

Reconstructing English Teaching Objectives from the Perspective of GELT: From Standard-Language Accuracy to International Communicative Competence

Zixi Zheng

College of Foreign Languages, Minnan Normal University, Zhangzhou 363000, China

Abstract

With the globalization of English, English users, interlocutors, and communicative contexts have become increasingly diverse. Traditional English teaching objectives, which mainly use British and American standard English as their reference, are gradually proving insufficient to fully meet the needs of real-world international communication. From the perspective of Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT), this paper discusses the shift in English teaching objectives from “standard-language accuracy” to “international communicative competence.” First, it analyzes the historical rationality and limitations of the traditional accuracy-oriented approach based on standard English, highlighting its shortcomings in language ideology, views of communication, and the development of learner agency. Second, it explains the core connotations of international communicative competence in terms of intelligibility, intercultural awareness, negotiation and accommodation abilities, local cultural expression, and the construction of subjectivity. Finally, it proposes corresponding adjustments in curriculum content, classroom tasks, and assessment concepts. This paper argues that reconstructing teaching objectives from the GELT perspective does not mean denying linguistic accuracy. Rather, it repositions accuracy within the framework of authentic communication, enabling it to serve effective communication, intercultural understanding, and learners’ subjective expression.

Keywords

GELT; standard-language accuracy; international communicative competence; intercultural awareness; English teaching objectives.

1. Introduction

With the gradual advancement of globalization, the use of English has changed significantly in terms of scope, interlocutors, and social functions. It has long been not only a language used within traditional English-speaking countries such as Britain and the United States, but also a tool for communication between English learners and native speakers. On the contrary, it is gradually becoming a shared resource, which is used by people from different first languages and different cultural backgrounds in daily international communication. Studies on World English, International English, and Global English have pointed out that English will naturally be regionalized, localized, and diversified after it is spread around the world. As a result, the old view that British English and American English are the only legitimate standard forms is probably not very tenable [1]. In addition, the study of communication in English as a lingua franca (ELF) also shows that whether communication can be achieved smoothly does not depend entirely on whether the speaker has the same set of norms as the native speaker. There is a considerable relationship between the speaker, the listener, and the specific communication scene at that time [2]. Therefore, against the increasingly complex reality of

global English use, whether English teaching objectives should still revolve primarily around “standard-language accuracy” deserves further discussion.

Traditional English teaching has long attached importance to standard-language norms. This orientation once had a certain practical rationality in curriculum design, textbook compilation, and examination assessment, because it could provide learners with a relatively stable reference for learning. However, when English users and communicative contexts become increasingly diverse, a single standard-language orientation may also limit learners’ adaptation to real-world international communication. Ivor Timmis’s survey of students and teachers in different countries shows that whether native-speaker norms should be followed cannot be determined only by teachers or researchers; questions such as whether teachers’ consensus corresponds to students’ views, and to what extent and with what attitudes students want to conform to native-speaker language standards, must also be included in the discussion [3]. Some studies have also found that although non-native English teachers recognize the diversity of English accents and pragmatic norms, they still often tend to adopt native-speaker language models in teaching and prefer native-speaker standard English to accented English varieties [4]. In the Chinese context, foreign language education is also affected by problems such as exam-oriented learning and certificate orientation, which can easily cause a disconnection between language knowledge learning and practical language-use ability. Therefore, foreign language teaching needs to pay greater attention to authentic application ability, especially the cultivation of intercultural competence [5]. Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) provides an important perspective for this shift. Introducing Global Englishes awareness into the classroom helps students understand the diversity of English varieties, reflect on standard-language ideology, and re-understand the relationship among English, identity, culture, and communicative effectiveness [6]. Based on this, this paper discusses the reconstruction of English teaching objectives from the perspective of GELT, arguing that English teaching should move beyond a single concern with whether learners sound like standard English users and turn toward international communicative competence, which places greater emphasis on intelligibility, intercultural awareness, negotiation and accommodation abilities, and local cultural expression.

2. The Limitations of the Traditional “Standard-Language Accuracy” Orientation and the Theoretical Basis for Objective Reconstruction

Traditional English teaching has long taken “standard-language accuracy” as its core objective, and this orientation had practical rationality at a certain historical stage. For foreign language learners, relatively unified standard-language norms can provide a clear learning reference and help teachers conduct systematic training in such basic language units as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and discourse. In the early stage of English learning, such accuracy training can often help learners to slowly establish the feeling of basic language rules, and at the same time, it can also reduce the obvious ambiguity of expression. In this way, it lays a solid foundation for more complex language use occasions in the future. If we look at it from the perspective of school education, the standard language standards, the preparation of teaching materials, the evaluation in the classroom, and the specific implementation of those large-scale examinations are also beneficial. For a long time, people have been accustomed to regarding the observance of standard language norms as an important basis for measuring a person’s English proficiency. However, there is something worth noting - for example, Terrence G. Willey and Margaret Lux, when studying the ideology of Standard English, once mentioned that the concept of standard language is often naturalized through the education system, and then guides the learner to understand a particular language form as the only legal form in English [7]. In fact, the accuracy of standard language is not a completely neutral language problem. It

is often associated with educational opportunities, social evaluation, and language authority. When a certain form of English is fixed and then described as “correct”, “standard,” or “advanced”, those other English variants, localized expressions, and non-native speakers’ usual language habits are likely to be put in a relatively low position. In addition, Timmis has conducted a survey of teachers and students in different countries, and the results of this survey are consistent with the above conclusion. From the perspective of learners, their attitudes towards the norms of their mother tongue are not completely consistent. Indeed, some students have clearly stated that they want to learn the accent of the native speaker, but they should think carefully. Behind this pursuit, it is often related to the examination, the stability of the study, the good employment, and the social recognition of these more realistic factors [3]. In addition, the results of the study of non-native English teachers also show that although these teachers also understand that English accent and pragmatic norms are originally diverse, they will still be set down by those established language standards in practice. The language standards are pinned down, and they always want to move closer to the norms of native speakers [4]. From these cases, it can be seen that the norm of mother tongue is still very strong in the field of English education. Therefore, the accuracy of standard language can indeed be a very important part of English learning, but we cannot directly treat it as the whole goal of English teaching.

Today, with the globalization of English, the limitations of a single orientation toward “standard-language accuracy” have gradually become apparent. Early discussions of Global English already pointed out that language is a product of its time, that English continuously displays openness and internationality in the process of global dissemination, and that traditional British English and American English will no longer be the so-called “standard English” [1]. Under the trends of globalization and intercultural communication, English, as a major language of communication, increasingly appears in contexts where cultures meet. Its role has long moved beyond that of a language used only within traditional English-speaking countries such as Britain and the United States; instead, it functions as a shared resource for international communication among users with different first languages and cultural backgrounds. If English teaching still takes British and American standard English as the only reference, it may be unable to respond fully to the linguistic diversity and complexity of real-world international communication. On the one hand, the number, identities, and communicative purposes of English users worldwide have changed, and much English communication does not occur between native and non-native speakers, but among speakers from different non-native backgrounds. On the other hand, as English spreads and is used in different regions, it is influenced by local languages, cultures, and communicative habits, giving rise to expressions with regional characteristics. In this context, the English as a second language classroom urgently needs guidance from a new teaching philosophy. Galloway and Rose’s classroom research proposed the integration of Global Englishes with English teaching, showing that enhancing students’ awareness of Global Englishes varieties can increase second-language learners’ linguistic confidence and change their fixed views about the legitimacy of different non-standard English varieties [6]. A review of GELT by Chinese scholars also points out that the shift toward Global Englishes teaching involves not only language standards, but also multiple aspects such as teaching policy, pre-service and in-service teacher education programs, teaching research, and frameworks for the design and evaluation of teaching materials [8]. It can therefore be seen that the problem with the traditional standard-language orientation does not lie in its emphasis on norms, but in its tendency to make norms singular and absolute, thereby obscuring the multicentric reality of global English use.

From the perspective of learners’ communicative competence, the traditional orientation toward standard-language accuracy can also easily place “formal correctness” above “meaning achievement.” In the context of real international communication, the two sides of the dialogue

are often not British and American native speakers, and the situation of communication is not the kind of fixed practice in the classroom or the questions in the exam. Users from different language backgrounds speak English with their own accent, use their own expressions, and communicate with each other with their own cultural presuppositions - but this does not mean that they can not communicate. In the end, whether the communication can go on smoothly depends more on whether the participants have the ability to adjust their own statements according to the context at that time. Can they correct the misunderstanding by repeating, explaining clearly, confirming, changing the statement, or simply asking a question when they encounter a misunderstanding? To put it bluntly, comprehensibility is not something that can be obtained by the speaker unilaterally sending his pronunciation to the native speaker; on the contrary, it is more about the speaker, the listener, and the specific context, which interact and collide with each other and are slowly generated [2]. In other words, "effective expression" in international communication is not equivalent to complete conformity to a particular standard English form, but emphasizes whether information can be understood, relationships can be maintained, and meanings can be achieved through interaction. On this point, a point of view is put forward that English teaching, not only to stare at the learner's accuracy, but also to see whether they can speak clearly, can understand what the other party is talking about, and can not in the process of communication, and then to carry out that kind of sense of negotiation. International communicative competence itself also involves cultural understanding and the sensitivity to differences. If the English classroom is surrounded by the British and American target language culture for a long time, it is easy for learners to use English, with a few aspects of English culture firmly tied together, instead of being set aside in broader international communication situations. Therefore, English teaching should be to jump out of the single target culture mode, to help learners to understand, from different cultural backgrounds of those English users, they have what kind of expression, and what kind of communication habits [9]. Some studies on intercultural communicative competence in China have actually reminded us that English teaching in our country really needs to go deeper. It is necessary for learners to have a better understanding of cultural differences, contextual changes, and identity expression [10]. Therefore, if the goal is reconsidered from the perspective of GELT, what it says is not to lose accuracy; instead, under the framework of real communication, accuracy is put in a new position to re-examine and position it so that it can truly serve the transmission of comprehensible information, the effective interaction, and the cross-cultural understanding itself.

When it comes to the specific context of English teaching in China, the objective reconstruction of this matter, in fact, still faces a key problem: how to deal with the relationship between "normative learning" and "subjective expression." Chinese learners, indeed, still need to master a set of relatively stable and transferable English knowledge. Because of the necessary language accuracy, it is a very important basic condition for participating in academic exchanges, professional exchanges and international exchanges. But then again, if the teaching goal always stays at the level of imitating British and American standard English, for a long time, it is easy for learners to be fixed in the position of followers of standard English, rather than become a real communicative subject who can use their own English to express personal experience, cultural position, and social identity. For Chinese students, English learning should not only help them understand the outside world, but also help them express their Chinese experience, Chinese culture, and their personal views in international communication. A study of Chinese learners' attitudes toward Chinese English shows that students' understanding of localized English expression remains insufficient. It is necessary for teaching to help them understand the diversification of English ownership and recognize that English can also be a tool for expressing Chinese culture and personal experience [11]. In other words, if students can only use English to reproduce British and American cultural materials but lack the ability to

introduce local culture, explain Chinese social phenomena, and express their own positions, then such English competence remains incomplete and urgently requires correction through a new teaching model. At the same time, another issue is that among Chinese English teachers, although they may be aware of the globalization of English and the diversity of its users, they still tend in teaching and assessment to regard native-speaker English from traditional English-speaking countries as a more appropriate standard. This indicates that implementing GELT in Chinese classrooms must confront practical factors such as teacher beliefs, examination assessment, and teaching resources [12]. Against the broader background of foreign language education reform in China, foreign language teaching also needs to move further away from purely exam-oriented learning and certificate orientation, and toward greater emphasis on authentic language-use ability, intercultural competence, and the needs of national development [5]. Therefore, the reconstruction of English teaching objectives from the GELT perspective should maintain a balanced position: it should retain necessary language-norm training while breaking through the limitations of a single standard-language accuracy orientation, enabling learners to move from being evaluated according to whether they sound like standard English users to becoming international communicators who can communicate effectively, understand differences, and express their own cultural experience in diverse contexts.

3. From “Standard-Language Accuracy” to “International Communicative Competence”: Core Dimensions of Objective Reconstruction

From the perspective of GELT, the reconstruction of English teaching objectives should first be appropriate to re-understand the “accuracy.” In the traditional teaching, when it comes to accuracy, people often think about pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary to see whether they meet the British and American standards. Especially when it comes to oral English teaching, it is particularly easy to use as an important basis for evaluating their English level because of how much the students’ speech is similar to the standard accent. However, in the real international communication situation, the person who talks to you is not always a native speaker of English or American, and the context of communication is often immediate and complex, which can not be expected in advance. Therefore, the goal of English teaching should not only focus on how similar the learners are to a certain standard language form; in addition, it also depends on whether the learner’s expression can be understood by others, whether the information is effectively conveyed in place, and whether the interaction can continue. In the end, the thing of comprehensibility is not to negate accuracy, but to say that it makes a functional transformation of the role of accuracy-language form, which is of course still important, but its value should be put to the level of meaning transmission to serve, rather than mechanically and wholeheartedly moving towards a single standard to converge. When Niina Hynninen reviewed the ELF teaching method, she once pointed out that the teaching practice of ELF did not mean to simply exclude standard English, but to transform standard English from the original single goal into a reference point that can be referred to in learning activities. In this way, it can leave some space and leeway for learners’ own English development [13]. This statement is still enlightening for the reconstruction of English teaching objectives: learners certainly need to master the necessary language norms, but at the same time, they also need to know how to use these norms flexibly in so many varied communication situations. In addition, the comprehensible expression in international communication is also related to whether the learner is willing to speak, whether they have that self-confidence, and their ability to judge specific situations. From the perspective of the model of willingness to communicate in a second language, whether learners will actually participate in communication is not only affected by language ability, but also by communicative situation, self-confidence, motivation and

interpersonal relationship [14]. If English teaching only focuses on the accuracy of the form, it may not be able to fully explain why some students can answer the questions, but when they really want to speak, they dare not speak out. In other words, why some students can make sentences that can not be picked out in grammar, but in actual communication, they will still encounter various obstacles. In such a context, the GELT framework places more emphasis on communicative competence, diversity, and the ability to negotiate. It argues that by exposing learners to the language practices of World English and the ELF, it helps them to communicate meaningfully in different language communities [15]. Therefore, the first level of goal reconstruction, it means that the “accuracy” from the original kind of static, see the degree of conformity is not enough to the standard, into a dynamic, look at the effectiveness of communication standards, so that students can not only pursue the right words, but also to be able to speak clearly, can understand others, can continue to communicate.

In the context of today’s unprecedented globalization, the scope of international communicative competence should naturally include cross-cultural awareness and the ability to understand the differences between different cultures. In terms of cultural objectives, traditional English teaching has often centered on British and American cultures, and textbooks and classroom activities frequently revolve around festivals, lifestyles, social systems, and communicative habits in English-speaking countries. Such arrangements help students understand certain English-speaking cultures, but if British and American cultures are long equated with English culture, students may mistakenly assume that English communication mainly occurs with British and American native speakers, and they may ignore the diverse reality of English use in Asia, Africa, Europe, and other regions. The GELT perspective emphasizes that English has become a communicative resource shared by users from different cultural backgrounds. Therefore, culture teaching should shift from “target-culture learning” to “multicultural understanding.” This shift requires students not only to learn fixed cultural knowledge, but also to understand, compare, and interpret different cultural positions. In a 2017 study, Rose and Galloway designed a classroom debate around the “Speak Good English Movement,” guiding students to discuss the relationship between Singapore English (Singlish) and standard English. The results showed that students were able to reflect on standard-language ideology through discussion and recognize the connection between English varieties and cultural identity [16]. This indicates that cross-cultural awareness is not just the knowledge of foreign customs, what is more important is whether you can understand why different English users use English in different ways, and what kind of identity they carry behind their expressions, what kind of history they carry, and what social significance they have. It is a kind of ability to read the things behind the differences. At the same time, English education under the GELT framework is also effective in anti-racist education. Traditional ELT can easily associate the image of the white native speaker with “ideal English,” whereas GELT advocates weakening this singular and hierarchical linguistic imagination by recognizing linguistic and cultural diversity [15]. It can thus be seen that intercultural awareness is not a secondary content attached to language teaching, but an important component of international communicative competence. For Chinese learners, this ability is especially important: their future English interlocutors may come from different countries and regions and use different accents, pragmatic habits, and cultural expressions. If the classroom still mainly trains students to adapt to a single British or American cultural standard, students may lack tolerance for and interpretive ability toward differences in real communication. Therefore, English teaching objectives should guide students from understanding the cultures of English-speaking countries toward understanding diverse English users, thereby forming an open attitude and sound judgment when facing differences.

On the basis of the two dimensions above, genuine international communicative competence today also includes negotiation and accommodation abilities, as well as the subject ability to

express local culture and personal positions in English. Real international communication is not a linear process that unfolds exactly according to textbook dialogues. In communication, problems such as not understanding, unclear expression, inconsistent cultural presuppositions, or different expressive habits often arise. In such cases, communicative success does not depend on whether learners use completely standard expressions from the very beginning, but on whether they can continuously repair misunderstandings and advance interaction through explanation, repetition, confirmation, reformulation, exemplification, and questioning. In other words, negotiation and accommodation abilities enable learners to actively solve problems in uncertain communicative environments rather than fall silent once they deviate from a standard answer. MacIntyre and colleagues place “communication behavior” at the top of their model of willingness to communicate in a second language, emphasizing that real language use results from the joint effects of multiple psychological, social, and situational factors [14]. English teaching should not only evaluate whether students have mastered language knowledge, but also consider whether they are willing and able to mobilize linguistic resources in specific contexts to complete communication. What’s more, subjective expression is also an indispensable and important part of objective reconstruction based on GELT. Learners should not be mere imitators of British and American Standard English; they should be the kind of communicative participants who can describe their local culture in English, explain Chinese experience, and express their personal views. GELT is a framework that extends the ownership of the English language from the so-called “inner country” to global users; the goal of learning is transformed from “approaching native-speaker level” to “multicultural users”; it replaced the standard of assessment, which is also engaged in pre-established norms, with actual communicative competence [15]. This point is consistent with the reconstruction of the goal that this paper has always emphasized: the ultimate goal of English teaching is not to let all students eliminate the traces of their own language and culture as much as possible, but to hope that they can express themselves clearly, appropriately, and confidently in an international context. The practice of ELF teaching does not give a simple and new standard. On the contrary, it requires teachers to be able to face up to the complexity of real English use, and then on this basis, step by step to ponder and to develop the kind of teaching plan that can be implemented [13]. Therefore, the shift from “standard-language accuracy” to “international communicative competence” includes four interrelated dimensions: resetting the function of accuracy through intelligibility, expanding the scope of culture learning through intercultural awareness, responding to the uncertainty of real communication through negotiation and accommodation abilities, and breaking through the learner’s identity as a mere imitator through local cultural expression and subjectivity construction. Only by incorporating these dimensions into teaching objectives can English teaching truly move from the single evaluation of whether learners sound like standard English users to the cultivation of the ability to communicate effectively in diverse contexts.

4. Practical Implications for Reconstructing English Teaching Objectives from the Perspective of GELT

The reconstruction of English teaching objectives from the perspective of GELT first needs to be reflected in the diversified expansion of curriculum objectives and teaching content. In traditional teaching contexts, English curriculum objectives often emphasize the normativity of pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and discourse expression, and course content is also more often centered on British and American standard English and British and American culture. This teaching design has its advantages: it can provide learners with relatively stable language input and facilitate learners’ early-stage absorption and imitation. However, if a single standard remains the center of the curriculum for a long time, students may develop a relatively

one-sided understanding of English, seeing it as the language of a small number of native-speaking countries and overlooking its nature as a communicative resource jointly constructed by global participants. Therefore, at the level of curriculum objectives, “mastering knowledge of standard English” should be expanded into “being able to use English effectively, appropriately, and confidently in diverse international contexts.” This adjustment does not mean lowering language requirements; rather, it requires the curriculum to more explicitly integrate linguistic accuracy, communicative effectiveness, cultural understanding, and identity expression. Speaking of content selection, textbooks and classroom materials can be appropriately integrated with some examples of English use from different regions, with different accents, and from different cultural backgrounds. For example, like the actual usage of Asian English, what is the context when ASEAN countries communicate in English, excerpts of conversations at international conferences, emails in cross-border business, and texts related to studying abroad and tourism services can be included. In this way, students can gradually see that English is not only a sound, a culture, or a fixed expression. It is very diverse and rich. Regarding the ideological issues in global English education, Seyyed-Abdolhamid Mirhosseini once discussed them specifically. He pointed out that, at that time, those teaching practices that are taken for granted, natural and neutral, in fact, imply a specific view of language and a specific social and cultural position. Therefore, if the English curriculum is to be reformed, it is necessary to consciously reflect on what the concept of “correct English” is that has long been neglected by everyone [17]. At present, the communication between China and ASEAN is not always deepening. In such a background, English teaching can not only focus on British and American culture, but also guide students to understand what the English varieties in the region are like, and what the social and cultural context behind these varieties is [18]. In other words, in today’s increasingly frequent international communication, English education should by no means remain only at the level of teaching linguistic and grammatical rules; it should go deeper into the cultural contexts and identity issues behind language use. English education still has to re-recognize and look at those non-native speakers, as well as non-native teachers, whose own value cannot always be the identity of the native speaker, and continue to be used as a default measure of English proficiency and teaching authority [19]. From this point of view, the diversification of the objectives and contents of the course does not mean that simply adding a few reading texts from different countries to it will be done; on a deeper level, what it actually requires is to change students’ understanding of English ownership, English standards, and English users at that level of the curriculum, so that they can gradually form a realistic international communication-oriented view of language. If, according to the teaching goal after the reconstruction, the direction of the communicative tasks in the classroom has to change accordingly, from the original closed and mechanized practice to a more open, situational, and consultative form of activities. In the end, the reform of English education, it can not only stay at the level of curriculum documents, writing and painting are finished; it also has to really fall into the classroom teaching organization link [20]. Taking the traditional classroom as an example, there are many activities of speaking and listening in the classroom. In fact, it is mainly based on the repeated practice of fixed sentence patterns, which is nothing more than letting students repeat according to the standard answer, and then correcting it by the teacher. What students have to do is mainly to make as few mistakes as possible and to rely on standard expressions as much as possible. In this way, they are actually in a very passive position in the whole process and all they are left with passive acceptance and mechanical imitation [20]. This kind of activity does have a certain role in language basic training, but if classroom teaching remains in this mode for a long time, students, in real communication, may not be able to respond flexibly to different interlocutors and contexts even after acquiring substantial language knowledge. Besides, the native-speaker-centered belief doesn’t just stay at the theoretical level; it will also slip into the daily teaching practice through the teacher’s

expectations of the students, the materials used in the classroom, and the students' own imagination of "ideal English" [21]. If teachers recognize only expressions close to British or American standards in classroom interaction, it will be difficult for students to truly develop an open attitude toward English diversity. Classroom tasks from the GELT perspective should place greater emphasis on meaning negotiation and problem solving. For example, teachers can ask students to engage in role plays around intercultural misunderstandings, compare differences in expressions among English varieties, analyze cases of communication breakdown in international communication, or complete project tasks that require explanation, confirmation, reformulation, and cooperative decision-making. Such classroom activities can help students realize that differences in communication are not necessarily errors; the key is whether understanding can be achieved through interaction. Bai's discussion of ASEAN English varieties also shows that English use in regional exchanges inevitably integrates and carries local culture, and that teachers should not ignore the input of these cultural factors when designing classroom activities that meet students' future communicative needs [18]. Therefore, from a GELT perspective, the classroom shouldn't just be a place where students are trained to produce grammatically correct sentences; rather, it ought to function as a communicative space where they can practice clarifying meaning, recognizing differences, adjusting their expressions, and articulating their own positions in real interactions. In task design, teachers can reduce single-answer evaluations and increase peer assessment, group discussion, contextual simulation, and project presentation, so that students can develop international communicative competence through real or near-real interaction.

Finally, assessment concepts should also shift from single result-oriented and form-oriented assessment to process-oriented and context-sensitive assessment. In traditional English assessment, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary use, pronunciation standardness, and written expression norms often occupy an important position. These indicators are operable and facilitate the implementation of large-scale examinations. However, if assessment relies excessively on these indicators, it can easily reduce English ability to the degree of mastery of standard forms while ignoring learners' task-completion ability, interactive negotiation ability, intercultural appropriateness, and subjective expression in real communication. The influence of native-speakerism is reflected not only in the evaluation of teacher identity, but also in people's imagination of standard-language ideology [19]. Therefore, assessment reform must guard against continuing to treat native-speaker norms as the implicit highest standard. English education from the GELT perspective should retain necessary accuracy indicators while further expanding the focus of assessment to whether communication can be completed. For example, in oral assessment, in addition to pronunciation, intonation, grammar, and vocabulary, teachers can also examine whether students can adjust their expression according to listeners' responses, explain local cultural content, and actively clarify misunderstandings when they occur. When it comes to writing assessment, in addition to the language form itself, we can also pay more attention to the organization of information, reader awareness, contextual relevance, and the expression of ideas. Samuell's study also reminds us that the native-speaker-centered ideology is complex in its own right and deeply hidden; it is likely that it will continue to affect learners' understanding of English learning goals through exams, textbooks, and feedback in the classroom [21]. From this perspective, it's pretty clear that if assessment practices don't change, GELT is going to have a tough time really taking root. If exams keep rewarding only those expressions that stick to a single standard, then even if we tweak the curriculum and classroom tasks, students' learning priorities won't really shift in any meaningful way. When you get down to it, a lot of the practical choices we make in English teaching aren't just technical issues—they're tied up with deeper judgments about what kind of language use is valued [17]. So, from a GELT standpoint, it makes sense to design a more comprehensive assessment framework that covers not just linguistic accuracy, but also intelligibility, task completion,

interaction strategies, cross-cultural awareness, and the ability to express local culture in English. To be more specific, teachers could use classroom observation, learning portfolios, project presentations, peer feedback, reflection journals, and performance tasks to carry out ongoing assessment of students' communicative processes, rather than just zeroing in on the final product. This approach can avoid compressing students' English ability into standard answers in a single examination. At the same time, it can also encourage students to express themselves, willing to take the initiative to negotiate, step by step, to improve themselves in a variety of contexts. In short, adjustments in curriculum content, classroom tasks, and assessment concepts are interconnected: the curriculum provides diverse input, the classroom creates real interaction opportunities, and assessment guides the direction of learning. Only when all three shift together can English teaching objectives truly move from "standard-language accuracy" toward "international communicative competence."

5. Conclusion

In the final analysis, the globalization of English has changed the basic reality of English teaching. This language has long been not only in the hands of British and American native speakers, but also no longer just to meet the needs of communication between learners and native speakers. On the other hand, it is increasingly becoming a common resource for people who come from different language backgrounds and different cultural backgrounds, and use it when they use it for international communication. Under such a background, the traditional teaching goal with "standard-language accuracy" as the core still has its certain value; however, if we take it as the only standard to make it absolute, it is easy to ignore the diversity of English use, the nature of negotiation in communication, and the need of learners to express their cultural identity. The GELT perspective provides a relatively clear theoretical direction for reconstructing English teaching objectives. It does not require English teaching to abandon accuracy, nor does it mean that learners may use English arbitrarily. Rather, it emphasizes that accuracy should be re-understood within real international communication. In other words, the normativity of language form remains important, but its ultimate purpose should be to help learners convey the information clearly, effectively negotiate and communicate, and behave properly and decently in cross-cultural communication. What's more, they can express their own local culture and their own subjective consciousness in English. Accordingly, English teaching objectives should shift from the original single direction of whether learners sound like standard English users to seeing whether the learner can complete the real communication task in different contexts.

For English teaching in China, this shift has practical significance. On the one hand, students still have to master the necessary language knowledge, as well as standardized expression; on the other hand, the classroom should also slowly break through the single-centered model of British and American standard English and British and American target language culture, and bring students into contact with those more real and diversified English use contexts. Looking back, the reform of English teaching is best to push forward the course content, classroom tasks, and assessment methods - so that students can understand differences, negotiate meanings, and express their positions in international exchanges while learning English knowledge.

Biographies

Zixi Zheng: postgraduate student, School of Foreign Languages, Minnan Normal University. Email: 2772364712@qq.com. Research interests: English language teaching and Global Englishes.

Acknowledgements

Fund Project: Key Project of the 2025 Graduate Education and Teaching Reform Research Program of Minnan Normal University, "Strengthening Foundations and Enhancing Quality, Targeted Guidance and Cultivation: A Study on Innovation in the Training Model for Master of Education Students in English under the Guidance of the Spirit of Educators" (YJG202503).

References

- [1] Hu, X. Q. (2007). The development trend of "Global English" in the context of globalization and its implications for English teaching in China. *Foreign Language Teaching Abroad*, (2), 16–23. (In Chinese)
- [2] Pickering, L. (2006). Current research on intelligibility in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 219–233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000115>
- [3] Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 240–249. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.3.240>
- [4] Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2018). Idealized native-speaker linguistic and pragmatic norms in English as an international language: exploring the perceptions of nonnative English teachers. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 18(3), 300–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2018.1440280>
- [5] Yang, D. (2024). Language strategy for a major country: challenges and transformations of foreign language education in the new era. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 56(1), 3–11, 158. (In Chinese)
- [6] Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx040>
- [7] Wiley, T. G., & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 511–535. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587697>
- [8] Tao, W. (2020). Toward Global Englishes language teaching: a review of Global Englishes for Language Teaching. *Frontiers of Foreign Language Education Research*, 3(1), 77–81. (In Chinese)
- [9] Nguyen, D. C. (2013). Cultural diversity in English language teaching: learners' voices. *English Language Teaching*, 6(4), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n4p1>
- [10] Zhou, R., Samad, A., & Perinpasingam, T. (2024). A systematic review of cross-cultural communicative competence in EFL teaching: insights from China. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 1750. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03260-3>
- [11] Liu, H., Zhang, X., & Fang, F. (2023). Young English learners' attitudes towards China English: unpacking their identity construction with implications for secondary level language education in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(1), 283–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2156476>
- [12] Fu, Y. (2024). Should Global Englishes be taught? Perceptions from Chinese English teachers in middle school education. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2363147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2363147>
- [13] Hynninen, N. (2017). Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a lingua franca: review of Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca by Bayyurt and Akcan. *ELT Journal*, 71(2), 258–260. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw066>
- [14] MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: a situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x>
- [15] Deng, Y., & Budiman, A. (2024). Embracing linguistic diversity: Global Englishes language teaching for anti-racist education. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1413778. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1413778>

- [16] Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2017). Debating standard language ideology in the classroom: using the "Speak Good English Movement" to raise awareness of Global Englishes. *RELC Journal*, 48(3), 294–301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217713204>
- [17] Mirhosseini, S. A. (2018). Issues of ideology in English language education worldwide: an overview. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 26(1), 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14794408.2017.1347034>
- [18] Bai, J. F. (2011). Implications of English globalization for English varieties and culture teaching in ASEAN countries. *Southeast Asian Studies*, (12), 71–74. (In Chinese)
- [19] Llurda, E., & Calvet-Terré, J. (2024). Native-speakerism and non-native second language teachers: a research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 57(2), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000347>
- [20] Xia, L. (2016). Implications of English education reforms in Finland and South Korea for China's English education model. *Teaching and Management*, (1), 116–120. (In Chinese)
- [21] Samuell, C. (2024). Native speakerism and the Japanese ideal of English language teaching: globalisation, ideology, and practice. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 24(2), 90–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2023.2298438>