts (Illes, 2016; Moor, 2005). Widdowson (2003) and (Illes, 2016) suggested giving teachers the chance to pursue critical inquiries and reflective practices on what they think and do regarding ELF perspectives on pedagogy without imposing any specific perspectives on them. Following Widdowson (2003) and (Illés, 2016), I employ critical awareness approaches to GELT in teacher education without a transformative orientation.

Encouraging Critical Awareness and Reflective Practices in GELT Courses

Hall et al. (2013) created 'Changing Englishes', an online course for ELT teachers, and fully updated it in 2019. They aimed to raise teachers' awareness of the plurilithic nature of English and develop pedagogical approaches that can respond to the global reality of English. They designed the course to function as a mentor to discuss published literature pertaining to ELF and prompt critical reflection of teachers' experiences. Some teachers' reflections showed clear evidence it had generated a shift in teachers' perceptions of English and influenced their professional practices.

Dewey (2014) argued teachers' awareness of ELF was not enough to bring positive responses in their practices because some teachers needed to learn the practical aspects of incorporating ELF into their practices, and others had a strong attachment to traditional ELT perspectives

and skepticism towards ELF approaches. He argued developing critical awareness through narrative inquiry was an effective way to guide teachers to reexamine their inherited beliefs and reshape their practices in response to ELF perspectives. Critical awareness approaches are encouraged in GELT courses to reexamine the very idea of language standardisation that is incompatible with the pluralistic nature of English in multilingual scenarios. Thus, several ELF researchers (e.g. Dewey, 2007, 2012, 2014; Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2004, 2013) asserted the significance of developing a high level of critical awareness and practicing self-reflectiveness among ELT professionals to equip them with the necessary knowledge and practical implications of ELF-oriented ELT. Thus, a good GELT course encourages reflective practices and critical awareness to help ELT teachers arrive at conclusions shaped by their own rational calculations.

METHOD

Participants

I selected two criteria for my study's sample. The first criterion required the participants be postgraduate students or have a postgraduate qualification in TESOL, applied linguistics or linguistics. I selected this criterion to move easily through the project content. The second criterion required the participants have not previously studied or are not currently studying at a university that offers a GELT course. I selected this criterion to minimise the influence of external factors on my study. I then randomly invited 100 Saudi preservice and inservice teachers to participate. However, 41 did not respond, and I excluded 15 either because they did not match the criteria of my target sample or because they dropped out of the study. In the end, the research group consisted of 44 participants (Table 3). All participants signed consent forms prior to their inclusion in the study.

Research Design

The research design adapted for my study is experimental with a control group. I divided the 44 participants evenly into two groups: 22 in the control group and 22 in the intervention group. To check the homogeneity of the two groups, I distributed a pre-questionnaire to all participants before the intervention. After the participants filled out the pre-questionnaire, only the intervention group joined a GELT course. Each group filled out the questionnaire twice: once at the beginning of the trimester and once at the end of the trimester.

Course Design

I designed and delivered the course with the aim of raising teachers' critical awareness of GELT and empowering them to put GELT frameworks into action. I delivered the 12-week course online for 4 hours per week during the third trimester in 2023. It included lectures, workshops and webinars. The main resources for the course included (a) *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students* by Jennifer Jenkins, (b) *Global Englishes for Language Teaching* by Heath Rose and Nicola Galloway (2019) and (c) *Language Teacher Education for Global Englishes: A Practical Resource Book* edited by Ali Selvi and Bedrettin Yazan (2021).

Data Collection Instruments and Analysis

I formulated the questionnaire based on Table 1 and administered it via Google Forms. The questionnaire included 27 closed items on a 5-point Likert scale: 1 (*strongly disagree*), 2 (*disagree*), 3 (*neutral*), 4 (*agree*) and 5 (*strongly agree*). I analysed the data with version 26 of IBM's SPSS Statistics software. I used the frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations to describe the variables. I conducted independent *t* tests to examine the variance between the control and intervention groups, and I conducted the paired *t* test to compare pre-scores and post-scores for both groups. I regarded a *p* value below 0.05 as indicative of statistical significance. I calculated the scoring system as follows:

Interval level = (greatest value − smallest value) / (number of points)
Interval level = (5 − 1) / 5 = 0.80

I measured opinions from '*strongly disagree*' to '*strongly agree*' based on Table 2.

Table 2. The Interval Level of the 5-Point Likert Scale

Mean Interval	Opinion
1–1.80	*Strongly disagree*
1.81–2.60	*Disagree*
2.61–3.40	*Neutral*
3.41–4.20	*Agree*
4.21–5.00	*Strongly agree*

FINDINGS

Demographic Information

Table 3 shows the demographic information of the 44 participants.

Table 3. Demographic Information

Variable		*N*	%
Gender	Male	23	52.3
	Female	21	47.7
Age	20–25	8	18.2
	26–30	14	31.8
	31–35	11	25.0
	36–40	7	15.9
	> 40	4	9.1
Academic qualification	Master's (in progress or finished)	36	81.8
	PhD (in progress or finished)	8	18.2
Major	Applied Linguistics	20	45.5
	TESOL	16	36.4
	Linguistics	8	18.2
Years of teaching experience	None	13	29.5
	1–5	10	22.7
	6–10	11	25.0
	11–15	7	15.9
	16–20	2	4.5
	+ 20	1	2.3

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha achieved good scores for both variables, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Cronbach's Alpha

Variable	N	Cronbach's alpha
Variable 1 (GELT)	15	0.894
Variable 2 (ELT)	12	0.902

The Pre-questionnaire's Findings of Attitudes Towards GELT

As shown in Tables 5 and 6, participants of both groups in the pre-questionnaire had positive attitudes towards GELT perspectives. The pre-control group had a mean score of 3.84, and the pre-intervention group had a mean score of 3.71.

Table 5. Attitudes of the Pre-control Group Towards GELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree N	Strongly disagree %	Disagree N	Disagree %	Neutral N	Neutral %	Agree N	Agree %	Strongly agree N	Strongly agree %	Mean	SD
1	1	4.5	2	9.1	3	13.6	4	18.2	12	54.5	4.09	1.231
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	63.6	8	36.4	4.36	0.492
3	0	0.0	9	40.9	1	4.5	4	18.2	8	36.4	3.50	1.371
4	1	4.5	7	31.8	1	4.5	6	27.3	7	31.8	3.50	1.371
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	63.6	8	36.4	4.36	0.492
6	0	0.0	9	40.9	0	0.0	4	18.2	9	40.9	3.59	1.403
7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	59.1	9	40.9	4.41	0.503
8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	12	54.5	8	36.4	4.27	0.631
9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	11	50.0	9	40.9	4.32	0.646
10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	68.2	7	31.8	4.32	0.477
11	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	10	45.5	10	45.5	4.36	0.658
12	0	0.0	10	45.5	4	18.2	2	9.1	6	27.3	3.18	1.296
13	9	40.9	7	31.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	27.3	2.41	1.681
14	0	0.0	9	40.9	2	9.1	2	9.1	9	40.9	3.50	1.406
15	0	0.0	9	40.9	1	4.5	7	31.8	5	22.7	3.36	1.255
Total mean/SD											3.84	0.99
Total response											*Agree*	

Table 6. Attitudes of the Pre-intervention Group Towards GELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	72.7	6	27.3	4.27	0.456
2	2	9.1	14	63.6	2	9.1	1	4.5	3	13.6	2.50	1.185
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	40.9	3	13.6	10	45.5	4.05	0.950
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	16	72.7	5	22.7	4.18	0.501
5	0	0.0	8	36.4	1	4.5	8	36.4	5	22.7	3.45	1.224
6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	12	54.5	9	40.9	4.36	0.581
7	0	0.0	1	4.5	1	4.5	15	68.2	5	22.7	4.09	0.684
8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	8	36.4	13	59.1	4.55	0.596
9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	15	68.2	6	27.3	4.23	0.528
10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	72.7	6	27.3	4.27	0.456
11	7	31.8	10	45.5	1	4.5	1	4.5	3	13.6	2.23	1.343
12	8	36.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	18.2	10	45.5	3.36	1.866
13	0	0.0	8	36.4	3	13.6	7	31.8	4	18.2	3.32	1.171
14	0	0.0	8	36.4	3	13.6	8	36.4	3	13.6	3.27	1.120
15	0	0.0	8	36.4	1	4.5	7	31.8	6	27.3	3.50	1.263
Total mean/SD											3.71	0.93
Total response											Agree	

The Pre-questionnaire's Findings of Attitudes Towards Traditional ELT

As shown in Tables 7 and 8, the pre-control group displayed a slight attachment to traditional ELT perspectives, and the pre-intervention group displayed a neutral position towards traditional ELT perspectives. The pre-control group had a mean score of 3.57, whereas the pre-intervention group had a mean score of 3.37.

Table 7. Attitudes of the Pre-control Group Towards Traditional ELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
16	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	45.5	5	22.7	7	31.8	3.86	0.889
17	5	22.7	4	18.2	2	9.1	0	0.0	11	50.0	3.36	1.761
18	4	18.2	7	31.8	0	0.0	10	45.5	1	4.5	2.86	1.320
19	4	18.2	16	72.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	2.09	1.019
20	4	18.2	8	36.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	45.5	3.18	1.736
21	6	27.3	6	27.3	0	0.0	9	40.9	1	4.5	2.68	1.393
22	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	6	27.3	15	68.2	4.64	0.581
23	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	27.3	16	72.7	4.73	0.456
24	4	18.2	1	4.5	0	0.0	5	22.7	12	54.5	3.91	1.571
25	4	18.2	1	4.5	1	4.5	3	13.6	13	59.1	3.91	1.601
26	2	9.1	6	27.3	3	13.6	10	45.5	1	4.5	3.09	1.151
27	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	4.5	4	18.2	16	72.7	4.55	0.963
Total mean/SD											3.57	1.20
Total response											Agree	

Table 8. Attitudes of the Pre-intervention Group Towards Traditional ELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
16	5	22.7	9	40.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	36.4	2.86	1.699
17	6	27.3	8	36.4	0	0.0	8	36.4	0	0.0	2.45	1.262
18	6	27.3	16	72.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.73	0.456
19	10	45.5	4	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	36.4	2.64	1.866
20	6	27.3	8	36.4	0	0.0	8	36.4	0	0.0	2.45	1.262
21	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	8	36.4	11	50.0	4.36	0.727
22	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	40.9	13	59.1	4.59	0.503
23	0	0.0	1	4.5	1	4.5	2	9.1	18	81.8	4.68	0.780
24	1	4.5	7	31.8	3	13.6	0	0.0	11	50.0	3.59	1.501
25	3	13.6	8	36.4	2	9.1	9	40.9	0	0.0	2.77	1.152
26	1	4.5	0	0.0	2	9.1	8	36.4	11	50.0	4.27	0.985
27	1	4.5	2	9.1	1	4.5	10	45.5	8	36.4	4.00	1.113
Total mean/SD											3.37	1.11
Total response											Neutral	

Equivalence of the Two Groups

I conducted the independent test to analyse variations in mean scores between the pre-control group and the pre-intervention group. As shown in Table 9, there is no significant difference between the pre-groups' scores for Variable 1 ($p = 0.387$) that is higher than 0.05, and there is no significant difference between the pre-groups' scores for Variable 2 ($p = 0.227$) that is higher than 0.05. Thus, I argue both groups are equivalent for my study.

Table 9. The Independent T Test for the Pre-groups (N = 44)

Variable	Group	N	Mean ± SD/level	T	df	p value
Variable 1 (GELT)	Pre-control group	22	3.8364 ± 0.92140	0.873	42	0.387
	Pre-intervention group	22	3.5720 ± 1.08052			
Variable 2 (ELT)	Pre-control group	22	3.7091 ± 0.83382	1.227	42	0.227
	Pre-intervention group	22	3.3674 ± 1.00549			

*$p \leq 0.05$; **$p \leq 0.01$; ***$p \leq 0.001$

The Post-Questionnaire's Findings of Attitudes Towards GELT

As shown in Tables 10 and 11, participants of both groups in the post-questionnaire still had positive attitudes towards GELT perspectives. The post-control group had a mean score of 3.83, whereas the post-intervention group had a mean score of 4.31.

Table 10. Attitudes of the Post-control Group Towards GELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	0	0.0	4	18.2	2	9.1	6	27.3	10	45.5	4.00	1.155
2	1	4.5	1	4.5	2	9.1	10	45.5	8	36.4	4.05	1.046
3	4	18.2	4	18.2	0	0.0	5	22.7	9	40.9	3.50	1.626
4	0	0.0	6	27.3	2	9.1	9	40.9	5	22.7	3.59	1.141
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	10	45.5	10	45.5	4.36	0.658
6	2	9.1	6	27.3	1	4.5	7	31.8	6	27.3	3.41	1.403
7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	68.2	7	31.8	4.32	0.477
8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	7	31.8	14	63.6	4.59	0.590
9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	11	50.0	10	45.5	4.41	0.590
10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	50.0	11	50.0	4.50	0.512
11	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	45.5	12	54.5	4.55	0.510
12	4	18.2	7	31.8	3	13.6	3	13.6	5	22.7	2.91	1.477
13	7	31.8	8	36.4	1	4.5	4	18.2	2	9.1	2.36	1.364
14	3	13.6	5	22.7	2	9.1	5	22.7	7	31.8	3.36	1.497
15	0	0.0	7	31.8	3	13.6	4	18.2	8	36.4	3.59	1.297
Total mean/SD											3.83	1.02
Total response											Agree	

Table 11. Attitudes of the Post-intervention Group Towards GELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	40.9	13	59.1	4.59	0.503
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	10	45.5	9	40.9	4.27	0.703
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	54.5	10	45.5	4.45	0.510
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	9	40.9	11	50.0	4.41	0.666
5	1	4.5	1	4.5	1	4.5	9	40.9	10	45.5	4.18	1.053
6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	54.5	10	45.5	4.45	0.510
7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	40.9	13	59.1	4.59	0.503
8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	54.5	10	45.5	4.45	0.510
9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	13	59.1	8	36.4	4.32	0.568
10	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	11	50.0	10	45.	4.41	0.590
11	3	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	45.5	9	40.9	4.00	1.309
12	2	9.1	1	4.5	0	0.0	9	40.9	10	45.5	4.09	1.231
13	3	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	40.9	10	45.5	4.05	1.327
14	1	4.5	1	4.5	1	4.5	7	31.8	12	54.5	4.27	1.077
15	3	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	40.9	10	45.5	4.05	1.327
Total mean/SD											4.31	0.83
Total response											Strongly agree	

The Post-questionnaire's Findings of Attitudes Towards Traditional ELT

As shown in Tables 12 and 13, the post-control group still had a slight attachment to traditional ELT perspectives with a mean score of 3.59, whereas the post-intervention group displayed a willingness to detach from traditional ELT perspectives with a mean score of 2.36.

Table 12. Attitudes of the Post-control Group Towards GELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
16	1	4.5	3	13.6	10	45.5	3	13.6	5	22.7	3.36	1.136
17	0	0.0	1	4.5	6	27.3	9	40.9	6	27.3	3.91	0.868
18	3	13.6	5	22.7	2	9.1	5	22.7	7	31.8	3.36	1.497
19	4	18.2	13	59.1	2	9.1	2	9.1	1	4.5	2.23	1.020
20	5	22.7	7	31.8	0	0.0	2	9.1	8	36.4	3.05	1.704
21	0	0.0	11	50.0	1	4.5	7	31.8	3	13.6	3.09	1.192
22	1	4.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	8	36.4	12	54.5	4.32	1.041
23	2	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	50.0	9	40.9	4.14	1.125
24	3	13.6	2	9.1	1	4.5	6	27.3	10	45.5	3.82	1.468
25	2	9.1	3	13.6	0	0.0	5	22.7	12	54.5	4.00	1.414
26	1	4.5	5	22.7	5	22.7	7	31.8	4	18.2	3.36	1.177
27	0	0.0	1	4.5	2	9.1	5	22.7	14	63.6	4.45	0.858
Total mean/SD											3.59	1.21
Total response											Agree	

Table 13. Attitudes of the Post-Intervention Group Towards Traditional ELT Perspectives

Item	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
16	9	40.9	10	45.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	2.00	1.309
17	10	45.5	9	40.9	2	9.1	0	0.0	1	4.5	1.77	0.973
18	13	59.1	9	40.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.41	0.503
19	10	45.5	9	40.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	1.95	1.327
20	10	45.5	9	40.9	3	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.68	0.716
21	3	13.6	3	13.6	9	40.9	4	18.2	3	13.6	3.05	1.214
22	3	13.6	3	13.6	13	59.1	1	4.5	2	9.1	2.82	1.053
23	4	18.2	2	9.1	11	50.0	2	9.1	3	13.6	2.91	1.231
24	3	13.6	3	13.6	13	59.1	0	0.0	3	13.6	2.86	1.125
25	9	40.9	10	45.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	2.00	1.309
26	3	13.6	3	13.6	10	45.5	3	13.6	3	13.6	3.00	1.195
27	3	13.6	3	13.6	13	59.1	0	0.0	3	13.6	2.86	1.125
Total mean/SD											2.36	1.09
Total response											Disagree	

The Impact of a GELT Course on Attitudes

As shown in Table 14, there is no significant difference between the pre-control and post-control groups' scores for Variable 1 ($p = 0.943$) that is higher than 0.05, and there is no significant difference between the pre-control and post-control groups' scores for Variable 2 ($p = 0.701$) that is higher than 0.05. These results revealed there is no significant difference between the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire findings of the control group. In both questionnaires, the control group had positive attitudes towards GELT and a slight attachment to traditional ELT perspectives.

In contrast, there is a significant difference between the pre-intervention and post- intervention groups' scores for Variable 1 ($p = 0.000$) that is less than 0.05, and there is a significant difference between the pre-intervention and post-intervention groups' scores for Variable 2 ($p = 0.000$) that is less than 0.05. These results revealed there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire findings of the intervention group. These findings revealed the GELT course could raise the intervention group's appreciation of GELT and encourage a willingness to detach from traditional ELT.

Table 14. The Paired T Test for the Pre- and Post-groups (N = 44)

Group	Mean ± SD/level		Variable 1 (GELT)			Variable 2 (ELT)		
	Variable 1	Variable 2	t	df	p value	t	df	p value
Pre-control group	3.8364 ± 0.92140	3.5720 ± 1.08052	0.073	21	0.943	−0.389	21	0.701
Post-control group	3.8333 ± 0.95191	3.5909 ± 1.09620						
Pre-intervention group	3.7091 ± 0.83382	3.3674 ± 1.00549	−6.544	21	0.000	8.269	21	0.000
Post-intervention group	4.3061 ± 0.75723	2.3598 ± 1.02139						

CONCLUSION

ELT nowadays needs to reflect today's status of English as a global medium of communication. ELT teachers are thus central to promoting a global dimension in their teaching practices to prepare learners for today's global function of the English language. I aimed with my intervention research to explore teachers' attitudes towards GELT and examine the effect of a GELT course on their attitudes. For this purpose I selected 44 Saudi preservice and inservice teachers and randomly assigned them to the two control and intervention groups. There were 22 participants in each group. I gave a pre-questionnaire to both groups at the beginning of the trimester. The control group did not join any GELT course and filled out the questionnaire again at the end of the trimester. In contrast, the intervention group joined a GELT course

voluntarily and filled out the questionnaire again after completing the GELT course at the end of the trimester.

The findings of the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire showed the control group had positive attitudes towards GELT and a slight attachment to traditional ELT perspectives. There is evidence in previous research for Saudis' awareness and acceptance of lingua franca communications because of their experiences with Arabic and English as lingua francas (Alharkan, 2023; Bukhari, 2019). Thus, it is possible participants in this study displayed positive attitudes towards GELT because of their experiences with multilingua francas or because they participated in this project voluntarily. Furthermore, this study demonstrates a statistically significant difference between the results of the pre-intervention group and those of the post-intervention group. The paired t test showed the GELT course could raise the intervention group's appreciation of global perspectives on English language teaching and encourage a willingness to detach from traditional perspectives on English language teaching. In addition to the present study, the body of research reporting the positive impact of GELT on learners' attitudes is increasing (Galloway, 2017; Galloway & Rose, 2013; Sung, 2015), which, in turn, increases the calls for incorporating GELT into TESOL (Rose & Galloway, 2019). Galloway and Numajiri (2020) administered 21 interviews and distributed 47 questionnaires to TESOL students to explore attitudes towards an optional GELT course. Their study revealed a positive orientation towards GELT, but the participants' attitudes remained bounded to native speaker norms. In line with this finding, Hall et al. (2013) revealed student teachers had positive attitudes towards GELT, but some of them were still attached to native speaker norms. Vettorel's (2016) study revealed a GELT course raised student teachers' awareness of GELT-related issues, and some participants became ready to move towards GELT-informed approaches.

This research offers valuable perspectives on the practicality of integrating GELT perspectives into curriculum innovation and teacher education. In some countries, many postgraduate TESOL and applied linguistics programmes offer a GELT course (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020, p. 127), but Saudi universities do not give a GELT course a proper space. I call for incorporating a GELT course within preservice and inservice teacher education programmes in Saudi Arabia. In addition, I encourage teacher educators, curriculum developers and policy planners to draw on Global Englishes and recognise the significance it has for ELT and teacher education. Teacher educators can utilise GELT-oriented perspectives as a critical lens in their classes. For instance, they can (a) expose their teacher students to listen to native and non-native English users via a wide range of audio-mediated and video-mediated resources, (b) discuss with preservice teachers some works by Jennifer Jenkins and Braj Kachru, (c) ask preservice and inservice teachers to prepare GELT-aware lesson plans or (d) invite teacher students to analyse an ELT coursebook based on a Global Englishes–related checklist. Because I delivered my course online and relied solely on a closed-ended questionnaire for my data collection, I recommend future researchers deliver the course face to face and use multiple data collection instruments such as classroom observations, interviews and critical reflections at the different stages of the course to enable a deeper investigation and understanding of this area of research.

REFERENCES

Alharkan, A. (2023). *Exploring teachers' teaching practices when engaging in systematic reflective practice: Teacher cognitions and identity* [Doctoral thesis]. University of Southampton, the United Kingdom.

Al Asmari, A. (2014). Redefining pedagogical priorities: An investigation of EFL teachers' perceptions towards teaching English as a lingua franca in the Saudi higher education context. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(28), 81-93.

Al-Asmari, A., & Khan, M. (2014). World Englishes in the EFL teaching in Saudi Arabia. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(1), 316-325.

Alharbi, N. (2016). *Business English as a lingua franca in Saudi multinational corporations: A qualitative investigation of communicative strategies and orientations to use in international workplaces* [Doctoral thesis]. King's College London, the United Kingdom.

Baker, W. (2015a). *Culture and identity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication* (Vol. 8). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Baker, W. (2015b). Culture and complexity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking competences and pedagogy in ELT. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1), 9-30.

Baird, R., Baker, W., & Kitazawa, M. (2014). The complexity of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(1), 17-196.

Bukhari, S. (2019). *Complexity theory approaches to the interrelationships between Saudis' perceptions of English and their reported practices of English* [Doctoral thesis]. University of Southampton, the United Kingdom.

Bukhari, S. (2021a). English language teachers' views on 'Saudi English': Errors vs. variants. *Taibah University Journal of Arts and Humanitites*, 28 (1), 464-496.

Bukhari, S. (2021b). A Showcase study on ELF-oriented classroom practices in a general English course. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 9 (5), 61-72.

Calvo, L., El Kadri, M., & El Kadri, A. (2016). ELF in teacher education programs: Mapping the proposals presented in ELF5 and ELF6. ELF. In N. Tsantila, J. Mandalios, & M. Ilkos (Eds.), *ELF: Pedagogical and interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 268-277). Athens: Deree-The American College of Greece.

Cavalheiro, L. (2015). *English as a lingua franca: Bridging the gap between theory and practice in English language teaching* [Doctoral thesis]. University of Lisbon, Portugal.

Dewey, M. (2007). English as a lingua franca and globalization: an interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 332-354.

Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a lingua franca*, 1(1), 141-170.

Dewey, M. (2014). Pedagogic Criticality and English as a Lingua Franca. *Atlantis. Journal of the Spanish Association for Anglo-American Studies*,36(2), 11-30.

Deniz, B., Ozkan, Y., & Bayyurt, Y. (2020). ELF-awareness in pre-service English language teacher education: A case study from Turkey. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 35(2), 270-284.

Doan, N. (2014). Teaching the target culture in English teacher education programs: Issues of EIL in Vietnam. In R. Marlina, & R. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 79–93). Basel: Springer.

Elyas, T., & Mahboob, A. (2020). World Englishes in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). *World Englishes*, 40 (2), 154-158.

Elyas, T., Alzahrani, M., & Widodo, H. (2021). Translanguaging and 'Culigion'features of Saudi English. *World Englishes*, 40(2), 219-230.

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

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2013). "They envision going to New York, not Jakarta": The differing attitudes toward ELF of students, teaching assistants, and instructors in an English-medium business program in Japan. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2 (2), 229–253.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing global englishes*. London: Routledge.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3-14.

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

Galloway, N., & Numajiri, T. (2020). Global Englishes language teaching: Bottom-up curriculum implementation. *Tesol Quarterly*, 54(1), 118-145.

Hall, C., Wicaksono, R., Liu, S., Qian, Y., & Xiaoqing, X. (2013). *English reconceived: Raising teachers' awareness of English as a "plurilithic" resource through an online course*. London: British Council.

Illes, E. (2016). Issues in ELF-aware teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5(1), 135-145.

Ishikawa, T. (2020). Complexity of English as a Multilingua Franca: Place of monolingual Standard English. In M. Konakahara, & K. Tsuchiya (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca in Japan: Towards multilingual practices* (pp. 91–109). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jenkins, J. (2006a). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 137-162.

Jenkins, J. (2006b). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL quarterly*, *40*(1), 157-181.

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

Jenkins, J. (2014). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2018). Not English but English-within-multilingualism. In S. Coffey, & U. Wingate

(Eds.), *New directions for research in foreign language education* (pp. 65-78). Abingdon: Routledge.

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

Kallstrom, R., & Lindberg, I. (Eds.) (2011). *Young urban Swedish: Variation and change in multilingual settings*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg

May, S. (2014). Introducing the 'multilingual turn'. In S. May (Ed.), *The Multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 1-6). New York: Routledge.

Matsuda, A. (Ed.) (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language* (Vol. 53). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (2020). World Englishes and pedagogy. In C. Nelson, Z. Proshina, & D. Davis (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 686-702). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1994). Understanding transformation theory. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44(4), 222-232.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. In P. Cranton (Ed.), New directions for adult and continuing education (pp. 5-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1998). On critical reflection. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48(3), 185-198.

Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moore, J. (2005). Is higher education ready for transformative learning? A question explored in the study of sustainability. *Journal of transformative education*, 3(1), 76-91.

Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st century: disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning*, 63 (suppl. 1), 1-24.

Pitzl, M. (2012). *Preparing teachers for an ELF future: What we can tell them*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca. May 24-26. Bogaziçi University, Turkey.

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

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 24, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2013). *Understanding English as a lingua franca.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Selvi, A., & Yazan, B. (2013). *Teaching English as an international language*. Alexandria: TESOL Press.

Selvi A., & Yazan B. (Eds) (2021). *Language teacher education for Global Englishes: A practical resource book.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Sifakis, N. (2007). The education of teachers of English as a lingua franca: A transformative perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*,17(3), 355-375.

Sifakis, N. (2009). Teacher education in the post-modern era: Introducing a transformative dimension in the teaching of English as a Lingua Franca. *Selected Papers from the 18th ISTAL* (pp. 345–353). Retrieved December 1, 2021, from https://doi.org/10.26262/istal.v18i0.5453

Sifakis, N. (2014). ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: a transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(2), 317-335.

Sifakis, N., & Bayyurt, Y. (2015). Educating the ELF-aware teacher: Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes*, 34(3), 471-484.

Sung, C. (2015). Implementing a Global Englishes component in a university English course in Hong Kong. *English Today*, 31(4), 42–49.

Widdowson, H. (2003). Defining issues in English language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vettorel, P. (2016). WE- and ELF-informed classroom practices: Proposals from a pre-service teacher education programme in Italy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5(1), 107–133.