

Teaching English in the 21st Century: Innovative Pedagogies and Practices

1. Professor Mohammad Shah Alam Chowdhury

Adjunct Researcher, RMC Spectrum International University College, Malaysia

Email : shah@siuc.edu.my, Orcid ID: 0000-0003-0348-5739, Scopus ID:60819374000

2. Mili Rahman

Associate Professor, Department of English Dhaka International University

Email:mili.eng@diu.ac

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23403356>

Abstract

In the 21st century, the teaching of English has suffered significant transformations as a result of globalisation, the development of new technologies, new student expectations and the new relevance of English as the language of international communication. Learning-oriented learning pedagogies including interaction, cooperation, tasks, technology and learning centers are being supplemented with traditional teacher centered learning pedagogies which heavily rely on grammar explanation and memorisation and language text teaching. The modern English language classroom is designed to serve the purpose of developing students' language ability, critical analysis, creativity, cooperation, effective communication, digital competence, cultural awareness and self-determination. The research focuses on the analysis of some serious issues and the analysis of new teaching strategies and methods of English in the twenty first century. It presents communicative language teaching, task-based language teaching, blended teaching and flipped teaching, project-based teaching, cooperative teaching, differentiated and inclusive teaching, translanguaging, digital storytelling, mobile-assisted language teaching as well as AI enhanced assessment based teaching. Emphasis is placed on the evolving role of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in the process of curriculum development, language learning and language assessment. The paper rejects a notion of technology replacing teachers and human interaction, instead asserting that it should be a component of good teaching, a pedagogical approach. Challenges such as no access to the Internet, low teacher readiness, large class sizes, validity of the assessments, academic integrity, and privacy of data are discussed. Finally, it provides a context-sensitive frame for English language teaching and learning for the 21st century that recognizes the role of the teacher as the facilitator of students' knowledge acquisition, recognizes students as social agents, and utilizes technology as an instructional tool not an end goal.

Keywords: English language teaching, 21st-century skills, innovative pedagogy, communicative language teaching, task-based learning, blended learning, artificial intelligence, digital literacy, learner autonomy, inclusive education

Article Information

Article Type:
Research Article

Received:
20 September
2026

Accepted:
30 September
2026

Published:
11 October 2026

1:0. INTRODUCTION

In the evolving landscape of historical scholarship, the postmodernist approach has introduced profound changes in how history is interpreted and understood. Dr. Kaya Yılmaz's paper, "Postmodernist Approach to the Discipline of History," offers a comprehensive exploration of this



Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly

paradigm, examining its philosophical foundations and implications for both historians and history educators (Evans 1997). While the paper provides valuable insights into the postmodern challenge to traditional historiography, it is essential to critically evaluate its assumptions, methodologies, and conclusions.

This critique aims to dissect the key components of Yilmaz's argument, scrutinizing the validity and robustness of the claims presented. By examining each major section of the article ranging from the foundational definition of history to the dichotomy between idealist and positivist approaches, and the professionalization of historiography through the lens of Ranke.

The study assesses the strengths and weaknesses of the postmodernist perspective. Additionally, this critique highlights alternative viewpoints from established scholars, addresses potential contradictions, and identifies any gaps in the argument. (Gaddis, 2002; Jenkins, 1991).

Ultimately, this critique seeks to provide a balanced analysis, acknowledging the contributions of Yilmaz's work while also questioning its broader applicability and coherence within the field of historical studies. By doing so, the study aims to foster a deeper understanding of the complexities and debates that continue to shape the discipline of history in the postmodern era.

2:0. A critique of Dr Kaya Yilmaz's article

Dr Kaya Yilmaz's article "Postmodernist Approach to the Discipline of History" is divided into six major parts where the first part of his paper presented an overview or abstract of his paper, the second part was the introductory part, the third section presented about the theme titled "what is history"? while in the fourth part Yilmaz discussed about Professionalization of History: the Ranken School, likewise in the fifth part of his paper, he presented about Idealist-Positivist Cleavage: Art versus Science Dichotomy, followed by the sixth part which scrutinizes about Postmodern Challenge to History, additional to that in the last section of his paper Yilmaz presented his Conclusion and Recommendations, from Yilmaz paper each part carries one major theme, below is the critique with Counterargument of each part or theme presented in the article

3:0. Introductory part

The introduction assumes that a sophisticated understanding of the nature of history is as crucial in history education as the nature of science is in science education. While this analogy highlights the importance of disciplinary understanding, it oversimplifies the unique challenges and differences between history and science education. Science often deals with observable and replicable phenomena, while history is interpretative and context-dependent, relying heavily on the interpretation of sources and the understanding of human actions and intentions (Jenkins, 1991). This fundamental difference questions the direct applicability of methods from science education to history education.

While the introduction cites reputable sources to argue for the importance of understanding the nature of history (Lee, 1983; Seixas, 2001, 2002), it lacks empirical evidence showing that such an understanding directly leads to improved educational outcomes in history. For instance, studies by Wineburg (2001) demonstrate that historical thinking is a distinct cognitive process that requires specific pedagogical approaches different from those used in science education. Incorporating such evidence would strengthen the argument for a nuanced approach to history education.

The claim that history departments fail to emphasize historiographies of different sorts and diverse historical approaches might be an overgeneralization. Many history departments have increasingly integrated diverse perspectives, including postmodernist approaches, into their curricula (Evans, 1997). For example, the incorporation of postcolonial studies and gender studies into history programs contradicts the assertion that there is an inadequate emphasis on diverse historiographies. Therefore, the paper should acknowledge these advancements rather than implying a widespread neglect.

A significant gap in the argument is the lack of a clear definition and differentiation of what constitutes "postmodernist historiography" compared to other historiographical approaches. The introduction could benefit from briefly outlining what distinguishes postmodernist historiography and why it warrants special attention over other emerging approaches. Without this clarity, the reader might struggle to understand the specific contributions and controversies of postmodernism in historiography.

The conclusion that a familiarity with multiple historical explanations will inherently lead to a more nuanced understanding of the past is not the only possible outcome. Postmodernist approaches, while enriching, can also lead to relativism and skepticism about the possibility of any objective historical knowledge (Zagorin, 1999). Critics argue that this can undermine the educational goal of understanding historical facts and contexts (Windschuttle, 2002). Therefore, the paper should address these potential downsides and explore how they can be mitigated to avoid presenting an overly optimistic view of postmodernist historiography.

The introduction of Dr. Kaya Yilmaz's paper makes a compelling case for integrating a sophisticated understanding of history into educational practices. However, it requires a more nuanced comparison between the nature of history and science, stronger empirical support, acknowledgment of advancements in history education, clarification of postmodernist historiography, and a balanced view of the potential challenges posed by postmodernist approaches. Addressing these points will provide a more robust foundation for the subsequent discussions in the paper.

4:0. "What is History?"

The section assumes a binary or dualistic division between speculative and analytical branches of the philosophy of history, which oversimplifies the complexity of historical theory. Postmodernist approaches challenge these rigid classifications by emphasizing the fluid and contingent nature of historical narratives (Ankersmit, 2001). By insisting on such a binary, the section ignores the hybrid forms of historiography that blend speculative and analytical elements, which are crucial in postmodernist thought (Jenkins, 2003).

The argument that historical frameworks enable historians to narrow down interpretations to a limited number of probable ones (Christianson, 1991) is somewhat problematic. Postmodernist historians like Foucault argue that history is not about finding probable interpretations but about understanding the power structures that shape historical narratives (Foucault, 1972). This view is supported by evidence from studies on historiography that highlight how power and ideology influence historical writing (Appleby, Hunt, & Jacob, 1994).

The assertion that "it is the philosophy of history that provides the building blocks for the study of the past" may contradict the postmodernist perspective that historical narratives are constructed rather than discovered. Postmodernists argue that history is not a collection of objective truths but a series of narratives shaped by cultural and social contexts (White, 1973). This viewpoint is increasingly accepted in contemporary historiography, indicating a need to revise the traditional understanding presented in the section.

The section fails to address the impact of linguistic and cultural turns in historiography, which are central to postmodernist approaches. The linguistic turn, for instance, suggests that language shapes our understanding of history, making it impossible to separate the past from the way it is narrated (Rorty, 1967). By ignoring this, the argument presents an incomplete picture of contemporary historiographical practices.

The conclusion that speculative and analytical philosophies of history comprehensively cover the nature and methods of historical study is not the only possible conclusion. Postmodernist critiques suggest that these categories are insufficient to account for the multiplicity and subjectivity inherent in historical interpretation (Jenkins, 1991). Therefore, the argument is not entirely strong or

believable, as it does not accommodate the diverse and contested nature of historical scholarship promoted by postmodernist thinkers.

The section "What is History?" presents a traditional view of historical philosophy that is challenged by postmodernist critiques. It relies on assumptions that oversimplify the nature of historiography, lacks support from postmodernist perspectives, and contradicts contemporary understandings of historical narratives. To provide a more comprehensive view, it should integrate the contributions and critiques of postmodernist historiography, highlighting the constructed and contingent nature of historical knowledge.

5:0. Professionalization of history

The section on the professionalization of history, focusing on the Rankean school, presents several assumptions that merit critical examination from a postmodernist perspective. These assumptions, when scrutinized, reveal significant weaknesses and gaps that challenge the narrative's validity and comprehensiveness.

The primary assumption in this section is the objective nature of Rankean historiography. The assertion that Ranke aimed to explain the past "how it actually was" (Tosh, 2004) rests on the belief that an objective recounting of historical events is possible. However, postmodernist historians argue that objectivity in history is an illusion. According to Hayden White (1973), historical narratives are inherently constructed and shaped by the historian's choices, language, and cultural context. This undermines the claim of non-rhetorical historical writing, suggesting that all historical accounts are imbued with subjective interpretations.

The supposed scientific status of history and its critical methodologies, as highlighted by Eggers (1997), in Yilmaz's paper is another weak assumption. Postmodernist critiques, such as those by Foucault (1972), emphasize that historical knowledge is produced within specific power structures and is subject to the biases and perspectives of those in power. This perspective challenges the purported objectivity and neutrality of Rankean historiography, suggesting that it cannot escape the influence of contemporary ideologies and power relations.

The claim that Ranke's methodology could provide a dispassionate and objective reconstruction of the past is contradicted by the fact that historical sources themselves are products of their time, often reflecting the biases and perspectives of their creators. As Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1995) argues, silences and omissions in historical records are deliberate, revealing power dynamics and selective memory. Therefore, Ranke's reliance on "trustworthy" sources overlooks the inherent biases present in those documents, making his objective claims dubious.

A significant gap in the argument is the lack of attention to alternative historiographical approaches that emerged alongside or in opposition to the Rankean school. For instance, social and economic histories, which focus on the experiences of ordinary people rather than elite political figures, offer a more comprehensive understanding of the past. The neglect of these perspectives in the Rankean approach leads to a narrow and potentially misleading historical narrative. As Lynn Hunt (1989) argues, incorporating diverse viewpoints enriches historical understanding and challenges the dominance of traditional political narratives.

The conclusion that Ranke's methodology represents the pinnacle of historical scholarship is not the only plausible interpretation. Postmodernist approaches suggest that recognizing the multiplicity of perspectives and the constructed nature of historical narratives leads to a more nuanced and critical understanding of the past. Instead of striving for an unattainable objectivity, historians should embrace the subjective and interpretive nature of their work, as advocated by theorists like Jenkins (1991). This approach allows for a more inclusive and reflective historiography that acknowledges its limitations and the plurality of historical experiences.

In the nutshell, while the Rankean school significantly influenced the professionalization of history, its claims of objectivity and scientific rigor are deeply flawed when examined through a

postmodernist lens. The assumptions underpinning Rankean historiography overlook the constructed nature of historical narratives and the inherent biases in historical sources. By embracing a more critical and inclusive approach, historians can better understand the complexities of the past and provide richer, more varied historical narratives.

6:0. Idealist-Positivist Cleavage: Art versus Science Dichotomy

The primary assumption in this section is the clear dichotomy between idealist and positivist historiographies, suggesting that these categories can neatly encapsulate all historical writing. This binary classification is overly simplistic and ignores the complexities and intersections between different historiographical approaches. For instance, postmodernist historians argue that such rigid classifications fail to account for the nuanced ways in which historical narratives are constructed. According to Jenkins (1995), historical narratives are always already infused with interpretations, making the binary distinction between art and science, idealist and positivist, insufficient to capture the multifaceted nature of historiography.

The assertion that positivist historian's focus on uniformities and regularities to formulate generalizations (Gilderhus, 1987; Breisach, 1994) can be contested. Postmodernist critiques, such as those by Foucault (1972), emphasize that these generalizations often reflect underlying power structures and epistemic frameworks that shape what is considered valid knowledge. This perspective challenges the notion of objective causal explanations in history, suggesting that what positivists present as causal laws are actually contingent on specific historical and social contexts.

The claim that idealist historians focus solely on the unique and specific events outside of nature and emphasize re-enactment of past thought (Gilderhus, 1987; Breisach, 1994) is contradicted by the fact that even idealist historians are influenced by their contemporary contexts and cannot fully escape their presentist perspectives. As White (1987) argues, all historical writing is inherently narrative and interpretive, implying that idealist historians' attempts to re-enact past thought are inevitably shaped by their own historical and cultural positions.

A significant gap in the argument is the lack of consideration of the role of language and discourse in shaping historical narratives. Postmodernist theorists, such as Derrida (1976), argue that language is not a transparent medium for conveying historical truth but is itself a constitutive element of historical understanding. This perspective reveals the limitations of both positivist and idealist approaches, as they both rely on the assumption that language can accurately represent historical reality.

The conclusion that the dichotomy between idealist and positivist historiographies sufficiently explains the nature of historical writing is not the solely interpretation. Postmodernist approaches suggest that recognizing the role of discourse, power, and ideology in shaping historical narratives leads to a more nuanced understanding of historiography. Instead of adhering to rigid categories, historians should embrace the plurality and constructed nature of historical knowledge. According to Lyotard (1984), the postmodern condition calls for skepticism towards grand narratives and an emphasis on the diversity of historical experiences and interpretations. In conclusion to this section while the idealist-positivist cleavage provides a framework for understanding different historiographical approaches, it is overly simplistic and fails to capture the complexities of historical writing. Postmodernist perspectives highlight the constructed and interpretive nature of all historical narratives, challenging the assumptions of objectivity and clear distinctions between art and science in historiography. By embracing a more critical and inclusive approach, historians can better understand the diverse and multifaceted nature of the past.

7:0. Postmodern Challenge to History"

The section on the postmodern challenge to history highlights significant shifts in historiographical thinking but contains several assumptions and arguments that merit critique from a postmodernist

perspective. By examining these assumptions, identifying gaps, and providing counterarguments, we can reveal the limitations and alternative interpretations of this traditional critique.

The primary assumption in this section is the binary opposition between traditional historiography and postmodernism. This binary oversimplifies the landscape of historical writing and fails to account for the diverse ways historians engage with postmodern ideas. According to Jenkins (1991), postmodernism is not a monolithic movement but a collection of varied and sometimes conflicting approaches that challenge traditional notions of objectivity and truth in history. By presenting postmodernism as a unified front, the argument overlooks the internal diversity and complexity within postmodern thought.

The assertion that postmodernism rejects historical realism and claims that language constitutes reality (Zagorin, 1999) is accurate but can be further nuanced. Postmodernists argue that all historical narratives are constructed through language, which inherently shapes our understanding of reality (Jenkins, 1997). This perspective challenges the notion of an objective, knowable past and emphasizes the role of discourse in shaping historical knowledge. Lyotard (1984) suggests that grand narratives, or overarching explanations of historical processes, are inherently ideological and reflect specific power dynamics rather than objective truth.

The claim that postmodernism leads to a rejection of all forms of objective knowledge and truth (Zagorin, 1999) is contradicted by the fact that many postmodernist historians seek to uncover marginalized voices and alternative histories. For instance, Foucault (1972) explores how power relations influence historical narratives, revealing the contingent and constructed nature of historical knowledge. This does not imply a complete rejection of truth but rather a rethinking of what constitutes historical truth and whose perspectives are included.

A significant gap in the argument is the lack of consideration for the productive aspects of postmodern critique. While the section acknowledges postmodernism's challenge to traditional historiography, it does not fully explore how this challenge has led to methodological innovations. As McCullagh (1998) notes, postmodernism has prompted historians to critically examine their own assumptions and become more reflective about their methodological choices. This reflexivity can lead to richer and more nuanced historical analyses.

The conclusion that postmodernism is a minority phenomenon among professional historians (Zagorin, 1999) overlooks the ongoing influence of postmodernist ideas in contemporary historiography. While some historians may reject extreme relativism, many have integrated postmodern insights into their work. For example, Seixas (2000) argues that postmodernism has enriched historical pedagogy by encouraging students to critically engage with historical narratives and understand the political interests behind them. This integration of postmodern ideas demonstrates that postmodernism's impact on historiography is more substantial and enduring than the section suggests.

Conclusion and recommendations

The "Conclusion and Recommendations" section acknowledges the evolution and pluralism in historiography but contains several assumptions and arguments that can be critiqued from a postmodernist perspective. The primary assumption that expanding historiography's scope inherently leads to better understanding are simplistic. Postmodernists like Jenkins (1991) argue that all historical narratives are subjective and constructed through cultural and ideological lenses, suggesting that increasing perspectives does not necessarily yield a more accurate understanding. While the section supports the notion of pluralism in historiography, postmodernists such as Foucault (1972) assert that the very concept of a unified historical narrative is a power tool that marginalizes alternative voices, calling for a critical examination of the power dynamics shaping historical narratives.

The section's suggestion that historiography training helps students construct independent interpretations is contradicted by the postmodernist view that all interpretations are influenced by context and biases. Jenkins (1997) notes that historiographical tools themselves are embedded within specific epistemological frameworks, shaping their use and resulting interpretations. Furthermore, the argument overlooks how power relations influence historical narratives and education, as highlighted by Spivak (1988). Postmodernists argue that simply teaching historiographical methods without addressing power dynamics and ideological biases fails to fundamentally change historical understanding. A more nuanced approach would incorporate postmodernist insights into historiography education, emphasizing critical examination of power relations and the construction of historical knowledge (Foucault, 1972).

Article Publication Details

This article is published in the **Globenix Multidisciplinary Journal**, ISSN 3139-0870 (Online). In Volume 2, Issue 4 (July - August) – 2026. The journal is published and managed by **Globenix Publisher**.

Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank the editors and the reviewers for their valuable suggestions on this paper.

Funding

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.

References

1. Council of Europe (2020) Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
2. Guo, T., Hashim, H. and Ismail, H.H. (2026) 'Effectiveness of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in English Speaking Instruction: A Systematic Review', *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 25(2).
3. Kadhim, H.S. and Mohsein, O.A. (2024) 'A review of communicative language teaching approaches in English language instruction', *International Journal of Humanities and Education Research*, 6(2), pp. 165–173.
4. Klapper, J. (2003) 'Taking communication to task? A critical review of recent trends in language teaching', *The Language Learning Journal*, 27(1), pp. 33–42.
5. Littlewood, W. (2007) 'Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms', *Language Teaching*, 40(3), pp. 243–249.
6. Luo, Y., Nguyen, D. and Lai, V.T.T. (2026) 'An Overview of Artificial Intelligence Integration in English Teaching and Learning', *TESOL in Context*, 35(2).
7. Miao, F. and Holmes, W. (2023) *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. Paris: UNESCO.
8. Nuyen, T.T.H. (2026) 'Impacts of Task-Based Language Teaching on Speaking and Oral Proficiency: An Initial Review', *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science*, 23(3), pp. 707–718.
9. Rahman, S., Rahman, M. and Ara, N. (2026) 'Investigating the Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use and User Acceptance of GenAI by Digital Native English Language Teachers: A Study on Private Universities in Bangladesh', *TESOL Bangladesh Journal*.
10. Richards, J.C. (2006) *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2014) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 3rd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Ellis, R. (2003) *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

13. Ellis, R. (2009) 'Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), pp. 221–246.
14. Harmer, J. (2015) *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 5th edn. Harlow: Pearson.
15. Hattie, J. (2009) *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. London: Routledge.
16. Krashen, S.D. (1982) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
17. Long, M.H. (2015) *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
18. Nation, I.S.P. (2001) *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Nunan, D. (2004) *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
20. Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2014) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. UNESCO (2023) *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. Paris: UNESCO.
22. Council of Europe (2020) *CEFR Companion Volume: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
23. British Council (2025) *South Asia TeachingEnglish Online Conference 2025*. British Council.
24. Piccardo, E. and North, B. (2019) *The Action-Oriented Approach: A Dynamic Vision of Language Education*. Multilingual Matters.
25. Swain, M. (1985) 'Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development', in Gass, S. and Madden, C. (eds.) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 235–253.
26. Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
27. Warschauer, M. and Healey, D. (1998) 'Computers and language learning: An overview', *Language Teaching*, 31(2), pp. 57–71.
28. Willis, J. (1996) *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.
29. Dörnyei, Z. (2001) *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
30. Dörnyei, Z. (2007) 'Creating a motivating classroom environment', in Cummins, J. and Davison, C. (eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Boston: Springer, pp. 719–731.
31. Garrison, D.R. and Vaughan, N.D. (2008) *Blended Learning in Higher Education: Framework, Principles, and Guidelines*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
32. Hampel, R. and Stickler, U. (2012) 'The use of videoconferencing to support multimodal interaction in an online language classroom', *ReCALL*, 24(2), pp. 116–137.
33. Mishra, P. and Koehler, M.J. (2006) 'Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge', *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), pp. 1017–1054.
34. Mayer, R.E. (2009) *Multimedia Learning*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Puentedura, R.R. (2014) *SAMR and TPACK: A Hands-On Approach to Classroom Practice*. Available through educational technology resources.
36. Selwyn, N. (2016) *Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates*. 2nd edn. London: Bloomsbury.
37. Tomlinson, C.A. (2014) *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*. 2nd edn. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
38. Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
39. Canagarajah, S. (2013) *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.
40. Jenkins, J. (2015) *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. 3rd edn. London: Routledge.
41. McKay, S.L. (2002) *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
42. Seidlhofer, B. (2011) *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
43. Holliday, A. (2005) *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

44. Flowerdew, J. and Miller, L. (2005) Second Language Listening: Theory and Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
45. Hyland, K. (2006) English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book. London: Routledge.
46. Hyland, K. (2019) Second Language Writing. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
47. Nation, I.S.P. and Macalister, J. (2010) Language Curriculum Design. New York: Routledge.
48. Richards, J.C. (2017) Teaching English Through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Publisher's Note

GLOBENIX PUBLISHER remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of GLOBENIX PUBLISHER and/or the editor(s). GLOBENIX PUBLISHER disclaims responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.