

Approaches to the Teaching of World English in the Ghanaian Classroom Context: A Survey of Public SHS Teachers in the Krachi East Municipality, in Oti Region

Charles Kwesi Gbungburi Wumbei¹, John Adukpo^{2*}, Godwin Yao Gaaku³ & Joana Emefa Adansi⁴

1. Dambai College of Education, Department of Languages, Ghana
Email: cwumbei@gmail.com
2. Dambai College of Education, Department of Languages, Ghana
*Email: jadukpo@dace.edu.gh
3. Dambai College of Education, Department of Languages, Ghana
Email: ggaaku@dace.edu.gh
4. St. Francis College of Education, Department of Languages, Ghana
Email: jemefaadansi@gmail.com

Received: August 15, 2024

Revised: February 8, 2025

Accepted: June 10, 2025

To cite this article: Wumbei, C. K. G., Adukpo, J., Gaaku, G. Y., & Adansi, J. E. (2025). Approaches to the teaching of world Englishes in the Ghanaian classroom context: A survey of public SHS teachers in the Krachi East municipality in Oti region. *Journal of Transformative Education and Development*, 1(2), 259 – 299.

Abstract

Research on the impact of World Englishes on instruction in public senior high schools in Ghana's Oti Region's Krachi East Municipality served as the basis for this thesis. The teaching of English is hampered by a number of unprecedented challenges that modern English language instructors must overcome. Not as much has been written about Ghanaian senior high school teachers' thoughts on teaching writing using World Englishes as there has been about the globalization of English and the relationship between regional dialects and standard English (Canagarajah, 2006; Jenkins, 2014; Kachru, 1992; Saraceni, 2015). Because of this, data for the study was collected from 36 teachers employed by the Krachi East Municipality's public senior high schools.

The study used a mixed-method methodology in an attempt to address the problem. The results demonstrate that the teachers who participated in the study have a solid understanding of Wes. Additionally, the survey discovered that most teachers had a favourable opinion of code-switching between their home tongue and the target language. Furthermore, the study's findings showed that the majority of educators have favourable opinions about using regional or local English dialects when instructing students in writing. Nonetheless, the teachers noted several barriers to incorporating regional and local language variations into their lessons, including time constraints, the complexity of these variations, and ignorance of their differences. The results show that professional development programmes are essential to improve the professional self-esteem of Senior High School (SHS) teachers, address the issues and challenges brought up, and teach them about the linguistic superiority of native speakers rather than their normalcy and naturalness, as well as the political and ideological nature of standardization. Views of senior high school instructors in Ghana regarding the use of World Englishes in writing instruction. Because of this, data for the study was collected from 36 teachers employed by the Krachi East Municipality's public senior high schools.

Keywords: *World Englishes, Lingua Franca, Translingual Approach, Standardisation*

Introduction

The different dialects and styles of English that are spoken in multicultural and multilingual contexts worldwide are referred to as "World Englishes" (Wes). Both domestically and globally, English is the most extensively spoken language in the world (Jenkins, 2014; Matsuda and Matsuda, 2010; Saraceni, 2015). The idea that English is a single, dominating variety is contested by Wes studies, which emphasizes the language's pluralization. In contrast to native speakerism, which holds that native speakers (NSs) are linguistically better, Wes assert that English belongs to everyone who uses it, whether as a main or secondary language. Localised or indigenous English dialects are also referred to as Wes, especially in areas where the US or the UK have had an influence. It entails recognising different dialects of English and examining the ways in which sociolinguistic histories, cultural contexts, and contextual elements influence English usage across the globe. The Three-Circle Model

developed by Kachru (1992) places the US, UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand in the Inner Circle, where English is the primary language; Ghana, India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka in the Outer Circle, where English is used as an additional language for both intra-national and international communication; and China, Egypt, Indonesia, and Israel in the Expanding Circle, where English is used primarily for international communication.

According to Jenkins (2014), there are more English speakers in the Outer and Expanding Circles than in the Inner Circle. In order to investigate geographical variations in English, the study of Wes was first initiated in 1978. The practical aspects of English's use as a global language include appropriateness, comprehensibility, and interpretability. The International Association for World Englishes (IAWE) was founded in 1992 at the University of Illinois in the United States, while the International Committee of the Study of World Englishes (ICWE) was founded at the 1988 TESOL conference in Honolulu, Hawaii. English is currently used as a first (L1) or institutionalized second (L2) language in about 75 territories for administrative, educational, and legislative purposes.

The term WEs was first used in 1985 by Smith and Kachru. In circumstances where English is being used as a second language (ESL) or as a foreign language (EFL), standard variations and myths about native speakerism still exist (Jenkins, 2014; Saraceni, 2015). Saraceni (2015) contends that NSs are frequently given preference in employment markets and that native-speaking models are primarily used in EL teaching materials. Consequently, Wes scholars advocate a paradigm shift from monolingual to pluralistic approaches. They propose methodologies that are contextually appropriate, culturally sensitive, and promote multilingualism in teaching (Canagarajah, 2006b; Matsuda and Matsuda, 2010; Saraceni, 2015). According to some academics, writing training should incorporate a variety of English dialects, regional cultures, and religious beliefs (Andniou, 2015; Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b, 2011; Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue, 2011; Thresia, 2015).

World English and Wes are sometimes mistaken. World Englishes are several English dialects that have been created all over the world, whereas World English refers to English as a lingua franca in international contexts like commerce and diplomacy. To emphasize how globalization contributed to the

spread of English and its use as a lingua franca, some academics favour the term “Global Englishes.”

Native speaker myths and monolingual presumptions still exist in Ghana, as they do in other nations in the Expanding Circle (such as China, Japan, and Korea). Ghana follows Kachru’s (1992) model as a norm-dependent country, relying on Inner Circle varieties (British and American English) for teaching models, educational materials, and performance evaluation. British English (BrE) is preferred for academia, administration, and social communication. Many Ghanaian teachers and students believe proficiency in Inner Circle English varieties ensures international success.

English continues expanding due to globalisation and the increasing need for cross-border communication. It remains vital in fields such as business and science. However, EL teachers worldwide face challenges due to insufficient teaching materials, particularly in Outer and Expanding Circle countries. Many rely on textbooks based on Inner Circle norms, primarily British or American English (Matsuda, 2003). This reliance impacts teaching ideology and identity formation.

Even though English is widely used, little is known about EL instruction and learning in Ghanaian EFL environments. Scholarly attention to writing teaching in Ghana has been scant. Western cultural ideals are frequently included into teaching materials, which may not be in line with Ghanaian customs. Researchers from Wes advise incorporating regional cultural values and languages into writing instruction in order to close this gap. In EFL situations, Saraceni (2015) emphasizes bringing attention to problems like white privilege, neo-colonialism, Western cultural domination, and native speakerism. In a similar vein, Kirckpatrick (2012) recommends replacing Inner Circle cultural norms with regional and local cultural issues in EL curricula.

In order to address these issues, a study on the opinions of EL instructors at three public senior high schools in Ghana’s Krachi East Municipality intends to investigate their viewpoints regarding the use of Wes-oriented approaches in writing instruction. Curriculum designers, including the Ghana Education Service (GES) and the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment

(NaCCA), will use the study's findings to create curricula that integrate regional languages and cultures.

The goal of this research is to investigate how EL writing teaching in Ghanaian senior high schools may be improved by Wes-oriented pluralistic approaches. It will specifically look at how EL teachers feel about Wes-oriented/pluralistic methods to teaching EL writing and determine what supports or hinders localization of these approaches in EL writing instruction.

To sum up, World Englishes offers a framework for comprehending the variety of English dialects found around the world. Although EL instruction is still influenced by Inner Circle English standards, Wes scholarship promotes a change to pluralistic and context-sensitive methods. By investigating how Wes-oriented approaches might enrich EL writing teaching. This discussion would be enhanced by the planned study on the opinions of senior high school teachers in Ghana.

EL instruction in Ghana can become more inclusive and contextually relevant by including regional languages and cultural values into curricula.

Literature Review

The literature on the subject is reviewed in this section.

Context of English in Kachru's three concentric circles

The literature on the division of English into three categories—English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as a Second Language (ESL), and English as a Native Language (ENL)—is reviewed in this section. These are separated into the Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle by Kachru's (1992a) Three-Circle Model, which illustrates various sociolinguistic realities and historical processes of English's spread. The inner circle consists of native English-speaking nations, or ENLs. The United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand are among the nations represented by the Inner Circle where English is the primary language.

English has become deeply embedded in many countries as a result of historical migration and colonisation. These people are known as native speakers (NSs) and are considered to speak English as their mother tongue (L1) (Jenkins, 2014; Kachru, 1992a; Saraceni, 2015).

Inner Circle countries have historically controlled the norms and criteria for English learning and performance globally, despite the fact that Kachru's concept does not imply linguistic dominance. American and British English standards serve as the foundation for these "norm-providing" countries' English language teaching (ELT) and evaluation techniques (such TOEFL and IELTS). Among these nations, the UK is commonly recognized as the "origin" of English, and its variation is known as Standard English. The spread of the English language from the United Kingdom to other countries in the Inner Circle is referred to as the "first diaspora". The United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand are among the nations represented by the Inner Circle where English is the primary language.

Outer Circle (Post-Colonial Countries – ESL)

Former American and British colonies where English was introduced during colonial power include the second diaspora, symbolized by the Outer Circle. These countries include the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Pakistan, Nigeria, and India. English is utilized as a Second Language (ESL) and as an official or administrative language in these regions (Higgins, 2003).

English is a "norm-developing" language because, despite its localization and cultural adaptation, British and American norms nevertheless influence English education and competency evaluation in Outer Circle nations (Saraceni, 2015). Scholars such as Lowenberg (2002) contend, however, that these regional English dialects, which are frequently referred to as institutionalized variants, have evolved unique lexical and grammatical characteristics.

In spite of this, ELT in these areas is nevertheless shaped by native-speaker standards. To promote the use of Standard English rather than regional variants like Singlish, the Singaporean government, for example, started the "Speak Good English Movement" in 2000. According to Kirkpatrick (2012), a large number of Asian Englishes continue to use native-speaker models for evaluation, learning resources, and pedagogy. Saraceni (2015) points out that the fact that many nations do not recognize regional English dialects is one factor contributing to this persistence.

Whether ESL speakers should be regarded as native speakers of their regional English dialects is a major topic of discussion in the literature. Even if ESL

variants are different from interlanguages, Kachru's model insists that only Inner Circle speakers are considered NSs (Kachru, 1997; Lowenberg, 1986). Other names for these variants have been suggested by scholars, including "second language varieties" (Prator, 1968), "local Englishes" (Streven, 1992), and "institutionalised varieties" (Kachru, 1982).

Expanding Circle (EFL Contexts)

The Expanding Circle, which encompasses countries where English is studied as a foreign language (EFL) rather than being widely institutionalized or spoken natively, represents the third exodus. Examples of this include Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Japan, Korea, China, and Russia. English has no official standing and is mostly used for international communication in these contexts (Matsuda & Matsuda, 2010; Saraceni, 2015).

Unlike the Outer Circle, where English has been localized, EFL users solely use Inner Circle standards for language learning, proficiency assessment, and instruction. English is a lingua franca for worldwide communication, despite the fact that native speakers are regarded as superior in some countries. Standard English varieties, primarily American English (AE) and British English (BrE), are the sole acknowledged forms for learning and evaluation (Jenkins, 2014; Saraceni, 2015).

Because native-speaker norms predominate in Expanding Circle countries, English proficiency tests that are exclusively based on BrE and AE norms, such as the TOEFL, IELTS, and TOEIC, have received international respect (Lowenberg, 2002). The widespread belief that only Standard English is "authentic" has led to debates over who is allowed to use and possess non-native dialects.

Discussions on English variants' acceptance and ownership

The ownership of English has been a topic of significant debate. Some scholars believe that English belongs to all of its users, not just native speakers. Widdowson (2003) asserts that English is an international language that cannot be governed by a single nation. Similarly, Crystal (2012) argues that once a language becomes global, it belongs to all speakers, not just native speakers.

However, Yoo (2013) contends that context determines ownership: English speakers in the Inner Circle own their native dialects (such as British or American English); speakers in the Outer Circle own their regional dialects (such as Indian or Singaporean English); and speakers in the Expanding Circle do not, since there are no recognized regional dialects.

It's still up for debate whether non-native English speakers should be allowed to serve as acceptable teaching and assessment models. Quirk (1990) promoted constant exposure to Inner Circle standards, arguing that non-native English speakers were inadequate and unable to teach. In a similar vein, Yoo (2013) rejected some non-native Englishes (like Konglish) as "broken English" because they lacked regular linguistic patterns.

Other academics, however, disagree with this viewpoint. According to Saraceni (2015), language variations ought to be seen as inventions as opposed to mistakes. Similarly, Kachru (1991) argues in favor of non-native varieties' inventiveness, claiming that their distinctions are due to sociolinguistic and cultural factors rather than flaws.

Because it emphasizes the conflict between linguistic diversity and the persistence of native-speaker norms, this study of World Englishes has a direct bearing on how English is used. British and American English remain the norms for teaching, learning, and assessment, even though English has evolved into many locally distinct dialects. This bolsters the idea that proficiency is associated with native-speaker models, despite English's widespread use as a global lingua franca. Language policies and instructional practices in ESL and EFL contexts are therefore influenced by ongoing discussions regarding linguistic ownership and validity.

Materials and ideology

Ideology can be seen as a tool used in language training to divide different people and groups. It provides pupils with an ideal model to follow (McGroarty 2010: 8). In light of this notion, McGroarty contends that the inner circle countries' publications offer a Standard English variation that is either RP or General American as the ideal. However, when it comes to ideology, there are other factors to take into account. One study, for instance, examined published textbooks used in private schools in Iran, a nation that is part of the growing circle.

According to the researcher, those textbooks provide a strong emphasis on conversation and characters that are primarily focused on market economy, entertainment, and business dealings (Taki 2008:139). This ideology is not acceptable in other circumstances, despite being common in western culture. Furthermore, the idea that English language and culture are superior is promoted by these works that are based on inner circle circumstances (Abdollahzadeh and Baniasad 2010:217). Textbooks depict successful white middle-class individuals leading ideal lives, with their primary concerns being where to spend their summer vacation. However, there are hidden realities that are seldom highlighted, such the large number of Indian or African minorities residing in the UK (Dendrinos 1992:153).

In addition to what has already been discussed, textbooks that concentrate on inner circle norms are ill-suited to preparing students in outer and growing circle nations where non-native English speakers will be the primary target language community. According to McKay (2012), one strategy used in English instruction is to modify a British English textbook for the Ghanaian environment. The book's characters and illustrations should reflect both British and local culture. This is because the book's cultural friendliness would make it more pleasant to utilize. Teachers do, however, have a propen'ity to think that novels written by non-native speakers are inferior to those written in the inner circle nations (Dendrinos 1992: 49).

According to Crystal (Crystal 2003:125), there is an innate desire to speak one's mother tongue and to reject a language that has been imposed from another culture. There are various methods to show this dissatisfaction. Students may demonstrate resistance to textbooks by purposefully leaving their books at home, writing on the margins, or tearing them to pieces.

Additionally, instructional materials affect identity development in addition to second language acquisition. Learning a second language also means learning a second culture and, consequently, a second identity, as Brown (1994: 63, cited in Birkner 2014). The best features of the inner circle countries' cultures are shown in textbooks, as was previously said. This could have two effects on the students. First, especially in countries that are a part of the expanding circle, some students may find the foreign culture interesting.

They are therefore more impacted by the materials in the inner circle. Students may take on an imagined identity in an attempt to closely resemble the model that is taught in textbooks. Their desire to be a part of an imaginary group is the issue. Since it's an imagined community, confronting reality might cause a lot of annoyance.

Methodology and evaluation

In order to “absorb what they felt were the latest ideas in English teaching,” thousands of instructors from the outer and expanding circle countries annually enroll in postgraduate courses in the US and the UK (Quirk 1990:3–10). Through exposition and language use in communicative activities, CLT enables students to utilize the language in a more realistic manner, claims Harmer (2007:50). It indicates that rather than studying about the language, the pupils learn how to utilize it. The teacher's job is to help the students by offering criticism and encouraging self-reliance.

CLT places greater emphasis on speaking and listening abilities, despite the fact that the four skills are developed in various circumstances. Students spend a lot of time working in groups to discuss various topics. In terms of ideology and identity, this approach appears to be comfortable for pupils from western cultures, based on my personal teaching experience. Since the majority of them are accustomed to this style of instruction, they do not perceive a foreign technique being imposed upon them, and they appear to take pleasure in group activities. Identity is not in danger in this situation since CLT enables educators to concentrate on local contexts and take into account the backgrounds of their students.

While establishing a consistent target variety is crucial for teaching English, other crucial factors in English Language Teaching (ELT) include creating appropriate materials and building successful curricula. Given the constantly changing English language scene, ELT curricula and resources must be creative to address the growing complexity of English language instruction. Making ELT materials and curricula effective while dealing with the difficulties presented by different, WE phenomena is frequently challenging. In the twenty-first century, two key concepts for addressing the novel problems people face on a daily basis are innovation and adaptability.

This phenomenon applies to ELT just like it does to other areas of life. Similar to this, it is crucial to take into account the adaptation factors in ELT, which are elements that would ensure that different facets of the curriculum, materials, methods, and approaches serve the intended aims as effectively as possible. According to Hadley (1999, cited in Birkner 2014), certain Japanese colleges and universities have introduced innovative ELT courses at the postsecondary level. In response to the Japanese Ministry of Education's orders and to satisfy the need for efficient English language education, these colleges and universities adopted what Hadley refers to as "innovative" ELT curricula.

The use of English only in the classroom (also known as immersion), the lack of teacher-centered instruction, and the allowance for students to express themselves freely—including "laughing, joking, and expressing their opinions in English" (Hadley, 1999 cited in Birkner 2014)—are some characteristics of these curricula.

Several interesting tendencies emerge when examining the characteristics of "innovative" ELT courses. It is clear that the administration of these institutions treated the development of pupils' communication abilities seriously. Additionally, by creating English-speaking scenarios in non-native surroundings, an effort is made to provide learners as much exposure to English as feasible. The overt efforts to involve native-speaking teachers and kids in the process may be a reminder of the "Anglo-Saxon attitudes" of grassroots administrators. These kinds of problems continue to perplex ELT circles worldwide.

The language curriculum should be in line with the "theory of language as social action." To structure and arrange the curriculum, Coffin (2003, cited in Bhowmik, 2015) advises language teachers and curriculum designers to leverage the "functional" aspects of language use. She cites text structure, experience, interpersonal, and textual grammar as the four language domains in which students need to improve their comprehension.

These four domains each support different facets of language use in daily life. For instance, understanding text structure might benefit students who are dealing with a variety of written and spoken texts in various situations and cultures.

Students who comprehend experiential grammar get “grammatical resources for representing the world,” which increases their awareness of the people, things, circumstances, and procedures involved in language use. Textual grammar also helps students organize their communications to facilitate the smooth “flow of information,” while interpersonal grammar deals with how to effectively incorporate linguistic choices based on a variety of social relationships and attitudes (Coffin, 2003).

According to Coffin, a thorough and methodical examination of these four linguistic domains can yield valuable information for creating curricula for English language learners. Coffin’s argument is intriguing because she suggests identifying a group of written and spoken genres that are closely related to the social and cultural environments in which language learners are most likely to function. The language curriculum might then include these genres.

Although Coffin’s acknowledgement of social and cultural sensitivity supports the pluricentrism at the center of the discussion around a World Englishes perspective of ELT, there may be issues with her concept of an ELT curriculum. English training has spread across all national borders in the twenty-first century. It is therefore exceedingly difficult to develop a localized, context-specific curriculum that would encompass all social and cultural contexts that English language learners may face. Additionally, the primary goal of ELT at the moment is the development of communicative skills.

It would undoubtedly not help students achieve this goal to study a few spoken and written genres. In order to contribute to the contemporary discourse on ELT, Ellis (1993, referenced in Bhowmik, 2015) makes the case for structural syllabuses in English language programs. For English language learners, structural syllabuses would include language structures at different levels (such as phonology, morphology, and syntax). Ellis’ thesis is based on the idea that teaching grammar to students should be a component of “raising their consciousness.” To put it briefly, consciousness raising is the process of establishing in learners an awareness of the different “formal and functional properties” of the target language.

The “learnability” paradigm of L2 acquisition is consistent with this consciousness-raising process (Ellis, 1993). It is important to keep in mind

that there have been lengthy discussions on whether or not grammar teaching actually aids language learning, even though Ellis' reports offer intriguing perspectives on L2 acquisition to the design of ELT curricula. According to Ferris (1999) and Truscott (1996), cited in Bhowmik (2015), ELT curricula that fail to take contextual factors like these into consideration may prove to be ineffectual as research attempts to establish a common understanding of the intelligibility of various English dialects worldwide.

Additionally, realistic texts are thought to help close the gap between students' language proficiency and their ability to utilize the language in everyday contexts. According to the literature in the topic, authentic texts and materials do have some issues despite their purported efficacy.

The discrepancy between real texts and language exercises is one issue. According to Ferris and Truscott, authentic resources are useless unless they are able to elicit genuine answers from language learners. When it comes to English-language materials, this phenomenon is particularly prevalent. For example, ELT tasks tend to focus more on guessing than precise control and understanding because students cannot relate the tasks to the contexts (i.e., the materials used come from contexts like the USA or Britain that are completely new to them).

It's also important to exercise care when it comes to the assertion that authentic materials boost motivation for language assignments. Artificial materials were thought to be more intriguing than authentic ones. The effectiveness of authentic materials depends on a number of factors, including the teacher's perception of "each student's ability," the students' "temperament and readiness," and the teacher's evaluation of how to work with the resources. In this situation, it seems sense to include local teacher educators' perspectives while developing curriculum and materials.

As it is evident, resources cannot engage students in language learning activities on their own. Teachers must put in a lot of effort and commitment to do this. In actuality, language learners find it very challenging to utilize the resources to their full potential in the absence of teachers' diligent efforts. The bottom line is that it is hard for teachers and students to relate to the language tasks in ELT classes unless more locally relevant, culturally and contextually particular materials are provided.

English language learners should be exposed to English as an International Language (EIL) by include more characters from expanding-circle and outer-circle countries in textbooks, as Matsuda (2003) rightly argues. To successfully incorporate EIL components into the materials and elicit “authentic” answers from students, textbook authors and material producers need to be aware of the appropriateness of the tasks and characters.

All English language learners must be ready for future encounters with speakers of English dialects other than their own, since English is a genuinely global language (Crystal 2003) (Jenkins, 2006). Exposure to many kinds is one method of preparing children (Matsuda 2003). The internet, radio, television, and numerous worldwide newspapers all provide examples of various English dialects (Cook 1999). For instance, the International Corpus of English (www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/ice) provides teachers and students with online samples of a number of national and regional English dialects. Links to English-language newspapers from throughout the globe can be found on World-Newspapers (www.world-newspapers.com), another resource for educators and learners. English-language television networks from all over the world can also be viewed online.

For instance, Indian English broadcasters are available on New Delhi Television (www.ndtv.com) in India. In addition to exposing pupils to other English dialects, teachers should place a strong emphasis on teaching them intercultural competency and strategic thinking. Jenkins (2006) states that this will enable them to “adjust their speech in order to be intelligible to interlocutors from a wide range of [first language] backgrounds, most of whom are not inner circle native speakers” (p. 174). When communication breaks down, learners are able to negotiate for meaning through the purposeful and intentional application of strategic competency abilities. Having clear articulation and reducing speaking rates are two examples of these abilities (Petzold 2002).

Asking the other person to slow down, repeat, or wait while the student chooses the right word are examples of strategic strategies that should be taught to students. It would be very helpful to teach kids how to say things like “Could you please repeat that more slowly?” or “Could you please wait a moment while I search for the right word?” The ability to overcome sociolinguistic disparities is known as intercultural competence (Alptekin

2002; El-Sayed 1991). In order to negotiate sociocultural convergence within the ad-hoc speech community, learners should be able to discuss the sociocultural norms of their respective cultures (El-Sayed 1991, 166).

Teaching materials representing EIL users

Using World Englishes in instructional materials can further enhance their portrayal of EIL. Textbooks should, for instance, provide more prominent figures from the outer and growing circles more significant parts in chapter discussions than they already do. Furthermore, the inclusion of characters from outer- and expanding-circle countries facilitates the incorporation of cultural themes and images from those countries. Dialogues illustrating or discussing the use of English as a lingua franca in multilingual outer-circle countries can also be included in chapters. Including users and uses from expanding-circle and outer-circle countries that students are unfamiliar with would help them comprehend that English is not only utilized in the inner circle. The topic of EIL, including its history, prevalence now, prospective futures, and the role EIL learners will play in those potentials, can also be covered in detail in chapters of textbooks written for older students.

Internationalization, globalization, and the spread of English can all be examined in relation to some of the common global topics included in EFL textbooks, including history, nature, health, human rights, world peace, and power inequality.

Pedagogical approaches

Translingual approach

According to Huang (2010), the translingual approach to teaching L2 emphasizes “unifying language use,” in contrast to monolingual or native speaker approaches that view languages as distinct or disconnected cognitive processes. Kellman (1996) defines translingual writers as those who emphasize their freedom from monolingual and cultural constraints by using languages other than their own one. The pedagogical framework known as “Translingual Writing,” “Translingual Approach,” or “Translingualism” has been proposed by Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur (2011), Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue (2011), and Lee (2014) as a way to help modern EL students in writing and/or composition classes more successfully.

The Translingual Approach to writing Instruction views language variations as assets rather than problems that need to be resolved. Additionally, this method promotes the inclusion of learners' needs, cultural values, and nondominant languages in writing sessions. The translingual approach encourages the following, according to Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011): (1) acknowledging the variety and hybridity of languages and linguistics in the US and other nations; (2) respecting all language users and their capacity to adapt a language to suit their own unique contexts; and (3) challenging monomodal and monolingual approaches by researching and teaching writers how to perform both with and against mythical expectations.

The principles of the translingual method

The driving pedagogies, curriculum, and design of this approach to writing and teaching writing in the US are relevant in other multilingual contexts since it challenges the idea of monolingualism (Lu and Horner, 2016). Seven ideas form the foundation of the "translingual approach" to teaching English writing and writing in the language. The rules that follow are directly lifted from Lu and Horner (2016):

- Language as performative: something we do instead than own, including English dialects, media, discourses, and modalities;
- communication activities as being influenced by and shaped by asymmetrical power relations in the social-historical, cultural, geopolitical, and economic spheres rather than being neutral or innocent;
- Language users actively shape and alter the very norms we use and the socio-historical contexts of usage;
- writers' social positionings and utterance contexts influence language use decisions, which directly affect our lives and the society we live in;
- the distinction as the standard for all speech, understood as translations across and among languages, media, and modality during apparent repetitions of prevailing norms as well as departures from the standard;
- All language users, including those who are socially categorized as mainstream or minority, native or first- or second-language speakers, published or student authors, and others, have expressed a wish to

change accepted settings, opinions, and meaning-making standards; and

- the reality that every kind of communication is a mesopolitical activity that actively negotiates and establishes intricate power dynamics at the dynamic nexus of social-historical (macro) and personal (micro) levels.

The idea behind these guidelines is that all languages and/or dialects ought to be positioned with respect to Standard English. Stated differently, it draws attention to the fact that several linguistic codes are more equally powerful. This method is thought to be an excellent example of language use. The main goal of this method is to close linguistic gaps in writing training. However, translingual approaches to writing education support “Students’ Right to Their Own Language” (Horner et al. 2011), whereas monolingual approaches to writing instruction have alienated and marginalized their users’ language practices.

Learners gain a sense of control over both English and their mother tongues when a variety of EL types are used throughout the writing session. According to Lee (2014), students’ understanding of how they use language both within and outside of the classroom can be significantly improved by teaching writing classes utilizing the translingual approach to composition pedagogy. As previously noted, in many ESL and EFL situations, characteristics of the dominant sorts nearly always overlap with Western cultural standards that are at odds with local cultures (Canagarajah, 2006b; Jenkins, 2015; Lee, 2014; Saraceni, 2014).

Therefore, it is crucial to include local cultural issues and local languages in writing teaching in Ghana in addition to the dominant culture. Because they will learn to use both dominant and non-dominant (local or regional) types of English, blended education methods and/or their integration can help students succeed academically, in national and worldwide job markets, and while studying abroad.

Code-meshing/mixing and code-switching strategies

The terms code-switching and code-meshing are sometimes used interchangeably by academics who research second languages. In contrast to code-switching, which involves meshing or mixing linguistic units (words,

phrases, and sentences) within a speech, code-mixing involves combining or putting together various linguistic units (affixes, words, phrases, and clauses) from the grammatical systems of the two dissimilar languages in the speech context and the sentence.

The two terms' modified sections are positioned differently. Code-switching entails an intersentential code shift, whereas code-mixing entails an intrasentential code change. Some scholars define code-switching as the process by which a multilingual speaker transitions between languages, whereas code-mixing is the merging of forms from several grammars (King, 2006). Some scholars believe that these strategies should be used in the work of Expanding Circles lecturers, writers, and students.

The code-mixing approach to writing instruction was initially put forth by Canagarajah (2006b, 2011, 2012; Young, 2004, 2007, 2011; Young, 2004) as a framework for AAL writers and users to increase their linguistic resources in order to thrive in educational settings. Canagarajah (2006b) urges students and inexperienced researchers to apply code meshing in their academic publications, both in their first draft and in their final published versions, as part of his recommended code-meshing writing style.

According to him, code-meshing is a useful tactic for incorporating regional variations into scholarly writing or publications. He also says that we need to let students know that there are a lot of well-known and accomplished academics in multicultural and multilingual settings who are using scholarly writing to represent their norms and voices. He asserts that the code-meshing approach necessitates that students and academics not only understand local and existing norms, but also possess the ability to unite them in support of one's goals and voice. Teachers, students, authors, and academics must possess organized language and rhetorical knowledge in order to use this method. Likewise, Elbow (1999) proposes a code-switching approach to writing instruction. Students are easily able to integrate their regional styles into their initial drafts of scholarly writing because to Elbow's two-part code-switching approach to writing training. However, students should only follow normal written English norms while uploading their works.

However, Barbour (2002) supports oral academic communication in a range of English dialects. Barbour objected to the pluralized manner of the writing.

He argues that writers who are multilingual should only write in the most widely used varieties of American or British English. Unlike Barbour, Canagarajah (2006b) concludes that code-meshing, or the introduction of local variations in writing, is not intended to subvert dominant codes or elevate local codes in established varieties, nor is it a direct challenge to native or dominant codes.

Students in a multilingual setting will be able to tolerate monolingual English from the inside out by incorporating their own conventions into the current norms. By doing this, the dominant version will gain knowledge in addition to being inspired to create new codes.

For teaching writing in particular and English as a foreign language (EL) in general, the code-meshing method is more useful and efficient than the traditional code-switching technique. While code-meshing enables students to utilize a wide variety in their writing, which will help them succeed in the academic setting, code-switching permits the limited use of many varieties in students' writing and expects them to pick up the ability to apply different types discriminately. The distinction between code-switching and code-meshing approaches is not well understood by educators and learners in Ghana's EFL context, both at the school and university levels.

Thus, workshops, seminars, and trainings covering the aforementioned topics are essential for instructors' professional development in order to successfully incorporate such approaches into writing teaching and/or curricula.

One translingual tactic that Glee (2014) incorporates into her composition instruction is the code-meshing technique. Stated differently, she employs the code-meshing technique in her writing classes and claims that it gives the pupils a clearer perspective. She provides a number of the best methods and approaches for using the code-meshing methodology in writing instruction. It is crucial to talk about those methods and suggest them to teachers who feel that their composition pedagogies are changing.

The Circle of WEs Chart, which McArthur (1998) proposed, ought to be shown to the students. This picture can be used by educators to start establishing the foundation for students' comprehension of the Translingual approach, which will be followed by the application and advantages of code-meshing. The chart includes a number of EL dialects that are spoken around

the world. As a result, students will learn and/or discover that, in addition to the British and American varieties, there are many more varieties of English that are used around the world, including in the context in which they are studying the language. Teachers will thus gain a better understanding of Wes thanks to this.

After learning about Wes, educators can use the translingual approach, code-mixing, and code-meshing strategies into their lesson plans. Saraceni (2015) provides EL teachers in Expanding Circle countries with similar advice.

Teachers can practice and use the translingual approach that code-mixing symbolizes through multimedia tasks such as digital literacy tales. Through these exercises, students can investigate the hazy and fluctuating lines that separate contextual concepts of fluidity and distinctness, as well as nonstandard and standard.

Teachers should encourage their students to use both academic register and a combination of words and structures from their home language when standard/academic phrases do not express the exact idea that students want to convey.

Additionally, educators ought to give students access to code-meshed materials written by Wes experts and intellectuals. Students have the opportunity to examine the advantages and disadvantages of integrated communication and discourse.

Ghanaian educators might modify and adapt these methods to fit their own setting. They are very practical and helpful activities, so Ghanaian teachers should incorporate them into the curriculum and teach writing in senior high schools.

Users of the local variations are encouraged to advocate and write in their own English by the seemingly persuasive code-meshing and code-switching tactics. Nevertheless, there isn't a recognized regional variation that is pertinent to Ghana. The local/regional variations of English and pluralistic approaches are not well known to students, academics, or even teachers. Additionally, nothing is known about SWE norms by students, academics, and educators. The question of "errors or features?" and intelligence can be contentious. Prior to implementing the implications or strategies proposed by

Canagarajah (2006b) and Elbow (2011) in academic writing and instruction, English users in a multilingual and multicultural country such as Ghana should be aware of these difficulties.

The problems of “features and intelligibility” or “errors”

The issue of “errors or features” is being thoroughly examined. Any difference from the other variations, whether in pronunciation or a feature of a new English variety, ought to be allowed, claims Saraceni (2015). However, Quirk (1990) asserts that>NNLs are deficiencies. He noted that non-native English speakers are not good examples for teaching since they are poorly taught languages of Standard English forms. According to him, speakers, teachers, and students in Outer and Expanding Circle countries should be in continuous connection with NSs of Inner Circle countries. While strongly disagreeing with Quirk’s concern, Kachru (1991) sees non-native types as creative or innovative. He argues that the institutionalized kinds in the contexts are unsuitable for long-term interactions with NL. He provides two useful explanations for this: first, teachers are unable to keep in continual contact with the native language (NL) due to the abundance of information from the local variation and the scarcity of resources. The number of EL teachers is the second. He concludes that a variety of factors, 279question279g creativity, language, cultural contact, and the basic sociolinguistic reality of identity in a global context, may influence how one perceives what Quirk would consider a lack. He claims that English is owned by those who use it in different contexts.

Additionally, Standard English and Kachru’s (1991) declaration of ownership are supported by Widdowson (1994). He points out that those who speak English in Inner Circle nations have no claim to the language. The reasons made by other Wes researchers who advocate for the pluralization of English and the inclusion of a variety of dialects in writing and instruction seem more persuasive and motivating than Quirk’s (1990) stance. Their study mostly focuses on empowering non-native variety users, shifting from exonormative to endonormative usage—where users of new Englishes set their own norms—and shifting away from reliance on native models and toward local models to introduce non-native varieties.

Including non-native variations will aid in the development of English, which is becoming more complex and richer. There are well-known dialects, such as Singaporean Standard English and Indian English, that create their own standards and have their characteristics standardized by the best dictionaries in the world. After reading this encouraging research on English pluralization, it is clear that English teachers ought to incorporate a range of context-appropriate teaching and learning strategies.

Since Afghan EFL teachers might not be familiar with the problems of error and feature, it might be a good idea for them to study these topics before attempting to include their own unique style of English into their lessons. Administrators of Senior High Schools and GES could create and carry out teacher professional development programs to accomplish this. These professional development programs might be held annually, and the current topic could be one of the instructional focuses for the year. Following training, educators might be able to integrate the code-meshing methodology into their lesson plans.

The question of "intelligibility" is the other topic of dispute when it comes to English pluralization. According to Smith (1992), intelligibility is the ability of speakers of different language kinds to comprehend one another with ease. As a result, it concerns how a given language can be understood by English speakers. The most often utilized language for wider communication worldwide at the moment is English as a Foreign Language (EL). Nonetheless, all three of Kachru's model's circles continue to use a single, standardized form of English (Matsuda, 2006). This one-dimensional perspective on EL learning ought to be replaced with a multilingual and/or pluralistic approach. Intelligence is a primary concern in the transition from a monolingual to a bilingual approach.

Larry Smith is one of the foremost authorities on the topic of intelligibility. Smith (1992) and other World Englishes and English as an International Language researchers, such as Nelson (1992), focus on intelligibility in communication between EIL and WE speakers. Smith states on page 75 of his 1992 book that "every English user must be intelligible to every other English user." In the aforementioned quotation, he made no explicit reference to speakers of any "standard" form of English. Nonetheless, he makes reference to any native or

non-native English that is intelligible to both native speakers and non-native speakers of the English language.

Smith (1992) makes the case in his article that all people who wish to express their thoughts, whether in person or in writing, should be able to understand what is being said. NSs shouldn't be the exclusive ones assessing the intelligibility of a communication, claim Smith and Nelson (1985). Being a native speaker does not mean that they should be the only ones establishing regulations because speakers of other languages may find them difficult to grasp. Similarly, Bayyurt (2018) argues that in today's world, it is essential for native and non-native English speakers to understand each other. According to his findings, research on intelligibility in Wes and EIL shows that intelligibility and native English speaker status are unrelated.

According to the body of research on intelligibility, one of the most important aspects of communication for maintaining both short-term and long-term relationships is mutual comprehension. The key to teaching English is having an appropriate pedagogy that is appropriate for the environment in which it is studied and used. The literature on writing training demonstrates that academics and intellectuals have not given this field much attention. Therefore, it may be said that educators, administrators, students, and English users may not have a basic awareness of concerns such as intelligibility and faults or features. It is also probable that most English instructors, writers, and students are not familiar with Wes-informed methods and the ideas that go along with them (e.g., Britain, America, white people, Christianity, neo-colonialism, "the west," and so on). According to most Wes academics, new English dialects are novel and should be taught in WE classes, according to the Expanding Circle framework (Barbour, 2002; Elbow, 1999; Jenkins, 2014; Kachru, 1992a; Matsuda & Matsuda, 2010; Saraceni, 2015; Widdowson, 1994). However, other scholars contend that when it comes to issues like intelligibility, new innovations or variations of the EL should be comprehensible to both NSs and NNSs (Bayyurt, 2018; Smith, 1992).

Academics greatly support mutual intelligibility both within and between settings, as well as innovations in the EL. Teachers in Ghana might not be aware of these problems. Therefore, it is recommended that Afghan EFL teachers and students be made more aware of three difficulties prior to incorporating the new English variety. They could be taught, first, what

constitutes innovation and what constitutes error. Second, workshops and seminars may also increase their understanding of the intelligibility issue. It's also critical for writers to understand who they will be writing for. Through workshops and training, they can also learn about audience recognition.

Teachers and students may be able to write differently for a variety of audiences after they have a deeper awareness of these three issues. They can employ fresh inventions or EL variants specific to their setting, for instance, if they are writing for a national audience because it will be mutually accessible and understandable. They may not have any comprehension problems because they are used to the local English dialect due to their shared surroundings.

Nonetheless, they should refrain from using their local dialect of English in their writing if they are writing for a global readership that is unfamiliar with their surroundings and may not understand it. Once they are at ease and have mastered the use of English in their writing, they may present their diversity to a global audience.

The model of negotiation

According to Lee (2014), Canagarajah proposed and promoted the Negotiation Model for teaching writing in 2002a, 2006b, 2007, and 2012. When developing their lesson plans, EL teachers are advised by Lee (2014) to consider his writing pedagogy model. Writing in multiple languages is promoted by the "Negotiation Model." Canagarajah (2006c) contends that writers should be dynamic, versatile (e.g., writing between multiple cultures and languages), agentive, and able to creatively move/shuttle between discourse in order to achieve the communicative goals, as opposed to being static, passive, and stable monolingual writers and/or situating themselves within one language.

Canagarajah (2006c) asserts that "the main variable is not language or culture, but rhetorical context/objective" (p.14) in multilingual writing. Regardless of the language they employ, writers can alter their discourse and style in response to the rhetorical context.

To support this negotiation model orientation, Canagarajah (2006c) offers the following instructional implications: (4) Textual differences should not be interpreted as errors but rather as the authors' creative, purposeful, and strategic choices to achieve their contextual/rhetorical goals; (5) writers

should be encouraged to stop emphasizing writing as the only process of text construction; writing is a rhetorical negotiation for attaining functions and social meanings. (3) Students should be made aware that texts are not written only to reveal specific perspectives or information and are not transparent and objectives. Additionally, the texts are representational. We are unable to escape our identities, values, and interests when we write. When teaching writing in Ghanaian schools, this thorough and efficient method must be taken into account.

We provide guidelines for teaching writing. In order to create composition/writing classrooms where students' expectations and needs are satisfied, where learners' sociocultural backgrounds are respected, and where heterogeneity-blended linguistics is the norm, some Wes scholars have suggested pedagogical practices as instructional materials that other teachers should take into consideration.

According to Matsuda and Matsuda (2010), in EFL environments there are more intranational (national) and international uses for English. As a result, it has become difficult to use the local model or concentrate on only one kind. Additionally, they claim that it is no longer unrealistic to take into account the problems of comprehensibility and intelligibility in instruction. In the context of the Expanding Circle, they put up five pedagogical principles for teaching English. They advise Expanding Circle English teachers to incorporate these ideas into their lesson plans.

Teach the forms and functions of the dominant language. English teachers in EFL contexts should teach students the forms and functions of the dominant language, claim Matsuda and Matsuda (2010). Likewise, in his first recommendation, Kachru (1992b) addresses sociolinguistic profile, stating that pupils should be cognizant of the following: The global context of English; its main variations, uses, and applications; the distinctions between monolingual and multilingual society; and its consequences, such as code-meshing and code-switching.

It might be suggested that in addition to teaching the dominant language forms and functions, Afghan EFL teachers should also impart pragmatics concepts. It is recommended that workshops and training be used to increase the instructors' awareness of these concepts, as they may not be familiar with

them. To learn more about these concepts, they can also read published research publications about Wes.

Teach the non-dominant language's forms and functions. Additionally, Matsuda and Matsuda (2010) advise teachers to teach the nondominant language's forms and functions in EFL contexts. The main EL varieties, both native and non-native, as well as their users and purposes, shared and non-shared characteristics across different linguistic levels, and specific interactional context-relevant information—what he refers to as variety exposer—should also be studied by students, according to Kachru. In order to learn EL language that is pertinent to their situation, teachers can encourage their pupils to look at signboards in their neighbourhood. As Canagarajah (2006b) suggests, they can either gloss the footnotes or use the language and/or terminology that arose in the context for code-meshing.

Teach kids how to negotiate in discourse. Third, according to Matsuda & Matsuda (2010), educators should impart the “principles and strategies of discourse negotiation” to their students. Similarly, in his “contrastive pragmatic,” Kachru (1992b) exhorts EFL and ESL teachers to teach the connection between local cultural codes, including the use of apologies, regrets, condolences, persuasion, politeness, and declining offers and requests, and stylistic and discursive innovations. These guidelines address the growth of students' pragmatic knowledge and negotiating abilities. First, it could be proposed that teachers at the SHS level in Ghana work to improve their pupils' ability to negotiate. For instance, students should be able to explain why they have chosen to learn a local variation of English language proficiency (EL) if it may not be applicable in situations when native English speakers or others are present. For example, they can claim to have learned it since it is applicable to their situation and that they would utilise it to succeed professionally in their own setting.

Other principles and points for teaching Wes in Outer and Expanding Circle countries either speaking or writing

Students should be taught to distinguish between what works and what doesn't. Matsuda & Matsuda advise language teachers to teach their students the distinctions between what works and what doesn't in their fourth (4) principle. Although it might not be sufficient, Ghanaian teachers may need to expose their students to a local or non-dominant form of English in order to

successfully use this strategy. In a particular communicative context, they could also instruct students on the difference between invention (diversity) and error (difference). This mostly has to do with understanding. As a result, educators and students may need to exercise extra caution when determining which innovations are appropriate and which are not.

Explain the dangers of utilizing deviational traits. Language instructors should warn students about the risks of taking advantage of deviational components, according to Matsuda and Matsuda (2010). The risks could include poorer scores, meaning impairment, and understanding difficulties. Due to their inadequate understanding of the dominant variation, students who solely learn the local dialect of English and pursue further education elsewhere may receive inferior grades. A message that is written or spoken with too much divergence will be difficult for readers from both inside and outside the context to understand. Given the information presented above, it might be suggested that educators advise pupils to avoid deviating significantly from prevailing standards.

Enhancing the procedural knowledge of students, Canagarajah (2014) suggests a paradigm change based on the concept of Wes, contending that rather than focusing on propositional knowledge (such language rules and norms), EL instructors (ELTs) should help students build procedural knowledge (like how to negotiate or what to know). He also provides strategies for EL teachers to help their students grow and improve their procedural knowledge, such as: (1) language awareness (learning how grammar works in all languages); (2) negotiation techniques (promoting language and genre reconstruction or variation based on one's own preferences and dominant norms); and (3) rhetorical sensitivity (learning the value of elements like voice, genre, and creativity in communication). He believes that experience with a language in everyday situations should build this instinctively rather than explicitly teaching it to them.

Similarly, Matsuda & Matsuda (2010) advocate for the advancement of language reconstruction and variation linked to one's own inclinations and prevailing norms (using a local variety). They contend that teachers should teach pupils both the standard and regional varieties of English. . Furthermore, a similar perspective was advocated by Kachru (1992b), who said that pupils should be familiar with both the major and regional forms of English. Kachru

(1992b) and Matsuda & Matsuda (2010) both emphasize the incorporation of personal preference or local variety. In conclusion, the recommendations put out by Wes researchers above are applicable to both standard ELT and English teachers' use of them when teaching writing in multicultural and multilingual contexts. Before adding procedural knowledge to the curriculum, it could be important to better educate Ghanaian teachers through training, seminars, and workshops.

According to fall (2000), Ghana's pronunciation of English is also very different from that of any other West African country with a similar colonial past and sociolinguistic and sociological roots. Ghanaian English is distinctive because to its restructure of (RP) ///, fe'J, post-tonic /a/ with orthographic, fel before a final /n/, the pronunciation of -able and -ative nouns, certain phrases with the Alternating Stress Rule, and a few other factors.

He contends that, for instance, /a/ and Id replaces a variety of (RP) segments and that, throughout the past 20 years, there have been discernible shifts in the direction of these two vowels. Finally, he points out that although Ghana's pronunciation differs from that of her more proximate neighbours and colonial companions, there are notable parallels in certain re-structuring patterns with both northern Nigeria and geographically more distant east and southern Africa.

Furthermore, fall contends that the lack of information on geographical variations has resulted in overgeneralization or the notion that certain qualities that transcend national or regional borders are geographically limited. Ghana offers a typical example of a national English accent in West Africa that has developed in a distinctly different way despite having a colonial past and a sociolinguistic foundation that is typically shared or comparable with other nations in the region.

At a period when researchers were still debating the legitimacy and status of Ghanaian English in relation to global English, Kofi Awoonor (1971), a well-known Ghanaian scholar who studied several elements of the English dialect used in Ghana, coined the term Ghanaian English. He contends that reflecting usages even at that time shows a great deal of innovation in the use of English in the Ghanaian society depicted in the novel. It particularly draws attention to a few lexical and syntactic elements that are creatively employed in

communication, as well as the linguistic and sociocultural ramifications for English in the nation. His claim and additional research on Ghanaian English's grammar and sound provide compelling evidence in favour of Ghanaian English's official designation.

As a result, Nii Amartey Amartey (2008) contends that the question of whether there is a dialect of English that is used that can be referred to as Ghanaian has been up for controversy for the past forty years. In order to restore the idea that Ghanaian English is distinct, he reexamines Ahulu's "How Ghanaian is Ghanaian English?" Amartey broadens his argument to encompass the generality of "New Englishes" in order to support the demand for codification for its legitimacy and legality. Additionally, he urges additional academic publications to back up Ghanaian English's acceptability and indigenization. He advises language instructors, policymakers, new English speakers, and anybody else interested in Ghanaian English to concentrate on the codification goal.

Methods

As part of a mixed-method approach, the study gathered data using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. A social topic under study can only be partially understood by a particular research methodology, such as qualitative or quantitative (Greene, 2008). People have diverse mental realities, and societies have varied realities. There isn't a single research method or tool that can help us better understand these many realities. In order to fully comprehend the study problem, mixed-method research (MMS) combines, gathers, and assesses both qualitative and quantitative data or methodologies in one or more studies or research projects (Creswell & Plano, 2011).

Instead of employing a single research method, the primary goal of this strategy is to gain a deeper understanding of a topic or study problem by integrating or mixing both research methodologies (i.e., qualitative and quantitative). Consequently, the research employed a mixed-method approach, gathering both qualitative and quantitative data through interviews and survey questionnaires. According to Creswell and Plano (2011), this kind of design incorporates certain research procedures that are selected by the researcher at the start of the project.

More precisely, an exploratory sequential design was used in the study (Creswell & Plano, 2011). “A qualitative exploration followed by a quantitative follow-up or by a quantitative analysis explained through a qualitative follow-up” is one possible starting point for this kind of study design (Creswell & Plano, 2011; p. 8). This design was chosen because the survey questionnaire had both qualitative (open-ended) and quantitative (closed-ended) items, while the interview solely had qualitative (open-ended) questions.

As a result, both qualitative and quantitative data analysis were required. To completely comprehend teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, and experiences regarding the implementation and local adaption of pluralistic approaches based on the concept of Wes to English instruction in Ghanaian schools, mixed-methods data collecting was also employed. Additionally, the data was assessed both statistically and interpretively using the mixed method.

Data collection instruments

Surveys and interviews were utilized to collect the data for this study.

Data collection process

Survey

Three parts made up the survey: questions about demographics, questions on the content, and a section about going to a follow-up interview. The survey consists of 17 questions, including three statements on a Likert scale, five yes/no statements, and nine open-ended prompts. We inquired about respondents’ demographics, their knowledge of the Wes topic, whether they had participated in seminars, trainings, or workshops on the topic, whether they believed pluralistic approaches based on the concept of Wes or regional English dialects were appropriate, and whether they used a variety of English in their ELT practices, particularly writing instruction. The types of professional development programs (PDPs) that would aid them in teaching English writing and were pertinent to Wes were also requested to be written down or listed.

Interview

The interview is the most common and efficient method for obtaining detailed information about the topic under study in qualitative research. The study employed semi-structured interviews to gain a deeper understanding of

teachers' attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, and experiences about the application and local adaptation of Wes-oriented or pluralistic approaches to teaching EL writing.

Data analysis

The interview is the most common and efficient method for obtaining detailed information about the topic under study in qualitative research. The study used semi-structured interviews to better understand teachers' attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, and experiences about the use and local adaption of Wes-oriented or pluralistic methods to teaching EL writing.

According to Cavanagh (1997), content analysis is a versatile method of textual analysis. To find sequences and/or patterns in the gathered data, qualitative content analysis (QCA) counts the categories or terms. After that, the significance of those patterns is thoroughly examined (Morgan, 1993; Sandelowski, 2000).

According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007), content analysis includes categorizing, coding, comparing, and ultimately deriving conclusions from the data.

Morgan (1993) asserts that data are "inductively" created into a number of categories in qualitative content analysis (QCA). Consequently, the current study evaluated the data using an exploratory approach. The exploratory method, also known as inductive category construction, creates new categories based on the data and/or content (Mayring, 2014). Similarly, Guest et al. (2012) pointed out that codes in exploratory design are not predefined but rather are produced from the material/data.

Therefore, rather than being predetermined, codes and categories were created using the data collected for this study. The survey's numerical data was statistically analysed using qualitative analysis information provided by Qualtrics software.

Q1: What is the attitude of Ghanaian educators toward teaching writing through pluralistic/WE-informed methods? In order to determine teachers' opinions regarding the use of pluralistic techniques and/or language variation in the teaching of English writing, the first study problem was examined utilizing survey and interview data. Seven teachers were unsure, whereas 29

of the 36 survey participants said that teaching writing in the classroom required the use of pluralistic techniques.

“Using local varieties of English in our classrooms will be very beneficial,” an instructor stated during the interview, “but there are challenges such as time constraints, the complexity of local varieties, and lack of awareness of the different varieties.” To solve those challenges, it will be beneficial to set up Professional Development Sessions (PDS).

Q2: How might regional initiatives to implement Wes-oriented writing teaching be impacted by the viewpoints of Ghanaian educators? Interview data was used to address the second research topic. The purpose of this study was to identify strategies for enhancing WE-oriented writing training’s localization. In order to further inform local adaptation efforts of pluralistic approaches based on the concept of Wes, this study topic sought input from instructors.

According to the poll results, 31 out of 36 respondents had a favourable attitude toward code-switching between the target and native languages, while the other five had a negative impression. “Using code switching and code mixing will help learners understand unfamiliar concepts with little or no difficulty,” a participant in the interview state.

Ensuring trustworthiness

Credibility (believability and/or trustworthiness) and dependability are the two most crucial factors that researchers must guarantee in qualitative, quantitative, or naturalistic research. Several research approaches employ triangulation to increase reliability, validity, and generalizability. It is said by Patton (2002) that “by combining methods, triangulation strengthens a study.” This could mean using a range of methods or data, including both qualitative and quantitative approaches (p. 247). According to Johnson (1997), using data, method, and investigator triangulation is the most efficient way to produce the different worlds that individuals conceive.

As a result, triangulation can take many different forms, including investigator triangulation (using many investigators), data triangulation (using a variety of sources), and method triangulation (using different types of data gathering methods). The current study validated its credibility and/or trustworthiness by member checks using a combination of quantitative and qualitative research

approaches. The study also employed a verification process to demonstrate reliability. Transcripts of interviews were checked by members as part of the verification process. The study was able to cross-check data from several sources and confirm the accuracy of interview transcripts by utilizing the researcher's reflection and feedback from the academic and professional network.

Findings

The results demonstrate that the teachers who participated in the study have a solid understanding of Wes. Additionally, the survey discovered that most teachers had a favourable opinion of code-switching between their home tongue and the target language. Furthermore, the study's findings showed that the majority of teachers have favourable opinions about using regional or local English dialects when teaching writing. However, they noted a number of obstacles that keep them from utilizing these kinds in the classroom, including time limits, the intricacy of local/regional variety, and their ignorance of the various varieties.

The findings suggest that in order to address the challenges and issues brought up, improve the professional self-esteem of SHS teachers, and inform them about the political and ideological nature of standardization as well as the superiority of native speakers' language, professional development programs are required. To develop a curriculum and pedagogical model that are more beneficial and effective, teachers' viewpoints, suggestions, and opinions should be taken into account.

Conclusion

The study's conclusions show that although teachers are well-versed in World Englishes and typically have favourable opinions about code-switching and the use of regional or local English dialects in writing instruction, a number of obstacles prevent their widespread adoption. Teachers are unable to properly include these variations into their teaching practices due to obstacles like time restrictions, their complexity, and a lack of awareness. These findings highlight the necessity of professional development initiatives that tackle these issues while also boosting instructors' self-esteem.

These kinds of programs ought to assist teachers in realizing that native-speaker superiority and standardization are ideological creations rather than

inherent linguistic standards. To encourage a more inclusive approach to teaching English, more useful and efficient curriculum and pedagogical models can be created by taking into account the opinions and concerns of teachers.

Recommendations

Programs must provide pre-service teachers with adequate assistance to help them become fluent in English, but they must also provide ongoing chances for teachers to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, overcome their shortcomings, and build on their strengths both during and after the program. A presentation on NNS instructors or an opportunity for students to network with other NNS teachers (e.g., through the Nonnative English Speakers in TESOL Caucus) are two ways that certain TESOL institutions in the United States address this issue. They also rework an existing course to better meet the demands of pre-service NNS teachers. Similar efforts should be made in teacher education programs outside of English-speaking nations where the majority of teachers are NNS.

The concept of World Englishes and Its consequences for English language teaching (ELT) may be obvious to TESOL specialists, but the general public—including students and their parents—may find these concepts strange, out of the ordinary, or even contentious.

To successfully implement curriculum modifications, educators and administrators must not only understand public attitudes toward English dialects and potential resistance but also take steps to ease any worries they may have. Administrators and instructors can talk about curriculum innovations and strengths at conference days, open-campus events for prospective students, or Parent-Teacher Association meetings at many schools.

These chances can be utilized to demonstrate that adding World Englishes to the current repertory and, consequently, improving the curriculum, does not imply that native English variants should be disregarded or substituted with less-than-ideal ones in English courses.

To prepare their students for using English in international contexts, Ghanaian language teachers must assist their students in learning about English speakers who use the language differently from the norms portrayed in the majority of commercial ELT resources. Cross-cultural curricula should take this into

account for learner-led research that uses online, self-access, and library resources to successfully engage students and encourage critical reflection on global Englishes.

The Ministry of Education's Ghana Education Service (GES) ought to incorporate regional/local English dialects, local cultures, pluralistic approaches, and the idea of Wes into the curriculum.

The concept of Wes and related pluralistic approaches will be covered in trainings, seminars, and workshops for teacher professional development that the Ministry of Education will design and conduct using GES.

In order to interact with the organizers of WE-related conferences, seminars, and other teacher professional development activities in other nations, the Ministry of Education should use GES. Ghanaian teachers should be sent to these programs to increase their understanding of Wes and associated disciplines.

Understanding how to employ action research in the classroom is essential for all educators. Through GES, the Ministry of Education should organize, develop, and implement teacher training programs, conferences, and seminars on Wes and related approaches to teaching English writing to working teachers.

Lastly, when choosing the appropriate teaching resources for Ghanaian schools, it's critical to take into account the pupils' backgrounds and the environment in which they will be utilizing English. Teachers can make as many changes as they like to a required textbook from the inner circle countries to better suit the needs of their pupils.

Ethical Statement

This study, which involved human subjects, was reviewed and approved by Ghana's Dambai College of Education's Ethical Research Committee. Each participant provided written informed permission prior to study participation. Additionally, the book has been proofread to increase its language clarity and accuracy.

Acknowledgement

We would like to sincerely thank Dr. Benedicta Awusi Atiku, our principal, whose tremendous advice, encouragement, patience, and support made this

study possible. We are grateful to Dr. Frank Awuah for his assistance in shaping it into its final form through his meticulous reading of the drafts. We should also express our gratitude to the instructors, students, and heads of the many schools who voluntarily agreed to participate in our interviews and questionnaires.

Conflict of Interest

Regarding the publishing of this work, the authors affirm that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authorship Contribution Statement

Wumbei: Conception of research idea, formulating research questions and drafting the manuscript. Adukpo: Research design, data collection, and analysis, formatting, citations, and compliance with ethical research standards. Gaaku: Review of relevant literature, developed the theoretical framework, editing and proofreading. Joana Emefa Adansi: responsible for editing and proof reading of the manuscript to ensure clarity, coherence, and language accuracy.

References

- Abdollahzadeh, E. and Baniasad, S. (2010). Ideologies in the Imported English Textbooks: EFL learners and Teachers' Awareness and Attitude". *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 53(217), 1 – 17.
- Amartey, N. A. (2008). In support of Ghanaian English: Probing the significance of Ahulu's *How Ghanaian is Ghanaian English?* *International Journal of Research and Scholarly Communication*, 3(4), 20–40.
- Awoonor, K. (1971). *Use of Ghanaian English in Kofi Awoonor's "This Earth, My Brother": A study in the Ghanaian varieties of English*. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Barbour, S. (2002). *Language, nationalism, and globalism: Educational consequences of changing patterns of language use* (pp. 11-18.) *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.29278485.4>

- Bayyurt, Y. (2018). Issues of intelligibility in World Englishes and EIL contexts. *World Englishes*, 37(3), 407-415. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12327>
- Birkner, V. (2014). The challenges of teaching World Englishes in different contexts: Its interface with ideology and identity 8(9), 1–19.
- Bobda, S. A. (2000). The uniqueness of Ghanaian English pronunciation in West Africa. 30(2), 20-32. <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/9659>
- Bokamba, E. G. (1988). Code-mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory: Evidence from Bantu languages. *Lingua*, 76(1), 21-62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(88\)90017-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(88)90017-4)
- Canagarajah, S. (2006a). 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, S. (2006b). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4), 586–619. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc20065061>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006c). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ce20065039>
- Cavanagh, S. (1997). Content analysis: Concepts, methods and applications. *Nurse Researcher*, 4(3), 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr1997.04.4.3.5.c5869>
- Cohen, L. Manion. L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203029053>
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge university press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139196970>
- Dendrinos, B. (1992). *The EFL textbook and ideology* (1st ed.). N. C. Grivas Publications.

- Elbow, P. (1999). Inviting the mother tongue: Beyond 'mistakes,' 'bad English,' and 'wrong English. *JAC: A Journal of Advanced Composition*, 19(2), 359–388. http://works.bepress.com/peter_elbow/12/
- El-Sayed, A. (1991). Towards an international standard of English in the Arab world: An ethno-sociolinguistic perspective. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 4(3), 5-16.
- Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. British Council. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.20.1.11gor>
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied thematic analysis*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483384436>
- Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303-321. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ce201113403>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English* (1st ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Huang, T. C. (2010). The application of translingualism to language revitalisation in Taiwan. *Asian Social Science*, 6(2), 44 – 51. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v6n2p44>
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(1), 157-181. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264515>
- Johnson, R. B. (1997). Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education*, 118(2), 282–292. <https://www.researchgate.net/.../Examining-the-Validity-Structure-of-Qualitative-Research.pdf>
- Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1982). *The other tongue*. University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1991). Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today*, 7(1), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607840000523X>
- Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1992b). *The other tongue* (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press.

- Kellman, S. G. (1996). JM Coetzee and Samuel Beckett: The Translingual Link. *Comparative literature studies*, 33(2), 161-172.
- King, K. A. (2006). *Child language acquisition: In introduction to language and linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (Multilingual Education, Vol. 1, pp. 29–44). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4578-0_3
- Lee, M. E. (2014). Shifting to the world Englishes paradigm by way of the translingual approach: Code-meshing as a necessary means of transforming composition pedagogy. *TESOL Journal*, 5(2), 312-329. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.121>
- Lowenberg, P. H. (2002). Assessing English proficiency in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 431-435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00261>
- Lu, M. Z., & Horner, B. (2016). Introduction: Translingual work. *College English*, 78(3), 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ce201627651>
- Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 483-496.
- Matsuda, A., & Matsuda, P. K. (2010). World Englishes and the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(2), 369-374. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.222222>
- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution* (pp. 1–143). Klagenfurt, Austria: Open Access Repository SSOAR. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173>
- McGroarty, M. (2010). Language and ideologies. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 3–39). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692849-003>

- McKay, S. L. (2012). Teaching materials for English as an international language. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 70–83). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847697042-007>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Morgan, D. L. (1993). Qualitative content analysis: a guide to paths not taken. *Qualitative Health Research*, 3(1), 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973239300300107>
- Nelson, C. L. (1992). Sociocultural parameters of intelligibility. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 58–73). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Prator, C. (1968). The British heresy in TESL. In J. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. DasGupta (Eds.), *Language problems in developing nations* (pp. 459–476). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329–348. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587668>
- Petzold, R. (2002). Toward a pedagogical model for ELT. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 485–491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00259>
- Quirk, R. (1990). Language varieties and standard language. *English Today*, 6(1), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400004454>
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Combining qualitative and quantitative sampling, data collection, and analysis techniques in mixed-method studies. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23(3), 246-255. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X\(200006\)23:3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200006)23:3)
- Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: A critical analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Seidlhofer, B. (2006). English as a lingua franca in the expanding circle: What it isn't. In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 40–50). Continuum.
- Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4(3), 333-342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1985.tb00423.x>
- Stevens, P. (1992). English as an international language: Directions in the 1990s. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue* (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press.
- Thresia, F. (2015a). Integrating local culture to promote character education in teaching writing. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, 4(1), 34–56. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v4i1.276>
- Thresia, F. (2015b). Integrating local culture to promote character education in teaching writing. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v4i2.303>
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Yoo, I. W. (2013). Nonnative teachers in the expanding circle and the ownership of English. *Applied linguistics*, 35(1), 82-86. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt043>
- Young, V. A. (2004). Your average nigga. *College Composition & Communication*, 55(4), 693-715. <https://doi.org/10.58680/cc20042779>