

Task-based essay writing material: Integrating global Englishes into English language teaching

Anggara Jatu Kusumawati ^{a,1,*} Dwi Yulianto Nugroho ^{b,2}

^a Universitas Islam Indonesia, Jl. Kaliurang Km 14.5, Sleman, Yogyakarta 55584, Indonesia

^b Universitas Pelita Harapan, Jl. Boulevard Diponegoro No.1100, Kelapa Dua, Tangerang, Banten 15811, Indonesia

¹ anggarajatu@uii.ac.id *, ² dwi.nugroho@uph.edu

*Corresponding author



ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received 23 January 2026;

Revised: 28 March 2026;

Accepted 13 April 2026

Available Online 30 April 2026

Keywords

ELT

Task-based language teaching

Global Englishes

Material development

ABSTRACT

This study explores how essay writing material integrating task-based approach and Global Englishes (GE) in English Language Teaching (ELT). Native-speaker norms and prescriptive standards are often emphasized in traditional writing pedagogy especially in higher education contexts, neglecting learners' multilingual repertoires and the role of English as a global lingua franca. Due to this gap, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) framework was used to design materials to scaffold academic writing skills and to justify students' multilingual repertoires. Employing a qualitative case study, this study shows how TBLT and diverse English varieties can be integrated into essay writing tasks using data from needs analysis, classroom observations, and student feedback. This study involved our lecturers and fifty-three undergraduate students in an essay writing course, who share similar backgrounds and regularly use multiple languages. The findings show that (1) students participated more actively in writing tasks, (2) they demonstrated greater critical awareness of multilingual English use in their reflections and essays, and (3) they expressed increased confidence in using their own linguistic resources. The module also addresses the limitations of monolingual writing conventions in the Indonesian higher education context. Overall, the study shows that TBLT is an effective approach for integrating GE into writing classrooms. Aligning academic pedagogy with the sociolinguistic diversities of GE was the implication for material developers, teachers, and institutions.



© The Authors 2026. Published by Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.
This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



How to Cite: Kusumawati, A.J. & Nugroho, D.Y. (2026). Task-based essay writing material: integrating global Englishes into English language teaching. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 9(1), 121-131. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v9i1.15692>

1. Introduction

Academic writing is a key component of tertiary education, supporting students' reasoning, argumentation, and participation in academic exchange (Hyland, 2013). In Indonesia, essay writing courses are likewise valued for developing academic and professional communication (RahmtAllah, 2020; Rahnuma, 2025). Yet academic writing instruction often remains shaped by monolingual ideologies. Teaching materials and classroom pedagogy have long been dominated by English-only policies and native-speaker norms (Canagarajah, 2002; Jenkins, 2014). This dominant orientation tends to privilege Anglo-American rhetorical conventions and narrow ideas of grammatical correctness, usually at a price. It marginalizes diverse English varieties and the multilingual resources students actualize in their learning contexts (Bayyurt & Altinmakas, 2024; Bygate, 2015; Canagarajah, 2002), framing learners as deficient rather than highlighting them as competent, Multilanguage authors. In this context, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has emerged as a widely used approach that is learner-centered and process-oriented — focused on making meaning through authentic communication as the foundation for pedagogy (Ellis, 2009; Willis & Willis, 2007). In writing classrooms in particular, TBLT can walk

students through the recursive stages of composing by framing tasks such as brainstorming assignments, drafting experiences, revising processes and peer response (Byrnes, 2014), and has been associated with stronger engagement, critical thinking, and negotiation of meaning in writing activities (Vo et al., 2025). Despite its pedagogical potential, much TBLT-informed writing instruction is still framed within a monolingual and Western-centric normative structure in which quality is still judged primarily by native-speaker standards of coherence and accuracy (Galloway, 2017; Seidlhofer, 2011a; Sulaiman, 2025). Consequently, task-based writing practices risk replicating existing norms and allowing little local voice and linguistic diversity (in academic communication) to emerge.

It is against this residuality of monolingual dispositions that the Global Englishes (GE) paradigm intervenes, reconceptualizing English as a dynamic and plural resource shaped by different users and contextual volatility. GE shifts goal of learning from strict conformity to native-speaker correctness toward intelligibility, effectiveness, and intercultural awareness in communication (Matsuda, 2019; Boonsuk, 2025). This view, in academic writing, conforms varied rhetorical alternatives, cultural-based topics, and multilingual practices that reflect English as a global lingua franca effectively (Canagarajah, 2013; Seidlhofer, 2011b). Yet, the integration of GE-informed pedagogy into writing instruction was still limited compared to other skills such as speaking, listening and intercultural competence (Rose & Galloway, 2019), and open future investigation how GE-informed pedagogy might look like in recent classroom (Tardy, 2025).

Developing this discussion to instructional design, material development is fundamental to English Language Teaching (ELT). This function as a classroom resource and pedagogical viewpoint build conceptualized language learning. Learning materials are designed with learner-centered, contextual based to develop meaningful language use (Santoso et al., 2025; Tomlinson, 2013). Consequently, the materials are expected to be authentic, contextual based, and create opportunities for real communication (Nunan, 2010; Richards, 2006). In the process of developing material, especially in academic writing pedagogy, this is projected not only to include models and assignments but also to scaffold writing processes that increase learner autonomy, critical thinking and goal-oriented communication.

However, material development has been inhibited by pervasive standardization in mass-produced textbooks. At the same time, these materials often render English a monolingual, uniform standard (Gray, 2010; Galloway & Rose, 2015), providing their students with little real exposure to alternative rhetorical conventions or English language varieties more broadly. In so doing, such texts risk evoking local contexts around the world while failing to explicitly engage students' multilingual repertoires as valued and/or adequate. Alternatively, teachers who try to create locally responsive materials often encounter a variety of practical constraints including time poverty, differences in professional expertise and institutional cultures that value compliance with the curriculum over pedagogic innovation. (Cirocki et al., 2024). These constraints are particularly visible in writing instruction. Materials commonly emphasize fixed formats and grammatical correctness rather than communicative effectiveness and intercultural meaning-making.

Some approaches to ELT materials were applied to address limitations such as corpus-informed resources, technology-enhanced platforms, and culturally grounded materials that could reflect learners' language repertoire (Breen, 2001; McGrath, 2016). Furthermore, task-based materials are emphasized as positive paths as their learning ground aiming at purposeful communication and aligning with process-oriented writing development (Ellis, 2009; Feng, 2025). It may further accommodate learners' multilingual repertoire, encourage critical language awareness when the task-based academic writing combined with Global Englishes principles. Also, students' communicative needs (both local and global) could also be accommodated through the modified essay-writing tasks.

In relation to the communicative goal in process-oriented writing development, translanguaging has become a key of both theoretical and pedagogical perspective in multilingual classroom. This approach enables learners to use their language repertoires for learning and meaning-making process (García & Wei, 2014). During its process (brainstorming, drafting, and revising, or producing the final draft in English) learners are allowed to draw on their first languages and local discourses (Canagarajah, 2011). Translanguaging challenges monolingual perceptions that academic competence is associated with native-speaker norms rather than situates writing as a social and cultural mediated practice (Hornberger & Link, 2012). Moreover, from a pedagogical viewpoint, translanguaging has been associated with stronger cognitive and affective engagement in writing classrooms. Students may generate richer ideas demonstrate deeper critical thinking and develop greater ownership of their texts when are allowed to use

their multilingual repertoire (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; García & Kleyn, 2016). This perspective is mostly relevant in Indonesian higher education. Learners come from diverse linguistics backgrounds and are required to write exclusively in English especially for classroom assignments and projects. Hence, incorporating both translanguaging and GE principles into academic writing instruction could value linguistic diversity and linking academic tasks to local knowledge and worldviews (Galloway & Rose, 2015; Jenkins, 2014). However, some tensions remain in implementing translanguaging in academic writing as institutional policies, textbooks, and assessment practices frequently grounded in monolingual standards (Rafi & Morgan, 2023). Although previous studies have reported benefits of translanguaging strategies, empirical work on how such practices can be systematically embedded within task-based writing pedagogy and materials remains limited. This gap makes evident the relevance of exploring how ‘translanguaging’ could be implemented in TBLT-informed materials for academic essay writing, and more especially in multilingual university settings.

While meaning-driven approaches are increasingly adopted in ELT, TBLT has a more established tradition of being utilized to teaching speaking rather than academic writing development, especially in multilingual higher education (Mahaputri et al., 2024; Purba & Febria, 2025; Tardy et al., 2021; Widodo et al., 2022). In the meantime, Global Englishes (GE) research has added force to theoretical discussions around linguistic diversity and the acceptability of multiple Englishes; however, there is little understanding in terms of how GE principles can be translated into academic writing practices in classroom contexts. At materials level, ELT research consistently advocates for context-specific and learner-centered design, however much published material still favors monolingual ideologies and native speaker norms (Santoso et al., 2025; Tomlison, 2013).

Similarly, translanguaging research points to the potential for leveraging students’ entire language repertoire during academic writing activity, yet procedural constraints tend to hinder its systematic uptake. These tendrils reveal a constancy between theory and praxis. However, a gap emerges within discursive practices when one looks for an amalgamation of TBLT with GE-informed pedagogy alongside the teaching of multilingual writing that is based upon concrete materials design and usage in actual classroom context. As an original contribution, the study goes beyond advocating conceptual work by rationalizing GE principles into task-based academic essay writing materials. It also examines how such materials are enacted and negotiated in a multilingual Indonesian university classroom. Thus, the study adds value to the writing studies and materials development literature by providing a data-driven model of GE-informed task design. It also offers pedagogical implications for teachers and curriculum developers who intend to design more inclusive writing instruction that supports linguistic diversity in academic settings.

In response to this gap, the current study develops and implements TBLT materials for academic essay writing based on GE principles in an Indonesian university context. In particular, it addresses the following research questions:

1. What are task-based materials for academic essay writing in Global Englishes?
2. How the students make use of these materials, in essay-writing classrooms?
3. What advantages and disadvantages arise from incorporating Global Englishes into the design of TBLT-informed materials?

2. Method

A qualitative case study design (Creswell, 2018; Yin, 2018) was adopted to investigate how task-based materials for academic essays are developed and employed following Global Englishes.

2.1. Participants

This study was carried out in essay writing and academic writing classes at a higher education institution in Indonesia comprising four lecturers and fifty-three undergraduate students sampled using purposive sampling. The same group of students was observed across two different semesters (semester 2 and 3), with learning activities ranging from beginner-intermediate to advanced levels. The other group were four lecturers who taught essay writing and academic writing class. Those groups have similar backgrounds and actively use more than one language in daily academic and social interaction. They used at least three languages (a local/regional language, Bahasa Indonesia and English).

2.2. Data Collection Technique

Data collection was focused on developing and implementing task-based essay writing materials. First, the material development followed three stages: (1) a needs analysis through surveys and interviews with students and lecturers, (2) the design of TBLT-based tasks that integrated Global Englishes principles such as diverse English varieties and multilingual resources, and (3) expert validation by ELT specialists (Ellis, 2009; Galloway & Rose, 2015). Second, the validated materials were implemented in 6 weeks. During the implementation, four data types were collected in the study, namely classroom observations, student reflective journals, questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews. The researcher also acted as a classroom observer during the implementation of the module, allowing for close documentation of teaching and learning processes while maintaining a non-interventionist role during data collection.

2.3. Data Analysis

Data were subject to qualitative analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2013) in the form of thematic processes to draw out patterns and create themes. The process involves six iterative phases: familiarization with the data, coding, searching and reviewing themes, defining and naming themes and writing up. The coding process incorporated both deductive and inductive approaches to enable analytical clarity and ensure that the study's objectives aligned with what the data were revealing. Deductive codes were informed by the principles of TBLT and GE, while inductive codes emerged from recurring patterns in the survey and interview data. The resulting themes were then organized according to the three research questions, allowing for a focused examination of Table 1. The design of GE-informed task-based writing materials, Table 2. How students engaged with these materials in essay-writing classrooms, and Table 3. The perceived advantages and challenges of integrating GE into TBLT-informed materials.

Table 1. The Design of GE-Informed Task-Based Writing Materials

Sub-theme	Deductive code	Inductive data code (with examples)
Learning orientation	Communicative competence	• “Achieving nativism is not the goal... but the ability to communicate with people from various backgrounds.” (Interview)
	Intelligibility over nativeness	• “As long as their English is understandable, it's okay.” (Survey) • “Understandable English is the key.” (Survey)
Material design features	GE-informed content	• English as a lingua franca • Exposure to diverse English users
	Contextualized tasks	• “Language is a tool... for knowledge, tolerance, and understanding.” (Interview)
Assessment orientation	Functional language use	• “Language is a tool... for knowledge, tolerance, and understanding.” (Interview)
	Critique of test-based norms (<i>emergent</i>)	• “The parameter is still based on grammar and receptive skills.” (Survey)

Table 2. How Students Engaged with these Materials in Essay-Writing Classrooms

Sub-theme	Deductive code	Inductive data code (with examples)
Engagement with tasks	Active participation	• Increased involvement in discussions and writing tasks (observed pattern)
Meaning-making strategies	Use of multilingual resources	• Drawing on personal and linguistic background • “Background matters because we are shaped by our past stories.” (Survey)
Writing approach	Focus on meaning over form	• Prioritising clarity and audience understanding
Reflection and awareness	Critical awareness of English use	• Recognising English as a global and flexible resource

Table 3. The Perceived Advantages and Challenges of Integrating GE into TBLT-Informed Materials

Sub-theme	Deductive code	Inductive data code (with examples)
Advantages	Increased engagement	• More active participation in tasks
	Critical multilingual awareness	• Understanding diverse English users and contexts
	Confidence in language use	• Reduced pressure to achieve native-like norms
	Relevance to real-world use	• English as a lingua franca for communication
Disadvantages / Challenges	Tension with assessment norms	• “Still based on academic tests... grammar-focused.” (Survey)
	Uncertainty about standards	• Confusion about correctness vs. acceptability (emergent)
	Institutional constraints	• Dominance of monolingual conventions in academia

2.5. Trustworthiness

For trustworthiness, triangulation, peer debriefing and member checking were employed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The multiple instruments served to triangulate the data and enhance trustworthiness of the findings (Denzin, 2017). For data consistency and reliability, some interview questions were designed from the questionnaire to check participants' responses after the study. All participants were informed of consent, privacy and institutional ethical norm also ensured.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1. Findings

a) *RQ1. What are task-based materials for academic essay writing in global Englishes?*

Based on the results of the needs analysis and expert validation, an essay writing module was developed and modified to integrate Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) principles with the spirit of Global Englishes. The aim was to provide materials that not only scaffold the stages of academic essay writing but also reflect students' multilingual repertoire and diverse cultural backgrounds. The module consisted of seven units and was available in both printed and digital formats. An overview of the module is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 . Overview of the Modified Essay Writing Module

Aspect	Description
Design Approach	Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) with four stages: <i>Topic Orientation, Pre-activities, Learn More!, Post-activities.</i>
Content Sources	Adapted from Oshima & Hogue (2007) <i>Introduction to Academic Writing</i> and Zemach & Rumisek (2003) <i>Academic Writing from Paragraph to Essay.</i>
Modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced some texts with materials from diverse English contexts (e.g., Cambodia, China, Indonesia). • Integrated local cultural topics (e.g., Borobudur Temple) alongside Western texts. • Balanced native and non-native English input.
Affective Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ice-breaker pre-activities (e.g., brainstorming with balloon diagrams). • Group discussions to encourage participation and reduce anxiety.
Cognitive Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical thinking and research-oriented tasks. • Pre-writing stages: topic selection, narrowing focus, and collaborative brainstorming. • Structured scaffolding from brainstorming to essay drafting.

As shown in Table 4, the module followed a task-based approach and was structured around four main parts: *Topic Orientation, Pre-activities, Learn More!, and Post-activities.* The four stages were intended to help students move from brainstorming all the way through drafting an essay. The module was originally informed by typical academic writing textbooks which reflected native-speaker standards. These materials were later modified to reflect GE through adding textual material from a variety of cultural contexts including Cambodia, China and Indonesia. Topics relevant to the surrounding culture, such as the Borobudur temple were chosen to link the module content with students lived in experiences.

The rationale is that this design allowed students access to a range of varieties, instead of previous models focusing only on standard native-speaker varieties to monotonous repetition. The module also

promoted affective engagement through interactive pre-tasks (visual mapping and group discussions) aimed at fostering engagement by minimizing writing anxiety. Critical thinking and research-oriented tasks were methods used to promote cognitive engagement, such as the selection of topics, development of ideas, and collaborative brainstorming. These activities guided students step by step in the writing process and encouraged active language use. In addition, institutional elements were also included to strengthen students' sense of relevance and ownership of the materials.

b) *RQ2: How do the students make use of these materials, in essay-writing classrooms?*

The results indicate that the students interacted with task-based materials informed by Global Englishes at affective and cognitive level. Affectively, the more flexible use of languages in language learning environment made students to feel less tense and nervous, and less pressure to gain native-like English. "*Saya rasa tidak. Kami menggunakan Bahasa Indonesia pada saat susah. Atau waktu mengungkapkan sesuatu, seperti sekarang.*" (No, I guess. We speak Bahasa Indonesia when we struggle with learning English. Either or we make use of Bahasa to articulate our ideas, which is exactly what I am doing now) demonstrating how language-switching autonomy supported them to become more at ease writing.

Another affective involvement could be seen as learners connecting essay questions to their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, thus enhancing confidence and participation. Consider the drawing from local salience: students in both the description and argumentation writing groups sourced their subjects such as the Borobudur temple, traditional markets they visit, and the routines of their communities for their compositions. Collaborative small-group brainstorming in the L1 preceding the othering of drafting in the L2 allowed students to negotiate their ideas collectively and scaffold one another's writing process. Conspicuously, one survey respondent wrote "*Kami dipengaruhi oleh latar belakang bahasa yang kami dapat sebelumnya*" (Background matters because we are shaped by our past stories). Consequently, their authored texts frequently showed the in-fielding of perspectives from complexes in which they grew up. Task-based essay-specific cognitive engagement strategies included structured pre-writing activities, the intricate interstiling of Western and Indonesian critical reading alongside Indonesian sub-continental critical reading, and reflective questionnaires.

While some students continued to express ambivalence as to whether local or non-native models could be "correct" within the essay genre, sustained exposure to a variety of world Englishes had many reconsiders their allegiance to static native speaker norms and acknowledge communicative success as a similarly valid standard by which they could (and did) judge language use. This change was also seen in students' wider approach to writing: instead of worrying so much about formal linguistic construction, they focused on communicating meaning clearly and anticipating audience understanding, which had implications for how they structured ideas and built arguments. Beyond the textual plane, students displayed an emergent reflex to English as a global language, one that is flexibly deployed and does not belong only to native speakers. This consciousness emerged throughout their written work and critical meditation.

c) *RQ3: What advantages and disadvantages arise from incorporating global Englishes into the design of TBLT-informed materials?*

In undertaking this task, integrating Global Englishes within the context of task-based essay writing materials provided opportunities but also challenges. The good news was that students said they were more motivated and felt a greater sense of belonging when the materials validated their multilingual identities and affirmed the value of local cultural knowledge. A student highlighted the relevance of locally contextualized materials, stating, "*Saya rasa gak semua dari English Native itu bisa dipakai di sini (Indonesia) karena kita ngomong dengan ahasa yang berbeda dan kita akan punya cara berpikir yang berbeda. Jadi kalau materinya digabung dengan yang berhubungan dengan Indonesia tentunya akan lebih membantu*". (I don't believe native materials in English context can always be applied to the situation here in Indonesia because we have a different language and way of thinking. If the tasks are domesticated to Indonesian culture, they serve us better than native-based materials). This reaction indicates that students appreciate writing assignments based on language and culture, where such incorporation allows for the material to be more relevant to them and can prompt engagement of a higher level. Collectively, they also found that reading essays and texts written in different varieties of English expanded their conception of what academic writing is. They became more aware that academic writing can take multiple forms and is not limited to a single standard.

But a couple of complications arose. Several students were self-conscious about writing with local examples, because they felt these did not fit “academic” standards modelled to them from the West. Many teachers approved of this condition in lots of classrooms to this day. One teacher participant explained, “*Saya rasa kelas bahasa Inggris di Indonesia kiblatnya masih native banget. Siswa diharapkan untuk bisa menulis dengan grammar yang bagus and berbicara seperti orang Inggris atau Amerika. Kita harus sadar kalau siswa kita adalah pembelajar Bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing, jadi harus mengurangi masalah yang timbul.*” (I think language classrooms in Indonesia are still native-oriented. Many expect students to write grammatically correct sentences and speak with British or American accents. We should be more aware that our students are EFL learners, so we need to lessen the burden.) This highlights the continuing influence of the belief that there is only one “correct” kind of English in universities. Additionally, teachers reported that designing and assessing tasks that accommodate diverse English varieties required more time, effort and pedagogical preparation.

3.2. Discussion

a) *Reframing academic writing materials through global Englishes-oriented TBLT*

The findings show that the task-based, GE-based materials provided a balance between Western and regional examples in both essays, prompts and topics. This design offered students an opportunity to employ their diverse skills of language use and culture. This is consistent with the proposal that tasks of TBLT are authentic only to the degree that they mirror students’ realistic communicative needs in L2 communication outside the classroom (Ellis, 2009). The essay writing materials are also in line with Global Englishes pedagogy that validates different repertoires of English(es) and local knowledge in classroom practice (Galloway & Rose, 2015). More critically, material design can be understood as a shift in academic ideology. For decades, conventional writing resources have cemented a single, native-speaker standard as the default measure of academic legitimacy. This integration of regional texts and culturally grounded references, such as Borobudur, counters the hegemony of this writing, while at the same time redefining academic writing as a more inclusive and humane practice. In so doing, it represents a significant turn in epistemic authority: local knowledge is no longer on the margins or supplement to academic inquiry but treated as an entirely valid source of academic content.

b) *From form-focused to meaning-focused writing and multilingual practices*

Students engaged more deeply with these types of essay tasks when they were able to root them in established conceptual contexts, such as being asked to write an informative essay about the Borobudur Temple. Their reflective journals suggested that this also increased their confidence, and exposure to a range of English varieties made them think more deeply about how the language functions in different world regions. Hence, these results underpin the perspective that by diverse exposure to Englishes. This critical language awareness is developed enabling learners and users of the language to challenge NS standards (Jenkins, 2014). That said, not all students felt comfortable citing local examples in their writing; some were concerned that doing so would impact the academic credibility of their work. This reticence indicates a more comprehensive process of identity negotiation, one in which students are at risk of being stuck between establishing their validity as academic writers and creatively pulling from their local knowledge. Their concerns that locally grounded examples may not be accepted reveal internalised assumptions of what counts as proper academic English, assumptions invariably tied to the ideology of correctness, which continues to privilege Western, standardising norms. These dynamics also allude to underlying power relations encoded in the use of language. The ongoing privileging of near-native proficiency, such as teacher preferences for native speech or advanced vocabulary, maintains a hierarchical view of English that sees certain varieties as inherently superseding others. Even in pedagogical contexts that explicitly promote multilingual practices, such ideologies can silently inhibit students from using the full range of their linguistic resources. As a result, the movement toward meaning-focused and multilingual writing is an incomplete process, one hotly debated, rather than replacing grammatical prose in a straightforward way.

c) *Pedagogical affordances and tensions in integrating global Englishes*

The paper discusses the potential and pitfalls of incorporating GE into TBLT materials. On one hand, the steps in the writing process, brainstorming, drafting, feedback from peers, all involved students affectively and cognitively. Consequently, they took more initiative in writing and gained confidence putting their ideas on paper. This is in line with the flexibility of TBLT (Ellis, 2017). In contrast, academic conventions from the West put pressure on students in such a way that they were expected to reconcile

their local knowledge with established conventions. Such tension might be read as a microcosm of power relations in higher education at large, with homogenised norms still dictating what constitutes legitimate knowledge and appropriate use of language. But it is equally essential to reconcile respect for entrenched traditions in scholarship with the embrace of more equitable kinds of pedagogy.

Such findings also have pedagogical implications, especially regarding materials design. Regional and local source texts may be used alongside Western models, arguably making writing instruction more relevant, meaningful, and empowering for students. Professional development particularly teacher education should prepare teachers to support traditional essay-writing practices and legitimate multilingual resources in classrooms. All the assessment criteria have to go into reverse and give a one-button preference to content, as well as solid argumentation and critical thinking. Hence, the study highlights how TBLT provides a practical way to integrate GE into essay writing. Constant challenge was also emphasized in navigating institutional beliefs about what counts as standard.

4. Conclusion

Overall, this study contributes to ELT by demonstrating how task-based essay writing materials can be systematically integrated with GE. It shows how this integration can support more inclusive and context-sensitive writing instruction. The findings show that such materials can enhance learners' engagement (both affective and cognitive), foster critical awareness of multilingual users, and validate linguistic competence in higher education especially in Indonesian university setting. The modified module was designed to serve an orienting purpose between the monolingual writing conventions and the linguistic diversity inherent in the concept of English as a lingua franca. This was achieved by taking traditional essay-writing resources and making them more culturally relevant, using a wider variety of Englishes. In this sense, this study adds to the ELT literature by arguing that TBLT can provide a viable and salient route for realizing Global Englishes content in writing classrooms. That said, its execution does not occur in a vacuum; deeper questions of identity, ideology and power will inevitably shape how students will engage with and make sense of such materials. Tensions between institutional expectations for standard academic English and the more explicit practices that the module promotes through this online forum remain very much alive, which have shown that both pedagogy and assessment are still contested terrain.

From a pedagogical standpoint, the findings highlight a pressing need for teacher education programs that genuinely equip teachers to design and deliver GE-informed tasks. Equally important are curricular materials that weave together local and global perspectives, alongside assessment practices that move beyond monolingual, native-speaker benchmarks. As with any single case study, the scope of the current research is inherently limited, and broader generalizations would require investigation across wider and more varied settings. Future research would benefit from longitudinal and larger-scale approaches capable of probing both the sustainability and the transferability of these kinds of innovations across diverse educational contexts.

Acknowledgment

The authors wish to express her thanks to Universitas Islam Indonesia and the participants for their time and support throughout this research. The authors also mention that the ChatGPT was only used sparsely (minor language refinement). All research decisions, data analysis, and interpretations were produced independently by the author and written in line with academic integrity principles.

Declarations

- Author contribution** : Both authors are responsible for the research project and manuscript writing.
- Funding statement** : No funding statement is available in this research.
- Conflict of interest** : There is no competing interest in this research.
- Ethics Declaration** : We as the authors acknowledge that this work has been written based on ethical research that conforms with the regulations of our university and that we have obtained permission from the participants when collecting data.

We support ELTEJ in maintaining high standards of personal conduct, practicing honesty in all our professional practices and endeavors.

Additional information : No additional information is available for this paper.

REFERENCES

- Bayyurt, Y., & Altinmakas, D. (2024). Insights into academic writing in English as lingua franca contexts. *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning*, 14(1), 81-96. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11779/2257>
- Boonsuk, Y. (2025). “Oh, this person speaks English in this way; they ‘must be Thai’ or they ‘must be Chinese’”: Developing global Englishes awareness among Thai secondary ELT stakeholders. *System*, 133, 103733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103733>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Breen, M. P. (2001). *Learner contributions to task design*. London: Pearson Education.
- Bygate, M. (2015). Sources, developments and directions of task-based language teaching. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(4), 381–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1039566>
- Byrnes, H. (2014). Theorizing language development at the intersection of “task” and L2 writing: Reconsidering complexity. In H. Byrnes & R. M. Manchón (Eds.), *Task-based language learning: Insights from and for L2 writing* (pp. 79-103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.7.04byr>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203120293>
- Canagarajah, S. (2002). Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for academic purposes*, 1(1), 29-44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(02\)00007-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(02)00007-3)
- Cirocki, A., Sapp, T., & Farrelly, R. (2024). Developing Materials for ELT Classrooms: A Brief Introduction. In *Developing Materials for Innovative Teaching and Sustainable Learning: ELT Practitioners’ Experiences from Diverse Global Contexts* (pp. 1-25). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69206-2_1
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K. (2017). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (4th ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315134543>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221–246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>
- Ellis, R. (2017). Task-based language teaching. In *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 108-125). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676968>
- Feng, X. (2025). A Review of The Effectiveness of Process-Oriented English Writing Strategies in Higher Education. *ISRG Journal of Education, Humanities and Literature*, 3(2), 14-21. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14958987>

- Galloway, N. (2017). ELF and ELT teaching materials. In *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 468-480). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173>
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734347>
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments* (1st ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315695242>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46-62). London: Palgrave Pivot. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_4
- Gray, J. (2010). *The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT global coursebook*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230283084>
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 15(3), 261-278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016>
- Hyland, K. (2013). Writing in the university: Education, knowledge and reputation. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 53-70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000036>
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315761596>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. (pp. 289-331). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(85\)90062-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8)
- Mahapatra, R. A., Emilia, E., Kurniawan, E., & Suwarno. (2024). Instagram for learning interculturality: a blueprint in a global Englishes era. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 25(1), 142-155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2024.2307596>
- Matsuda, A. (2019). World Englishes in English language teaching: Kachru's six fallacies and the TEIL Paradigm. *World Englishes*, 38(1-2), 144-154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12368>
- McGrath, I. (2016). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748694822>
- Nunan, D. (2010). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667336>
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to academic writing* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education Longman.
- Purba, H. R. P., & Febria, D. (2025). Incorporating World Englishes (WE) Into Indonesian Higher Education: Pre-Service Teachers' Perspectives on ELT Pedagogical Implementation. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(3), 1529-1544. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i3.15119>
- Rafi, A. S. M., & Morgan, A. M. (2023). Translanguaging and power in academic writing discourse: the case of a Bangladeshi university. *Classroom Discourse*, 14(2), 192-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2022.2046621>
- RahmtAllah, E. A. E. (2020). EFL Students' Coherence Skill in Writing: A Case Study of Third Year Students of Bachelors in English Language. *English Language Teaching*, 13(8), 120-126. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n8p120>
- Rahnuma, N. (2025). Exploring ESL students' experiences of academic writing in higher education- a cultural historical activity theory perspective. *Education Inquiry*, 16(3), 303-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2023.2222450>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). Materials development and research—Making the connection. *RELC Journal*, 37(1), 5-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206063470>
- Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316678343>

- Santoso, W., Hamied, F. A., & Muslim, A. B. (2025). Investigating Indonesian university students' attitudes toward ELF-informed materials in business English contexts. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 12(1), 103-117. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v12i1.38286>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011a). Conceptualizing 'English' for a multilingual Europe. In *English in Europe today* (pp. 133-146). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.8>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011b). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2011.00305.x>
- Sulaiman, M. (2025). Beyond Likes and Shares: Rethinking Academic Writing Literacy through Facebook as a Digital Learning Space in Bangladeshi Higher Education. *ICRRD Journal*, 6(4), 209-229. <https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd.v6i4.8>
- Tardy, C. M. (2025). The case for a GELT paradigm in teaching multilingual writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 69, 101232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101232>
- Tardy, C. M., Reed, K., Slinkard, J. R., & LaMance, R. (2021). Exploring Global Englishes content and language variation in an academic writing course. *TESOL Journal*, 12(1), Article e00520. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.520>
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Developing materials for language teaching* (2nd ed.). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Vo, T. H. L., Tran, X. T., & Chowdhury, R. (2025). Improving students' engagement in writing lessons for non-English major students using task-based language teaching. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 41(1), 82-101. <https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5343>
- Widodo, H. P., Fang, F., & Elyas, T. (2022). Designing English language materials from the perspective of Global Englishes. *Asian Englishes*, 24(2), 186-198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2062540>
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing Task-Based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). *Academic writing from paragraph to essay*. New York: Macmillan.