Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of English Language Education
ISSN 2325-0887
2014, Vol. 2, No. 2

Calling for English for Specific Cultures-based Coursebooks in English as an International Language Era

Mehdi Solhi Andarab

English Preparatory School, Bahcesehir University

316, Abide-i Hürriyet St. Sisli Campus, Istanbul, Turkey

Tel: 90-212-381-0736 E-mail: solhi.mehdi@gmail.com

Received: October 14, 2014 Accepted: November 4, 2014 Published: November 14, 2014

doi:10.5296/ijele.v2i2.6619 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v2i2.6619

Abstract

In recent years, the emergence of English as an International Language (EIL) has paved the way for its global speakers to use it as a means of interacting globally, and representing themselves and their cultures internationally. Although English is globally considered as an international language and as a tool to be used in cross-cultural communication with people having various first languages from different parts of the world, native-speakers' norms and cultures still dominate the language materials that are developed to be globally used. In fact, English language coursebooks insists on bombarding the ELT world with culturally-loaded native-speaker themes, such as actors in Hollywood (Coskun, 2009). Prodromou (1988) similarly underlines the issue that the majority of English language coursebooks are published by major Anglo-American publishers in Inner Circle countries and these coursebooks include cultural situations that most students will never come across, such as 'finding a flat in London' (p. 80). Considering the importance given to the growing role of EIL, the issue of linguistic norms and cultural content in language learning materials has remained one of the unresolved problems in the process of materials development. A group of scholars argues in favor of localizing the materials by using the learners' experiences and making English language coursebooks culturally responsive to their needs. The opponents solely favor the integration of the linguistic and cultural norms of the native speakers of English in language learning materials. As far as EIL is concerned, there are several aspects that need to be taken into close account when language teaching materials are being prepared to be globally used. In a nutshell, in EIL era, while preparing English language coursebooks, rather than just integrating *English of Specific Cultures*, the linguistic and cultural norms of the native speakers of English, as the sole reference in the contents of the English language coursebook, at least a due attention should be paid to *English for Specific Cultures*, the linguistifc and cultural norms of non-native speakers of English. This study recommends a group of essential features for the future English language coursebooks in EIL era.

Keywords: English as an International Language, English of Specific Cultures, English for Specific Cultures

I. Introduction

Due to the ever-increasing on-set of globalization, the way English is perceived all over the world has recently undergone a fundamental change. Today English is being studied and used more and more as an international language in which learners acquire English as an additional language of wider communication. A dramatic increase in the number of speakers of English and a shift in the cultural basis of the language are to be seen as two developments which have significantly altered the nature of English. In fact, the development of English as an International Language (EIL), according to McKay (2003b) has changed the very nature of English in terms of how it is used by its speakers and how it relates to culture. She, hence, argues that the teaching of EIL should be based on an entirely different set of assumptions than has typically informed ELT pedagogy. That is due to the fact that, in recent years, the dominance of native speakers and their culture in ELT pedagogy has been seriously challenged. Given this shift in the nature of English, it is time to recognize the multilingual context of English use and to put aside a native speaker model of research and pedagogy. Only then can an appropriate EIL pedagogy be developed in which local educators take ownership of English and the manner in which it is taught (McKay, 2003c). This novelty in the perception of English has brought about significant changes in the status of the native speaker norms within EIL context. The rise of EIL and the resultant status of English as a medium for global communication has raised new challenges to the ELT profession in the sense that some of the already dominant concepts, aims, and objectives should be reconsidered (McKay, 2002). As Modiano (2001) also points out, the new status of EIL poses major challenges to the dominating power of British and American native-speaker norms in ELT practices. Consequently, this paradigm shift from *English of Specific Cultures (EofSC)*, the native-speaker norms (mostly British and American) of English and cultural and linguistic hegemony of these native-speaker Englishes, over the non-native varieties of English has paved the way for the emergence of what Yano (2009) conceptualize as *English for Specific Cultures (EforSC)*. In fact, the call for a shift *English of Specific Cultures* to *English for Specific Cultures* accepts the language authority and norms of English-language learners and accepts English as a medium of intercultural communication (Seidlhofer, 2003).

2. Global Coursebooks and Their Cultural Load

As Sárdi (2002) clarifies, there are two widely spread and opposing views regarding the inclusion of cultural content in the materials; inseparability of language-culture and English teaching should be carried out independently of its cultural context. It is noteworthy that both views support the inclusion of cultural elements in the English language course. The second statement, as well as the first one, assumes that language cannot be separated from the larger contexts in which it is used, and that these contexts are determined, among other variables, by the cultural background of the participants. The question, then, is not whether to include cultural elements in the teaching of English. Actually, the question is which culture or cultures should receive focus and how this should be done. Victor (1999) also emphasizes that the issue of cultural content of the materials remains an unresolved issue. He questions the compatibility of the materials designed for learners in France and similarly used for teaching of English in Gabon. According to him, such materials are incompatible with

learners' needs from cognitive, linguistic, and semantic points of view. McKay (2000) also points out that culture in English language teaching materials has been subject to discussion for many years. According to her, the reason for the use of cultural content in classroom is for the assumption that it will foster learner motivation.

In light of the globalization of the English language, Nault (2006) points out that the manner in which culture is taught to English language learners needs to be rethought. According to her, change is needed in at least three areas. *Firstly*, English teaching professionals should put aside the notion that the US and Great Britain represent the sole 'target cultures' of the English language. *Secondly*, they should reconsider the goals of culture and language education to better meet their students' diverse needs. And *thirdly*, ELT professionals should do more to design and/or select teaching materials that are international and inclusive in scope. As Kizilkaya (2004) states, cultural content is a key to teach and learn a language effectively provided that problems arising from introducing culture into EFL classroom are dealt with effectively and teaching strategies and learning materials are chosen appropriately.

Some scholars, however, argue against teaching of the target language without teaching the target culture (Byram, 1986; Jiang, 2000). They believe that the learners will be exposed to an empty frame of language if we do not integrate the target culture in the learning process. However, there seem, as Sárdi (2002) points out, to be some dilemmas with considering English and its culture as inseparable. She believes that *firstly*, the use of target culture elements in the process of ELT encourages a view, which equates English with the ways it is used by native speakers. Such a view leads to the assumption that native speakers are not only representatives but also the only owners of the language (Alptekin, 1993). *Secondly*, English already represents many cultures. First language speakers live, mostly, in countries in which the dominant culture is centered on English. As an example, this is the case in Great Britain, the USA, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. But the fact that the first language of most people in these countries is English does not mean that there are no cultural differences between them. *Thirdly*, there are indications that some ELT coursebooks focusing on the target culture have an alienating effect on students who do not want to be culturally assimilated and, as a consequence, give up learning the language (Gray, 2000). On the other hand, it is not uncommon for many students to become alienated from their own social and cultural settings as they become adjusted to the value system of the Anglo-American world.

As evident, in recent years there has been a shift in cultural contents of the global coursebooks, as new coursebooks and new editions of older coursebooks include more and more references to an emergent global culture (Gray, 2002). Thus, if in the past the idea of culture in the global coursebook was linked to nation–states such as Britain and the US, more recent coursebooks have begun to integrate the culture of non-native speakers of English (Block, 2010).

3. Hegemony of English of Specific Cultures in Global Coursebooks

Ndura (2004) maintains that the contents of instructional materials significantly influence students' attitudes and behaviors towards themselves, other people and society. As Shin,

Eslami, and Chen (2012) conclude, coursebooks should incorporate learners' diverse racial and cultural backgrounds and empower them to identify various voices and perspectives. They add that, unfortunately, most texts present cultural information mainly related to tourism and surface-level culture at the factual levels. Therefore, there is a need to provide opportunities for learners to discuss profound cultural issues such as beliefs and values at a deeper level so that they have a greater capacity to gain insights into their own culture and belief in the new cultural and social setting. However, culture teaching should not become merely a simple presentation of cultural facts. ELT coursebooks and curricula should provide a lens through which learners expand their cultural awareness to include global and multicultural perspectives. As Menard-Warwick (2009) believes, the main goal of cultural teaching is to develop responsive action.

McKay (2000) observes that many teachers utilize cultural content in their classrooms. She believes that such attention is likely to motivate their students. However, as English assumes the role of an international language, the question of *which* culture to teach and *how* to teach it raises several important questions. In fact, determining the cultural basis of EIL is one of the most complex problems that arises in teaching it. In fact, the manifestations of the attitudes toward including Western culture in EIL teaching materials vary by country. Some countries focus on the local culture as the sole cultural content of the materials while other countries reject any inclusion of the Western culture. But the point worth mentioning here is that the use of the Western characters in some language teaching materials is implying that the use of English necessitates the acceptance of Western values (McKay, 2004).

Despite the fact that most EFL learners' instrumental motivation is to learn English as a tool to be used in cross-cultural communication with people having different first languages from different parts of the world, English language coursebooks insists on bombarding the ELT world with culturally-loaded native-speaker themes, such as actors in Hollywood, the history of Coca- Cola, the life of Lady Diana, and what American do on Halloween (Coskun, 2009). Prodromou (1988) similarly underlines the issue that most coursebooks include cultural situations that most students will never come across, such as 'finding a flat in London, talking to landladies in Bristol, and rowing on the river in Cambridge' (p.80).

Prodromou (1988) is also critical of the cultural contents of the coursebooks, but focuses more on what he sees as the 'alienating effects' of such materials on students, and how they can produce disengagement with learning. Echoing Prodromou, Canagarajah (1999, p. 99) has described the cultural content of North American textbooks being used in Sri Lanka as `alien and intrusive'. Garcia (2005) similarly believes that, today, coursebook design is a product of massive international marketing and is likely to incorporate elements that make the product attractive rather than focusing on sociocultural issues that promote cultural analysis and intercultural reflection. Kumaravadivelu (2003) similarly believes that textbooks, to be relevant, must be sensitive to the aims and objectives, needs and wants of learners from a particular pedagogic setting. However, because of the global spread of English, ELT has become a global industry with high economic status, and coursebook production has become one of the engines that drives the industry. It is very common, as McKay (2000, p. 9) points out, to see teacher and students coming from the same linguistic and cultural background, but

using coursebooks that draw heavily on a foreign culture, as in the case of classrooms in Thailand or in Korea where local teachers use materials written in the United States or Great Britain.

It is argued by many eminent scholars that coursebooks prepared in native speaker countries are occasionally inaccurate in presenting cultural information and images about many cultures beyond the Anglo-Saxon and European world. In sum, this is due to the fact that the English used in such coursebooks represents the American or English native speaker's linguistic norms and cultures, and apparently *English of Specific Cultures* overwhelmingly dominates the norms and cultural contents of the global coursebooks. In fact, the cultural content of these coursebooks tends to lean predominantly towards mainly American and British cultures. Hence, they have been criticized for not engaging the student's culture to any significant extent.

Some scholars (e.g. Kramsch, 1988) points out that the content of a majority of coursebooks rarely addresses social issues; instead portraying stereotypical families and cultures that are apparently homogeneous, whereas the societies in which English is used as a lingua franca are complex, multilingual, and multicultural. Generally, stereotypical representations of that culture in much instructional material worsen the problem of presentation of the target language in relation to its own culture. Hartmann and Judd (1978), for example, indicate how many American EFL materials present stereotyped portrayals of men and women (often to the detriment of the latter), through one-sided role allocation, overt stigmatization, or simple omissions. Byram (1990) also emphasizes that one of the most criticized issues of EFL material is their superficial and biased representation of reality. Ndura (2004) also points to the stereotypical presentation of the characters and consequent lack of dynamic representation of the native speakers of the target culture. In general, Britishness and Americanness seem to be the standards, and cross-cultural perspectives in communication are deemphasized or denied. Misrepresenting cultures by reinforcing popular stereotypes and constructing these cultures as monolithic, static 'Others', rather than as dynamic entities is likely to result in failure in making cultural content an effective element in language learning and teaching (Guest, 2002).

Despite the dominance of *English of Specific cultures* in the global coursebooks, in recent years there has been a growing awareness among publishers that content which is appropriate in one part of the world might not be appropriate in another. As it has been mentioned in Matsuda (2006; 2012), some coursebooks targeted specifically at EIL learners have also been published (e.g. Honna & Kirkpatrick, 2004; Honna, Kirkpatrick, and Gilbert, 2001; Shaules *et al.*, 2004; Yoneoka & Arimoto, 2000) entitled '*Intercultural English*' and '*English Across Cultures*', to mention a few. These global coursebooks claim to be in parallel with the objectives of EIL and consequently claim to be based on *English for Specific Cultures*. The need to have global coursebook based on *English for Specific Cultures* stems from the fact that English is used for a wide variety of cross-cultural communicative purposes and in developing an appropriate pedagogy, EIL educators also need to consider how English is embedded in the local context. Instead of developing pedagogy that inappropriately privileges native-speaker norms, more attention should be paid to the source culture (i.e. the learners'

culture) and international culture. This reconsideration of materials stems from the fact that Inner Circle alone can no longer provide adequate cultural content. The need for E for SC-based global coursebooks also is the result of the fact that privileging the United States and UK, in terms of both linguistic and cultural contents may not adequately prepare future EIL users who will encounter English users from other countries.

Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) argue in favor of appropriate rather than authentic pedagogy. They believe that interest in an appropriate rather than an authentic ELT pedagogy also stems from the realization that the teaching methodologies and materials developed in Europe or the United States could not be used in the way they were intended by their original authors once they reached African or Asian countries. For Kramsch and Sullivan, such a view of an appropriate pedagogy is in keeping with the political motto "think globally, act locally", which translated into a language pedagogy might be "global thinking, local teaching" (p. 200). This motto is particularly important for the teaching of EIL. Widdowson (1994) similarly suggests a pedagogy of the appropriate which revises the authentic and adapts it to local conditions.

Similarly, Matsuda (2009) discusses how teaching materials and assessment need to be reconsidered in order to serve the needs of EIL learners better. The current practices in ELT tend to privilege the United States and UK, in terms of both linguistic and cultural contents. She argues that such 'traditional' approaches may not adequately prepare future EIL users who will encounter English users from other countries (Matsuda, 2006). McKay (2003a) presents insights on how to separate EIL from a given culture: First, the cultural content of EIL materials should not be confined to native English-speaking cultures. Second, an appropriate pedagogy of EIL needs to be informed by local expectations regarding the role of the teacher and learner. Third, the strengths of bilingual teachers of English need to be recognized.

4. Recommendations for the Future Coursebooks Based on EIL

With the advent of discussions about EIL, the issue of cultural content of language learning coursebooks has recently become a contentious issue in the process of materials development. While a number of scholars argue in favor of localized materials, other groups place enormous emphasis on the authenticity of the materials and that of native speaker norms. In fact, the existing review of literature indicates the dominance of native speakers and their uses of English in the majority of the published language learning coursebooks. However, it is worth stating that the majority of scholars argue in favor of including cultural contents that can activate meta-cultural competence of the language learners rather than advocate the teaching of a variety called EIL, or any particular variety for that matter (e.g. Jenkins, 2004; Matsuda, 2006; Sharifian, 2009).

According to Matsuda (2003), in order to facilitate a better understanding of English users and uses, some changes are needed in English language coursebooks. She suggests that applied linguists and publishers will need to find ways of applying a more EIL perspective to teaching materials, including coursebooks. Jenkins (2004) similarly invites publishers to develop EIL-oriented materials. According to her, the current emphasis of materials should be

more on increasing awareness of EIL contextual factors rather than on providing classroom pronunciation courses. Jenkins (2002) draws our attention to the status of EIL and the need for readdressing the materials, citing that even if the perspective of ELF has gained acceptance, it is surprising that it has had little or no impact on language teaching or teaching materials.

Jenkins (2004) goes on to claim that ELT publishers can be seen as gatekeepers who do not consider the importance of ELF; the majority of them marginalize ELF accents in their teaching materials although such accents could be the most beneficial for learners. As for tape material, Jenkins (2000) argues that there are few recordings of speakers with different non-native accents available in published materials. Kirkpatrick (2009) also believes that teaching ELF would also see fundamental changes in ELT curricula and materials. Kirkpatrick (2009) believes that consequently regional lingua franca speakers would become commonly represented and heard in ELT materials. Modiano (1999) also predicts that teaching materials for teaching English as an international language will be available in the near future.

Tomlinson (2001), too, puts forward possible future directions in developing the materials. In his view, materials will be more international in the future, presenting English as a world language rather than as the language of a particular nation and culture. Therefore, attempts will be made to localize materials in global coursebooks. He implicitly underlines the role of English as an international language, highlighting that the majority of second language learners of English do not learn English mainly to communicate with native speakers of English. Instead, they learn it for academic and professional achievements and to communicate with other non-native speakers of English. However, major global coursebooks series are implementing a mono-cultural approach. He believes that 'soon coursebooks focusing on daily life in US or the UK will be rare' (71).

Owning to the fact that English language classroom can provide a cross-cultural learning environment for the learners, ELF speakers need to know about the cultures of the people they are likely to be communicating with. Besides, they need to be able to discuss and describe their own cultures and cultural values to other people. It is worthy pointing out that not only second language learners of English, but those who learn English as a foreign language also use English to communicate with mostly non-native speakers (Sharifian, 2010; Seidlhofer; 2001; Tomlinson, 2001). Therefore, developing the coursebooks with a perspective on EIL can pave the way for both native and non-native speakers of English to familiarize themselves with different linguistic and cultural norms that they are likely to encounter in the communications with speakers from different cultural backgrounds.

Although there is a wide range of research studies regarding the EFL coursebook analysis, there appears no particular study conducted to examine the EIL-based coursebook. In addition, although many scholars argue in favor of developing EIL-based materials, it seems only few have suggested a paradigm for the EIL-based coursebooks. The need for further investigation into ELF orientation in teaching materials (Matsuda, 2006) may well account for this. As noted earlier, McKay (2002) and Tomlinson (2001) are among the few scholars

who have attempted to note some paradigm for the future coursebooks based EIL.

Based on the body of literature, a number of suggestions can be offered for the composition of future coursebooks regarding the treatment of cultural content. These can be listed as the following:

4.1 Target Community Culture Rather Than Merely Native-Speaker Culture

While developing the language learning coursebooks, as Nault (2006) states, English educators ought to not only be more culturally and linguistically aware, but better able to design curricula with an international and multicultural focus. In addition, in a globalizing perspective, we should keep in mind to put equal value on both non-native and native speakers' cultural knowledge concerning both the target and local elements in teaching materials. Both ELT coursebooks and the ELT curriculum should provide an opportunity for learners to foster their cultural awareness by including global and multicultural perspectives (Shin, Eslami and Chen, 2012).

Using the source culture should be considered as a means of empowering the students and encouraging them practice using English to express their own culture and identity. According to McKay (2002), presenting international cultural materials could demonstrate cross-cultural pragmatics by which the bilingual users of English can demonstrate their own rules of social appropriateness, while they are also learning to understand the appropriateness of other cultures. In the domain of teaching international culture in the classroom, non-native speaker and native speaker English teachers are on a level field, and both should focus on enhancing international awareness. Therefore, while preparing forthcoming coursebook, rather than having extreme sides (source or target culture materials), various bodies of cultural information from both native and non-native speaker countries should be integrated in the forthcoming global coursebooks, thus giving due attention to 'international target culture materials' (Cortazzi and Jin, 1999).

McKay (2002) argues that the Inner Circle alone can no longer provide adequate cultural content in EIL teaching, and thus materials from the source culture (i.e. the learners' culture) and international culture must also be included in the coursebooks. In a globalizing perspective, equal value should be placed on both non-native and native speakers' cultural knowledge regarding both the target and local elements in teaching materials. Both ELT coursebooks and the ELT curriculum in general should provide a lens through which learners can expand their cultural awareness to include global, multicultural perspectives (shin, et al., 2011). As McKay (2002) notes, teachers and teaching materials should create an intercultural atmosphere in EIL classrooms so that individuals could gain insight into their own culture.

Jenkins (2007) believes that the current problem is not only the lack of non-native-oriented materials, but also the fact that ENL is almost always portrayed as the sole 'real' English, of which its speakers are the sole 'experts'. In curriculum specifications, Standard British English or American English norms are taken for granted as the only valid measures of proficiency. The advocacy of authentic materials constitutes a kind of pedagogic slogan, and teachers are supposed to help their learners cope with 'real English', which is taken to be the

English used by native speakers in their speech communities in, say, the UK or the US (Seidlhofer, 2006). However, native speaker competence may not necessarily enable individuals to be effective speakers in EIL contexts, particularly if their competence has been exclusively developed in monocultural contexts. The notion of 'language proficiency', however, may need further discussion, as the notion of 'being proficient' in EIL appears to require more than just the mastery of grammar and lexicon in EIL contexts. The 'more proficient' speakers are individuals who participate with flexibility in EIL communication and effectively clarify their cultural themes when their interlocutors need. The kind of competence that underpins the skills that are described here may best be termed *meta-cultural competence* (Sharifian, 2009).

The traditional notion of the communicative competence of the native speaker is no longer adequate as a goal to be taken for granted in EIL program. Therefore, the transition from familiar to unfamiliar schematic data should not necessarily be thought of as moving from the learner's native culture to the culture of the native speaker of English. Meta-cultural competence does not advocate teaching a variety called EIL, or any particular variety for that matter. There are multiple varieties of English that could be used effectively in international communication, but there is no one variety that is guaranteed to be the most appropriate choice in all situations (Sharifian, 2009). So, instead of solely exposing the learners to the cultural norms of native-speaker of English in the global coursebooks, while developing the coursebooks, due attention should be given to the cultural themes of the non-native speakers of English to foster the meta-cultural competence of the learners. To exemplify, rather than including cultural contents that unconsciously or consciously motivate the learners to think like native speakers to be able to achieve a native speaker competence, language learners should be exposed to varying cultural themes that are relevant to both native and non-native speakers. This knowledge can translate into the development of their 'meta cultural competence'.

4.2 Literatures in English rather than Solely English Literature

Despite the existence of a wealth of literature in Outer and Expanding Circle countries, little to none of this is refered to in the global coursebooks. In majority of coursebooks, the most attention is devoted to Inner Circle literature and language learners are being exposed to a canon of literature that encompasses works of English or American novelists, writers, and poets. *Global English, for instance,* is one of the coursebooks with heavy emphasis on Inner Circle literature. Throughout the entire series of the coursebooks, a bombardment of literary works by native-speakers of English is presented, with very few literary works from various Outer Circle authors (whose literary works have been written in English) are present. The heavy use of Inner Circle literature in the global coursebooks is in not in parallel with the main objectives of EIL-based coursebooks. Therefore, in the development of cultural contents of the coursebook, not only English or American literary works but also non-native speakers' literature should be taken into account. Instead of solely integrating English literature into the coursebooks, the future global coursebooks should also insert Outer and Expanding Circle literary works accompanied by those of Inner Circle literature into the global coursebook. Being exposed to different kinds of literary works from different corners of the world can

familiarize the learners with the ideas of different writers and can pave the way for the learners to become aware of the cultural conceptualization of the different speakers of English. In contrast to the coursebooks inundated with English literature, global coursebooks with the focus on 'literatures in English' can foster the *meta-cultural competence* of the learners by helping them take note of the cultural assumptions underlying writings from a different society and/or time and, in the meantime, help them become aware of their own cultures.

4.3 Unbiased Representation of both Native and Non-Native Speakers of English

Clarke and Clarke (1990) point to numerous instances of stereotyping in British EFL materials, maintaining that EFL materials insist on stereotypical representations of native speakers of English. Stereotypical representation of native speaker culture in much instructional material aggravates the problem of presentation of the target language in relation to its own culture. ELT coursebooks construct particular images of native speakers, mostly with highly positive characteristics, so it would not be surprising to see nonnative speakers attempting to assimilate those identities by imitating native speaker accents in their English (Sharifian, 2009). In brief, either due to stereotyped or restricted perspective of the foreign communities, the current foreign language coursebooks have not succeeded in reflecting social reality (Byram, 1990). Instead of portraying native speakers of English as ideal community who live in a utopian society, the equal emphasis should be paid on more unbiased representation of native-speakers of English. In sum, the future coursebooks should strike a balance between the fair representation of both native and non-native speakers of English.

Due to the fact that the Inner Circle norms and cultures are represented as the most ideal patters to follow in the coursebooks, the learners see the Inner Circle varieties and cultures as superior to their own cultural values and beliefs. Instead of merely empowering the Inner Circle norms and cultures in the coursebooks, equal attention should be allocated to Outer and Expanding Circle norms and cultures to trigger equal balance in presentation of the characters in the coursebooks. The coursebooks could include texts written and spoken in different varieties of English, as well as those produced by native speakers, and examinations could start rewarding effective communication and stop penalizing non-standard pronunciation and grammar which in no way impedes communication.

4.4 Cultural Liberty (Learning From Other Cultures) rather than Cultural Literacy (Learning about Other Cultures)

The world-wide spread of English has not ended up with the global acceptance of American English or British English as the norm of usage. Rather, the global spread of English has prompted the multicultural diversification of English. In EIL era, intercultural literacy is needed to improve mutual communicability among different varieties of English. At the same time, teaching awareness of language is useful in the endevour of teaching students how to become conscious of the function of language in multilingual and multicultural settings (Honna, 2008).

According to Shin, Eslami and Chen (2012), future textbooks should focus not only on cultural facts but also on deeper beliefs and values. Kumaravadivelu (2011) similarly argues in favor of 'cultural library' rather than 'cultural literacy'. According to him, in our globalized world, as far as learning cultures is concerned, more attention should be given to learning '*from* other cultures', rather than '*about* other cultures'. Learning *about* other cultures leads to *cultural literacy.* In contrast, learning *from* other cultures leads to *cultural liberty.* According to him, rather than promoting superficial cultural artifacts like 'food', 'fashion' or 'festivals' as cultural literacy in the classroom, we need to go much deeper into the contemporary realities which shape and reshape cultural identities in our world. He adds that one possible alternative is to create *critical cultural consciousness* (referred to as "Critical cultural awareness", in Holliday's term) among learners. Developing global cultural consciousness promotes not just cultural literacy but also cultural liberty, paving the way for individual's genuine cultural growth (Kumaravadivelu, 2008).

Cultural liberty appears as an imperative for the future global coursebook. Instead of solely indicating *haecceity* of a culture in the global coursebook, more attention could be allocated to *why* and *how*. In sum, the central focus could be shifted from cultural literacy towards reasons behind the cultural ideas, beliefs represented in the coursebooks. In fact, the coursebooks should not solely classify the cultural ideas of a particular country or group in the cultural content because that is likely to lead to an essentialist view of culture and can develop stereotypical perspective toward a particular cultural group.

4.5 Emphasis on Dialogues Taking Place among Non-Native Speakers of English rather than Dialogues among Native Speakers or among Native and Non-Native Speakers of English

Global coursebooks should include main characters from the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle and assign them bigger roles in chapter dialogues than the minimal roles they currently have. Some dialogues that either represent or refer to the use of English as a lingua franca in multilingual Outer Circle countries could also be added to chapters (Matsuda, 2003). Also, the presence of characters from countries other than the Inner Circle would make the inclusion of cultural topics and pictures from those countries easy.

4.6 English for Specific Cultures rather than Solely English of Specific Cultures

Strongly highlighting the linguistic and cultural norms of English in the Inner Circle countries and not on those in the Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries is less likely to prepare students to adequately use English in the future while interacting with other nonnative speakers (Matsuda, 2003; Sharifian; 2009). Exposure to different linguistic and cultural norms used in Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries other than solely those of Inner Circle countries may help students understand that the sole use of English is not limited to that used by the Inner Circle (Matsuda, 2003). EFL and ESL materials should focus on preparing learners to use English both with other non-native speakers as a lingua franca and with native speakers too. They should do so not by teaching a particular model but by exposing learners to language as used in many different types of interactions and by providing them with opportunities to interact with different types of speakers and texts (Tomlinson, 2005). Material writers could include multiple varieties of English for

audiovisual materials as well. According to Matsuda (2003), in order to facilitate a better understanding of English users and uses, some changes in the coursebooks are thus needed.

As Seidlhofer (2004) affirms, exposure to a wide range of varieties of English can facilitate the acquisition of communicative abilities. Jenkins (2000, p. 183) also talks about accommodation in interlanguage talk, where one condition for successful communication is that the listener has had prior exposure to a range of non-native accents. This is needed in order to develop "a tolerance of difference". All in all, the point is not to present all the different accents as a model; it is simply to include them in order to teach students to listen more flexibly. Jenkins goes on to say that exposure to non-native accents is even more important than exposure to native accents because learners are more likely to encounter non-native speaker of English than its native speakers (Jenkins 2003).

Consequently, rather than strictly learning and following some countries' norms and cultural ideas, English can be applied to mirror and portray cultural features of wide range of countries. It is here that the mission of EIL is fulfilled. American and British varieties are often the only varieties of English introduced in global coursebooks and consequently in the classroom, creating the impression that these are the only correct varieties. Such an impression is not only inaccurate but could have negative effects on students' comprehension of and attitudes toward other varieties of English. They add that the limited exposure to different English varieties in the classroom may lead to confusion or resistance when students are confronted with different types of English users or uses outside of classroom.

The focus in curricula, textbooks and reference materials remains largely with the norm-providing Anglo-American culture(s), sometimes featuring 'exotic optional extras' such as postcolonial literature and New Englishes as an aside, but again through a predominantly British 'lens' (Seidlhofer, 2006). International use exclusively among nonnative speakers, which is believed to be increasing as a result of the worldwide spread of English (Graddol, 1997; Smith, 1983), is represented much less often than that involving native speakers. ELT materials in non-native English-speaking countries should make an effort to help students communicate in English with both fellow non-native speakers and native speakers (Tomlinson, 2005). The Inner Circle orientation to ELT may be befitting for ESL programs targeting at preparing language learners to function in the Inner Circle, but it is insufficient for a course that teaches EIL, due to the important differences in the ways in which EIL learners use English among themselves (Smith, 1983).

References

Alptekin, C. (1993). *Target-language culture in EFL materials*. *ELT Journal*, 47, 136-143.

Block, D. (2010) Globalization and Language Teaching. In N. Coupland (eds). *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. (pp. 287-304).

Byram, M. (1990). Foreign language teaching and young people's perceptions of other Cultures. In B. Harrison (Ed.), *Culture and the Language Classroom*. London: Modern English Publications and the British Council.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999a). Interrogating the "Native Speaker Fallacy": Non-linguistic roots,

non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77–92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Clarke, J. and Clarke, M. (1990) Stereotyping in TESOL materials. In B. Harrison (Ed.), *Culture and the Language Classroom.* London: Modern English Publications and the British Council.

Cortazzi, M. and Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL Classroom. In E. Hinkel (Eds.). *Culture in Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 196-219.

Coskun, A. (2009). EIL in an Actual Lesson. *English as an International Language Journal*. Volume 5. 74-80.

Hartman, P. and E. Judd. (1978). Sexism and TESOL materials. *TESOL Quarterly*, 12(4), 383-392.

Honna, N & Kirkpatrick, A. (2004). *Intercultural English*. Tokyo: Ikubundo Press.

Honna, N., Kirkpatrick, A. and Gilbert, S. (2001). *English Across Cultures.* Tokyo, Sansusha.

Honna, N. (2008). *English as a multicultural language in Asian contexts: Issues and ideas*. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Garcia, M. (2005). International and intercultural issues in English teaching textbooks: The case of Spain. *Intercultural Education*, 16(1), 57-68.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The Future of English?* London: British Council.

Gray, J. (2000). The ELT coursebook as cultural artefact: How teachers censor and adapt. *ELT Journal*, 54(3), 274-283.

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block and D. Cameron (eds), *Globalization and language teaching*. London: Routledge.

Guest, M. (2002). A critical 'checkbook' for culture teaching and learning. *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 154-161.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 83-103.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students.* London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2004). Global intelligibility and local diversity: possibility or paradox? In R. Rubdi & M. Saraceni (eds), *English in the World: Global rules, global roles*. Bangkok: IELE Press at Assumption University.

Jennifer, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jiang, W. (2000). The Relationship between Culture and Language. *ELT Journal*, 54(4), 328-334.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2009). *Learning English and Other Languages in Multinlingual Settings: Myths and Principles*. Retrieved 10 September 2013 from libir1.ied.edu.hk/pubdata /ir/link/pub/9917.pdf

Kizilkaya, F. (2004). *Authentic Materials and Cultural Content in EFL Classrooms*. Retrieved on 2nd October 2012 from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/ Kilickaya-AutenticMaterial.html

Kramsch, C. (1988). The cultural discourse of FL textbooks. In A. J. Singerman (Eds.), *Toward a new integration of language and culture* (pp. 63-88). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Kramsch, C. and Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*. 50 (3). 199-212.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Beyond Methods: *Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural Globalization and Language Education*. New Heaven and London.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2011). *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society*. Routledge Publication.

Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese schools, *World Englishes,* 22, 483-96.

Matsuda, A. (2006). Negotiating ELT assumptions in EIL classrooms. In J. Edge (ed.) *(Re)Locating TESOL in an Age of Empire* (pp. 158-170). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Matsuda, A. (2009). Desirable But Not Necessary? The Place of World Englishes and English as an International Language in English Teacher Preparation Programs in Japan. In F. Sharifian (eds.), *English as an International Language Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues* (pp. 169-189). UK: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language*. UK: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. L. (2000). Teaching English as an international language: Implications for cultural materials in the classroom. *TESOL Journal* 9 (4), 7-11.

McKay, S. L. (2002) *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2003a). Teaching English as an international language: The Chilean context. *ELT Journal*, 57(2), 139-147.

McKay, S. L. (2003b). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.

McKay, S. L. (2004). Western Culture and the Teaching of English as an International Language. *English Teaching Forum* (pp. 10-15).

Menard-Warwick, J. (2009). Co-constructing representations of culture in ESL and EFL classrooms: Discursive faultlines in Chile and California. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 30-45.

Modiano, M. (1999). Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today*, *15*(4), 3-13.

Modiano, M. (2001). Linguistic imperialism, cultural integrity, and EIL. *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 339-346.

Nault, D. (2006). Going Global: Rethinking Culture Teaching in ELT Contexts. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(3), 314-328.

Ndura, E. (2004). ESL and cultural bias: An analysis of elementary through high school textbooks in the western United States of America. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17(2), 143-53.

Prodromou, L. (1988). English as cultural action. *ELT Journal 42(2),* 73-83.

Sárdi, C. (2002). On the Relationship between Culture and ELT. *Studies about Languages*. Volume 3, 101-107.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a Lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11 (2), 133-158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *A concept of international English and related issues: From 'real English' to 'realistic English'*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/seidlhoferen.pdf

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24. 209-39.

Seidlhofer, B. (2006). Lingua Franca English in Europe. In A. Kirkpatrick (eds,), Handbook of World Englishes.

Sharifian, F. (2009). English as an International Language: An Overview. In Sharifian, F. (Ed.). *English as an international language*. (pp. 1-18). Multilingual Matters.

Sharifian , F. (2010). Glocalization of English in World Englishes: An Emerging Variety among Persian Speakers of Englis. In M. Saxena and T. Omoniyi (eds). *Contending with Globalization in World Englishes*. Multilingual Matters . (pp. 137-158).

Shaules, J., Tsujioka, H. and Iida, M. (2004) *Identity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shin, J., Eslamia, Z. R., and Chen, W. (2012). Presentation of local and international culture in current international English-language teaching textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 24 (3), 253-268.

Smith, L. E. (1983). English as an international language: No room for linguistic chauvinism. In L. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp.7-11). Oxford: Pergamon.

Tomlinson, B. (2001). Humanising the Coursebook. Retrieved on 2nd August 2012 from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/sep01/mart1.htm

Tomlinson, B. (2005). The future for ELT materials in Asia. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 2, 5-13.

Victor, M. (1999). Learning English in Gabon: The question of cultural content. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 12(1), 23-30.

Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly 28* (2), pp. 377-88.

Yano, Y. (2009). The Future of English: Beyond the Kachruvian Three Circle Model? In Murata, K & Jenkins, J. (E.d). *Global Englishes in Asian Contexts Current and Future Debates* (pp. 208-223). Palgrave Macmillan.

Yoneoka, J. and Arimoto, J. (2000). *Englishes of the World.* Tokyo: Sanshusha.

Copyright Disclaimer