

Article

Linguistic Justice through GenAI: A Collaborative Autoethnography

William F. Perales

Mark Bedoya Ulla*

Walailak University, Thailand

Stephenie Ong Busbus

Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines

Received: 16 April 2026/ Revised: 16 September 2026/ Accepted: 17 September 2026/ Online first: 23 September 2026

Abstract

This study addresses the growing need to critically examine GenAI in language education through teachers' lived experiences. Using a collaborative autoethnography, it draws on reflective narratives to explore how language teachers make sense of linguistic inclusion and justice as they work with GenAI in their classrooms. Using the five stages of collaborative autoethnography (Chang et al., 2013), the findings, analyzed through reflexive thematic analysis, reveal that GenAI functions as a contested pedagogical space where issues of language, power, and identity are actively negotiated. While it offers possibilities for inclusion and creativity, it also reproduces dominant, Western-centric language norms that privilege standardized English. Teachers respond to these tensions in agentic and reflexive ways, using GenAI as a site for critique, dialogue, and the validation of diverse Englishes. However, institutional expectations that continue to privilege dominant linguistic forms still constrain their practices. This study positions GenAI as an algorithmic architecture that actively enforces raciolinguistic standards, requiring teachers to move beyond functional tool usage toward critical, counter-hegemonic pedagogical mediation.

Keywords

Critical pedagogy, generative AI, language teacher agency, linguistic justice, linguistic inclusion

1 Introduction

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) continues to transform language education, generating discussions not only about pedagogical innovation but also about the politics of linguistic inclusion and justice. While early GenAI research has largely emphasized technological affordances, including accessibility, personalized learning, grammatical refinement, and instructional efficiency (Kohnke, 2024; Kohnke et al., 2025; Teng, 2024; Ulla et al., 2023a), less attention has been given to the sociolinguistic

*Corresponding author. Email: mark.ul@mail.wu.ac.th

power relations embedded within these systems. As GenAI tools such as ChatGPT become increasingly integrated into teaching and learning, critical questions emerge regarding which languages, identities, and epistemologies are privileged and which are marginalized (de Roock, 2024; Dovchin, 2024; Ghimire, 2025).

These concerns are particularly significant in multilingual contexts, where English continues to operate within unequal linguistic hierarchies. Although GenAI can expand access to language support and create new learning opportunities (Kohnke & Ulla, 2024; Ulla et al., 2023a), it may also reinforce dominant language ideologies by privileging standardized forms of English over Indigenous, local, and multilingual practices. From a linguistic justice perspective, GenAI should be examined not only as a pedagogical tool but also as a sociolinguistic technology that shapes whose language practices are recognized as legitimate. In this regard, AI-mediated writing practices may contribute to epistemic laundering, a term we borrowed from Kalaitzidis (2026) and defined as a process in which multilingual, translingual, and culturally situated forms of expression are transformed into standardized linguistic forms that appear more legitimate within dominant academic contexts.

Research on large language models has shown that these systems are shaped by historical and geopolitical inequalities embedded in their training data, often privileging dominant varieties of English and reproducing existing linguistic hierarchies (Jiang & Gu, 2025; Nash, 2024). In language classrooms, these tendencies may shape students' writing, perceptions of correctness, and understanding of legitimate language use. However, GenAI should not be viewed as inherently oppressive. Recent scholarship also highlights its potential to support inclusive learning through multilingual resources, adaptive feedback, and expanded access to language education (Dovchin, 2024; Szabó & Szoke, 2024; Ulla et al., 2024a). Thus, the educational consequences of GenAI depend largely on how teachers interpret, mediate, and critically engage with these technologies.

This issue is particularly relevant in Thailand, where English functions not only as a foreign language but also as linguistic capital associated with academic success, employability, and international mobility. Despite growing recognition of multilingual practices, English education in Thailand remains shaped by standardized English norms, native-speaker ideologies, and institutional expectations of proficiency (Thongwichit et al., 2026; Ulla & Kohnke, 2025). In this context, introducing GenAI is more than a technological update. It creates a sociolinguistic space where existing language hierarchies may be reinforced, while also offering teachers opportunities to challenge dominant assumptions about language, correctness, and legitimacy.

Despite growing research on GenAI in language education, existing studies have primarily focused on technological affordances (Donley, 2024), learner acceptance (Slamet, 2024; Teng, 2025), regulation, writing improvement, lesson planning (Ulla et al., 2023b), and instructional effectiveness (Mohamed, 2024; Pando et al., 2025). Limited attention has been given to how language teachers critically negotiate the linguistic implications of GenAI, particularly how they respond to tensions between technological efficiency, standardized language expectations, and commitments to linguistic justice. Therefore, this study employs collaborative autoethnography to examine how language teachers negotiate linguistic justice as they integrate GenAI into their classrooms.

Drawing on teachers' lived experiences and reflective narratives, the study explores moments when GenAI reproduces exclusionary language practices, the strategies teachers use to challenge these tendencies, and the possibilities they envision for more equitable AI-mediated language education. Specifically, this study addresses the following questions:

1. How do language teachers perceive the role of GenAI in shaping linguistic inclusion and justice in language teaching?
2. How do language teachers reinforce or challenge linguistic exclusion and marginalization when using GenAI tools in classroom practice?

2 Linguistic Justice and GenAI in Language Education

Linguistic justice has emerged as a critical response to the historical and structural inequalities that shape language use, language policy, and language education (Baker-Bell, 2020; Cushing & Choudrey, 2026; Jiang & Gu, 2025). It recognizes language as deeply intertwined with power, identity, race, and access to educational opportunities, as dominant language ideologies privilege the languages and language practices of socially and politically powerful groups while marginalizing Indigenous, multilingual, and minoritized ways of speaking and knowing (May, 2023; Phyak, 2021; Xu & Fang, 2025). Consequently, linguistic justice extends beyond expanding language access to challenging the ideological and institutional conditions that position standardized language varieties as the sole markers of linguistic legitimacy. Therefore, it calls for recognizing multilingualism as an epistemic resource and affirming the linguistic identities of historically marginalized communities.

Although Western scholarship has largely theorized linguistic justice, similar concerns are evident across Asian English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) contexts, where English functions simultaneously as a resource for global mobility and a mechanism for reproducing linguistic inequalities. Across Thailand, the Philippines, mainland China, Japan, South Korea, and Hong Kong, English language education continues to privilege standardized and native-speaker varieties despite growing recognition of multilingualism and World Englishes (Ahn, 2011; Canilao, 2020; Jiang & Gu, 2025; Samuell, 2024; Thongwicht & Ulla, 2024; Ulla et al., 2024b; Zhang, 2022). These contexts illustrate persistent tensions between institutional expectations for standardized English and learners' multilingual realities, showing that linguistic justice remains a significant concern in language education across the Global South (Fang & Dovchin, 2024).

3 Digital Linguistic Hegemony in Large Language Models

The rapid emergence of GenAI introduces new dimensions to these longstanding linguistic inequalities. Although large language models (LLMs) are frequently presented as linguistically neutral technologies, their outputs reflect the characteristics of the data on which they are trained. Contemporary LLMs rely predominantly on high-resource, digitized, and standardized language corpora, much of which originates from English-language websites, published texts, and other Western-centered digital repositories (Mohamed, 2024; Nash, 2024; Szabó & Szoke, 2024). Consequently, localized multilingual practices, including translanguaging, Thai English, Philippine English, and other contextually situated varieties, remain substantially underrepresented within these datasets. This structural imbalance contributes to what this study calls digital linguistic hegemony, where algorithmic language technologies normalize standardized English while rendering localized, multilingual, and non-dominant language practices less visible and less legitimate.

Furthermore, teachers occupy a central position within this negotiation because they mediate the relationship between AI technologies, language ideologies, and classroom practice. Research consistently demonstrates that educators promote linguistic justice by validating learners' multilingual repertoires, implementing translanguaging pedagogies, and adopting anti-racist approaches that challenge monolingual assumptions (Pourbahram & Sadeghi, 2023; Veliz & Chen, 2025; Wong & Ortega, 2024). In other words, teachers actively negotiate institutional expectations while creating spaces that recognize linguistic diversity as an educational resource.

As GenAI becomes increasingly integrated into language education, this pedagogical responsibility extends to critically evaluating AI-generated content. Equitable implementation depends not only on technological infrastructure but also on teachers' ability to recognize linguistic bias, question dominant language ideologies, adapt AI-generated materials, and mediate technology in ways that respond to local sociocultural contexts (Cong-Lem et al., 2025; Pourbahram & Sadeghi, 2023). Thus, linguistic justice in

AI-mediated classrooms depends less on the technology itself than on how teachers critically interpret, negotiate, and reshape its use in their everyday pedagogical practices.

Although empirical research on GenAI in language education has expanded rapidly, it has focused predominantly on pedagogical applications, including teachers' perceptions, students' acceptance, writing support, lesson planning, assessment, and technological effectiveness (Kohnke et al., 2025; Ulla et al., 2023a). Comparatively little attention has focused on the intersection of GenAI and linguistic justice. Existing scholarship shows that GenAI has considerable pedagogical potential while also reproducing dominant language ideologies and standardized English norms (Mohamed, 2024; Nash, 2024). Research has also demonstrated that teachers play a critical role in advancing linguistic justice through multilingual, anti-racist, and inclusive pedagogies (Veliz & Chen, 2025; Wong & Ortega, 2024). However, these two strands of scholarship have largely developed in parallel, leaving a limited understanding of how language teachers recognize, interpret, negotiate, or resist the linguistic biases embedded within GenAI as they integrate these technologies into classroom practice. Similarly, little is known about how teachers balance GenAI's pedagogical affordances with their ethical commitments to multilingualism, inclusion, and linguistic justice. This gap is particularly significant in contexts such as Thailand, where standardized English, native-speaker ideologies, and institutional enthusiasm for AI continue to shape language education (Ulla et al., 2024b). Addressing this gap requires approaches that foreground teachers' situated experiences and critical reflections rather than simply documenting their attitudes toward technology.

Collaborative autoethnography provides such an approach by enabling teacher-researchers to examine their own pedagogical experiences through systematic dialogue, shared reflection, and collective meaning-making. Through teachers' lived experiences as they negotiate AI-generated linguistic bias, instructional choices, and ethical dilemmas, this methodology offers contextually grounded insights into how linguistic justice is enacted, contested, and reimaged within AI-mediated language education. Accordingly, this study contributes to the emerging literature by examining how language teachers critically reflect on and enact linguistically just pedagogical practices as they integrate GenAI into their classrooms.

4 Methodology

This study employed collaborative autoethnography (CAE), a qualitative methodology that enables researchers to examine their lived experiences collectively while situating those experiences within broader social, cultural, and political contexts (Chang et al., 2013). CAE recognizes the researchers as situated knowers whose experiences constitute legitimate sources of knowledge for understanding complex social phenomena. Through collaborative reflection and dialogue, researchers critically examine how their personal experiences intersect with institutional structures, dominant ideologies, and power relations.

To conduct the study, we followed the five stages of collaborative autoethnography proposed by Chang et al. (2013): (1) forming the collaborative research team; (2) identifying a shared research focus; (3) establishing a collaborative model of inquiry; (4) negotiating researchers' roles, responsibilities, and boundaries of participation; and (5) adhering to ethical principles throughout the research process.

4.1 Forming a research team and deciding on a research focus

William and I are colleagues at the same university in Thailand, and we share closely aligned sociocultural and institutional trajectories. We both come from the same island in the Philippines, which means we were shaped by similar linguistic, cultural, and educational contexts before moving abroad. Our academic paths also intersect. I completed my PhD at a particular Philippine institution, and William is currently pursuing his doctoral degree at that same university.

Professionally, I have taught for over twenty years across different levels of education. William holds a master's degree and has accumulated seven years of teaching experience. Although he is earlier in his career and still completing his PhD, our shared background and overlapping academic training create a strong foundation for collaboration and mutual understanding within our current institutional setting in Thailand.

Furthermore, we developed this research through sustained discussions between William and me after publishing our earlier GenAI study in another journal. Building on that work, we turned our attention to a more critical examination of our own teaching practices, particularly our engagements with GenAI in language education.

4.2 Selecting a collaboration model and defining our roles

We used the method described by Yazan et al. (2023) to select a teamwork model for our CAE project. In April 2026, we worked together, meeting regularly face-to-face in coffee shops, restaurants, and even our own offices to keep each other updated on progress and new issues. During the first month, we refined the research questions and planned the study's overall setup. We also developed shared reflective questions that guided both our writing and the next steps in our analysis. These early discussions helped us articulate what we knew, what we believed, and how GenAI reproduces or disrupts linguistic inequalities in our language classrooms. The following were the guiding reflective questions used for this study:

1. How do my positionality, institutional affiliation, and ideological commitments shape the ways I interpret GenAI as a tool that can either reproduce or disrupt linguistic inequalities in language education?
2. In my everyday classroom interactions with GenAI, how do broader power structures, such as standard language ideologies, colonial language hierarchies, and neoliberal logics of efficiency, become visible in my pedagogical choices and classroom practices?
3. When using GenAI, how have my actions as a language teacher reinforced or contested linguistic marginalization, particularly in relation to students' accents, multilingual resources, and non-dominant forms of expression?
4. What tensions, contradictions, or ethical dilemmas do I encounter when attempting to use GenAI for linguistic inclusion within institutional constraints, and how do these moments reveal the limits of teacher agency?
5. How does critically examining my own GenAI-mediated teaching practices enable me to reimagine language pedagogy as a means of resistance, advocacy, and transformative linguistic justice?

The reflective prompts were derived directly from the study's two research questions and were designed to elicit comprehensive, experience-based accounts of how linguistic justice is perceived and enacted in the context of using GenAI in language education. These prompts operationalized essential concepts, including linguistic inclusion, linguistic exclusion, marginalization, teacher agency, pedagogical practice, and institutional constraints. This methodology aligns with collaborative autoethnography, which aims to produce detailed narratives rooted in participants' lived experiences and critical self-reflection.

4.3 Data collection and analysis

Following the two-week reflective writing period, we reconvened to share our written narratives and engage in collaborative dialogue about our experiences. We produced two sets of reflective narratives (4 narratives total), and we agreed on an estimated total word count of 2,000 words per set. The final word

count for Mark's narrative included in the presentation was reduced to 1,262 words. William's was 1,027 words. We made 3 audio recordings through Zoom. One recording lasted for 1 hour and 15 minutes. The second recording lasted only 48 minutes. The last one lasted for 1 hour and 27 minutes.

Data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following Braun et al. (2023). We began by familiarizing ourselves with the dataset through repeated reading of the written narratives and transcripts while recording initial analytic observations and reflexive notes. Each researcher then independently generated preliminary codes that captured meaningful segments related to experiences of using GenAI, linguistic inclusion and exclusion, pedagogical decision-making, and reflections on linguistic justice. Coding remained inductive throughout the process, allowing patterns to emerge from the data rather than applying predetermined categories.

After independent coding, we met several times to compare our interpretations and discuss areas of convergence and divergence. Where differences in interpretation arose, we revisited the original narratives and transcripts, reflected on the contextual meanings of particular excerpts, and negotiated interpretations through discussion until we reached a shared understanding that accurately represented our experiences while acknowledging our distinct positionalities.

We then reviewed the preliminary codes and clustered them into broader categories based on conceptual similarity and recurring patterns across the dataset. These categories were then iteratively refined into candidate themes through multiple rounds of discussion and constant comparison between our individual narratives. Throughout this process, we considered both shared experiences and points of divergence, recognizing that similarities and differences between our accounts were equally important for understanding how we negotiated linguistic justice in our respective teaching contexts. Themes were reviewed against the complete dataset to ensure that they captured coherent patterns while remaining grounded in the narratives. They were refined, defined, and named collaboratively through ongoing reflexive dialogue until they provided a meaningful and analytically coherent representation of our collective and individual experiences.

Throughout the analysis, reflexivity remained central to the interpretive process. We maintained reflexive memos to document evolving interpretations, question our assumptions, and consider how our identities, teaching experiences, and commitments to linguistic justice and critical pedagogy shaped our analytic decisions. This ongoing reflexive engagement strengthened the trustworthiness of the analysis by ensuring that the reported themes emerged through sustained dialogue among our lived experiences, the empirical data, and the study's broader theoretical commitments.

4.4 Positionality and ethical considerations

In this study, our shared experiences as transnational Filipino language educators working in Thailand provided a distinctive interpretive standpoint for examining the intersections of GenAI and linguistic justice. As multilingual educators who have navigated postcolonial histories of English language education, native-speaker ideologies, and multilingual classroom realities across national and institutional contexts, we brought perspectives shaped by lived experiences of linguistic negotiation and marginalization. Our positionalities as postcolonial, multilingual scholars did not simply influence our perspectives, as they also served as an active decolonial and translingual interpretive framework through which we systematically interrogated the monolingual and standardizing impulses embedded in the GenAI technologies we used. This standpoint enabled us to critically examine how AI-mediated language practices intersected with broader questions of linguistic legitimacy, multilingualism, and educational equity, while remaining attentive to the possibilities for resisting and reimagining dominant language ideologies through everyday pedagogical practice.

We were aware of our positions from the outset and took deliberate time to reflect on our differing positionalities, identities, teaching experiences, and academic backgrounds. We recognized that these

factors could shape both the experiences we shared and the ways we interpreted them. In addition to securing Research Ethics approval (WUEC-26-143-01) for the study, we signed an authorship contribution agreement early in the project that clarified our shared ownership of the work. This agreement affirmed equal participation in decision-making, encouraged open and honest dialogue even in moments of disagreement, and committed us to reading and rereading one another's narratives to ensure that multiple perspectives were acknowledged and represented.

Moreover, we sought to balance knowledge production and collaboration by grounding our work in honesty, trust, and relational ethics (Yazan et al., 2023), recognizing that our narratives were co-constructed through shared interpretation and ongoing power relations. As Yazan et al. (2023) emphasize, relational ethics requires careful attention to protecting individuals' privacy in research accounts, regardless of whether those individuals are portrayed positively or negatively. To support transparency and collective engagement, we created a shared Google Drive folder to access project materials, including narratives and reflections. These documents were carefully organized and securely stored, with access limited to the research team.

5 Our Reflective Narratives

5.1 Highlighting teacher vulnerability and the “Neoliberal Trap”

Although our narratives emerged from different professional contexts, they revealed several common patterns. For instance, both of us viewed GenAI as a technology that simultaneously enables and constrains linguistic justice. We observed that AI-generated outputs frequently privilege standardized academic English, creating tensions between institutional expectations and our commitments to multilingualism and inclusion. At the same time, our narratives differed in emphasis. Mark foregrounded postcolonial concerns surrounding native-speakerism, linguistic identity, and multilingual Englishes in classroom practice, whereas William focused more explicitly on the institutional politics of academic writing, efficiency, and teacher agency. Table 1 summarizes these points of convergence and divergence before presenting our individual autoethnographic narratives.

5.2 Mark: At the crossroads of code and conscience: teaching for linguistic justice with GenAI

When I reflect on my engagement with GenAI in language education, I cannot separate the tool from who I am and where I stand. This is why I titled this reflection “*At the crossroads of code and conscience: teaching for linguistic justice with GenAI.*” My positionality as a Filipino scholar teaching in Thailand, trained in postcolonial and queer-informed traditions of language education, shapes the way I approach every technological promise with caution. I have spent years interrogating standard language ideologies, questioning whose English counts, and challenging the quiet authority of native-speakerism. Because of this, I do not encounter GenAI as a neutral innovation. I see it as a site of ideological struggle. On one hand, it can reproduce dominant linguistic norms by defaulting to standardized, Western-centric English. On the other hand, when used critically, it also offers opportunities to question and disrupt those norms. My institutional location within a university that values measurable outcomes, internationalization, and global competitiveness further shapes my perspective. I recognize that GenAI can polish students' writing to meet what is considered “acceptable” global English, potentially enhancing their academic mobility while erasing traces of their linguistic identities. These tensions continually return me to the same questions: *Whose English is being amplified? Whose linguistic identity is being quietly edited out of existence?*

Table 1

Comparison of Mark's and William's GenAI practices and critical reflections on linguistic justice.

Dimension	Mark	William
Professional context	Filipino language educator and researcher teaching English in Thailand; teaching undergraduate writing courses	PhD student in Language Education engaged in university-level language teaching and research
Initial orientation toward GenAI	Views GenAI as both a pedagogical resource and a site where colonial language ideologies are reproduced	Views GenAI as a promising but contradictory technology that simultaneously expands access and reinforces dominant language norms
Primary concern	Reproduction of standardized, Western-centric English and native-speaker ideologies	Standardization of students' writing and loss of linguistic diversity through AI-generated outputs
Observed classroom practices	Students use ChatGPT to improve persuasive writing, often producing "native-like" English; encourages comparison between students' drafts and AI-generated revisions	Students use GenAI for academic writing; notices increasing uniformity, conventional academic English, and reduced linguistic individuality
Strategies for promoting linguistic justice	Invites students to critique AI corrections, compare different English varieties (e.g., Philippine English), and question algorithmic authority	Encourages students to analyse AI outputs critically, identify whose language is privileged, and revise texts to restore their own linguistic voices
Ethical dilemmas	Balances supporting lower-proficiency learners with institutional expectations surrounding originality, academic integrity, and AI detection	Negotiates tensions between preparing students for institutional expectations and encouraging authentic multilingual expression
Understanding of teacher agency	Views agency as contextually constrained but exercised through critical pedagogy and reflective classroom dialogue	Understands agency as relational and limited by institutional structures, while recognising opportunities for critical intervention
Shared reflection	Regards GenAI as neither inherently equitable nor inherently oppressive but as a technology whose impact depends on critical pedagogical use	Shares the view that GenAI's educational value depends on teachers' reflexive mediation rather than the technology itself

In my everyday classroom interactions with GenAI, broader structures of power surface in subtle but persistent ways. In one writing class, I asked students to prepare a persuasive speech and permitted them to use ChatGPT during the drafting process. The responses generated by the tool almost always aligned with standardized British or American English, and our classroom conversations quickly shifted toward notions of correctness, clarity, and efficiency. These values reflect broader neoliberal discourses that privilege productivity, measurable performance, and marketable communication over linguistic diversity and critical reflection. What struck me most, however, was not the quality of the AI-generated language but my students' reactions to it. Many enthusiastically remarked that ChatGPT made their writing "sound native." Their excitement gave me pause. I realized that their satisfaction was not simply about producing grammatically accurate sentences. It reflected a deeper aspiration to approximate an idealized form of

English long associated with intelligence, authority, professionalism, and global legitimacy. In those moments, the desire to “sound native” felt less like a linguistic preference than an affective expression of internalized colonial language ideologies. Years of educational and social messaging had taught many students that linguistic success meant sounding as close as possible to an imagined native speaker.

GenAI makes this aspiration particularly seductive because it promises immediate access to the linguistic capital historically reserved for native speakers. With a single prompt, students can transform their writing into language that appears more polished, more internationally acceptable, and, in their eyes, more legitimate. Yet this convenience also risks obscuring the technology’s embedded ideological assumptions. Correction becomes more than a grammatical exercise; it quietly communicates that certain ways of using English deserve recognition while others require improvement. As students celebrate AI-generated revisions, I find myself wondering whether they are also learning to celebrate the gradual disappearance of their own linguistic identities. In Thailand, where English proficiency is closely associated with educational achievement, employability, and participation in the global economy, these moments reveal how colonial language hierarchies continue to shape learners’ aspirations. The classroom becomes more than a space for language learning. It becomes a site where algorithmic authority intersects with longstanding ideologies of native-speakerism and linguistic legitimacy. Even my own decisions about when to encourage or restrict GenAI use reflect ongoing negotiations with institutional expectations surrounding academic integrity, employability, and performance.

These experiences have also forced me to confront uncomfortable questions about my own pedagogical practices. At times, I encouraged students to compare their original drafts with GenAI-generated revisions to identify grammatical inaccuracies. Initially, I regarded this as a useful strategy for developing grammatical awareness. However, over time, I began to question the assumptions embedded within this activity. I thought that by presenting the AI-generated version as the reference point, I was implicitly positioning standardized English as the norm against which students’ multilingual writing should be evaluated. What seemed like a neutral act of correction carried ideological consequences. It risked framing students’ multilingual expressions, localized linguistic choices, and culturally situated voices as deficiencies requiring repair rather than as legitimate resources for meaning-making. Every correction, however well-intentioned, subtly reinforced assumptions about whose English deserved recognition and whose required modification.

At the same time, I have intentionally used GenAI in ways that affirm linguistic diversity rather than erase it. I ask the tool to generate texts in Philippine English, compare multiple English varieties, and explain how meaning shifts across linguistic and cultural contexts. Rather than accepting its responses uncritically, I invite students to interrogate its revisions, identify whose linguistic norms it privileges, and examine where the technology flattens or silences their own voices. In doing so, I attempt to reposition GenAI from an unquestioned linguistic authority to an object of critical inquiry. Even so, I recognize that critical reflection alone cannot fully dismantle the structural weight of standard language ideology. My teaching continues to oscillate between moments of reinforcement and resistance, and I have come to accept that this tension is an inevitable part of practicing linguistically just pedagogy within AI-mediated classrooms.

Ethical dilemmas continue to surface throughout this process. I want to use GenAI to support students with lower levels of English proficiency, particularly those who experience anxiety when writing in English. At the same time, institutional policies emphasize originality, authorship, and surveillance, requiring teachers to detect AI-generated writing, police boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable use, and uphold standardized academic expectations. These competing demands often leave me questioning the limits of my own agency. While I can design reflective activities that privilege process over product and dialogue over correction, I cannot single-handedly transform assessment systems that continue to reward standardized linguistic performance. Whenever I frame GenAI as a collaborative learning partner rather than an unquestionable authority, I find myself gently resisting institutional discourses that construct AI primarily as either a productivity tool or an academic threat.

These experiences remind me that teacher agency is always situated within broader structures of power, not exercised in isolation.

Critically examining my GenAI-mediated practices has become an ongoing exercise in reflexivity. I continually ask myself not only how the technology shapes my students' writing but also how it reshapes my own pedagogical imagination. When I resist the temptation to treat GenAI as a corrective machine and instead position it as an object of inquiry, the classroom begins to change. Students start to recognize that language norms are socially constructed rather than natural or inevitable. They question why certain expressions are labeled "awkward," why others are considered "academic," and who ultimately decides what counts as legitimate English. In these conversations, language teaching moves beyond developing communicative skills. It becomes a space to critically examine power, identity, ideology, and linguistic justice.

For me, this is where GenAI's transformative potential lies. The technology neither automatically produces linguistic justice nor inevitably reproduces linguistic inequality. Its educational significance depends on how consciously and critically it is integrated into pedagogical practice. When I affirm students' multilingual repertoires, validate diverse Englishes, and encourage critical interrogation of algorithmic authority, I begin to reimagine the classroom as a space of resistance rather than compliance. In those moments, GenAI becomes less a tool for perfecting language and more a catalyst for dialogue, reflexivity, and advocacy. It invites both my students and me to participate in the ongoing work of unsettling linguistic hierarchies and imagining more linguistically just futures for language education.

5.3 William: Working within and against institutional inequities in the pursuit of linguistic justice

I am writing this from a place that often feels contradictory but also productive. I see myself as someone committed to linguistic justice, yet I work within institutions that routinely reproduce the very inequities I want to challenge. As a PhD student in Language Education, my perspective is shaped by my grounding in critical applied linguistics, my lived experience as a multilingual speaker, and my position within an academic system that continues to privilege standardized ways of producing and validating knowledge. All of this shapes how I make sense of GenAI. I'm drawn to its promise because it can broaden access to language support and offer students new ways to express themselves. At the same time, I remain cautious because I know these systems are trained on dominant-language datasets and often reproduce the very linguistic hierarchies they appear to transcend. That tension sits at the center of my thinking. *Is GenAI creating space for more voices, or is it quietly reinforcing existing inequalities under the guise of innovation?*

This tension becomes very real in the classroom. When I ask students to use GenAI in their writing, I notice how quickly their texts begin to sound alike. The language becomes polished, standardized, and increasingly detached from the linguistic diversity that characterizes their lived experiences. It reminds me how deeply the idea of a "correct" form of English remains embedded in educational practice. Even when students begin by expressing ideas through their own languages or multilingual ways of meaning-making, GenAI often translates those ideas into conventional academic English, smoothing away the linguistic textures that communicate identity, culture, and context.

What unsettles me even more is recognizing how easily I become part of this process. As a teacher working within a university that values productivity, efficiency, and measurable outcomes, I find myself leaning into the logic of efficiency that GenAI promises. I begin to appreciate how quickly it produces polished writing, how easily it improves grammar, and how efficiently it helps students meet institutional expectations. Gradually, I realize that I am not simply adopting a new technology. I am also internalizing an institutional culture that rewards speed over reflection, standardized outputs over linguistic diversity, and polished products over the slower, messier process through which students develop ideas, experiment with language, and discover their own voices. This realization has been uncomfortable because it

exposes my own professional vulnerability. Despite my commitment to linguistic justice, I am not immune to the pressures of an academic environment that increasingly values efficiency, performance, and optimization. In trying to help students succeed within that system, I sometimes reproduce the very language ideologies I hope to challenge.

Looking back, I can identify moments when I unintentionally reinforced these dominant norms. When I encouraged students to “improve” their writing through GenAI, I often directed them toward standardized expectations rewarded within academic institutions. Their accents, code-switching practices, and hybrid ways of expressing meaning gradually became less visible, not because I deliberately rejected them, but because institutional definitions of “good writing” left little room for linguistic complexity. The more I reflected on these moments, the more I realized GenAI’s appeal extended beyond its technological capabilities. It also aligned with a broader institutional culture that values productivity and conformity. Authentic writing is often slow, uncertain, recursive, and deeply personal. Students revise ideas, move between languages, question their own thinking, and negotiate meaning in ways that cannot always be measured through polished final products. Yet these are precisely the qualities that become compressed when efficiency becomes the primary measure of success.

Still, I have tried to create moments of resistance within these constraints. Thus, instead of treating GenAI as an unquestioned authority, I now position it as an object of critical inquiry. I invite students to examine AI-generated texts, identify whose language practices are privileged, and discuss what forms of meaning have been erased or normalized. I encourage them to rewrite AI-generated responses by reintroducing their own linguistic repertoires, cultural references, and multilingual voices. These activities give students opportunities to engage critically with GenAI instead of simply accepting its outputs. At the same time, they reveal the difficult negotiations that both teachers and students must make as they balance institutional expectations for standardized academic English with commitments to linguistic diversity and authenticity.

The ethical questions remain difficult to resolve. Institutional expectations surrounding assessment, publication, employability, and academic English continue to define what counts as legitimate language. I often wonder whether encouraging students to preserve their multilingual identities might inadvertently disadvantage them within systems that continue to reward standardized English. *How far can I challenge dominant norms without placing students at greater risk?* GenAI intensifies these dilemmas by simultaneously expanding access to language support and quietly encouraging conformity to its preferred linguistic norms. These experiences remind me that teacher agency is always partial. My pedagogical decisions are shaped not only by my own values but also by institutional structures that I cannot fully control.

Sitting with these tensions has changed how I understand my role as a language teacher. I am not simply teaching grammar or academic writing. I am participating in broader struggles over whose language is recognized, whose knowledge is legitimized, and whose voices are heard. Working with GenAI has made these politics more visible than ever before. It has also encouraged me to imagine the classroom as a space where linguistic difference is not erased in pursuit of efficiency but critically examined, valued, and sustained. This means creating opportunities for students to draw on their full linguistic repertoires while using GenAI in ways that expose, rather than conceal, its assumptions and biases. It also means accepting that pursuing linguistic justice is necessarily slow, unfinished, and sometimes uncomfortable work.

Finally, I do not see GenAI as either inherently liberating or inherently oppressive. Its educational consequences depend on how teachers engage with it and, perhaps more importantly, how willing we are to question the institutional logics that shape its use. For me, pursuing linguistic justice requires remaining reflexive about my own complicity, resisting the pressure to equate efficiency with good teaching, and continually creating spaces where students’ multilingual voices are treated not as problems to be corrected but as resources for learning.

6 Discussion: Moving from Static Discussion to Systemic Critique

6.1 GenAI as a site of linguistic justice and linguistic inequality

This study shows that GenAI is not simply a technological innovation for improving language learning but a sociolinguistic space where competing language ideologies are negotiated. In our narratives, GenAI was considered a double-edged pedagogical resource. On one hand, it supported writing development, feedback, and language learning. On the other hand, it frequently generated outputs that privileged standardized academic English, raising concerns about whose language practices were legitimized and whose were marginalized. These findings reinforce recent critical GenAI scholarship that argues GenAI is embedded within existing social, cultural, and linguistic hierarchies rather than operating as a neutral technology (Mohamed, 2024).

Mark's reflections show how GenAI can reproduce dominant English-language ideologies through its preference for standardized, Western-centric varieties of English. His observations resonate with Nash (2024), who argues that many large language models implicitly normalize White, American English as the default linguistic standard. Similarly, William observed that students' writing became increasingly polished and standardized after using GenAI. However, this finding should be interpreted not only as a loss of stylistic individuality but also as an illustration of how AI-generated feedback can privilege dominant varieties of academic English while discouraging multilingual and localized forms of expression. From the perspective of May (2023), linguistic racism operates when particular language practices become systematically valued as more legitimate, appropriate, or academically desirable than others. Therefore, William's observations suggest that GenAI may inadvertently reinforce linguistic hierarchies by encouraging students to align their writing with standardized English norms, making alternative linguistic repertoires less visible in classroom practice.

These findings also extend recent work by Jiang and Gu (2025), who demonstrated that multilingual learners critically negotiate AI-generated language rather than accepting it uncritically. Our study complements their findings by showing how teachers themselves recognize these linguistic tensions during classroom instruction. In other words, this study highlights how linguistic justice becomes an everyday pedagogical concern as teachers decide whether to accept, adapt, or challenge AI-generated language. In doing so, the study contributes to emerging scholarship by showing that linguistic justice in AI-mediated education is negotiated not only through technological design but also through teachers' ongoing professional judgment.

6.2 Epistemic laundering and the flattening of multilingual repertoires

Our findings further suggest that GenAI's influence extends beyond questions of linguistic accuracy or stylistic standardization. The narratives reveal a process that may be understood as epistemic laundering, in which AI-mediated revisions transform students' writing into forms that appear linguistically polished while erasing the multilingual resources, cultural meanings, and localized ways of knowing embedded in their original texts. In this process, GenAI does not merely correct grammar or improve style. It systematically reshapes language in line with dominant academic conventions, making these transformations appear objective, neutral, and desirable.

William's reflections illustrate this process particularly clearly. Although students initially expressed their ideas through multilingual practices, code-switching, and culturally situated forms of expression, successive interactions with GenAI produced increasingly standardized versions of their writing. The resulting texts became grammatically refined and institutionally acceptable but often lost the translingual negotiations, dialectal textures, and culturally specific rhetorical patterns that reflected students' identities and lived experiences. This transformation reflects the subtle normalization of dominant linguistic ideologies through algorithmic mediation.

From a linguistic justice perspective (Jiang & Gu, 2025; May, 2023), these changes constitute more than linguistic editing. They involve gradually reducing multilingual repertoires into standardized academic forms that align with dominant expectations of legitimate knowledge production. Consequently, linguistic diversity is not explicitly prohibited but quietly rendered invisible through apparently helpful processes of revision and refinement. In this sense, GenAI may function as an agent of linguistic erasure, flattening multilingual expression into standardized forms that better conform to institutional expectations while diminishing the linguistic complexity through which learners construct meaning.

Importantly, this process is neither inevitable nor technologically determined. Both narratives demonstrate that teachers can interrupt epistemic laundering by encouraging students to critically compare AI-generated revisions with their original texts, identify what has been erased or transformed, and deliberately reintroduce multilingual voices into their writing. Such practices reposition GenAI from an unquestioned editor to an object of critical linguistic inquiry.

6.3 Teacher agency in friction with institutional assessment architectures

A second important finding concerns the nature of teacher agency. Our findings suggest that teacher agency is continually negotiated within institutional assessment architectures that privilege standardized language, measurable performance, and efficiency. Although both researchers sought to promote linguistic justice, their narratives show that broader institutional expectations about academic writing, assessment, publication, academic integrity, and employability constantly shaped their pedagogical decisions.

William's narrative is particularly revealing. His reflection on gradually "leaning into the logic of efficiency" illustrates how GenAI becomes attractive not only for its pedagogical affordances but also for its alignment with institutional demands for speed, productivity, and standardized outputs. The pressure to provide timely feedback, prepare students for high-stakes assessment, and meet expectations for academically acceptable writing creates conditions in which polished AI-generated texts can appear preferable to slower, more iterative, and linguistically diverse writing processes. Consequently, promoting linguistic justice becomes not simply a matter of teacher commitment but a continual negotiation with institutional structures that reward conformity to standardized language norms.

Similarly, Mark's reflections show that critical pedagogical intentions are often constrained by institutional expectations around academic English and publication. Although he sought to encourage multilingual expression, he also recognized that students ultimately navigate educational systems that continue to privilege globally recognized forms of standardized English. These findings extend previous work on teacher agency (Teng & Shen, 2026; Veliz & Chen, 2025; Wong & Ortega, 2024) by showing that teachers do not simply choose whether to resist linguistic injustice. They exercise agency within systems that simultaneously enable and constrain linguistically just pedagogies.

These institutional constraints reflect broader educational structures, including high-stakes assessment practices, academic integrity policies, AI detection technologies, and persistent native-speaker expectations that continue to position standardized English as the benchmark of academic legitimacy. These structures create systemic barriers that limit teachers' capacity to fully enact multilingual and linguistically just pedagogies, even when they recognize the linguistic biases embedded within GenAI. Teacher agency emerges not as unrestricted professional autonomy but as an ongoing process of negotiating competing institutional, ethical, and pedagogical demands.

Nevertheless, our findings also demonstrate that these constraints do not eliminate possibilities for resistance. Both researchers deliberately repositioned GenAI as an object of critical dialogue by inviting students to interrogate AI-generated language, examine whose linguistic practices were privileged, and reconstruct texts that better reflected their multilingual identities. Such practices illustrate that

linguistically just AI pedagogy depends not only on technological design but also on teachers' willingness to create spaces where dominant language ideologies can be questioned rather than reproduced.

6.4 Toward linguistically just AI-mediated language education

Our findings also reinforce an emerging consensus within critical GenAI scholarship that GenAI is neither inherently emancipatory nor inherently oppressive (Dovchin, 2024; Jiang & Gu, 2025; Mohamed, 2024). Its educational significance depends on how it is interpreted, mediated, and enacted within particular sociocultural and institutional contexts. Our collaborative autoethnographic narratives further show that linguistic justice cannot be understood solely as improving AI technologies or eliminating algorithmic bias. Instead, it requires sustained critical engagement with the institutional, ideological, and pedagogical conditions that shape GenAI use in language education.

Thus, through teachers' lived experiences, this study illustrates that pursuing linguistic justice in AI-mediated classrooms entails continual negotiation among competing demands for efficiency, standardization, multilingual inclusion, and educational equity. Teachers are not simply users of GenAI but active mediators who simultaneously reproduce, negotiate, and challenge dominant language ideologies through their everyday pedagogical decisions. In this respect, linguistically just AI pedagogy requires more than technical competence. It demands ongoing reflexivity, critical dialogue, and a willingness to resist educational practices that equate linguistic quality with standardized forms of English while overlooking the multilingual resources through which learners construct knowledge, identity, and meaning.

7 Conclusion & Implications: Reimagining Teacher Training for the AI Era

This collaborative autoethnographic study examined how two language educators critically negotiated the opportunities and tensions of integrating GenAI into language teaching through the lens of linguistic justice. The findings demonstrate that GenAI cannot be understood as a neutral or purely technical innovation. It operates within a complex interplay of linguistic ideologies, institutional expectations, and teachers' pedagogical decisions. Although GenAI offers meaningful opportunities to support language learning, increase accessibility, and promote creativity, it can also reproduce dominant language ideologies by privileging standardized forms of English while marginalizing multilingual repertoires and localized ways of meaning-making. At the same time, our findings show that these outcomes are not predetermined. Instead, teachers play a pivotal role in mediating the interpretation, questioning, and enactment of GenAI in classroom practice. Through the lived experiences and critical reflections of two language educators, this study contributes to the growing literature by demonstrating that linguistic justice in AI-mediated language education is continually negotiated through teachers' everyday pedagogical decisions rather than determined solely by technological design. In doing so, the study extends current discussions of GenAI beyond technological effectiveness to foreground linguistic justice, ethical reflexivity, and critical engagement with language ideologies.

The findings have important implications for language education, teacher education, and educational policy. Pedagogically, GenAI should not be positioned merely as a tool for improving efficiency, grammatical accuracy, or instructional productivity. Instead, it should be approached as an object of critical inquiry through which teachers and students examine whose language practices AI-generated outputs represent, legitimize, and marginalize. Classroom activities should encourage learners to compare AI-generated texts with their own multilingual writing, identify which linguistic and cultural resources have been erased or transformed, and reflect critically on how AI constructs notions of correctness, fluency, and academic legitimacy.

More importantly, this study suggests that teacher professional development must move beyond technical competency training focused on prompt engineering, lesson generation, or efficient GenAI use. Preparing teachers for the age of GenAI requires developing critical digital raciolinguistic literacy, which equips educators to recognize how AI systems reproduce historical, geopolitical, and linguistic inequalities through seemingly objective language outputs. Thus, teachers should be prepared to guide students in understanding AI-generated texts as ideological artifacts shaped by unequal digital infrastructures, dominant language ideologies, and the unequal representation of languages and language varieties within training datasets. Such preparation would enable teachers not only to identify algorithmic bias but also to design pedagogical practices that sustain multilingualism, affirm diverse Englishes, and critically interrogate the relationship between language, technology, and power.

The study also highlights important implications for educational institutions and policy. Promoting linguistically just AI-mediated education requires more than introducing GenAI into classrooms or providing teachers with technical training. Institutional assessment systems, language policies, academic integrity frameworks, and AI governance practices must also be reconsidered to ensure that they do not inadvertently reinforce standardized English as the sole indicator of academic quality. Without broader structural changes, teachers' efforts to implement multilingual and linguistically just pedagogies will remain constrained by institutional expectations that privilege efficiency, standardization, and native-speaker norms over linguistic diversity and equity.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. As a collaborative autoethnographic study, the findings are based on the situated experiences of two teacher-researchers working within specific educational contexts and are therefore intended to provide depth of understanding rather than statistical generalizability. Furthermore, the study foregrounds teachers' perspectives, leaving students' learning experiences with GenAI relatively unexplored. The absence of classroom observations also means that pedagogical interactions were interpreted through reflective narratives rather than direct observation. In addition, the rapid evolution of GenAI technologies means that the affordances and challenges discussed here will continue to evolve alongside advances in AI systems and educational practice.

Future research should examine linguistic justice and AI-mediated language education across a broader range of sociolinguistic and educational contexts while incorporating students' perspectives through classroom-based, participatory, and longitudinal research. Comparative studies across different educational systems would provide richer insights into how teachers and learners negotiate linguistic justice under diverse institutional conditions. Future scholarship should also develop and evaluate teacher education frameworks centered on critical digital raciolinguistic literacy, examining how such programs prepare educators to interrogate AI-generated language, resist reproducing dominant language ideologies, and foster linguistically just pedagogies in increasingly AI-mediated language classrooms.

Declaration of Use of Generative AI

The authors declare that Grammarly, ChatGPT, and Quillbot were used during the preparation of this manuscript to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall readability. The authors take full responsibility and accountability for the content of this work. All interpretations, analyses, arguments, and conclusions are solely those of the listed authors. The authors critically reviewed, revised, and approved the final manuscript.

References

- Ahn, K. (2011). Conceptualization of American English native speaker norms: A case study of an English language classroom in South Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(4), 691-702. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-011-9169-6>

- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., Davey, L., & Jenkinson, E. (2023). Doing reflexive thematic analysis. In *Supporting research in counselling and psychotherapy: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research* (pp. 19-38). Springer International Publishing.
- Canilao, M. L. E. N. (2020). Foregrounding Philippine Englishes in fostering linguistic equality. *Asian Englishes*, 22(2), 195–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1715575>
- Chang, H., Wambura Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K. A. C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press.
- Cong-Lem, N., Van Bui, C. N., Nhat Nguyen, N. P., & Huynh, M. Q. (2025). Bridging or breaking? A systematic review of how generative AI shapes equity in foreign language education. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.70052>
- Cushing, I., & Choudrey, S. (2026). An oracy framework for England's schools: linguistic justice edition. *Educational Review*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2026.2693801>
- de Roock, R. S. (2024). To become an object among objects: Generative artificial “intelligence,” writing, and linguistic white supremacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 59(4), 590–608. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.569>
- Donley, K. (2024). Teaching with ChatGPT as a linguistically responsive tool for multilingual learners. *Technology in Language Teaching and Learning*, 6(3), 1719 <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1719>
- Dovchin, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence in applied linguistics: A double-edged sword. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 47(3), 410–417. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.24145.dov>
- Fang, F., & Dovchin, S. (2024). Reflection and reform of applied linguistics from the Global South: Power and inequality in English users from the Global South. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(4), 1223-1230. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2022-0072>
- Ghimire, A. (2025). Utilizing ChatGPT to integrate world English and diverse knowledge: A transnational perspective in critical artificial intelligence (AI) literacy. *Computers and Composition*, 75, 102913. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102913>
- Jiang, L., & Gu, M. M. (2025). Advocating linguistic justice through digital multimodal composing against GenAI biases: A case study of multilingual youths in an EMI university. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2025.2526103>
- Kalaitzidis, T. (2026). Epistemic laundering: generative AI and the naturalization of misrecognition. *AI & Society*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-026-03068-9>
- Kohnke, L., Zou, D., & Su, F. (2025). Exploring the potential of GenAI for personalised English teaching: Learners' experiences and perceptions. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 100371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100371>
- Kohnke, L. (2024). Exploring EAP students' perceptions of GenAI and traditional grammar-checking tools for language learning. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100279>
- Kohnke, L., & Ulla, M. B. (2024). Embracing generative artificial intelligence: The perspectives of English instructors in Thai higher education institutions. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*, 16(4), 653–670. <https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2024.16.030>
- May, S. (2023). Linguistic racism: Origins and implications. *Ethnicities*, 23(5), 651- 661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687968231193072>
- Mohamed, A. M. (2024). Exploring the potential of an AI-based chatbot (ChatGPT) in enhancing English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching: Perceptions of EFL faculty members. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 3195–3217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11917-z>

- Nash, B. L. (2024). Love and learning in the age of algorithms: How intimate relationships with artificial intelligence may shape epistemology, sociality, and linguistic justice. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 59(4), 624–631. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.549>
- Pando, M., León, M., Dougherty, C. A., & del Rosal, K. (2025). Exploring dual language teachers' experiences, perceptions and pedagogical implications of ChatGPT in emergent bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 48(4), 480–494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2025.2478499>
- Phyak, P. (2021). Epistemicide, deficit language ideology, and (de)coloniality in language education policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (267-268), 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2020-0104>
- Pourbahram, R., & Sadeghi, K. (2023). Social justice in technology-mediated second language education: A systematic review. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 11(3), 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2023.121407>
- Slamet, J. (2024). Potential of ChatGPT as a digital language learning assistant: EFL teachers' and students' perceptions. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 4(46), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00143-2>
- 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/10.1080/14708477.2023.2248962>
- Szabó, F., & Szoke, J. (2024). How does generative AI promote autonomy and inclusivity in language teaching? *ELT Journal*, 78(4), 478–488. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccae052>
- Ulla, M. B., & Kohnke, L. (2025). Developing, negotiating, and articulating identities: an autoethnographic study of a Filipino English language teacher in Thailand. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 167-182. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2025.56704.3208>
- Ulla, M. B., Advincula, M. J. C., Mombay, C. D. S., Mercullo, H. M. A., Nacionales, J. P., & Entino-Señorita, A. D. (2024a). How can GenAI foster an inclusive language classroom? A critical language pedagogy perspective from Philippine university teachers. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100314>
- Ulla, M. B., Bolintao, J. J. M., & Praditsorn, P. (2024b). Challenging the raciolinguistic inequality in English education in Thailand: the macro, meso, and micro perspectives. *English in Education*, 58(1), 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2024.2309390>
- Ulla, M. B., Perales, W. F., & Busbus, S. O. (2023a). “To generate or stop generating response”: Exploring EFL teachers' perspectives on ChatGPT in English language teaching in Thailand. *Learning: Research and Practice*, 9(2), 168–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23735082.2023.2257252>
- Ulla, M. B., Perales, W. F., & Busbus, S. O. (2023b). ChatGPT in language education: How to use it ethically? *PASAA*, 67, 361–377.
- Teng, M. F., & Shen, X. (2026). Digital applied linguistics: What is it and where are we in the GenAI era?. *Digital Applied Linguistics*, 4, 103594. <https://doi.org/10.29140/dal.v4.103594>
- Teng, M. F. (2025). Understanding EFL student writers' metacognitive awareness in utilizing ChatGPT. *System*, 103848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103848>
- Teng, M. F. (2024). “ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies”: EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270>
- Thongwichit, N., Ulla, M. B., & Parba, J. (2026). Translanguaging for social justice in Thailand's language classrooms: a classroom ethnography. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 23(1), 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2517334>

- Thongwicht, N., & Ulla, M. B. (2024). Translanguaging pedagogy in Thailand's English medium of instruction classrooms: Teachers' perspectives and practices. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*, 27(4). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.27108a7>
- Veliz, L., & Chen, J. (2025). Challenging the monolingual mindset: language teachers' pushback and enactment of critical multilingual language awareness in Australian schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 46(10), 3613–3628. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2352161>
- Wong, W., & Ortega, Y. (2024). Addressing anti-black racism in English language teaching: experiences from duoethnography research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(4), 1428-1459. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3291>
- Xu, Y., & Fang, F. (2025). De-Mystifying linguistic prejudice and discrimination in standard language ideology: Towards decolonizing language education. In J. Setter, S. Dovchin, & V.A. Ramjattan (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Prejudice* (pp. 580-598). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yazan, B., Pentón Herrera, L. J., & Rashed, D. (2023). Transnational TESOL Practitioners' Identity Tensions: A Collaborative Autoethnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, 57(1), 140-167. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3130>
- Zhang, X. (2022). Investigating Student Teachers' Perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca and Its Teaching in Mainland China. *Asian Englishes*, 24(3), 247–262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1926647>

William F. Perales earned a Bachelor of Arts in English at Mindanao State University, General Santos City, Philippines. He completed his Master of Arts in English language Teaching at West Visayas State University in Iloilo City, Philippines. His research interests include Language Teaching, Education and Technology, ESL/EFL Teaching, and Teacher Education. He is currently a lecturer at the School of Languages and General Education at Walailak University, Thailand.

Mark Bedoya Ulla is an Associate Professor and Head of Research at the School of Languages and General Education, Walailak University, Thailand. He finished his Doctor of Communication degree from the University of the Philippines and his PhD in Language Education at Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines. His research interests include technology in language teaching, queer teacher migration, queer intercultural communication, language teacher identity, critical applied linguistics, and gender in language education.

Stephenie Ong Busbus holds a doctoral degree in Language Education from Saint Louis University, where she is connected as a professor. She is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Philippine Association for Language Teaching Inc., a TESOL International global professional, and a MOOC Camp facilitator for the Regional English Language Office (RELO) in Manila, the Philippines.