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ABSTRACT

TEACHERS’ BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF CULTURAL CONTENT IN THE ELT CLASSROOM: A MULTIFACETED ANALYSIS THROUGH THE EIL LENS

KAÇA, ENGİN

M.A., Department of English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Scott H. BOYD
January 2015, 150 pages

The use of English as an international language (EIL) has profound implications for the representation of culture in English language teaching (ELT). The dominant representations of Anglo-American cultures in the classroom fail to serve the various needs of learners resulting from the globally diverse contexts where English is used to fulfill an array of functions. This brings about the need to include local and international perspectives of culture in teaching in order to promote a sphere of interculturality (Kramsch, 1993). Using this argument as its foundation and deriving from an EIL viewpoint, the aim of this study was to examine teacher beliefs and practices regarding cultural content in the ELT classroom in an Intensive English Program (IEP) at an institution of higher education located in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). To this end, first a questionnaire was implemented to
explore the teacher beliefs of culture teaching. The results of the questionnaire aided the researcher to select four participants to observe during their teaching hours, which was necessary to find out their actual classroom practices of handling cultural content. Stimulated recall method was used in the post-observation interviews to explore the teacher motive and rationale when they refer to a specific cultural element. Finally, general in-depth interviews were conducted with a number of teachers from the same context. The findings of the study reveal the extent to which teachers’ beliefs and practices about the use of cultural content in the ELT classroom correspond to EIL assertions regarding the use of cultural content in the classroom. The study also shows whether teachers’ stated beliefs and their actual classroom behavior match. The study provides a direction for the promotion of EIL principles among ELT professionals. This would in turn contribute to the preparation of language learners for international communication.
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ÖZ

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DERSLERİN KÜLTÜREL İÇERİĞİ İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞ VE UYGULAMALARI: ULUSLARARASI BİR DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE PERSPEKTİFİNDEN ÇOK YÖNLÜ BİR İNCELEME

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Bölümü

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Scott BOYD
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Son olarak bir grup okutman ile yarı-yapilandırılmış genel mülakatlar yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar, okutmanların görüş ve uygulamalarının İngilizce’nin uluslararası konumu ile ne derece tutarlı olduğunu göstermekle birlikte, fikir ve tutumlarının sınıf içi uygulamaları ile ne kadar örtüşüğünü de ortaya koymustur. Çalışma, öğretmenlerin çokkültürlülüğünü ne derece desteklediklerini ortaya çıkararak, öğrencileri uluslararası iletişime hazırlamaya katkıda bulunacaktır.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Although it is impossible to provide a precise figure of the number of speakers of English, it is thought to be around two billion people in more than 100 countries, where it is spoken as a native, second, or a foreign language (Crystal, 2008). This can be viewed as a natural consequence of several interrelated factors (e.g. political, military, economic, technological, cultural, among others) that has given rise to the current international status of the English language. While some researchers attribute its rise into prominence to neutral historical processes and the chance factor (Wardhaugh, 1987), others believe it is the result of a purposeful set of actions with a political agenda, with grim consequences for the speakers of other languages (Phillipson, 2008). No matter what the underlying reasons are, it is impossible to deny the international status of English, which is the most widely spoken language to serve a wide-ranging list of purposes. Today, English is the “lingua franca,” “the international language,” “the global language” or “the world language” used for trade, business, sports, politics, entertainment, tourism, education and for both international and intranational communication (Crystal, 2003; Graddol, 2006; McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008).

The international status of English has had inevitable consequences for the demographics of its base of speakers. The previous statistical dominance of native speakers (NSs) has been replaced by non-native speakers (NNSs) by a ratio of one to three, which means that a major portion of the use of English occurs between NNSs (Crystal, 2008). In other words, most English conversations or correspondences
taking place over the globe right now do not necessarily include a NS. This has certain implications on the learning and teaching of English as a foreign language. Today, the longstanding privileged linguistic and cultural representations of the US and UK, and their use as a yardstick in English language teaching (ELT) do not satisfy learners’ future needs in a world where English is spoken among interlocutors from increasingly diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds for multifarious purposes (Baker, 2009; McKay & Bokhorst-Eng, 2008; Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011). This perspective has resulted in the formation of a new standpoint in ELT: English as an International Language (EIL). This standpoint envisages dramatic changes of principle in several areas of ELT, one of which provides the critical lens adopted for the undertaking of this study: the cultural content and its treatment by the teachers in the classroom.

The cultural dimension of language teaching bears utmost significance due to the complex relationship between culture and language. Culture controls the way human beings conceptualize their world, and these conceptualizations are naturally reflected in communication. The participants of a conversation embedded in a certain social situation bring along their own sets of meanings, and these are exchanged during the interaction (Halliday & Hasan, 1989). These sets of meanings or conceptualizations that individuals own, as well as the context provided by the social situation are two major factors that determine the success of communication. Therefore, it is required for the individuals to have the right set of cultural knowledge, skills and attitudes to use in cross-cultural contact situations (Byram & Kramsch, 2008).
Although it is easy to suggest that culture is indispensable to language teaching, the means to handle the cultural dimension of language teaching is not a universally agreed upon notion. The traditional approach to language teaching suggests that mutual intelligibility can only be maintained if the speakers from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds stick to the cultural and linguistic norms of “standard English,” which is traditionally associated with the English spoken by a small portion of the population in the US and/or the UK (Sinclair, 1987; Quirk, 1995; Kuo, 2007). The EIL perspective, on the other hand, presents a critical and innovative attitude regarding culture and its treatment in the classroom. It advocates that depending on their needs, learners may not necessarily need to attain a thorough knowledge of Anglo-American cultural notions, or conform to the norms of behavior that is associated with it (Alptekin, 1993; McKay, 2003a). The main argument behind this contention, as discussed above, is that the multicultural context within which English is spoken today rules out a strong association between the English language and the Anglo-American culture (Baker, 2009). Instead, EIL calls for an emphasized role for local and international culture in the classroom, as well as the necessary skills and attitudes for successful intercultural communication.

Guided by this critical attitude provided by the EIL perspective, this investigation examines whether these native-speakerist tendencies are influential on the culture-teaching beliefs and practices of a group of teachers in a Turkish university context. The detailed analysis of teachers’ perceptions and their treatment of cultural content in the classroom also yielded interesting results which were originally outside the scope of this study.
1.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the beliefs of a group of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in a Turkish university context regarding the importance they attach to teaching culture, their objectives of culture, the content matter and the source of culture they deem appropriate to be used in the classroom. The study also examined the actual classroom practices of teachers regarding their handling of the cultural content of the textbook, the criteria they use in their treatment of cultural content, how and for what purposes they use cultural content and finally the content and source of cultural content they use in the classroom. The level of correspondence between the beliefs of the teachers and their practices in terms of the aforementioned categories was also discussed. Moreover, the researcher also aimed to determine to what extent these beliefs and practices were congruent with EIL principles.

1.2 Significance of the Study

Empirical research on English teachers’ views of culture and its teaching is not very extensive. It is important to note that although a number of studies have been conducted to reveal teachers’ perceptions of culture both in international contexts (Ryan, 1995; Lessard-Clouston, 1996; Stapleton, 2000; Sercu, 2005; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Young & Sachdev, 2011), and in the Turkish context (Önal, 2005; Bayyurt, 2006; Gönen & Sağlam, 2012; Karabinar & Güler, 2012), none has attempted to reveal how harmonious teachers’ perceptions were with the EIL perspective regarding culture. In other words, these investigations did not necessarily focus on revealing the source of culture teachers found appropriate to
teach and include in their instruction and teaching materials. Moreover, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this study is the first that has additionally looked at teachers’ classroom practices of handling cultural content in 20 years after Ryan’s (1995) study, which also made use of actual observations in the classroom.

Considering the interwoven relationship between culture and language, the extensive overview of the teachers’ beliefs and practices of teaching culture presented by this study may provide valuable insight for the promotion of EIL principles among English language teachers. This, however, is only possible when the stakeholders and teacher trainers are themselves informed about such principles so that these views can be incorporated in pre-service and in-service teacher training programs. Furthermore, the findings of this study may prove useful for curriculum developers, syllabus designers, material designers and test developers for the better representation, incorporation and teaching of culture in language teaching programs by informing them of the different ways and uses teachers use culture for, their strengths and weaknesses and their treatment of the cultural content of the textbooks.

1.3 Research Questions

This study addresses the following questions:

1. What are the beliefs of NNESTs at METU NCC SFL regarding
   a. the importance of culture in teaching?
   b. the objectives of culture teaching?
   c. the content (subject-matter) of culture teaching?
   d. the source of cultural content in the classroom?
2. What are the actual classroom practices of NNESTs at METU NCC SFL regarding
   a. their handling of the cultural content of the textbook?
   b. the criteria in their use of cultural content?
   c. how and for what purposes they use cultural content?
   d. the content (subject-matter) of culture?
   e. the source of cultural content in the classroom?
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will first give an overview of the EIL framework, which provides the critical perspective adopted by this study. Next, as the study aims to explore teachers’ beliefs of culture in the classroom, a discussion of the link between culture and language will be presented. After providing the EIL perspective’s look at the cultural dimension of language teaching, the last section will review the studies on teacher beliefs of culture teaching culture in ELT.

2.1 The EIL Framework

English as an international language is a new orientation in English language teaching, which results from the growing acceptance of the international status of English, through its use within and across Kachruvian concentric circles\(^1\) for intra-national as well as international communication. This new orientation has paved the way for a paradigm shift in ELT by rejecting the long-standing notion that native speaker models should inform ELT pedagogy and research. Such a notion, according to Jenkins (2009), feeds monolingualism by positioning Anglo-American norms of English usage as a reference point, disregarding proficient speakers in Outer and Expanding circles. Relying on McKay’s (2002) assertion that “the teaching and learning of an international language must be based on an entirely different set of

---

\(^1\) Kachruvian circles refer to the three circle model of English developed by Braj Kachru (1986). These are the Inner Circle, in which English is the mother tongue (the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand), the Outer Circle, where English is a second language (India, Kenya, Ghana, and Singapore), and the Expanding Circle, where English is a foreign language (Russia, China, Turkey and the rest of the world).
assumptions than the teaching and learning of any other second and foreign language” (p. 1), EIL presents a critical overview of traditional practices and norms in ELT and proposes an alternative pedagogy, which has implications for several domains of ELT including instruction, testing, curriculum and material development as well as teacher education.

The aim of this section is to provide an overview of the concept of EIL. First, the historical and present day factors that make English an international language will be discussed. The second part will elaborate on the EIL perspective and its implications for ELT.

2.1.1 The Features of an International Language

It is very difficult to make a highly accurate estimate of the number of English speakers in the globe due to a lack of systematic research on the issue; however, it is thought to be in the region of two billion people, who use the language in varying degrees of proficiency levels to fulfill a wide range of different purposes (Crystal, 2008). However, it is not the sheer number of users by itself that makes English an international language. Such a claim would require the acceptance of Mandarin Chinese or Spanish as international languages with their staggering numbers of native speakers. Therefore, what makes English an international language if not the numbers?

One of the most essential qualities of an international language is that it must mainly spread via what Brutt-Griffler (2002) calls “macroacquisition;” that is, the spread of the language in question must depend on mass acquisition by already-established speech communities, but not on speaker migration. Although the early
spread of English was obviously driven by speaker migration and eventually gave birth to mostly monolingual societies like Australia, the U.S. or New Zealand (McKay 2003a), the present day spread of English is fuelled by large numbers of individuals who learn English as a foreign language for international communication.

Another factor that has “no” role in the making of an international language, according to Crystal (2008), is the number of countries in which a language is spoken as a mother-tongue by a majority. Spanish leads all the other languages in this respect, however, we can hardly call Spanish an international or a “global” language as Crystal himself puts it. As stated before, a language needs to be spread by macroacquisition in already existing speech communities, and according to Crystal (2008), this happens only when a country decides to give a second language “a special place” in their community. This special place may come due to various underlying reasons including historical bonds, political pragmatism, as well as the need or desire for cultural, commercial and technological interaction. Thanks to one reason or another, English seems to have gained that “special place” in more than 100 countries where it is taught as the main foreign language. Today, English is a language spoken “at the check-in desks and in the corridors and departure lounges of some of the world’s busiest airports, typically during multi-national business encounters, periodically during the Olympics or World Cup Football seasons, international trade fairs, academic conferences, and so on” (Rajagopalan, 2004, p. 112).
2.1.2 The Spread of English and the Three Concentric Circles Model

The current international state of English is obviously a result of a very successful dissemination process. This spread was conveniently described by Kachru (1986) in the “three concentric circles” model, which refer to the different functions English takes on throughout the globe. In this model, the inner circle includes countries such as USA, UK, Australia or Canada where English is spoken as a mother tongue. The outer circle is where English is spoken as a second language as a result of a British colonial history. Some examples in this category are India, Malaysia, Ghana or Singapore. The last circle is the expanding circle, which includes countries that have no colonial background, but where English is taught as a foreign language. Brumfit (1985) states that the spread of English results from two spans of domination: British imperialism and colonialism that started in the 17th century and lasted until the end of WWII, and the post-WWII era of US political, economic, technological and cultural hegemony. One can easily infer that the former has led to the formation of Kachru’s inner and outer circles, while the US dominant period mainly accounts for the spread of English in the expanding circle.

The British imperial and colonial past is chronologically the first reason behind the global spread of English. The beginning of this gigantic-scale spread dates back to the arrival of English in Britain from Northern Europe in the fifth century. Soon, the language started to increase its reach around today’s England as well as in parts of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland (Crystal, 2003). In these areas, English was first a contact language, but towards the end of the twelfth century, it had maintained its dominance in the formerly Gaelic and Celtic-speaking areas (Graddol, Leith &
Swann, 1996). Although the political climate of the British Isles showed considerable change from that point on, English language had irreversibly got on the path to become the dominant language of the region.

The actual transformation of English from local dominance to a global language started approximately towards the end of the sixteenth century with the pioneering voyages to Americas and South Pacific (Crystal, 2003). In fact, it is estimated that between the end of Elizabeth I’s reign (1605) and the start of Elizabeth II’s (1952), the number of mother-tongue English speakers rose from 5-7 million to around 250 million (Graddol, 1996). Almost 80% of these speakers lived outside the British Isles, which is undoubtedly an outcome of the colonial expansion of England.

The settlement colonies that were gradually set up in these areas attracted large numbers of native-speaking English immigrants, who in time replaced the original precolonial population (Graddol et al., 1996). These colonial formations eventually led to the foundation of several sovereign states that adopted English as an official language. These states, namely Canada, United States, Australia, New Zealand and of course Britain make up the inner circle in Kachru’s model (1986).

The British economic and political ventures were not limited to these areas, however. The formation of the British East India Company and the establishment of the first trading post in the Indian sub-continent in 1612 started a process that would conclude with a period of British sovereignty, which would last almost 200 years. The introduction of English as a medium of communication in the educational system and especially the newly-established universities in important cities guaranteed the future existence of the language even after the independence of the
country in 1947 (Kirkpatrick, 2007). In the 19th century, the colonial expansion continued in Africa, mainly in the west and south regions of the continent, and South Pacific, making English a truly global and international language spoken on every continent (Crystal, 2003). It must be noted, however, the colonial expansion in this category was different in nature. In Africa, Asia and South Pacific, the native speakers of English (the British), did not replace the original local population and lived in these areas for economic reasons, and mostly temporarily (Graddol et al., 1996). This resulted in the adoption of English as an official or semi-official second language by these nations after they gained independence in the mid-twentieth century. In Kachru’s model these countries such as Nigeria, India, Cameroon, Singapore or Malaysia, form the outer circle.

The colonial history of England by itself fails to explain the staggering numbers of people who speak the language today as a first, second or foreign language around the globe. The emergence of the U.S.A. from WWII as a global superpower is undoubtedly the most significant factor that propelled the growth of English in the twentieth century and onwards. The American political and cultural influence driven by military and economic motives ensured the maintenance of English as the leading international language. The rising influence of U.S. in fields such as media, education, communications, military and civilian technology, all of which are backed by a massive political and economic power, has not only helped retain the maintenance of English as a global lingua franca, it also progressively increased the language’s zone of influence (Barber, Beal & Shaw, 2009). The expanding circle in Kachru’s model includes the nations which are left in this zone of influence. Although the nations in this circle neither have a colonial history as those
of the inner and the outer circles, nor have they given the language any level of official status, they have accepted the status of English as an international language and promoted the learning of it to the assumed benefit of the nation. Such countries include Turkey, Japan, Russia and China.

Kachru himself (1992) states that, “these circles represent the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition, and the functional allocation of English in diverse cultural context” (p. 356). This model has long been considered a convenient tool in conceptualizing the historical and socio-political expansion of English.

2.1.3 EIL and its implications for English language teaching

As stated earlier, EIL encapsulates a new perspective in English language teaching and learning, which has been proposed as a natural response to the ever-more international status of English. English is used in increasingly different contexts and purposes for both international and intra-national communication by people from almost all the countries in the world. This gave birth to the EIL orientation and its critical attitude towards the outdated native-speakerist views in ELT.

The primary rationale for such a critical perspective is the dramatic change the role of English has seen since the last quarter of the 20th century. While previously there were more native speakers (NSs) of English than non-native speakers (NNSs), and therefore most of the interaction in English took place between NSs - NSs or NSs - NNSs, the statistics today reveal that for each NS, there are three to four NNSs (Crystal, 2008), and the main bulk of the interaction in English over the globe happens among NNSs. Therefore it could be argued that English belongs to
everyone who speaks it (Widdowson, 1994). Along the same lines, both Rajagopalan (2004) and Graddol (2006) acknowledge the increasingly diverse cultural background of interactions occurring in English, and contend that the focus on inner-circle cultural norms and elements fails to meet the needs of language learners. This increasing variety in the nature of interactions and the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the interlocutors is further illustrated by Matsuda and Friedrich (2011):

If a Chilean, an Indian, and an American attended a business meeting in Hong Kong, each participant might use a variety of English that they were most fluent in—for example, Chilean English, Indian English, and American English respectively. They are also likely to employ various strategies to negotiate linguistic and other differences to make themselves mutually intelligible and to communicate effectively. While a new international variety of English may develop in a particular, stable international community, there is no one variety that is or can be used successfully in all situations of international communication. (p. 333)

Therefore, the traditional methods and approaches that directly associate the English language with the inner circle countries, especially UK and US, are no longer justifiable, and they cannot meet the needs of learners whose future interlocutors will be coming from increasingly diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Baker, 2009; Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011). This necessitates the development of an understanding in ELT that welcomes variety, and that does not regard English as the property of a certain speech community. Along with the pursuit
of this goal, there have been several different issues discussed within the scope of EIL. These include the ownership of English, the status of non-native speakers, the issue of standards and norms of the language, linguistic variation and consideration for different identities and cultures.

2.1.4 The ownership of English

As early as 1976, Smith, in his attempt to define the features of an international language, made the assertion that the ownership of an international language has to become denationalized. In tandem with Smith, Widdowson (1994) proposed that although NSs of English find great pride in the fact that English is an international language, “it is only international to the extent that it is not their language” (p. 385). Widdowson (1994) points to the use of English in varied contexts where interlocutors bring their own sets of socio-pragmatics, lexical, syntactic and phonological differences and communication strategies, all of which might dramatically differ from native-speaker norms, but do not necessarily hamper communication goals.

The ownership of the language is closely linked to the issue of norms and standards of English and the right to make decisions in this matter. Today, millions of people around the globe - depending on the reader’s perspective - bend, break, modify, enrich or ruin English linguistic norms and standards to address their own needs. For Widdowson (1994), this is only natural for an international language which is used to fulfill different communication purposes. Particularly with the substantial increase in the number of bilingual speakers in the outer and the expanding circles, some researchers assert that it is no longer in NSs’ prerogative to
“own” the language and make decisions regarding correct and appropriate usage of the language, and the notion that English belongs to those who speak it regardless of their speaker status has been more and more accepted (Jenkins, 2000; McKay, 2002, Rajagopalan, 2004).

2.1.5 Problematizing Native Speaker Models in ELT and SLA

The issue of standards and norms is a vital factor in ELT as it determines the content, orientation and goals of almost every aspect of the field including approaches, methods, techniques, curriculum development, instructional design, teacher training and hiring practices. Traditional assumptions concerning the teaching and learning of English have been constructed upon a speaker migration context where immigrants to inner circle English-speaking countries aimed to replace their first language with English in order to communicate with NSs (McKay, 2003a). However, today, the international status of English brings about its use as an additional language for intercultural communication. In tandem with this fact, the current linguistic variety and multitude of contexts in which English is used justify the rejection of native speaker norms (Standard American/British English). There are other valid reasons why a native-speaker model is not ideal for all second language learners around the globe.

The assumption that the goal of English language learners is to reach native speaker proficiency is rejected by the EIL perspective. Such a view not only sets a highly unrealistic goal for learners, but also creates a power imbalance in communication by favoring NSs over NNSs, and setting them as language models and the absolute source of knowledge regarding correct use of language (Selvi &
Yazan, 2013). Besides, such native-speakerist tendencies disregard the fact that English is learnt by bilingual speakers alongside one or more other languages, which renders their use of the language quite different to monolingual speakers (McKay, 2003a). Bilingual speakers outside inner circle countries use English to fulfil different purposes and may never need native-like competence of the language. Given the current statistics of English usage in the globe, a learner may not aspire or need to use English to communicate specifically with native-speakers of English. Due to the international status of the language, learners should not have to stick to native-speaker norms unless they are learning English to live, do business, or get education in an inner circle country, where native speakers of English constitute the majority of the population.

Jenkins (2000) writes, “there is really no justification for doggedly persisting in referring to an item as ‘an error’ if the vast majority of the world’s L2 English speakers produce and understand it” (p. 160). Instead, the native-speakers should redefine their understanding of “correct and appropriate language,” considering the international status and diverse uses of English. Such views aired by EIL proponents also require a re-investigation of second language acquisition (SLA) research, which uses native-speaker competence as a yardstick, and consistently compares the second language learners with the native speaker in their achievement or failure (Bley-Vroman, 1983). McKay (2003a) contends that much of SLA theory is built on research that was carried out in the United States, with participants who were learning English there. However, the vast majority of English learners reside outside these inner circle countries today, and therefore these SLA theories and their assumptions cannot hold valid insight for such learners. The uses of English these
learners aim to excel at might be, and probably are, totally different from those who learn English to adapt to a country where English is spoken as a first language. As a matter of fact, the language-learning goals of those who learn English as a subsidiary language are considerably more limited than those who learn the language as a replacement to their first language in order to be able to function in every aspect of daily life in an inner circle country. The increasing number of such learners according to McKay (2003a) brings about the need for more research necessary for the design of a suitable pedagogy for these learners.

What EIL proposes as a replacement for traditional views of ELT, which takes the native speaker as a reference point and as arbiter of correct form, is a pluralistic perspective, one that offers different standards for different contexts of use instead of a monolithic view of standard English (McKay, 2012). This entails defining standards of English locally to suit the needs of the learners, and the contexts they will use the language in. Such an attempt necessitates a detailed examination of different learner groups’ specific uses of English to establish different learning goals for different learner groups. Adopting such a perspective does not require discarding norms and standards altogether, but gaining an understanding that these notions are changeable (H. Sewell, 2013). In other words, EIL defines proficiency not as the ability to perfect one single variety’s linguistic features, but as the ability “to move between contexts and communities” (Canagajarah 2007, p. 9), which will inevitably require making use of language features that do not fit in native-speaker standards and norms.
2.1.6 EIL and World Englishes

World Englishes are “regionally distinct varieties of English that have arisen in areas of Asia, Africa, and Oceania, where there is a long (often colonial) history of English being widely used in education, commerce, and government” (Celce-Murcia, 2014, p.64). Examples of World Englishes include Indian English, West African English, Filipino English and Singapore English. These varieties only add to the multiple lexical, syntactic and phonological differences that already exist among inner circle varieties, like American, British or Australian English. It is also important to note that the speakers of English with what we call the standard American or the British accent within US and UK are outnumbered by the speakers of regional and social varieties within the mentioned countries. On top of that, there are certain “ways” or accents of speaking English such as Chinese, Russian or Turkish English, which could not be called a distinct variety, but nonetheless have regularly occurring linguistic features (Kirkpatrick, 2007).

Such diversity regarding different norms and standards of English used around the globe is another valid reason why learners should not be forced to conform to NS norms and standards. This linguistic scene requires a fundamental perspective shift in ELT, which traditionally assumed that communication with NSs was the main learning goal for learners of English (Seidlhofer, 2005). Although it is neither practical nor possible to adopt multiple varieties for instructional purposes, EIL curricula may still include examples to familiarize the learners with some of these varieties for the fact that the spread of English will guarantee the development of new varieties over the globe as it has done in the last three hundred years.
(Kirkpatrick, 2007). In other words, the varieties are here to stay and even newer ones will appear as long as English retains its global status. Therefore, learners need to develop strategies to be able to maintain successful communication across different varieties. To this end, a syllabus should be supplemented with examples from different contexts of communication where distinct varieties of English are used. This will also improve learners’ receptive skills in processing these (Celce-Murcia, 2014).

However, the practicality of presenting learners with a sufficient amount of samples from dozens of distinct varieties is questionable. To what extent and whose English should be included in an EIL oriented teaching curriculum? McKay (2002) proposes that decisions in this respect should be left to local educators who are in the best position to determine the specific language learning needs of their learners. These educators are – theoretically – valid users of whatever variety is being spoken at a local context and thus, can act as learning models (Canagarajah, 2005).

2.1.7 EIL and Non-Native English-speaking Teachers

The spread of English has created a global demand for language teachers, which has primarily been satisfied from among those whose mother-tongue is not English. In fact, an overwhelming majority of English teachers today are thought to be NNSs (Graddol, 2006). However, it is clear that this superiority in numbers is not anyhow reflected on the actual professional legitimacy and status of NNESTs due to the persistence of NSist tendencies as in most aspects of ELT (Llurda, 2009). These views assert that NESTs, with their native pronunciation and linguistic intuition, are better than NNESTs and they present a better language model (McKay, 2003a). This
notion, known as NS fallacy (Phillipson, 1992), has had negative consequences for NNESTs including the hiring discrimination they face, undue stress to “lose” their accents, as well as insecurity regarding their linguistic competence and teaching abilities (Ali, 2009; Llurda, 2009; McKay, 2003a; Phan, 2008). These professional anxieties of NNESTs are further aggravated by the perceptions of students who mostly favor NESTs in the classroom (Benke & Medgyes, 2005).

The EIL perspective also carries important implications for the NNESTs. The same points made previously concerning the rejection of NS models apply in this respect as well. With the international status of English, teachers, just like the learners of the language, do not need to have native-like intuition or pronunciation as they use and teach English for uses that are different from and probably more limited than NSs of the language (McKay, 2003c). Moreover, it is unreasonable to suggest that being able to speak a certain variety of English (Standard American or British English) brings pedagogical competence necessary to teach a language (Mckay 2003a). Starting with Medgyes (1992), there has been an influx of research that has informed the EIL perspective regarding the perceptions, challenges and strengths of NNESTs. The pioneering work of Medgyes (1992) contended that NNESTs had the following advantages over NESTs:

a. Only non-NESTs can serve as imitable models of the successful learner of English;

b. Non-NESTs can teach learning strategies more effectively;

c. Non-NESTs can provide learners with more information about the English language;
d. Non-NESTs are more able to anticipate language difficulties;

e. Non-NESTs can be more empathetic to the needs and problems of their learners;

f. Only non-NESTs can benefit from sharing the learners’ mother tongue (p.7).

These assertions have been validated by subsequent research (Braine, 2010) and other evidence that NNESTs should not be considered “second-class citizens” of the ELT universe exists. NNESTs, having had the language learning experience themselves, are familiar with the problems faced in the process such as the widely faced issue of negative transfer from the first language (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). They are also thought to be better informed regarding psychological aspects of teaching and student needs and backgrounds which eventually leads to better relationships with students (Inbar-Lourie, 2001). Another asset of the NNESTs is the shared linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds with students (Ellis, 2002).

2.1.8 EIL and Languages other than English

Phillipson (1992) argues that the current spread of English is not the result of a neutral or an accidental process, but a carefully planned scheme by English-speaking countries, especially the US and the UK to retain global dominance by promoting the use of English for economic, academic and political interests. He aptly calls this view “linguistic imperialism,” and argues that it brings along linguicism as well as cultural and linguistic hegemony. This inevitably has consequences for other languages. Phillipson (2008) describes the aggressive spread of English using terms with very strong connotations such as “killer language,” “language genocide,” “lingua frankensteinia” or ‘lingua tyrannosaura” (p. 251). He argues that English has
been instrumental in the elimination of linguistic diversity in many places such as British isles (Gaelic and Welsh) or North America (Inuit and Indian). He further asserts that Euro languages, along with others around the globe, are the current victims of English. Phillipson contends that, under the pretense of internationalism, European Union promotes English at the expense of other languages, and according to him this is very dangerous as the “elimination of languages from certain domains is traumatic and can threaten social cohesion” (2008, p. 252).

The EIL perspective, for the reasons Phillipson laid out, considers it vital to give full recognition to the other languages spoken by English speakers. Traditional ELT pedagogy has long seen the first languages of learners as an obstacle rather than a resource, and thus adopted an “English-only” discourse (McKay, 2012). However, the linguistic repertoire of bilingual (and plurilingual) speakers can be used to project cultural identity and signal solidarity with an interlocutor (Jenkins, 2012). To this end, code-switching should not be stigmatized and could even be encouraged to provide equal status for both (or all) the languages a learner speaks (McKay, 2012). Other benefits of code-switching in the classroom include developing teamwork abilities, providing a convenient and a natural way of communication between the students and the teacher, being able to address immediate needs of the learners without wasting precious classroom time and most importantly utilizing the first language and its vocabulary, grammar, usage or culture to enable the comprehension of the very same items in the second language (Forman, 2010).
2.2 Culture and Language

This section will elaborate on what sense the term “culture” was used in the study, as well as the link between culture and language.

2.2.1 What is Culture?

Culture is an ever-changing, constantly re-created and dynamic concept and that any attempt at defining it would be limiting it to a static entity (Geertz, 1973). It is still necessary here to provide a working definition for culture before delving into the depths of the relationship between language and culture. However, adopting too broad a scope and trying to analyze, interpret and synthesize countless attempts at defining culture from a wide array of disciplines may prove to be a fruitless effort when the domain and the objectives of this study are considered. Therefore, only the most pertinent definitions of culture to the field of language teaching, and those which emphasize the relationship between language and culture will be discussed.

A. Sewell (1999) proposes two fundamentally distinct meanings for the term culture. The first one suggests that culture is a “theoretically defined category or aspect of social life that must be abstracted from the complex reality of human existence” (p. 39). This abstract, culture-as-theory approach includes five ways in which culture can be conceptualized: “learned behavior,” “an institutional sphere devoted to the making of meaning,” “creativity or agency,” “a system of symbols and meanings” and “practice” (pp.40-44). This definition entails a singular usage of culture, meaning that it cannot be used for comparing different “cultures.” The second definition, on the other hand, portrays a more concrete and bounded world represented by beliefs and practices. Culture in this sense is pluralizable, and can be
used to conceptualize distinct groups and sub-groups, with distinguishable qualities that enable comparison. In other words, it is this meaning of the word culture that researchers can use if they want to be able to talk about different groups of culture such as “American,” “Turkish” or “Mexican” culture. Although A. Sewell (1999) argues that this second sense of culture is “contradictory,” “loosely integrated,” “contested,” “subject to constant change” and “weakly bounded” (pp. 53-54), in this study, the word culture will be used in this sense so as to differentiate between different sources (groups) of culture, of which a teacher makes use in the classroom.

A. Sewell’s (1999) definition refers to (cultural) groups and sub-groups; however, it does not exactly discuss what forms the boundaries of these human groups. Kramsch’s (1998) definition of culture, however, precisely describes what that human group is by associating culture with “membership in a discourse community that shares a common social space and history, and a common system of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and acting” [emphasize added] (p.10). A discourse approach to culture such as Kramsch’s may well be the most appropriate one in an ELT context as it helps us capture the nature of the relationship between culture and language.

Providing a definition of culture also requires a discussion of what exactly the quoted “common systems of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and acting” (Kramsch, 1998, p. 10) are made up of. In other words, a clear description of the range of shared cultural elements and products within a cultural group is necessary, as these will be one of the mediums of comparison in this study. Brislin (1990) proposes that culture is composed of “widely shared ideals, values, formation
and uses of categories, assumptions about life, and goal-directed activities that become unconsciously or subconsciously accepted as ‘right’ and ‘correct’ by people who identify themselves as members of a society” (p.11). Several others have contributed to this list of “shared items.” Some examples are: “the ways of thinking, habits, customs, traditions, assumptions and norms” (Doyé, 1999); “social, artistic, and intellectual traditions” (Sowden, 2007); “socio-political institutions and social forms” (Giroux, 1992); “the implicit norms and conventions, methods of going about doing things” (Loveday, 1981) or “understandings and practices” (Philips, 2003). While these descriptions are detailed, they do not provide the structured framework necessary to undertake this study. The different dimensions of manifestations of culture or what constitutes this “common system of standards” for perceiving the world around us was conveniently outlined by Adaskou, Britten and Fahsi (1990) in a classification that has long served as a convenient framework for language teaching related studies. They define four different senses of culture that may appear in language education classrooms: the aesthetic sense, the semantic sense, the sociological sense and the pragmatic (or sociolinguistic) sense. The aesthetic sense refers to the literature, media, cinema and music of a particular country. The items in this category can also act as the informants of culture in the second sense, the sociological sense, in which a language is associated with the customs, rituals, traditions and institutions of a country such as religious or educational practices, home and family life conventions, social festivities, interpersonal relations or material conditions. The third dimension is the semantic sense. This refers to the conceptual system embodied in the language, conditioning all our perceptions and our thought processes, time and space relations, emotional states or even colors. It is
the semantic sense which forms the basis of meaning of the many items in the sociological sense. Idiomatic expressions are the most common examples of semantic culture that can be encountered in language teaching materials. Finally, the *pragmatic sense* is related to cultural norms, background knowledge, social and paralinguistic skills that determine the appropriate language for different contexts.

2.2.2 The Link between Culture and Language

The inextricable and interdependent nature of the relationship between language and culture has proven a complicated issue for many scholars from different disciplines. As early as the beginnings of the 20th century, this link was discussed by Sapir and Whorf in what is known as the *Sapir-Whorf hypothesis* (Carroll, 1956). There are two versions of the Whorfian view, the *strong* and the *light* versions (Boroditsky, 2001). The strong one proposes that there should be huge differences in the ways members of different language communities perceive the physical world around them, even in very similar situations. This view of *linguistic determinism* proposed that it was language that determined human cognition and behavior. This assertion was put to test in many color experiments which produced inconsistent results and thus has been largely abandoned (Robertson, Davies & Davidoff, 2000). However the lighter version that contends language has some responsibility in the differences we have in relating to and encoding our experiences is still sought after (Boroditsky, 2001). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is important in that it describes the interwoven nature of the relationship between language and culture by stating language is not only a medium that expresses a culture, but also a component of, or a driving force behind it.
The same notion was also supported by Buttjes and Byram (1991), who contend that the role of language is not limited to the sole reflection of objective cultural reality. Language is a vital constituent of this reality itself, and it is through language an individual interprets other components of objective cultural reality. Language both shapes and is shaped by sociocultural actions, beliefs and values; and when people make use of language they at the same time perform social phenomena, which means that in a given language community, people acquire language and culture together, and one supports the other’s development (Mitchell and Myles, 2004). Ho (2009) lists the terms which were coined to describe this entangled relation: *linguaculture* (Friedrich, 1989), *languaculture* (Risager, 2005), *language-and-culture* (Liddicoat et al., 2003) or *culturelanguage* (Papademetre & Scarino, 2006).

The link between culture and language is also closely connected to the concept of *context*. Social situations that require linguistic interaction convey a lot of information for the participants of a conversation about the meanings that are exchanged (Halliday & Hasan, 1989). In other words, it is the context that fills our utterances with meaning and that dictates what language patterns we use under different circumstances at a particular time and place (Byram, 1988). Therefore, the sole presentation of linguistic features without a proper context will fall short in illustrating the meaning and function, and will inevitably hinder overall competence and especially production in that language (Byram & Kramsch 2008).

Culture is naturally one of the principal dimensions of context in linguistic interaction. It determines the way we conceptualize our world and is inevitably reflected in language. Gudykunst and Kim (1992) propose two types of contexts that
are paramount in intercultural communication. The external context is concerned with the location and the setting of the interaction, and norms and meanings that are attached to them. The internal context, on the other hand, is about the cultural meanings brought into communication by individual participants. As cultural discrepancies among people unavoidably lead to differences in the ways they perceive situations, it is the internal context, among other factors, that determines success or failure in communication. That is to say, cultural context is one of the more important factors that define the appropriate language to be used within different social situations and with different participants (Byram, 1988).

2.3 The EIL Perspective and the Cultural Dimension of Language Teaching

When the interwoven nature of the relationship between culture and language is considered, it becomes clear that the incorporation of culture in language instruction is inherent in the process. But whose culture and what cultural components are ELT professionals supposed to use in their teaching? With approximately two billions speakers who are from more than one hundred different nations (Crystal, 2008), what is the culture of the English language? The critical and innovative attitude of the EIL framework toward moving beyond the pro-NS tendencies persisting in several aspects of ELT is also present regarding the teaching of culture in the classroom. From this point on, the approach of EIL to the issue of culture in the language classroom will be discussed.
2.3.1 The Issue of “Source”

Though it is not often explicitly stated, the main objective in English language teaching has traditionally been the successful imitation of the NS model, not only in terms of linguistic competence, but also cultural competence (Byram & Grundy, 2003). In the pursuit for “native-like” command of language, learners have been heavily exposed to Anglo-American cultural norms and information via course books that were written by NSs who believed that language could be learnt only within the context of its own culture (Alptekin, 1993). Such an approach could be justified in an English as a second language context where immigrants need to adopt the cultural norms of the country so as to survive in the society, but as Smith (1976) asserts while describing the tenets of an international language, the learners of English do not need to develop a cultural competence that would serve them only in the communities where this language is spoken as a native language, i.e., the inner circle countries. The multilingual, multinational and multicultural nature of communication that takes place in English today renders a direct and clear link between the language and its culture impossible (Baker, 2009). The international status of English, and the growing numbers of learners from diverse cultural backgrounds lead to the assertion that English does not belong to a specific culture and that in an EIL context, learners do not need to adopt, internalize or even learn about inner-circle (especially Anglo-American) cultural knowledge and norms of behavior that accompany the use of language. There are several arguments that support such a contention.
2.3.2 Learners’ Needs

The intertwined quality of the connection between culture and language and their “inseparability” has to be approached from a different perspective when the language under scrutiny enjoys the international. Risager (2006) argues that linguistic interactions can take on new cultural meanings during interactions. In other words, the link between language and culture is re-created in every communicative occasion depending on the backgrounds of the participants and the specific context. Jenkins (2012) supports this notion by asserting that non-native to non-native communication has the element of “online variability,” meaning speakers negotiate and accommodate meaning and form context-dependently. Such a view warrants a justified questioning of the relevance of Anglo-American cultural norms within an EIL context. Today, it is estimated that the number of NNSs far exceeds the number of NSs. In addition, these NNSs use English mostly to communicate with other NNSs to fulfill different communication purposes (Nault, 2006). This means a major portion of English speakers in the globe use English in contexts where American or British culture is of little use. The adoption of inner-circle cultural norms in such circumstances is aptly put into question by Alptekin (2002): “How relevant is the importance of Anglo-American eye contact, or the socially acceptable distance for conversation as properties of meaningful communication to Finnish and Italian academicians exchanging ideas in a professional meeting?” (p. 61). In the same vein, Canagarajah (2005) asserts that the majority of English learners do not learn the language to become a permanent member of a single linguistic (and cultural) community, but in contrast they traverse through different ones as their different
needs dictate. Thus, this understanding necessitates a departure from inner-circle norms regarding the cultural dimension of communication.

2.3.3 The Issue of Representativeness

The dominance of Anglo-American cultural norms and practices in ELT instruction and materials has created a cultural hegemony by expecting learners all around the world to adopt primarily Anglo-American and thus Western codes of communication. As one would expect, this results from a disregard for the cultural diversity in other places where English is spoken, namely the outer circle and expanding circle countries. However, such stereotyping also ignores the cultural variety that exists within the inner circle countries (Nault, 2006). Although there are similarities among inner circle countries, it is impossible to suggest that the cultural codes and practices in communication are identical among nations such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Ireland. In fact, the communication that takes place even within United States and Great Britain is becoming increasingly multicultural with big numbers of immigrant groups and other established linguistic communities (Kirkpatrick, 2007). Such variety clearly demonstrates that there is no uniformity regarding cultural aspects of communication even within inner-circle countries, and that US-UK perspectives cannot represent all the remaining English speaking nations, let alone other nations in the outer and expanding circles where substantial numbers of people use English on a daily basis.

2.3.4 The Link between Cultural Content and Language Acquisition

Another reason why there is a need for a revision in the approach to the cultural dimension of ELT is related to the role of cultural content in SLA. Alptekin
(1993) argues that excessive use of alien concepts of the target culture (Anglo-American culture in this case) might lead to problems in the acquisition of the language. This is due to a conflict between a learner’s existing schematic and systemic knowledge with the new schematic and systemic knowledge brought along by a new language. While schematic knowledge of a language is socially acquired by growing up in a linguistic and cultural community, and thus forges the way we perceive our world, the systemic knowledge is about the formal properties of language such as semantics or syntax. These two develop hand in hand in native language learning. During L2 learning, however, the new schematic data may conflict with the already existing schemata and this might result in complications in the acquisition of the systemic data of the L2. Therefore, Alptekin (1993) encourages the use of familiar schematic knowledge in the instruction and materials to help learners, who are already struggling with systemic data of a new language, to avoid difficulties in the organization and comprehension of the input.

2.3.5 The Importance of “Home” culture

The use of familiar cultural schemata in L2 instruction is not only conducive to the acquisition of the formal properties of a language. The EIL perspective places a strong focus on making use of home culture - a learner’s native culture - for other reasons as well. An integral principle of an international language according to Smith (1976) is that one learns it in order to communicate his/her own culture to others. Unlike the past when the main motive of people learning English was to learn about the inner-circle countries and their cultures, today people mainly learn the language to share information about their own countries, cultures and products for a variety of
reasons such as “encouraging economic development, promoting trade and tourism or contributing to international scholarly exchanges” (McKay, 2003a, p.2). This obviously requires students to be well-informed about various aspects of their own culture and to be able to transfer such knowledge in a second language (McKay, 2000). Therefore, teaching materials and instructional practices should provide opportunities for learners to re-examine their own cultures and experiences. A thorough awareness and understanding of one’s own culture is also necessary to be able to critically evaluate the foreign concepts which are introduced via L2 instruction so as not to reduce the comparison of the target culture and home culture to a low-level comparison of facts (Kramsch, 1987). In this sense, the use of what is culturally familiar could also be used in the classroom as a conceptual bridge to what is culturally unfamiliar (Alptekin, 2003).

2.3.6 EIL and Intercultural Competence

The EIL perspective necessitates learners to equip themselves with the right set of skills that will enable them to communicate with interlocutors from increasingly diverse cultural backgrounds. This requires a comprehensive understanding of the fluid and varying relationships between languages and cultures, and an ability to interact with complex human beings who have multiple identities (Byram, Gribkova & Starkey, 2002; Baker, 2009). This type of ability was termed by Buttjes and Byram (1991) as “intercultural competence” (IC). According to Byram and Zarate (1996), one of the main objectives of language teaching must be to help learners attain IC, which is an ability to comprehend how two cultures relate by assessing the differences and similarities between them. The questioning and
interpreting of one’s own cultural perspective as well as one’s interlocutor’s is central to IC. Such interpretation requires learners to observe themselves from an outside viewpoint and to stay aloof from ethnocentrism while evaluating others’ actions and behaviors. This is necessary so as to be able to examine and adjust one’s own behavior as communicational circumstances dictate and thus become an “intercultural speaker.”

Byram and Zarate (1996) assert that it is not the NS, but the intercultural speaker that learners must take as a model, which is first of all required by the global and cross-cultural use of the language. Moreover, the forced imitation of the NS model might create a fear of being absorbed by the culture of the language which might eventually lead to feelings of alienation from the language and the culture it represents (Canagarajah, 1993, as cited in Paige, 2003). Along the same lines, Alptekin further (1993) suggests that forcing of a new identity might cause mental problems such as reluctance or resistance to learning or regression. Therefore, intercultural speakers or “mediators,” who can communicate successfully with individuals with multiple social or cultural identities, should be raised via language teaching (Byram et al., 2002). These intercultural speakers can distinguish between stereotypical images and individual identities. In other words, they do not see their interlocutors as representatives of a stereotyped identity, but as a unique personality “whose qualities are to be discovered” (Byram et al., 2002, p.5). They have respect for individual characteristics and equality of human rights, and they establish communication on this democratic basis.
Byram et al. (2002) propose four items that are required to gain IC. The first one is intercultural attitudes. According to this, learners must be open to learn about values, beliefs and behaviors other than their own. The speakers should also be comfortable with the fact that their set of values is not necessarily better than others.’ Moreover, the speaker should be able to “decentre,” that is, he or she should be able to look at his or her values, beliefs and actions from an outsider’s perspective. The second factor is knowledge. Although learners (or teachers) cannot be expected to acquire all the knowledge they might need in their future interactions, they should at least know basically how the concepts of culture, group and identity work. Apart from the knowledge of social groups and their implications in one’s own and one’s interlocutor’s country, a learner should also be familiar with common processes of social and individual interaction. The third one is skills. A learner must be able to compare the products of different cultures, and see how it would look from a different cultural perspective. Using the above-mentioned knowledge, a learner should have the ability to see a certain cultural manifestation from another cultural perspective. In other words, intercultural speakers can compare, interpret and relate to cultural behavior different than their own. In addition, a learner should have or acquire the skill to discover new knowledge and incorporate this new information to the previous knowledge and be ready to use it, along with skills and attitude, in real communication. The last one is the critical cultural awareness, which is the ability to critically “evaluate perspectives, practices, and products of one’s own and other cultures and countries” (p. 9). The purpose here is to make learners conscious of their cultural values.
The EIL perspective and IC goals share common ground in their rejection of
the NS model in terms of linguistic, phonetic and cultural competence. They also
display considerable similarity in that they emphasize the need for learners to
scrutinize their own culture.

2.4 A Review of Studies on Teacher Beliefs of Culture Teaching in ELT

The current study aims to investigate English language teachers’ beliefs and
actual classroom practices of teaching culture in the ELT classroom. For this reason,
a review of relevant studies is vital so as to identify possible knowledge gaps that
require further examination. It is important to note that only the most recent studies
from the last 10-15 years will be discussed in this section as the EIL principles have
been gaining ground only since the start of the new millennium.

Firstly, it is necessary to state that although there have been a number of
studies on teachers’ conceptions of culture in the field of ELT, few have directly
adopted the EIL perspective as a foundation for their analysis. However, a number of
studies have worked on EFL teacher attitudes and practices towards intercultural
competence (Ryan, 1995; Sercu, 2005; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Young & Sachdev,
2011), which display considerable parallelism to EIL in its approach to handling the
cultural dimension of ELT. Another limitation of the current body of literature on the
topic is a scarcity of investigation on the actual classroom practices of teachers.
Some studies include an analysis of teacher practices (Önalan, 2005; Sercu, 2005;
Gönen & Sağlam, 2012), but these explore only the “stated” practices of teachers,
and thus can only be considered as the investigation of their beliefs regarding their
practices. Few studies (Ryan, 1995; Lorduy et al., 2011) use classroom observations
in their methodology to provide insight on how culture is actually presented in the classroom.

2.4.1 Teachers’ Definitions of Culture

Paige et al. (2003) asserts that the nature of foreign language and culture pedagogy is quite eclectic and it heavily relies on teachers’ individual definitions of culture. Therefore, an overview of the studies that explore teacher definitions of culture, the place of culture in their teaching, and culture teaching aims is a central component of any study that undertakes the analysis of teacher beliefs and practices of teaching culture.

Although the evidence provided by several studies indicate that teachers perceive culture as an important element in foreign language teaching (Paige, 2003; Önal, 2005 Sercu, 2005; Gönen & Sağlam, 2012), defining the concept itself seems to be a challenging task for teachers. Ryan (2005), in his qualitative analysis of teacher beliefs and practices regarding culture, states that the teachers were often “bewildered and overwhelmed” when they were asked to verbalize the concept (p. 8). The teachers in this study were found to rely upon personal experiences to define culture, and instead of giving definitive descriptions of culture, they proposed several qualities, examples of which include “culture is experiential,” “culture is daily life,” “culture is knowledge gained through reading” or “culture is transmitted from one generation to another” (p.6). They also resorted to the use of metaphors to reify their ideas of culture, some of which outlined a static view of culture, while others emphasized the changing quality of culture. Comparable results were obtained by another qualitative study by Larzén-Östermark (2008), who worked on the attitudes
of Finnish and Swedish English teachers toward the treatment of culture in foreign culture teaching. Similar to Ryan’s (1995) results, the participants in this study found culture as a very complex concept and they were unable to describe it with a few words. Therefore, they made long lists of attributes that belonged to culture. When these were analyzed, it was found out that the most commonly shared view of culture was one that perceived culture as measurable products or factual knowledge that could be transferred to students via instruction. The Chinese teachers that participated in Lessard-Clouston’s (1996) study also found it very difficult to make open-ended definitions of culture, and opted to list numerous aspects of culture, instead. Sociological aspects of culture, such as history, education, customs, geography, religion, politics or economics, were pre-dominant in the listings of teachers. This was further validated by Bayyurt (2006), whose interviews with Turkish teachers of English revealed that they believed culture was embodied in quantifiable elements such as lifestyle, gastronomy, traditions, history or geography.

2.4.2 The Importance Attached to Teaching Culture by Teachers

A review of relevant literature reveals that teachers, irrespective of their working definitions of the concept, predominantly state that culture is an important element in language teaching. In both qualitative and quantitative studies, a majority of teachers emphasize the inseparable nature of the relationship between culture and language and agree, at least in principle, that it is important to teach culture regardless of their content-related perspective (Ryan, 1995; Bayyurt, 2006; Young & Sachdev, 2011; Gönen & Sağlam, 2012). However, research reveals that this belief does not seem to be reflected in their actual practices and that culture-teaching is not
necessarily one of their top priorities when compared to other language teaching objectives. This has been demonstrated in the context of Turkish higher education, where English teachers from 5 prominent universities ranked culture ninth in their top ten priorities of language instruction (Önalan, 2005). It should also be noted that teachers in that study viewed teaching culture as simple transmission of information, like other aspects of language such as grammar or vocabulary; however, culture ranked much lower than those other aspects. Another study from the same context revealed that English teachers of both ELT and Non-ELT graduates found culture as an important element in foreign language teaching, but failed to deal with it in an extensive manner, or sometimes they ignored it altogether (Gönen & Sağlam, 2012). Overcrowded curriculum, teachers’ fear of not having sufficient knowledge, negative attitudes displayed by students towards target culture, and a lack of adequate training in teaching culture are the major reasons given by teachers for neglecting the cultural aspect of foreign language teaching. Karabinar and Güler (2012) also report lack of time as the most frequently stated reason for ignoring culture in foreign language teaching. In the same study, teachers also highlighted their own cultural ignorance and their students’ low level of English as other contributors to their avoiding culture. Students’ lack of interest in learning about the target language culture is indicated as another factor that discourages teachers to include cultural information in their teaching (Bayyurt, 2006).

Cultural dimension of ELT does not seem to receive a lot of attention outside the Turkish context either. In his study covering several EFL contexts in Europe, Sercu (2005) found that teachers gave culture learning objectives the least priority, while language learning goals ranked highest. Expectedly, the teachers devoted little
time to the development of intercultural communicative competence in learners, and focused solely on communicative competence instead. Although participating teachers stated their willingness to allot more time to culture teaching, they cited overcrowded curriculum, strong curricular focus on language teaching and lack of appropriate culture teaching materials as obstacles before doing so. Young and Sachdev (2011) presented comparable results, signaling a mismatch between participants’ beliefs and their practices. Teachers believed that an intercultural approach was necessary for learners, but certain circumstances prevented them from putting it into practice. The stated teacher reasons for neglecting and avoiding culture included lack of learner motivation and interest, inappropriate materials and curricular obstacles. Larzén-Östermark (2008) proposed similar constraints in the Swedish – Finnish context. A heavy focus on linguistic competence was brought forward among other reasons for not dealing with culture extensively, which was also proposed by Byram and Risager (1999) as the chief culprit for the neglect of culture in foreign language teaching. The disparity between beliefs and practice was also revealed by Lessard-Clouston (1996) in the Chinese context, where teachers found culture very important in language teaching, but an overwhelming majority seldom taught, or did not teach culture at all.

2.4.3 Teachers’ Objectives for Teaching Culture

An analysis of relevant studies indicates teacher objectives of culture can be grouped into three areas: cultural knowledge, skills and attitudes, which also happen to be the components of intercultural competence as proposed by Byram et al. (2002). This is not a coincidence since some of the studies use the IC framework as
part of their methodology. However, even when this is not the case, the objectives stated by teachers still fit in one of the categories mentioned above.

The few studies with findings regarding the culture teaching objectives of teachers are listed in Table 1. As can be seen, both in the Turkish and other foreign language teaching contexts, it is the knowledge dimension of culture which teachers mainly base their objectives on. Providing information about daily life and routines, cultural expressions, and in general providing general background information so as to increase learners’ linguistic and communicative competence were shown to be the most important objectives in this domain. (Sercu, 2005; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Gönen & Sağlam, 2012). However, it should be noted that the table includes only the highest ranking or the most recurrent objectives stated by the teachers in the mentioned studies. There are other objectives, though less prominent in the eye of the teachers, that were revealed by these studies. These include skill-based objectives such as the promoting the ability to handle intercultural contact situations (Gönen & Sağlam, 2012), promoting reflection on cultural differences or similarly “preparing for future intercultural encounters” (Larzén-Östermark, 2008, p. 537). The objectives that go in the attitudes dimension of culture teaching share a strong emphasis on the development of tolerance towards the target culture. This was clearly illustrated in Sleeter and Grant’s (1994) study, which revealed that 83% of respondents chose “all people are individuals” or “cooperation and tolerance are vital” out of a list of five culture teaching objectives (p. 33). Similarly, “promoting tolerance and empathy” was one of the top three objectives of teachers in the Swedish – Finnish context (Larzén-Östermark, 2008; p. 537). Teachers aimed to
achieve this by eliminating ethnocentricity, stereotypes and prejudiced views of other cultures.

Table 1. The most important culture teaching objective as stated by teachers in different studies categorized by cultural dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sleeter &amp; Grant, 1994</td>
<td>Promoting the idea that all people are individuals and tolerance is vital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Önalan, 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a global understanding of other cultures and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sercu, 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase learners’ familiarity with aspects of daily life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larzén-Östermark, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing general background information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gönen &amp; Sağlam, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing information about daily life and routines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karabinar &amp; Güler (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciating similarities and differences between their own culture and target culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.4 Teachers’ Beliefs Regarding the Content (Subject Matter) and Source of Culture

This section will report the findings of empirical research regarding what subject matter and the source of cultural content teachers believe is appropriate for the foreign language classroom. Adaskou et al.’s (1990) framework which presents four categories through which culture manifests itself in language teaching and
learning is a convenient tool in analyzing the different subject matters of culture teaching that teachers give priority. These four categories are the sociological, aesthetic, pragmatic and semantic senses of culture. The source of culture, on the other hand, can be grouped under three categories: target, international and home cultures. This categorization of cultural elements has been borrowed from Cortazzi and Jin’s (1999) study; however, the term source culture in their study was replaced with home culture for convenience in wording as it could get confusing for the reader to distinguish between what the terms like “source of culture” or “cultural source” represent for this study and Cortazzi and Jin’s term “source culture”, which refers to one of the possible types of cultural information.

Byram and Morgan (1999) assert that teachers believe it is necessary to support knowledge of grammar and meaning by providing information from the sociological sense predominantly. The specific areas they emphasize are social institutions, family structures or education systems. Although they do not openly state from what source this content should come from, it can be assumed that the phrase “target culture” refers to the American or British cultures, as it has by default whenever the cultural dimension in ELT is at hand. Önalan’s (2005) study is further evidence that teachers mainly depend on Anglo-American sociological aspects of culture in the classroom such as customs, traditions, daily life features and rituals. A considerable portion of the respondents in this study also believed that in order to avoid misconceptions, it was important to clarify idioms and vocabulary, which belong to the pragmatic sense of culture.
Another quantitative study from the Turkish context (Karabinar & Güler, 2012) produced comparable results and confirmed Önalans’s (2005) finding that sociological culture was given the most priority by Turkish teachers. The aesthetic sense of culture with expressive products such as literature, art or music, and the pragmatic sense of culture (manners, use of space, politeness etc.) shared the second and the third places with very little difference between their mean scores. Karabinar and Güler (2012) suspect that the popularity of the teaching of tangible products of culture that belong to the sociological aspect may arise from deliberate avoidance of more sophisticated topics such as semantic or pragmatic dimension due to teachers’ lack of knowledge on these topics. One limitation of their study is that there are very few references to the source of culture, although cultural subject matter is extensively discussed. The source of culture in the classroom is, most of the time, automatically linked to Anglo-American norms. Only 8.3% of the teachers explicitly emphasized the importance of learning about not only these two cultures (American and British), but also others. It is, on the other hand, interesting to note that the second highest ranked culture teaching objective by teachers in this study was “recognize the values of Turkish culture, how they are different from other cultures and the role they play in shaping attitude towards other cultures,” which is also one of the EIL culture objectives (Karabinar & Güler, 2012, p.119). The analysis of the interviews in their study also revealed that some teachers were worried that exposing students to too much target culture could promote linguistic/cultural imperialism, or create overt feelings of sympathy in students.

Gönen and Sağlam (2012) also yielded similar findings in a similar context. The majority of both ELT and non-ELT graduate teachers in their participant pool
believed that providing information about daily life and routines, which are elements of sociological sense of culture, was the most important cultural content for learners. However, the second highest ranked cultural subject matter differed for ELT and non-ELT graduates. While it was teaching a variety of expressions such as arts, music or literature for non-ELT graduates, for ELT graduates it was providing information about the history, geography and political conditions. In other words, non-ELT graduates, along with the sociological culture, gave importance to the aesthetic aspects, which were neglected by ELT graduates. The semantic sense of culture was the last of both groups’ priorities. Like other previous studies which are similar in scope, the issue of source of culture again was not openly discussed in this study as well. Phrases like target culture or foreign culture imply that the American or the British culture is considered as the reference point in culture teaching. However, the existence of the statement “foreign language teaching should enhance students’ understanding of their own cultural identity” (p. 32) in the questionnaire, and teachers’ broad agreement with this demonstrates that teachers may be aware of EIL principles in the same direction.

The only quantitative analysis with Turkish participants was conducted by Bayyurt (2006), and it reports an over-emphasis on subjects that fall within the domain of aesthetic and sociological senses of culture. Regarding the source of the cultural content, an overwhelming majority of the teachers argued that the content of the cultural information should come from every aspect of people who spoke English as a native language, and in an inner circle country, which indicates that the prevalence of NSist tendencies was demonstrated in her study as well. A limited number of teachers, on the other hand, asserted that cultural information from all
English speaking countries, including outer circle examples such as India, as well as content from the cultures of other countries that speak English as a foreign language should be provided equally.

The dominance of sociological aspects of culture such as history, work habits, people, life, politics, geography and institutions was also confirmed in other contexts (Lessard-Clouston, 1996). While 63% of his participants expressed that they taught sociological aspects like history, politics or geography, the second most taught aspect was the aesthetic sense with only 25%. The aesthetic cultural content consisted of only literature in this case. Lessard-Clouston (1996) notes that the participants made use of semantic and pragmatic culture (e.g. norms for politeness, etc.), but a lot less frequently when compared to the sociological aspect. In her study, too, the culture of the English language was Western by default, especially North American culture.

Sercu’s (2005) large-scale study which included participants from seven, mostly European states (Poland, Sweden, Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece, Spain and Mexico) also revealed that teachers favored information about daily life and routines, elements of sociological culture, as the type knowledge to be presented in the classroom. However, this does not reflect a crystal-clear preference as semantic elements of culture such as values and beliefs came right after them, while another set of sociological knowledge, history, geography and political conditions, was rated much lower. It is fair to argue that Sercu’s study produced complex results in terms of the beliefs of teachers as they attached certain items in sociological culture more importance than others. In addition, almost 80% of all the teachers stated that they would like to integrate intercultural competence in their teaching, which reflects a
potentially positive attitude towards EIL principles regarding culture. However, it must be noted that no direct questions regarding the source of culture the teachers deemed fit were asked, so it is not quite possible to determine whether the respondents were free of NSist opinions concerning culture teaching.

In addition to the above-mentioned studies, a limited number of researchers presented some subsidiary findings regarding teacher beliefs of the appropriate source of culture in the classroom, although their main focus was not to establish a link between teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding culture. These studies showed that Finnish, Swedish and Catalan teachers still value the knowledge of the culture of Britain or the USA, and to a lesser extent Canada and Australia (Llurda, 2004; Larzén-Östermark, 2008). The teachers viewed culture as simple transmission of information of inner circle countries. The only group of teachers whose beliefs were fairly consistent with the EIL perspective on cultural content of foreign language teaching were the Chilean teachers who supported the inclusion of content that deals with the life and culture of Chilean people in addition to different countries around the world (McKay, 2003b).

2.4.5 Teachers and Textbooks

Culture learning is not limited to the classroom, and can occur in a multitude of mediums including immigration, tourism, literature or media. However, it can be argued that learners are exposed to the biased, simplified and hugely Anglo-American and Western cultural representations of the English-speaking world through popular culture and media. Unless they have an intrinsic motivation to search out the more realistic representations of culture for themselves, learners will
inevitably develop false notions. Therefore, textbooks, as one of the most important sources of culture in the classroom, are essential in providing the cultural content that is necessary to develop the skill of intercultural competence. This important role of the culture is interwoven with the teacher perceptions of the cultural content of the textbooks, and their actions when covering textbooks in the classroom resulting from these perceptions. This requires a review of recent studies that include the qualitative or quantitative analysis of cultural content in textbooks (or other materials and curricula in general) in order to see the impact of EIL-informed principles have had on the way publishers design their textbook.

One such textbook analysis was conducted by Yuen (2011) with two textbooks used in Hong Kong. The findings signal an imbalance in the cultural representations of different ethnic groups. This, according to Yuen (2011), results from the fact that English-speaking cultures were favored in the books. Kim (2011), McConachy and Hata (2013), Shin, Eslami and Chen (2011), had similar results and conclusions. In one study with contrasting findings, Çelik and Erbay (2013) found out that three course books used as core language teaching texts at public elementary schools in Turkey made use of various cultural contents, which can be seen as a change from the dominant representation of inner circle cultures. Given the differing findings and interpretations, it is obvious that more examinations of textbooks used in different contexts are required to be able to detect how influential the EIL paradigm has been on the cultural content of textbooks.

It should be noted that it is not among the aims of this study is to directly detect the extent to which the textbook Language Leader Intermediate (textbook used
at METU NCC SFL at the time of the study) has been influenced by EIL principles. However, the textbook is seen as a source of prompts for teachers’ cultural references in the classroom; thus, the cultural content of this textbook is significant in this sense as it may be an important determiner of the overall nature of cultural content sourced in the classroom. Therefore, an overview of the cultural content of the observed lessons from the textbook will also be presented.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Questions and Research Design

This chapter will detail the research design of the study, the setting, participants, data collection tools and procedures as well as data analysis methods.

This study addresses the following questions:

1. What are the beliefs of NNESTs at METU NCC SFL regarding
   a. the importance of culture in teaching?
   b. the objectives of culture teaching?
   c. the content (subject-matter) of culture teaching?
   d. the source of cultural content in the classroom?

2. What are the actual classroom practices of NNESTs at METU NCC SFL regarding
   a. their handling of the cultural content of the textbook?
   b. the criteria in their use of cultural content?
   c. how and for what purposes they use cultural content?
   d. the content (subject-matter) of culture?
   e. the source of cultural content in the classroom?

The current study aims to cast light on the beliefs and actual classroom practices of NNESTs regarding different aspects of the cultural dimension of teaching EFL. The institutional boundaries and the sampling procedure used make
this a descriptive case study. The case is the Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus, School of Foreign Languages (METU NCC SFL) and the NNESTs employed at this institution. The handling of culture can be closely related to the textbook used in a certain teaching/learning environment, which is another factor that makes this a case study as it is well known that different textbooks chosen by different institutions display great variety concerning the handling of culture.

Although case studies are inherently linked to the qualitative paradigm, this is a mixed-method study, which makes use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods. Mixed-method studies bring together the strengths and eliminate the weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative approaches, providing a more comprehensive and elaborate grasp of the target phenomenon (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). For the first phase of the study a questionnaire was used to collect information about beliefs of teachers at METU NCC SFL regarding different aspects of culture teaching. The results of the questionnaire aided the researcher in the selection of the participants who would be observed during their teaching hours. It must be noted that the questionnaire applied in the first phase of the study, which was designed to reveal the beliefs of teachers concerning cultural content in the classroom, is neither context-dependent, nor it is designed with a specific consideration of METU NCC SFL teachers, and thus can generate more generalizable findings if used for other studies, with the correct sampling strategy.

The second phase (classroom practices), on the other hand, bears the traditional characteristics of a case study to a larger extent as it includes the investigation of classroom practices of four individual teachers through observations
and interviews. Classroom observations were required to see the actual practices of teachers concerning cultural information, and also to detect the level of correspondence between beliefs and practices of the teachers under focus. The observations were supplemented with semi-structured in-depth post-observation interviews, which ensured that the categories and interpretations generated by the researcher based on the findings of the observations were also validated by the participants.

3.2 Setting, Participants and the Textbook

3.2.1 Setting

The setting is the School of Foreign Languages at Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus (METU NCC SFL), located in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. METU NCC has been in operation since 2005, but the beginning of the campus project dates back to 2000, when the Governments of Republic of Turkey and Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) invited METU (a prominent state university in Turkey) to establish a campus in Northern Cyprus.

There are two separate programs within SFL. The first is the English Preparatory Program (EPP), which provides a compulsory one-year pre-undergraduate level intensive English course for students whose level of academic English is below the proficiency required for their respective academic programs at METU NCC. At the end of the academic year, the students take an exit proficiency exam and depending on the result, they either repeat the year or start their freshman year in their academic programs. At EPP, there are different levels of English
instruction: beginner, elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper Intermediate levels. The level of each student is determined by a placement exam at the beginning of the academic year. The second program within SFL is the Modern Languages Program (MLP), which offers compulsory English courses for undergraduate students. MLP also offers foreign language courses such as French, German and Spanish in different levels to students as part of their undergraduate studies.

The SFL has 55 full-time instructors in total, including a director, two program coordinators (EPP and MLP), a teacher trainer and 5 group coordinators. The researcher has been an instructor and a group coordinator at SFL for the last 9 years.

3.2.2 Participants

The participant pool consists of 46 NNESTs who, at the time of the data collection stage, were occupying teaching positions at SFL. The study focuses on the beliefs and practices of NNESTs because it is this group of teachers who make up the majority of English teachers in the globe (Canagarajah, 2005). This is also valid in the context of METU NCC SFL, where only two instructors are from native English-speaking countries.

All 46 instructors are university graduates, but from different departments and disciplines, and some of the instructors hold MAs or PhDs. Most of the instructors – except a few with dual citizenship - belong to one of the two categories in terms of cultural and national orientation: One group was born and raised in Turkey and have Turkish citizenship, while the other consists of Turkish Cypriots born and raised in
Northern Cyprus. The administrative as well as teacher training staff are also excluded from this stage of the research as they are not actively teaching and thus do not function as an immediate source of culture in the classroom. Out of the possible 46 instructors, 36 instructors agreed to complete the questionnaire and their demographic profile is provided in Table 2 below.

Out of the 36 teachers who responded to the questionnaire, 4 of them were selected for classroom observations, which were necessary to discover teachers’ culture teaching practices. In the selection, teachers’ responses to the questionnaire, their educational backgrounds, and their live-abroad experiences were considered. This was required so as to represent the overall characteristics of the original group of 36 to the best extent possible. For this purpose, guided by the profile of the teachers provided in Table 2, two ELT and two non-ELT graduates were chosen. In addition, while two of the selected teachers had MA degrees, the other two had BAs. Live-abroad experiences of the teachers were also considered, and while three of the teachers had resided in a country other than Turkey or TRNC for over three months, one had not. Finally, only one of the four teachers was a male. Background information for individual teachers will not be provided separately as the research does not aim to draw comparisons among the observed teachers, nor did it attempt to correlate the findings with the participants’ backgrounds. The objective was simply to provide an overall picture of teachers’ use of culture in the classroom.

The study also included general interviews with the teachers so as to collect in-depth data regarding teacher beliefs of teaching culture. To this end, seven instructors from the pool of 36 were selected with a purposive sampling strategy so
as to form a group that would reflect the general characteristics of the original group of 36. Therefore, similar to the selection of the observed teachers, both background information and the questionnaire responses of the participants were considered in the selection process so that different backgrounds and different perspectives regarding culture teaching could be represented in the interview data.

All the participants were provided an informed consent form (See Appendix A), which specified how long the procedure would take, and that they could quit the questionnaire, observations or the interviews without providing any excuse.

**Table 2 – Demographic Profile of Questionnaire Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N:36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish + Arabic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish + English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N:36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Degree Received</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N:36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

**Educational Background**
* (the last degree received)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Teaching</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**N:**36</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**N:**36</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residence in a Country (other than Turkey or TRNC) over 3 Months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA or UK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No residence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**N:**36</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 The Textbook

One of the aims of the study is to shed light on teachers’ practices regarding the treatment of cultural content in the textbook. Therefore, providing information about the textbook that was being used at METU NCC SFL at the time of the classroom observations is necessary. *Language Leader* (LL) series, published by Pearson - Longman has been in use at METU NCC SFL for the last 5 academic years. The series include textbooks in different levels, from Elementary to Advanced. However, during the observations, only the *Language Leader Intermediate* (LLINT) was used. LLINT consists of 12 units, each with 5 lessons with different aims. These are the introductory lesson, input lessons (two in each unit), scenario (which require
learners to practice the language presented in the input lessons) and study and writing skills. The book also has a review section after every 3 units.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

The data was collected via a questionnaire, classroom observations and interviews with observed teachers.

3.3.1 The Questionnaire

A questionnaire made up of carefully designed items can be a good tool to find out about people’s attitudes, perceptions and opinions (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). In the current study, the questionnaire administered for this purpose made use of certain parts of questionnaires conducted previously. Item 10 and 15, for example, were borrowed from Sercu’s (2005) study; while item 14 was adapted from Evci (2005). McKay (2003b) also inspired the design of certain items (items 12 and 16). The rest of the items were devised by the researcher so as to answer all the research questions of the study. Some items in the questionnaire (e.g. 14, 17) were supported with open-ended questions, which encouraged participants to explain their responses to these items. The questionnaire was administered online.

The questionnaire is made up of three sections. The first section (items 1-8) aims to gather background information from the participants. The requested data includes sex, nationality, educational background, foreign languages spoken, experience in language teaching and residence in a country other than Turkey or Northern Cyprus for periods over three months.

The items in the second section of the questionnaire were designed to obtain insights about the beliefs of teachers regarding cultural content in the classroom. Item 9 is a 5-point Likert scale question that inquires the overall importance teachers
attach to the inclusion of cultural information in foreign language teaching. If the participant chooses “not important at all” at this stage, the questionnaire automatically ends. Item 10 is designed so as to find out what objectives the teachers deem important when teaching culture. Objectives, each presented in a Likert scale format again, were listed for respondents to rate. In the same item, participants were also encouraged to add their own objectives of teaching culture in the space provided unless they were listed. Item 11 has the same format with 10, but it aims to reveal which types of information the teachers find more essential to include in their teaching. Item 12 asks the participants to rank different sources of cultural information (Home culture, Target culture, International culture) in terms of priority. Item 13 is a more refined version of item 12, asking participants again to rank different sources of cultural information, but this time 10 different aspects of culture were provided, and the survey takers needed to indicate which source of culture they thought should be used while teaching each of the aspects. Item 14 provides a quotation that highlights the international status of English, and via a Likert scale, asks learners to indicate their level of support on whether English’s international status should influence the cultural content of English classes and textbooks. The respondents were also asked to explain their stance in a space provided.

The third section (items 15-17) aimed to explore teachers’ opinions on the cultural content of textbooks. To this end, Item 15 was designed so as to understand whether the cultural content was one of teachers’ top criteria while selecting a textbook. In this item, nine different characteristics that may affect teacher’s opinions against or in favor of a particular textbook were listed, and the respondents were asked to select the four criteria that they think are the most important in the selection
of a textbook. Item 16 was included in the questionnaire to find out which source of cultural content teachers thought textbooks should be covering. For this, the teachers were asked to rank the three sources of culture in order of importance. The last item in the survey queries to what extent the cultural content of the textbooks used at METU NCC SFL using a Likert scale, and the teachers were also asked to explain their choice in the space provided.

The questionnaire was examined by six reviewers with differing academic backgrounds for face, content and construct validity. Two of these were Ph.D. holders, experienced in the subject of ELT. The other four were English instructors with MA degrees in ELT. The feedback of the latter was especially valuable as they had been working at METU NCC SFL for some time, and were familiar with the working environment and conditions. Thus, they were at a good position to judge the clarity of the items for their colleagues. Upon their comments, certain changes were made in the items to eliminate some ambiguity in their wording. Moreover, some of the instructions were replaced with clearer and simpler ones. Next, the questionnaire was piloted by six of the instructors from METU NCC SFL. The data from the piloting resulted in a minor adjustment in the format of one of the items in the questionnaire. The Likert scale items were also tested for reliability, and the items were found to be internally consistent. Cronbach’s alpha values which are 0.60 and above are considered reliable, and those above 0.80 are thought to be highly reliable. The analysis using the pilot data showed that, with a Cronbach’s alpha score of 0.879, the results of the current questionnaire items were reliable.

The questionnaire was published online, and its link was sent to each of the 46 instructors with a personalized request to complete it at a convenient time of
theirs. The introductory passage stated the aim of the research, and made it clear that participation was on a voluntary basis, that they were free to quit at any time, and that the confidentiality of their responses was guaranteed. The participants were also given the liberty to stay anonymous, but they were also asked to provide their names if they were interested in taking part in the later stages (observation and interview) of the research. Only four instructors opted to remain anonymous. A strategy employed at the delivery of the questionnaires was to send the links via individual e-mails, and address the potential respondents by name, instead of the usual bulk mail method. This proved useful as 36 out of 46 instructors completed the questionnaire, which corresponds to 78.2% response rate.

3.3.2 Observations and Post-Observation Semi-structured Stimulated Recall Interviews

Classroom observations were necessary to explore the actual classroom practices of teachers through the EIL lens, and to find out how the stated beliefs of teachers translate to real classroom behavior. Out of the questionnaire respondents who stated that they would like to participate in the later stages of the study, four were selected for classroom observations. As discussed above, although the current study does not aim to make comparisons among participants, or yield statistically generalizable findings, the researcher aimed to form a group of teachers with varied qualities, representing the overall heterogeneity of the original group of 46 as much as possible.

All teachers were observed while covering a lesson in LLINT. The number of observations depended on the time teachers took to finish one lesson in LLINT. In
total, each teacher was observed for the duration of four lessons in LLINT, which is equal to 6 to 7 class hours, and each class hour is 50 minutes.

A classroom observation protocol was developed by the researcher to make the field-note process easier and more efficient (See Appendix C). The protocol included two main categories, Cultural Reference from the Textbook, which was annotated whenever the teacher made a reference to an aspect of culture from the LLINT, and Cultural Reference from outside the Textbook, which included the teacher’s cultural references from outside LLINT. For any item observed in either category, the following sub-categories were also filled in. The purpose of the reference explained why the teacher felt the need to mention a specific cultural item or phenomenon. Examples include “to illustrate the meaning of a word,” “to attract students’ attention to the topic at hand” or simply “because it was part of the text, task, instruction etc. in the textbook.” The second category, The way the reference was used, summarized what the teacher did with the specific cultural element. Comparing, explaining, supplementing, highlighting, questioning, making a simple reference and even ignoring elements are examples of teacher actions related to the use of cultural elements. Under the aspect of culture, it was noted what dimension of culture the specific cultural reference belonged to. These aspects include factual information, different ethnic and social groups, daily life and routines, living conditions, food and drink, clothes, youth culture, education, professional life, traditions, folklore, tourist attractions, literature, music, cinema, drama, arts, values, beliefs, ideas, attitudes, popular culture and its products, personalities (fictitious or real), locations, business life entities, practices and products, languages and their features, institutions, rituals, festivities, special days, holidays, commemorations,
media and its products. All of these aspects fit in one of Adaskou et al’s (1990) four senses of culture, and this framework was used in the collection and analysis of the data. As discussed in detail in the literature review section, they define four different components of culture that could be introduced in language classrooms: (1) aesthetic culture, (2) the semantic culture, (3) the sociological culture and (4) the pragmatic culture.

The skill/knowledge category identifies what skill/knowledge was being covered at the time of the reference, such as reading, listening, writing, speaking, language (grammar) or vocabulary. The final sub category was the source of cultural reference, which stated whether the item comes from home culture (the local culture in which English is taught as a foreign language), the target culture (English speaking western cultures such as Britain, US, Australia, or Canada), or the international culture (a variety of non-native English speaking cultures from Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America).

The classroom observations were followed by post-observation semi-structured stimulated recall interviews with the observed teachers. With the data collected from the observations, these interviews were necessary to have a better understanding of the teacher practices regarding cultural content in the classroom. These interviews also ensured that the researcher’s interpretation of in-class teacher behavior concerning cultural content was compatible with the teacher’s actual intention behind that certain behavior. A sample set of post-observation interview questions is provided in Appendix D.
3.3.3 Interviews

As the last stage of data collection, in-depth interviews were conducted with seven teachers (four of whom were observed teachers) to collect additional qualitative data regarding their beliefs of the use and role of culture. Due to their interactive nature and the opportunities, interviews give researchers the opportunity to elicit additional information by acting upon a specific utterance by the interviewees. In this study, semi-structured interview model was preferred by the researcher to reveal enriched data regarding participants’ perceptions and attitudes (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The interview questions (See appendix E) were prepared in accordance with the research questions of the study and also made use of the initial raw data collected via the questionnaire and the classroom observations. Three of the questions (1, 2 and 6) were borrowed from Gönen and Sağlam’s (2012) study. The pre-determined list of questions did not require a rigid process of asking and answering questions as the interviewee was allowed, and even encouraged, to digress in the hope of obtaining new and valuable information regarding their perceptions.

It is important to build some level of rapport with the interviewees so that information that would be difficult to reveal with other data collection tools could be obtained (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). The fact that the researcher is a colleague of the interviewees was useful in establishing some rapport during the interviews. The interviews were carried out in the SFL building and were audio-recorded in order not to distract the interviewee with researcher’s note-taking. After the interviews, the audio-records were transcribed selectively for the analysis stage.
3.4 Data Analysis

The quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire were coded and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 22 program software, and charts and graphs that display the means and frequencies for the items were produced. Paired sample t-tests were conducted to detect whether the differences between the means of variables within certain items were significant or not. Since this is a descriptive case study exploring the perceptions and practices of METU NCC SFL instructors only, and thus drawing general conclusions beyond this sample is not one of the aims, descriptive statistics is thought to be sufficient, and providing inferential statistics was not necessary.

In the analysis of the qualitative data, which was collected through the open-ended items in the questionnaire, the post-observation interviews, and general interviews at the end of the process, grounded theory approach was used. In this approach, the objective is to develop theory based on data that has been methodically collected and analyzed without imposing preset categories on the data (Mackey & Gass, 2005). However, this does not mean that the codes and categories cannot be anticipated (a priori codes) before the analysis of the data (Duff, 2007). The topic of the study and the research questions, according to which the data collection items were designed, provided most of the codes the researcher was interested in. However, during the analysis the researcher was very careful not to miss a recurrent code or codes that would eventually lead to a significant theme that is not within the immediate scope of the study.

For this purpose, the data from the interviews was first transcribed and all instructor responses were compiled under the relevant initial category (the open
ended items, and the questions in the interviews). The research questions of the study had already provided certain focal points, and guided by these focal points, the next step was to code the raw text. Whenever the researcher came across a segment of text that revealed insight on any focal points of the research, it was assigned a code. These codes were then merged into themes which are major overarching ideas.

The classroom observation protocol (Appendix C) proved a useful tool in the analysis of the data obtained from observations. As stated above, the observations were audio-recorded and these recordings were selectively transcribed using the two main categories (Cultural Reference from the Textbook, and Cultural Reference from outside the Textbook). Each teacher reference to a cultural element was listed under the relevant category, and the sub-categories in the protocol were filled in with the data that accompanied a specific cultural reference.

The protocol made both qualitative and quantitative analysis possible. However, the quantitative analysis is not inferential, and was only used as a general statistical summary of more than 20 hours of classroom observation. It is not among the aims of the study to compare the observed teachers’ practices statistically, nor to produce statistically generalizable findings. Although the existence of the observation protocol suggests the use of a priori categories, which is thought to be against the nature of data-driven qualitative analysis, the protocol itself was not a fixed entity thanks to the use of constant comparative method. In this method according to Maykut and Morehouse (1994):

As each unit of meaning is selected for analysis, it is compared to all other units of meaning and subsequently grouped with similar units of meaning. If there are no similar units of meaning, a new category is formed. In this
process, there is room for continuous refinement; initial categories are changed, merged, or omitted; new categories are generated; and new relationships can be discovered (p. 134). The method of constant comparison made it possible to constantly revise the codes used in the sub-categories of the observation protocol as the data was analyzed.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Teacher Beliefs of Culture Teaching

In this section, the findings regarding teachers’ beliefs regarding the use and teaching of culture will be presented and discussed.

4.1.1 How and in What Ways Culture is Important for Teachers?

As stated in the methodology section, a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to explore the beliefs of teachers regarding culture. The ninth item (the first eight collected background information) in the survey was a filter question assessing the general importance teachers placed on culture in foreign language teaching. The results revealed that the majority of the teachers found it either very important or extremely important, with a combined 80.6% of all the teachers that completed the questionnaire (See Table 3). Further 5 teachers (13.9%) thought it was moderately important, while only 2 teachers believed it was slightly important. The mean value for the responses was found to be 3.92 (1=not important at all, 5=extremely important), which suggests that the teachers found the inclusion of culture to be fairly important in foreign language teaching.
Table 3 - The importance teachers attach to inclusion of cultural information in foreign language teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important do you consider the inclusion of cultural information in foreign language teaching?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated before, interviews were also carried out with nearly 20% (N=7) of the respondents to the questionnaire. This was required to obtain in-depth data regarding the beliefs of teachers, which could not be gathered by the questionnaire itself. The teachers were asked to comment on the role of culture in teaching and learning a foreign language, and in what ways they thought it was important. Although there was a clear consensus over the fairly important role of culture, the responses showed a variety of perspective concerning the factors behind this importance.

One of the most emphasized points in the interviews was the use of culture as a motivational and rapport-creating factor in the classroom. Four of the seven teachers that were interviewed basically viewed it as a tool that they used to motivate students, get their attention or create rapport, which they saw as elements that facilitated language learning. One teacher linked this with the globally dominant status of English and the culture that is attached to it, and students’ fascination with both the language and the Anglo-American culture. In his words,
The Anglo-American culture has long been presented and advertised as an attractive asset, and students demand it. Therefore, we teachers need to introduce this culture because it is a strong source of motivation for students, and also because it facilitates language learning in my opinion.

Another teacher clearly indicated that culture’s role in language teaching was limited to attracting the attention of the learners onto a specific language point to be covered in class:

“The role of culture in language teaching is to attract the attention and get their interest as well as to motivate… Especially when creating a context to introduce a grammar topic, it will ensure that the students are motivated if you can find a particularly interesting cultural topic.”

A third teacher stated that although culture was important in language learning, her students did not actually need culture in the context of SFL, where students learned English to pass the proficiency exam. Therefore, she viewed it as a “fun” element: “If I see my students really uninterested in the subject I use references of home culture. I throw around a reference of Lahmacun or and they raise their heads just like that!”

Although the teachers predominantly viewed culture as a motivational source, four of them also made references to its vital role in communication as well. However, most of these were fundamentally linked to the use of English in communication with NSs of English, which runs counter to the international status of English and the principles of EIL. One teacher, for instance, argued that in our context culture could just be used as a motivational factor, and only in an inner circle
country does it make sense to learn culture: “Maybe you will do business there, or you will study there, or you have a girlfriend there... Only then you have to learn this language together with its culture so that it will help you to get adapted to that country.” A second teacher displayed a similar standpoint through her example: “The word please is so important for the British; it is a very important indication of politeness, so we should teach these kinds of things.” Likewise, another teacher referred to her own mother learning English and said, “It is important because when she goes to these countries (US/UK), she will hear these phrases or references.”

The teachers’ positive perceptions of the place of culture in language teaching do not seem to be reflected in their stated practices, however. When they were asked whether they were able to deal with specific cultural aspects in the classroom extensively, most teachers responded negatively. When asked to elaborate on their answers, the teachers provided reasons that could be collected under three notions. The exam-oriented program appears to be the main culprit behind the teachers’ inability to allot time to teaching culture with several palpable references. One teacher simply said, “No, I cannot because we are too much focused on the exams,” while another detailed her negative response by adding: “The prep school here has an ultimate goal, the proficiency exam, and they do not test such (cultural) issues in this test.” A third teacher revealed her “seasonal” attitude towards culture-teaching claiming she dealt with culture more comprehensively in her class during the fall semester, when the proficiency test is far away, and the students are not that much worried about it. She said, “I would not dare to give a lot of time to culture during the spring semester as we are nearing the proficiency.” The tight schedule and the little room for teacher autonomy were also quoted by teachers, which they thought
led to a lack of time to deal with cultural issues in the classroom. One teacher complained: “We have to cover what the program dictates on time. This creates a shortage of time, and I cannot deal with cultural issues as much as I would like.”

A second reason commonly cited as to why teachers do not or cannot deal with culture extensively in the classroom was student disinterest or lack of motivation. This is particularly surprising when it is considered that one of the main factors that makes the use of culture important for teachers was, as discussed above, its potential as a tool to motivate students and stimulate their interest. One of the teachers confessed that she was not able to predict what cultural topics, areas or elements the students would be interested in as the students showed erratic reactions to the cultural materials she brought to the class. “One day they are interested, the next they are not!” she explained, and thus she was reluctant to teach culture in her class hours. The “unnatural” context in which English is taught, a context where Turkish is used mostly for real-life communication (Northern Cyprus), was the source of lack of motivation according to another teacher: “Students learn English to succeed in their departments. Therefore, such a motivation (as those who learn it to use it in target cultures) is missing in our case.” One teacher explained students’ lack of interest in such matters was resulting from the fact that their over-focus on the exam: “Yes, the exam is important, but they seem to be forgetting that they also learn the language to communicate.”

The third reason explaining insufficient culture-instruction was not attributed to external factors, but to a purposeful choice. One teacher did not believe that it was possible to teach culture comprehensively in the classroom: “When you think of all the examples of traditions, history, arts or literature, you realize it is a vain effort to
try to teach culture extensively!” A similar response was: “Where do I start? How can I decide what is good for students?” referring to the hardship in determining the content of culture teaching. The last teacher utterance that could be listed in this category reflected her reliance on the course books and other materials to deal with teaching culture in the classroom: “I do not need to teach culture. The textbooks we choose are already loaded with culture.”

The data collected in this section reveals that the teachers, although they find culture to be an important element in foreign language teaching, do not emphasize the intertwined nature of language and culture well enough, but rather see it as a tool they can resort to at times they struggle to maintain student motivation and attention. The teachers seem to value culture’s role in communication only when the learners are communicating with NSs of the language, or in inner-circle countries like the USA or the UK. This is not only incongruous with the principles of EIL arising from the international status of the English language, but might also be revealing the false assumption that communication between NNSs takes place in a cultural vacuum. The results also indicated that the teachers did not allocate much class time to the teaching of culture, and cited several reasons for this, the most stressed of which was the exam-oriented system and curricular factors that resulted in a lack of time. Obviously, cultural issues were sacrificed for the sake of linguistic goals.

The analysis in this section proved comparable results to previous studies that were similar in scope. The perceived importance of culture which was not reflected in practice was also a recurrent theme in other investigations of culture use both in and out of the Turkish EFL context. The reasons stated by the teachers were also parallel; anxiety caused by curricular restraints and lack of time (Gönen & Sağlam,
2012; Karabinar & Güler, 2012), learner disinterest (Bayyurt, 2006), and a focus on linguistic competence (Byram & Risager, 1999; Larzén-Östermark, 2008) were the most commonly cited factors.

4.1.2 Teacher Objectives of Teaching Culture

Teachers’ objectives of teaching culture were also investigated in this study as they inevitably influence their practices. Adapted from Sercu (2005), the tenth item in the questionnaire asked teachers to rate the importance of nine possible culture teaching objectives. Each of the objectives belonged to one dimension of intercultural competence (Byram et al., 2002), namely knowledge, skills or attitudes. This was required to see which dimension(s) the teachers focused on the most and whether there was a dimension that lacked attention. Table 4 below presents the objectives as they were ranked by the teachers. The information in brackets next to each objective indicates which dimension (attitudes, skills or knowledge) it belongs to.

The objective that was rated highest in importance by the teachers was the development of attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures, which belonged to the attitudes dimension. The second, the third and the fourth highest-ranking objectives came from the skills dimension, with very close mean values. The lowest ranks were populated by the objectives from the knowledge dimension, with the exception of the skills objective to promote increased understanding of students’ own culture, which was ranked seventh.
Table 4 - Teacher objectives of teaching culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. (Attitudes)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promote reflection on cultural differences. (Skills)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations. (Skills)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promote the ability to empathize with people living in other cultures. (Skills)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide information about shared values and beliefs. (Knowledge)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide information about daily life and routines. (Knowledge)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Promote increased understanding of students’ own culture. (Skills)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.). (Knowledge)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s). (Knowledge)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paired sample t-tests (Appendix F) between the objectives revealed the formation of four groups of objectives depending on their mean values. The difference between the highest ranking objective ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.794$) and the second ranking objective ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.893$) was found to be significant; $t(32) = 2.5$, $p = 0.019$. While there was no significant difference between the second ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.893$) and the third ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.914$), $t(32) = 0.24$, $p = 0.813$, as
well as between the third \((M = 4.09, SD = .914)\) and the fourth \((M = 4.09, SD = .947)\) objectives \(t(32) = 0.00, p = 1.0\), the difference between the fourth \((M = 4.09, SD = .947)\) and the fifth ranking objectives \((M = 3.73, SD = .839)\) was statistically significant \(t(32) = 2.7, p = 0.12\). Another significant difference was detected between the eighth \((M = 3.48, SD = .795)\) and the ninth objective \((M = 2.85, SD = .770); t(32) = 5.2, p = 0.00\).   

The interviews conducted with the teachers yielded further information about their culture-teaching objectives. As discussed in the previous section, some teachers viewed culture as just a teaching-facilitating tool and specified certain classroom uses for it, showing that they had no goals or objectives regarding the acquisition of culture at all, but just regarded it as an instrument to reach other language-related goals. Still, other teachers provided references to all the three dimensions and the objectives in them during the interviews.   

The first recurring theme in this respect was closely related to the attitudes dimension. Some teachers made remarks that clearly revealed their wish to make their students open and tolerant towards other cultures. One teacher, referring to Turkish mainlanders having difficulty adapting to the cultural environment in Cyprus, said, “Encouraging our students to be open to different cultures and to accept cultural differences must be one of our priorities. Only when they do this, they can improve themselves and adapt to a culturally foreign environment.” Another teacher presented a striking perspective regarding culture and its teaching: “My main objective as a teacher is to teach language, not to teach a certain culture.” Although this might be thought to indicate that he does not value culture in language teaching and communication overall, he clarified his stance in a further comment: “Our
The knowledge dimension of intercultural competence also seems to get some attention from teachers. To increase students “general world knowledge” was more or less the statement that three of the teachers used when talking about the objectives of culture teaching. “The objectives would be to give more insight to students, and increase their world knowledge about the international culture,” one teacher commented. Another stated that although he did not aim to teach culture, “increasing one’s knowledge of the world’s cultures would be a secondary benefit of language learning.”

The interviews also generated findings regarding the skills dimension of culture. Relevant teacher statements were focused on increasing student’s capacity to communicate successfully in cross-cultural contact situations, which also happen to be one of the highest ranked objectives in the questionnaire. One teacher explained that she exposed her students to real-life situations and tried to teach them how they would need to act in these situations in different cultures. A second statement came from a teacher who specifically emphasized the international status of the English language: “The students will use this language in international encounters. This brings about a necessity for students to learn about the culture or cultures this language is associated with.” This statement was particularly prominent in that it was quite parallel with EIL arguments, and highlighted the fact that the culture of the English language was not a uniform and monolithic entity, and could include multiple cultures. He further reinforced this interpretation by putting it: “This is
important as they will be sharing information of their own with some other person from a different part and culture of the world.”

The data gathered in this part reveals that the teachers see the attitudes dimension, specifically the need to “develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures” as the most important culture-teaching objective. Next in importance comes the skills dimension. However, it is interesting to observe that while the objective “promote reflection on cultural differences” was the second most important culture goal overall, a fundamentally related objective “promote increased understanding of students’ own culture” ranks towards the bottom of the list. This shows that while the teachers valued helping students consider the differences between their own culture and other cultures, they did not think it was their task to create a more heightened awareness of home culture. Sercu (2005), in a study involving teachers from seven mostly Eurozone countries found a similar tendency in teachers, and attributed it to their misconception that it is other teachers’ (mother tongue, history, arts, religion etc.) task to teach home culture, not theirs. However, Sercu’s (2005) findings and this study’s findings are in conflict with regard to their placement of knowledge and skills objectives. While the former stressed knowledge related objectives, and thus regarded culture teaching more in terms of transferring cultural information, the teachers in this study focused more on intercultural skills such as reflecting on cultural differences, or empathizing with people living in other cultures. From an EIL viewpoint, this could be a more appropriate approach as it may not be possible to present all the cultural insight, knowledge and modes of behavior that are brought into communication by countless number of different cultures the English language is used by. From this perspective,
the development of intercultural skills should be given priority along with the right set of attitudes.

4.1.3 The Content (Subject-matter) of Culture Teaching

 Teachers’ beliefs regarding the appropriate cultural subject matter to be covered in the classroom were also explored within this study. To this end the teachers were provided with a list of cultural topics (Item 11 in the questionnaire) and they were asked to state how important they found each item. The list was purposefully compiled by the researcher according to the *four senses of culture* framework designed by Adaskou *et al.* (1990). According to this framework, cultural issues to be studied in the classroom can be grouped under four categories: the aesthetic, sociological, semantic and pragmatic senses of culture. The types of cultural information in this questionnaire item were selected so as to fit in one of these senses of culture. This gave the researcher a convenient analysis tool to determine what areas of culture teachers found more significant to cover in the classroom. The use of such a tool is inevitable when the all-encompassing nature of culture and the extremely broad range of cultural topics are considered.

 Table 5 presents which types of cultural information the teachers thought were the most important. They are listed in a descending mean order, and the information in brackets indicates what sense of culture according to Adaskou *et al.*’s (1990) framework these items belong to. The table shows that the respondents found the cultural topics that were in the domain of the pragmatic sense of culture slightly more important than the others as two ranks out of the first three (1 and 3) were populated by these. The second highest-ranking item in mean value was *daily life and routines* which belonged to the sociological sense, and so did the fourth (*values*
and beliefs) and the fifth (customs, traditions, celebrations and festivals) items. Next came topics that are included in the semantic sense of culture such as idiomatic expressions or cultural references in the meanings of words. Aesthetic culture topics such as film, music, drama, arts and literature had the lowest mean values. The paired sample t-tests conducted (Appendix F) showed that the first two ranks were somewhat separated from the rest statistically, while the third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh ranking items formed a large group with little statistically significant difference in between. The eighth and ninth items were, on the other hand, found to be significantly lower than the others.

### Table 5 – Types of cultural information that the teachers consider important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting (Pragmatic culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Daily life and routines (Sociological culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. (Pragmatic Culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Values and beliefs (Sociological culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Customs, traditions, celebrations and festivals (Sociological Culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Idiomatic expressions (Semantic Culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words) (Semantic Culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Film, music, drama and arts (Aesthetic culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Literature (Aesthetic culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interviewees, as opposed to the respondents to the questionnaire, displayed a greater tendency to use the sociological culture than the pragmatic culture in their teaching. Five of the seven teachers made clear references to cultural topics that were from the sociological sense of culture. Although this domain is a very broad one, the teachers’ responses were centered more on daily life activities, traditions and festivities. Popular culture was another favorite cultural topic of teachers. “I think students would be interested in Black Friday because they can see it everywhere online and they must be thinking about it,” one teacher said, while another stated that her students were very interested in talking about Hollywood celebrities.

Although it was placed towards the bottom of the list in the questionnaire, the inclusion of semantic culture found some support from at least 3 teachers during the interviews. “I’d really like it if we taught more idioms and cultural phrases,” one teacher remarked. Another teacher pointed out the importance of drawing students’ attention on the role of culture in semantics and how the differences are effective in terming concepts: “It would be nice to see some common phrases and expressions like the love handles… Did you know that the Dutch called them fuck handles? You know… These kinds of cultural phrases and fun things.”

The inclusion of pragmatic culture had enjoyed the highest level of support in the questionnaire, but only two teachers referred to topics of this area in the interviews. Politeness in communication was one of such examples: “Why do we teach structures like Could you please...? or May I...? These are very cultural things, and students need to know them for proper conduct.” A second teacher, bringing together features of communicative language teaching and EIL principles,
“Norms of politeness, or modes of behavior may be different in different cultures. The way you behave at a bank in Japan may be different from the way you behave in one in Mexico.”

The highest level of correspondence between the questionnaire results and interview findings appeared in the approach to the use of aesthetic culture in teaching. The teachers had attached the least importance to aesthetic culture in the questionnaire and this was also validated in the interviews. None of the seven teachers made any mention of using the topics that were from this domain in their teaching.

In the interviews, two of the teachers did not specify any cultural topics that could be matched with a sense of culture. However, their responses are worth mentioning as they reflect their overall perspective on the role of culture in language teaching. One teacher argued that it is the needs of the students that should determine the type of cultural information to use in the classroom:

During the preparatory school, it could be more superficial, and we could provide culture sparingly on each subject, but in a wide array of aspects and subjects. However, in the departments we should have an ESP (English for specific purposes) approach, and we should cover what they might in their studies and after graduation.

The other teacher believed that anything that sparked an interest in his students was welcome regardless of what type or sense of culture it came from:

As I see culture as a facilitating tool for teaching English, anything that would motivate or stimulate an interest in students would be suitable. The more
useful it seems to be in this sense, the better. I don’t care what type of knowledge it is.

Data collected from the questionnaire, and specifically the interviews revealed that teachers believe in the importance of including elements of the sociological culture in their teaching. It is quite natural for the teachers to give more examples from this type of culture during the interviews when the broad range of topics under the sociological sense of culture is considered. One reason for this might be, notwithstanding the researcher’s encouragement to take as much time as they need to respond to the questions, that the interviewees might have felt under pressure to provide a quick answer, and items from the sociological sense are among the first to surface when an individual thinks of what culture is and what it involves. This could also explain the higher ranks of items from the pragmatic sense in the questionnaire, during which the participants did not feel the stress to respond quickly, and they might have had enough time to think about the place of the pragmatic sense of culture in communication, and thus might have concluded that they were important in a language learning context. Irrespective of the reason, sociological and pragmatic senses of culture enjoyed the highest priority among teachers. The focus on the sociological culture confirms the findings of several previous studies both from the Turkish and international contexts (Lessard-Clouston, 1996; Byram & Morgan, 1999; Önalan, 2005; Sercu, 2005; Karabinar & Güler, 2012). However, the popularity of the pragmatic dimension in this study is not a result that corroborates the same studies. Instead, in most of the aforementioned studies it was the aesthetic culture, which ranked the lowest in the current study, that
teachers found the most important along with sociological culture. The perception of
the semantic culture showed the highest level of parallelism with other studies.

### 4.1.4 Teachers’ Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Culture

Another goal of the current study was to investigate the beliefs of teachers at
SFL on the appropriate source of culture in the classroom. This examination was
particularly important as the issue of source is a much-emphasized area in the EIL
framework. The questionnaire items related to this research question were designed
to reveal which source of culture - the home culture, the target culture, or the
international culture - teachers believed the cultural content in the foreign language
teaching should mostly come from. The first of such questions was item 12 and it
sought to get the teachers’ general tendency in the choice of source. The item asked
the teachers to rank the possible sources of culture (home, target and the international
culture) in order of priority by assigning each source a number between 1 and 3,
number 1 representing the culture that has the most priority and number 3
representing the least. The results reported in Table 6 reveal that it was the target
culture that the teachers favored the most. In other words, teachers believed the
cultural content that came from inner circle countries where English is spoken as a
native language such as US or UK should constitute the majority of the cultural
content in the classroom. The second, though marginally, was international culture,
which included cultural information coming from a wide range of non-native English
speaking countries from Asia, South America, Africa or Europe. The last in priority
was found to be the home culture, that is, the local culture in which English is taught;
in this case, the Turkish or Turkish Cypriot culture. Paired sample t-test results can
be viewed in Appendix F.
Table 6 – Teacher beliefs on the source of cultural content (1 being highest priority, 3 being lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of cultural content</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 13 had a similar purpose to item 12. However, this time the teachers were asked which source of culture should be the main source of cultural content when dealing with a number of different aspects of culture in language learning. The topics again came from the four senses of culture, namely Aesthetic, Sociological and Pragmatic senses. The purpose behind this was to detect whether teachers had different source preferences for different cultural topics.

The results, displayed in Table 7 below, clearly demonstrated that in all the nine cultural topics, target culture dominated with the lowest mean scores. In other words, teachers saw it fit to use mainly the cultural elements from native English-speaking countries in their instruction. The second highest in priority was found to be the international culture. Only in two aspects of culture, (e.g. values and beliefs, and cultural semantics) was it surpassed by the home culture. Teachers gave the least priority in their instruction to home culture, which was ranked the lowest in 7 of all the cultural aspects, and second in two (Paired sample t-tests are included in Appendix F).
Table 7 – Teacher beliefs on the appropriate source of cultural content while teaching certain aspects of culture (1 being highest priority, 3 being lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of culture</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Source of Culture</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Literature (Aesthetic culture)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.79</strong></td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aesthetic culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.73</strong></td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Daily life and routines</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sociological culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.61</strong></td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Customs and traditions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Celebrations and Festivals)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sociological culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.85</strong></td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Values and beliefs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sociological culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.85</strong></td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Semantic culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.39</strong></td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Cultural semantics (cultural</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>references in the meanings of</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words) (Semantic culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.45</strong></td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Conversational norms and</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patterns in a variety of situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as greeting, thanking,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.42</strong></td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complimenting, apologizing, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requesting (Pragmatic Culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Nonverbal communication</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norms in eye contact, gestures,</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal space etc. (Pragmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td><strong>1.67</strong></td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses given to item 16, shown in Table 8 below, further validated the results obtained from the two previous items. In this question, the teachers were asked to rank the same sources of culture in the order of priority, but this time they were asked to state their beliefs regarding the appropriate source of culture they
thought textbooks should cover. Similar to the previous items, target culture was the highest ranked source of culture, while the international culture followed it, only by a marginal difference, however. The last in priority order was the home culture (See Appendix F for paired sample t-test results).

Table 8 – Teacher opinions on the appropriate source of cultural content in textbooks (1 being highest priority, 3 being lowest priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of cultural content in the textbooks</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviews also provided valuable data concerning what source of culture teachers would prefer to include in their instruction. They were especially fruitful in making up for the shortcomings of the questionnaire items as the analysis unearthed the teachers’ rationales behind the choice of a certain source of culture, which is quite hard to do with multiple choice items or Likert scales.

The questionnaire results had demonstrated that the inclusion of target culture elements received the highest support from the teachers. The interviews brought out multiple reasons that explained such support. These could be grouped under two different notions. The first of these was that the teachers still believed that the English language was directly linked to those who spoke the language as NSs. In other words, teachers associated the English language with inner circle countries and their cultures. Therefore, they viewed these countries and their cultural norms, especially the Anglo-American norms, as the standards that should be recognized by those who learn it as a foreign language. “Because it is their language,” one teacher
reflected in a tone that suggested she found the question meaningless. Another teacher said, “We teach the *English* culture… Isn’t that obvious?” (Emphasis added). A third teacher provided some further explanation only to reveal a perspective similar to the first two: “Culture and language are interwoven, so we should be teaching the target culture.”

Another reason why teachers regarded the presentation of target culture more important than others was their presumption that the learners will need to use English in communication with NSs predominantly. One of the interviewees cited from her own experience: “For example, I learnt it the hard way that requesting something using the structure ‘Will you (carry that bag)?’ is not very polite there,” referring to an inner circle country. One of the teachers again recounted her own experience with one of her students:

I generally provide answer keys to the worksheets on our Facebook group. Once, I forgot to do this, and this Arab student of mine sent me a message: ‘Teacher, I want the answer key’. I had to warn him that this was not polite for English or American people.

The teacher here was either assuming that her student was going to use English to communicate with English or American people, or she believed the politeness norms should be linked with Anglo-American standards regardless of the cultural identities of the interlocutors or the circumstances of the conversation.

The teachers provided certain uses for home culture as well. However, it cannot be argued that these were related to its role in intercultural communication. Teachers, as discussed earlier in section *How and in What Ways Culture is Important for Teachers*, regarded culture as an instrument to maintain student attention and
motivation. This notion also recurred when discussing the uses of home culture. In fact, teachers’ arguments supporting the inclusion of home culture elements were almost completely limited to its potential as a tool to appeal the students’ interest. A quote that strengthens this view was: “I use it (home culture) because learners can better relate to them. Especially examples from their own lives on the campus can quickly get their attention.”

Only two teachers provided reasons for including home culture elements that were based on its importance in cross-cultural communication. One teacher, displaying a parallel orientation with EIL principles asserted: “I believe people should first learn about their own culture extensively. Only after that we can teach other cultures.” The second teacher had a similar perspective, and provided further explanation for his stance: “The students should also be learning the English equivalents of their own cultural elements so that they can express themselves when talking about their own culture. A lack of these might render their communication skills insufficient.”

The data collected via the questionnaire and the interviews for this section of the research indicates the NNESTs at METU NCC SFL believe that the cultural content of their instruction should mainly come from the target culture, that is, the culture of those who speak it as their native language such as, and especially, the USA or the UK. The data shows that they may still be holding the concept that a foreign language is best learnt within the context of its own culture, and that culture for teachers is principally the Anglo-American culture. It would be an oversimplification to attribute this to the teacher’s lack of awareness that English is an international language and its - now greater- use as a Lingua Franca. As a matter
of fact, item 14 was specifically included in the questionnaire to see whether teachers were comfortable with the adoption of an EIL perspective in the language classroom. For this purpose the following quote was included in the item and the teachers were asked to state their level of support for the notion that the international status of English should influence the cultural content of English lessons: “It has been estimated that 80% of communication in English occurs between non-native speakers” (Graddol, 2006). Table 9 below demonstrates that 33 out of 36 teachers agreed with such an assertion. However, this attitude was not reflected on their responses to the source dimension of this study.

Table 9 – The Level of Teacher Support an EIL/ELF perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As explained in the second chapter, very few studies have presented findings on teacher beliefs of the appropriate source of culture in the classroom. Moreover, these few studies did not directly aim to inquire which source of culture teachers found appropriate to use in the classroom, and they provided only indirect findings. The limited and indirect information from these studies suggests that the cultural content of English instruction was automatically linked to inner circle nations (Lessard-Clouston, 1996; Byram and Morgan, 1999; Stapleton, 2000; Llurda, 2004; Önalan, 2005; Bayyurt 2006; Larzén-Östermark, 2008). The present study, with a
4.2. Teachers’ Practices of Teaching Culture

This section of the research focused on the actual classroom practices of teachers regarding the use of culture. To this end, four teachers were observed while they were covering a lesson in LLINT, the course book that was being used at the pre-intermediate level at the time of the study at METU NCC SFL. Each teacher was observed during four lessons from LLINT, which adds up to 5-6 class hours. The qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data as well as post observation interviews generated findings in five areas: teacher’s use of the textbook, the different purposes teachers use culture for, the selection criteria of cultural elements, the content (subject-matter) of culture teaching, and the source of cultural content. The findings in this section will be discussed in tandem with the findings of the first part of this chapter, Teacher’s Beliefs of Teaching Culture.

4.2.1. The Role of the Textbook

The use of the observation protocol (Appendix C) to categorize and analyze the data collected in observations was designed in order to enable the separate recording of cultural references from the textbook and cultural references that the teachers themselves inserted into their instruction. Cultural references from the textbooks occurred in two ways. The first was when teachers directly referred to a cultural element in the course book by explaining, supplementing, highlighting or simply reading it aloud while giving instruction. The second was when the teacher assigned a reading, listening or writing task, and the cultural reference simply
happened to be present in that particular task. Table 10 demonstrates the cumulative statistics of the cultural references made by the four participants observed, and it shows that 63.2% of all the cultural references came from the textbook via direct or indirect references by the teachers. The second type of cultural reference came from outside the textbook and was brought into the classroom by the teachers themselves. This type of reference, on the other hand, made up 36.8% of all the cultural references. These figures reveal that a considerable portion of cultural elements that are covered in the classroom come from the textbook. Despite the fact that Table 10 below indicates that individual teachers displayed different ratios of distribution between the two types of references (textbook reference/outside reference), the lowest textbook reference percentage was 37.3%, which corresponds to one in every three references. Given the statistics, it would be an overstatement to suggest that the cultural content of the lessons is solely defined by the textbook; however, it could be argued that it is a significant factor in determining the cultural content of classroom instruction.

The important role of the textbook in determining the cultural content of language instruction is also confirmed by teacher statements from the interviews (general and post-observation). Although they display some diversity in the level of importance they attach to the role of the textbook in culture-teaching, they seem to be in agreement that it is indeed a major agent. One teacher, for example, believed that
Table 10 – Distribution of Cultural References in the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Teacher references of culture from the textbook</th>
<th>Teacher references of culture from outside the textbook</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

textbooks were of utmost importance, and almost solely responsible for the cultural content of in the classroom in general: “How much culture is going to be taught or discussed in the classroom is dependent on the reading or listening texts, photos and other graphic illustrations, choice of topics etc.” Another teacher suggested that the textbooks provide all the cultural knowledge the students needed; in her own words, “The textbooks we use are already loaded with culture. Therefore, I don’t necessarily need to add any more cultural content to the course.”

However, not all the teachers were trustful of the abilities of the textbook to provide students what they needed in terms of culture. One teacher expressed his reservations regarding the role of the textbook: “Since we are required to spend a lot of time covering the textbook, it has a substantial role. However, this does not mean that the cultural insight in the textbooks alone would be sufficient for the students.” Another teacher provided a similar viewpoint and argued: “These books are produced with a one-size-fits-all mentality. They might not necessarily serve the needs of our students.” Later, she detailed her stance by proposing that the needs of
the learners must also be considered when evaluating the cultural content of the textbooks.

The relationship between teachers’ practices and the role of textbooks in culture teaching was another point of emphasis in teacher interviews. Two teachers, although they agreed with the important role of textbooks, proposed that it was, to a large extent, the teacher’s responsibility to make decisions regarding the cultural content of the textbooks, and make necessary adjustments. The first teacher explained that she felt free to adapt, modify or supplement cultural content in the textbooks in the context of METU NCC SFL, where the teachers were not asked to strictly follow whatever the textbook included. This demonstrates that, institution-specific policies also bear importance regarding the cultural content in the classroom. In the case of METU NCC SFL, teachers have the chance to intervene in the content of the textbook as long as they cover the vocabulary and language items in the texts, which highlights the centrality of teachers’ role in culture-instruction. A second teacher presented a similar perspective and explained that the textbook might provide a starting point for the teacher, but that the teacher could always manipulate the course of events in the classroom:

Yes, the textbook defines the cultural content and the main theme to be covered in the classroom; however, no matter what aspect or source of culture a specific lesson includes, the teacher can always take the initiative to encourage students to make comparisons between the culture that is presented in the textbook and their own culture or a third country’s culture.

Although some of the teachers pointed out that the cultural content of textbooks was closely linked with the teachers’ decisions and could be adjusted as
the teachers saw fit, the data collected during the observations and the teacher statements in general indicate that textbooks had nonetheless a significant role in determining the cultural content that the learners were exposed to.

4.2.2 Teachers’ Criteria in Selecting, Modifying or Ignoring Cultural Elements

The data from the observations and post-observation interviews also seem to validate the view that the role of the textbooks is closely connected to how they are exploited by the teachers. During the observations all the teachers were found to be performing different acts in their treatment of cultural elements included and not included in the textbook. These acts consist of modifying the cultural content from the textbook by means of replacing, adjusting, adapting a certain task in the book, ignoring it altogether, or bringing in completely different cultural elements from outside the textbook. These actions were recorded by the researcher during the observations, and then the teachers were queried on these in the post-observation interviews using the stimulated recall technique. In this section, teachers’ criteria in the aforementioned acts regarding the treatment of cultural elements will be discussed.

One criterion that the teachers use in their treatment of cultural knowledge is the filter that is constituted by their own worldviews, interests and backgrounds. In one classroom observation, the researcher noticed that the teacher did not make any reference to a photograph of Audrey Tatou, a French actress, in the opening lesson of Unit 11 in LLINT, which was about arts and media. Her photo covered almost half of the page in the book, and it was accompanied by the famous quote by Andy Warhol: “In the future, everyone will be famous for 15 minutes.” Both the photo and the quote were ignored by the teacher, who, after a warm-up activity, continued with the
tasks in the textbook. The researcher, suspecting this was a purposeful action by the observed teacher, asked the teacher to explain his motive behind this action in the post-observation interview. In his own words:

I needed to provide a warm-up activity for the students, and yes, sometimes I use the pictures, but in this case this photo did not appeal to me. I have my own tastes, and a certain object in the textbook should first capture my attention, so that I can use it to capture students’. Yes, it must be the students’ interests that matter, but I cannot act as if I were intrigued by something, when I am not.

A very similar attitude was displayed by another teacher who avoided using the very same items in LLINT mentioned above. When asked about this behavior, she said: “I just could not see the exact relationship between this picture here and the topic of the lesson. Also, it is not particularly interesting; I do not think the students would find it interesting, either.” More examples similar to the one recounted above were observed by the researcher in the class, which demonstrates that the teachers’ own personal interests and perspective of life are also at work when they are deciding what cultural elements to include in and what to exclude from their instruction.

The teachers also considered their students in their handling of cultural content. In the classroom, many teacher actions of this nature were observed, and one particular motive was to filter cultural elements based on their potential for generating and maintaining student motivation and interest. One specific example was observed when the teacher adapted a task in (LLINT, Unit 8, Lesson 4, Task 4a/4b/4c). The task originally required the students to role-play in small groups, and act as if they were the members of a board of governors at a Swiss university. They
were supposed to read from a list of student problems at this Swiss university campus, and try to think of possible solutions for these problems, discuss them, and finally present them to the whole class. The teacher, instead of following this procedure, first asked students to write down the problems they had in their actual life at the METU NCC campus, and proceed to find solutions and discuss these instead. When asked what the reason for this particular act was, she reflected: “I thought students would not be able to relate to the student problems from a university they have no idea about. Talking about their own problems would definitely stimulate their interest better, and thus increase participation.” Another salient example occurred when one teacher was covering LLINT Unit 11 Lesson 1, Task 4a and 4b. The task included certain products of media, with specific references. One of these was ER, the hospital drama from the US, which was popular especially in the 1990s. The teacher, in her instruction, simply assumed that the students would not know about it and explained what it was using a more recent hospital drama (House MD). In the interview, she explained her action in these words: “I believe such items must be examples of contemporary cultural elements, youth and popular culture. I myself was at high school when this show was popular. ER does not mean much for them.” Another method of intervention in the cultural content provided by the book was to completely ignore a particular element. This teacher, in Unit 11 Lesson 2, simply omitted a reading text from task 2a. The text was about J.D. Salinger, an American author, and the students were expected to answer some questions using this text. The teacher later argued that she omitted the text because she did not believe her students would show any interest in J. D. Salinger and his life. She also proposed, “the other two texts were about Syd Barrett (a former member of the band
Pink Floyd) and Stanley Kubrick (an English director) and these are better known by students, so I decided to omit the Salinger text,” which clearly indicated the teacher’s belief that such elements must address students’ interests.

Another factor that affects teacher decisions regarding cultural content in the classroom was whether the students would be able to relate to a certain cultural element through their own cultural schemata. Unit 10 in LLINT was about trends. Task 1a in Lesson 1 provided a number of trends and asked the students which of these were popular in their country. One of the items in the list was retiring at 70 years old. The teacher, while discussing these trends in the classroom, referred to this item and said: “Well, this has nothing to do with a trend, right? So let’s move on with the next one.” In the post observation interview, the teacher was asked about this particular behavior, and her answer suggested that she believed retiring at 70 could not be a trend or a cultural issue and that it was more of a technicality. “When you retire is determined by the law, not your own wishes,” she said, dismissing the possibility that some people might be willing to work after the minimum age for retirement. It could be argued that the teacher, considering the general notions of working and retirement in the Turkish society, might have thought that the students would not be able to conceptualize such an act (retiring after 70) as a trend, and decided to skip it altogether, instead of explaining this could be a trend in other cultures. The observation provided above was an example of how teachers could avoid a cultural element if they believed that the students would not be able to relate to it from their own cultural perspective. However, not all teachers resorted to avoiding a cultural element under similar circumstances. For instance, while covering Unit 10, Lesson 4, task 3a, which required the students to read two letters
which were sent to a local newspaper in a town named Belleview in the UK. After
the students finished reading the letters, the teacher felt the need to explain that these
were letters to the editor, and that this type of correspondence between publishers
and readers were very common in the US or the UK. When asked why she inserted
that specific information there, the teacher explained that she had thought the
students would have been foreign to such a concept, and thus they might not have
been able to make sense of the task. This example was particularly important in that
it shows teachers may attempt to explain a cultural item that they believe students
will not be able to comprehend, instead of simply avoiding it. This, of course, can
only happen when the teacher is informed on the subject himself/herself.

4.2.3 Teachers’ Uses of Culture

In the classroom observation protocol, one of the types of data that was
recorded was the purpose of the action. Along with each teacher’s reference to a
cultural element, this section was also completed. These were initially the
researcher’s interpretations of the teachers’ acts involving culture; however, during
the post-observation interviews, the teachers were queried on these, and these initial
speculations were either confirmed or rejected by the observed teachers themselves.

Originally, the researcher’s plan was to use the objectives of culture teaching
which were listed in section Table 4 as a tool for the analysis, as it was initially
assumed by the researcher that each specific use of culture was directly or indirectly
linked to a more global culture-teaching objective. However, as the data was
accumulated, it became clear that this list of objectives was not sufficient for the
analysis, and that the teachers used culture also for reasons which were not
necessarily related to any objective of culture teaching. Table 11 below provides the
list of different uses of cultures and their frequencies as revealed by all the observations. It must be noted that only the cultural references that the teachers themselves added to their instruction and the ones from the textbook that they focused on by explaining, highlighting or supplementing etc. were considered. The cultural references from the textbook for which the teachers did not specifically spend any class time were not included in the analysis.

Table 11 – Different Uses of Culture in the Classroom and their Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Culture</th>
<th>Home Culture</th>
<th>Target Culture</th>
<th>Inter. Culture</th>
<th>TOTAL(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To stimulate interest / draw and maintain attention</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36 (30.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To illustrate the meaning of a lexical item / concept</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To contribute to the performance of the students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 (15.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To provide cultural knowledge/information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To promote student reflection on cultural differences &amp; similarities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To promote increased understanding of students’ own culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / Uncategorized /No specific reason stated by the teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (%)</td>
<td>39 (32.8%)</td>
<td>65 (54.6%)</td>
<td>15 (12.6%)</td>
<td>119 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the most frequently detected uses of culture and cultural elements in the observation was its use as a tool to draw the attention of students. How such a motive shaped and influenced teacher acts in the classroom was discussed in detail in the previous section, and more examples will be provided here. Although it was detected in the observations that the teachers resorted to the use of cultural elements from all sources of culture (home, target, or international) in their attempt to maintain students’ attention and interest in the class, the source that was the most prevalent was the target culture. One teacher for example, before she started covering Unit 10, Lesson 1 (Trends) in the classroom, conducted a warm-up activity she had prepared herself. The activity included a number of images, about which the teacher asked students questions. The images differed in terms of the aspect of culture they were related to, but most were examples of the sociological or aesthetic senses of culture. The images included several media and arts personalities and bands such as James Brown, Jimi Hendrix, Chuck Berry, Tom Cruise or Led Zeppelin, as well as commercial products such as Ray-Ban glasses, or UGG boots. There were a few examples of the international culture such as the painting Mona Lisa and how it started the trend of “no-eyebrows” trend in Europe, or the lotus shoes practice in China. However, a huge majority of the cultural items covered during the warm-up activity came from Anglo-American cultures, and no cultural references were made to the home culture. The same unit and lesson was also observed in another teachers’ classroom, and this teacher had prepared slides as well. The slides included images of trends, and again the Anglo-American items such as Oscar awards, Hollywood celebrities, or clothing items such as TOMS shoes predominated. However, this teacher also made use of items from the local culture. The picture of a group of
people dressed in traditional Turkish peasant clothes and the teacher asking the students whether this was a trend among people living in urban areas in Turkey or not, was one example.

Similar to the first use of culture, the second category also demonstrated the teachers’ perception of culture as a tool that facilitates language learning. The observations demonstrated that the teachers used cultural elements of both home culture and target culture to illustrate the meaning of lexical items, as well as to explain other cultural concepts. One clear example of this was when a teacher was trying to explain the word “dam.” Rather than going into lengthy explanations, or using a picture or a photo, she simply uttered these words: “You know, we have the Keban Dam, for example.” Keban Dam is probably the best-known dam in Turkey, and any student who has gone through the Turkish education system must have heard the name often. The use of culture in this case enabled the effortless illustration of the meaning. Similarly another teacher used an imaginary scenario that included the local supermarket at the campus, Lemar, while trying to explain what shoplifting was. Although the use of home culture items was more dominant in this function of culture, the teachers also made use of target culture elements. The use of Madonna to illustrate the meaning of the word “trendsetter” was one example, but a failed one at that, so the teacher quickly responded by making use of the currently popular media personality in Turkey, Ivana Sert, which seemed to work better.

The class observations and the post-observation interviews also revealed that the teachers believed that students’ knowledge of cultural concepts and elements could be a factor in the classroom performances of the students, and this belief was reflected on their classroom practices. All the teachers in the study were observed in
acts of explaining or defining a cultural item as they believed that without the knowledge of the item in question, the students would not be able to fulfill the expectation of a certain task in the classroom. One particular example involved task 4a in Unit 11, Lesson 1, which required students to fill in the blanks in a text with vocabulary items that were related to books, films, or television programs. One particular reference in the text was *Psycho*, a cult movie by Alfred Hitchcock. Before the teacher allowed the students to start the activity, she asked the student whether they have seen this movie or not. The responses were mixed, and the teacher said: “it’s a classic horror movie, you should see it.” During the post-observation interview, the teacher when asked on the subject, explained that she thought students would know about it, but she could not be sure, so she told them that it was a movie. She said, “the students had to pick from a set of words, and they needed to know that this was a movie, but not a book or a theater play, so that they could pick the right word.” Another example came when the teacher changed the cultural content the textbook provided in Unit 10, Lesson 4, Task 1. In this task, the students were asked to discuss the differences between Belleview (a town in the UK – probably ) 30 years ago and Belleview now. The teacher, instead of asking them to discuss a town they had not even heard of, provided current pictures of Girne (A town in TRNC) and pictures of it from the past, and asked the students to compare these. The teacher later explained her reasons in doing so: “I wanted to give the students something they can actually talk about. They have all seen Girne, and would definitely find more to talk about it than a town named Belleview, which does not even appear on Google!” This was one of the rare acts on the part of the teachers that was parallel to the EIL principles.
The teachers also displayed examples of practices that were actually related to the teaching of culture, though these were in minority compared to the instrumental uses of culture discussed above. The first of such was simply providing cultural knowledge. Unlike the uses discussed previously, in this use, the teachers did not have subsidiary aims in providing cultural information such as motivating the students or to facilitate language learning. Rather, they simply wanted their students to know about the element in question. These came from all sources of cultures, but again from the target culture principally.

Another category in which teacher actions of culture could be placed was the promotion of student reflection on cultural differences and similarities, which was one of the objectives of culture teaching objectives as listed by Sercu (2005). This skill objective was practiced by three of the teachers who encouraged students to make comparisons between different cultures. Almost always, one half of the comparison was the home culture, and the other was whatever the textbook provided as part of a task. One example came when a teacher was doing task 2a in Unit 10, Lesson 1, which was a listening exercise. Three members of a town council from England were speaking about the problems of the town and the complaints they received, and one specific problem was that the public did not welcome “the American practice of charging people for entering beaches.” After the listening task, the teacher asked whether there was the same practice in TRNC or Turkey, and whether they would mind paying to enter beaches or not. Another example was from Unit 10, Lesson 3, Task 1, in which the students were expected to discuss a few questions that were about the concept of retirement, and what people did after
retirement. The task was also accompanied by pictures of older people who were clearly enjoying an active lifestyle. The teacher adjusted the content of the activity, and added the questions: “Do you think people in Turkey like to travel when they are retired?” and “What about other countries?” After the students were given the time to compare the lives of retired people in Turkey and other countries, they were given the chance to express their opinions on the subject to the whole class. Most seemed to think that older people in Turkey preferred to lead sedentary lives and did not travel much unlike people from Europe or the USA. At this point, the teacher interfered and asked a second question: “What do you think are the reasons for this?” to which the students had various responses. This adjustment of the activity gave the students a chance to compare the different cultures’ lifestyles and routines, and the conditions that they might be resulting from.

The next category of teacher acts involving cultural elements in the classroom, as indicated in Table 11 below, was aimed at promoting an increased understanding of students’ own culture. However, it must be taken into account that for some examples in this category, the interviewed teachers stated that they had not had such an intention, but nonetheless agreed with the researcher that the use of home culture elements in certain situations might have helped learners to attain a better understanding of certain aspects of their own culture. In other words, increasing students’ awareness of their own culture was not an intended goal, but a subsidiary benefit. One such example occurred during Task 1a in Unit 12, Lesson 1, which asked the students to discuss a list of crime-related actions, and decide which were serious crimes, which were petty crimes, and which were not a crime at all. During the discussion, the teacher asked them whether they knew what these not-so-
serious crimes were equal to in Turkish, and once the students failed to provide a correct answer, the teacher referred to the *Kabahatler Kanunu* (Misdemeanors) in Turkish, and explained in English that petty crimes were dealt with under this law and thus they could be called “Kabahat.” Another attempt at increasing students’ awareness of their own culture was when one teacher provided information about the history of Bodrum, a coastal tourist destination in Turkey, and how it changed from an isolated and remote area used as a place of exile to the current hugely popular holiday resort it is today.

**4.2.4 The Source and Subject-Matter of Cultural Content in the Classroom**

The study also aimed to investigate teachers’ choices regarding the source and subject matter of cultural elements that they use in the classroom. Some findings regarding these issues have already been provided previously, but a general statistical overview is also necessary to see the larger picture. For this purpose, the observation protocol included a column for the source of each cultural reference, which could be assigned to Home culture, Target culture or International culture. The subject-matter, on the other hand, also had its own column, and the references of teachers were marked as one of the following items from the Adaskou *et al.*’s (1990) framework that classifies cultural content in language teaching: Sociological, Aesthetic, Pragmatic and Semantic senses of culture. The data collected in these two aspects have been presented in cross-tables so as to provide a more insightful portrayal of the relationship between the source and subject-matter of the cultural content.

Table 12 below presents the frequencies regarding which source and subject-matter teachers’ references of culture in the classroom come from. This table includes the references from both the textbook and the references from outside the
textbook, which the teachers insert into their instruction themselves. The table demonstrates that cultural elements from the target culture makes up by far the largest portion of all references with 65.6%. The second most frequently used are international culture elements with 21%, while home culture, with 13.4%, were the least frequently used source. The table also reveals that the aesthetic and sociological senses of culture dominate all the references with a combined 97.8% of all cultural references. The Semantic and Pragmatic senses are nearly non-existent.

**Table 12 - The Distribution of Cultural References in terms of Source and Subject-Matter (Combined)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Aesthetic sense</th>
<th>Sociological sense</th>
<th>Semantic sense</th>
<th>Pragmatic sense</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target culture</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>130 (42.6%)</td>
<td>168 (55.1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>305 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as the references from the textbook constitutes a larger portion of all the cultural references in the classroom with 63.2% (see Table 10), it is also vital to see how the textbook and the teacher references influence the distribution separately. Table 13 below provides only the distribution of references from the textbook only. It shows that target culture elements show an even greater dominance in the textbook with 72% of all references, and it is followed by international culture elements which constitute slightly more than a quarter of the whole. Home culture is the least frequently represented source with 4%. In terms of subject matter, again the aesthetic and sociological senses of culture made up the main bulk, with 40.9% and
57.1%, respectively. Only a combined 2% of all references were from semantic or Pragmatic senses.

**Table 13-** The Distribution of Cultural References in terms of Source and Subject-Matter (Textbook-Sourced)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Aesthetic sense</th>
<th>Sociological sense</th>
<th>Semantic sense</th>
<th>Pragmatic sense</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target culture</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 (25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>79 (40.9%)</td>
<td>110 (57.1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>193 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the current study’s main focus is on teacher beliefs and practices regarding culture, a separate look at the distribution of references sourced from the teachers is significant, which is provided in Table 14 below. The teacher references display a more balanced distribution in terms of source of culture. However, the target culture elements is still the most frequently used with 54.5%, while as opposed to the previous two categories, home culture came up second with 33% of all references. The international culture, on the other hand, constituted 12.5% of all teacher references. The distribution in terms of subject matter did not show any variance compared to the two previous categories, with sociological culture (51.7%) being the most frequently used and aesthetic culture (45.6%) the second. The table also indicates that semantic and pragmatic senses of culture were hardly represented with a combined 2.7% of all references. It is important to state here the examples of pragmatic culture is mostly presented in lesson 4 in a given unit in LLINT, and the
researcher was able to observe the teachers only twice while they were covering this section. This could be one of the reasons why the occurrence of pragmatic culture was so low, and it could be regarded as a limitation of this study.

Table 14- The Distribution of Cultural References in terms of Source and Subject-Matter (Teacher-Sourced)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aesthetic sense</th>
<th>Sociological sense</th>
<th>Semantic sense</th>
<th>Pragmatic sense</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>51 (45.6%)</td>
<td>58 (51.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
<td>112 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target culture</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61 (54.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Culture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data obtained in this section of the analysis provided partly inconsistent results with the findings that were presented in section The Content (Subject-Matter) of Culture Teaching regarding the teachers’ beliefs about the appropriate subject matter to be covered in the classroom. In other words, the beliefs of teachers regarding the type of cultural information to include in their instruction, and their practices did not display a high level of correspondence. The sociological sense of culture was attributed the highest importance along with the pragmatic culture elements in the beliefs analysis, and this was confirmed in teachers’ practices (Tables 12 and 14). However, the quite high occurrence of the aesthetic culture elements in teachers’ practices revealed in Tables 12 and 14 was not foreseen in the beliefs investigation, where it received the least attention, from both questionnaire respondents and interviewees. The second striking disparity between teachers’ beliefs and practices was about the pragmatic culture, which had received the highest
importance in the questionnaire and also considerable emphasis in the interviews. The observations, however, demonstrated that it was the second least frequent item after the semantic culture (Tables 12 and 14).

Regarding the source of culture, the beliefs and practices showed a high level of consistency, though not completely. The beliefs questionnaire as well as the data from the interviews had indicated a clear adherence to target culture as the appropriate source. This was confirmed with the findings of the observations (Tables 12 and 14), which showed that more than half of all teacher references of culture came from target culture elements. The combined statistics of the textbook references and teacher references even further increased the percentage to 65.6%, showing that the students are mainly exposed to the target culture, which is contrary to EIL principles. One can argue that the teachers’ conceptions that English language should be learnt in relation to inner-circle countries find reflection in their classroom practices. However, it must also be noted that part of this dominance may be resulting from the teachers’ use of target culture, specifically Anglo-American cultures, for their potential in drawing the attention of the students, as it was revealed during the interviews.

One area that the beliefs and practice analysis showed considerable difference was in terms of home culture usage. The beliefs analysis revealed that it was the least favored source of culture in the classroom; however, the observations revealed that it was the second most frequently used source with 33%. This disparity might be resulting from the uses of home culture elements as a tool for different purposes, such as illustrating the meaning of a word with an example from the home culture, or using a Turkish pop-culture element to grab the attention of the students and
establish rapport. This might be suggesting that when teaching a class that is homogenous in terms of cultural backgrounds, the teachers make use of shared cultural perspectives with the students.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary of the Study

This study aimed to investigate a group of NNESTs’ beliefs and practices regarding cultural content in the classroom. For this purpose, guided by the research questions, the researcher examined the teacher perceptions on the following specific areas: the importance they attach to teaching culture, their objectives of culture and finally the content matter and the source of culture they find appropriate to be used in the classroom. In terms of teachers’ classroom practices, on the other hand, the focus was on the examination of teachers’ treatment of the cultural content in the textbook, the criteria they use in selecting cultural content, how and for what purposes they use cultural content for, and finally the subject-matter and source of cultural content they use in the classroom. The EIL principles and theories that were discussed in detail throughout the study provided the point of view that was adopted both in the collection of the data, and the analysis of the findings.

The setting of the study was the English preparatory school of a Turkish university, Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus (METU NCC SFL), located in TRNC. The participants were the NNESTs who were working there at the time when the study was conducted. This research could be considered as a case study as it aimed to reveal the beliefs and practices of teachers in one particular institution. The reason why the data collection was limited to the domains of a single institution was the idea that teacher beliefs and especially practices
regarding the cultural dimension of language teaching was closely linked to the textbooks, their cultural content, and the instructional context within which they are used. When it is considered that different institutions use different textbooks, conducting institution-specific studies may provide more dependable results especially regarding classroom practice.

The methodology followed to pursue the objectives of the study included three chronologically separate, but conceptually interrelated phases. The first phase included the design of a questionnaire (Appendix B) which was necessary to reveal the beliefs of teachers regarding the teaching of culture in the classroom. The questionnaire included different sections to collect data regarding teachers’ opinions on the objectives of culture teaching, the different types of information that should be used in the classroom, the source of culture that should be emphasized and the cultural content of textbooks. 36 out of a possible 46 teachers responded to the questionnaire.

For the second phase of the study, four participants were selected for the classroom observations. The teachers were observed while they were covering one of the five lessons in a unit in LLINT, and four lessons were observed in total. As each lesson takes about 1.5 to 2 class hours to finish, this equals to 6-7 class hours of observation in total for each teacher. During the classroom observations and in the transcription stage, an observation protocol (Appendix C) designed to answer the needs of the needs of the study was used. The use of the protocol enabled the categorization of the observation of the data. The observations were also followed by post-observation interviews to ensure the researcher’s interpretation of a particular
in-class teacher behavior concerning cultural content was parallel with the teacher’s actual intention behind that certain behavior. The questions in these interviews naturally varied from one teacher to another as the data collected was different in each observation. A sample set of post-observation questions is provided in Appendix D.

The last data collection phase of the study included interviews with seven teachers, four of which were the observed teachers in the second phase. The interview questions (Appendix E) were prepared with the guidance of the research questions, and provided in-depth data regarding both the beliefs and practices of the teachers.

5.2. Summary and Discussion of the Findings

The first finding of the research was that the vast majority of the teachers found teaching culture vital in ELT and provided several reasons for this. However, it was discovered that a significant portion of the teachers did not value including culture in their instruction due to its role in cross-cultural communication, but rather for its potential as a motivational tool used to attract attention of and stimulate interest in students for other tasks and topics. Those who linked the importance of culture to its part in communication, on the other hand, provided explanations and examples that revealed they believed culture played an important role when communicating with NSs of English.

The data from the interviews also indicated that, despite the fact that they valued the role of culture in language teaching, teachers were not able to deal with cultural subjects as much as they would like to and specified external factors such as
the exam-oriented system and curricular restraints as the chief reasons behind it. These, according to teachers, did not leave any time to cover cultural issues thoroughly in the classroom. It can be argued that teachers prioritize the acquisition of formal properties of a language over the acquisition of cultural competence. Teachers also cited students’ disinterest towards cultural issues as another reason why they did not cover such topics extensively. This is particularly interesting when it is considered the teachers had stated that they valued culture for its potential to generate student interest. It can be concluded from this contradiction that teachers do not include a lot of culture in their instruction, and when they do, they tend to select cultural content that they believe will address their students’ interests and not necessarily their communicational needs. This conclusion was further validated with the data that was collected via classroom observations. In the classroom, several teacher actions that included the use of a cultural element were observed to carry a similar motive. These interpretations were also confirmed by the teachers in almost all instances.

The study also explored the teacher beliefs on what should be the objectives of teaching culture. The list of the culture teaching objectives in that the teachers were asked to pick from was compiled in order to represent each dimension of intercultural competence: knowledge, skills and attitudes (Table 4). The objective that was rated highest in importance by the teachers was the development of attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures, which belonged to the attitudes dimension. The second, the third and the fourth highest-ranking objectives came from the skills dimension. Objectives from the knowledge dimension occupied the lowest ranks. The data from the interviews, on the other hand, provided teacher
statements of culture teaching objectives that fell in the domains of each of the three dimensions of intercultural competence. One particularly striking conclusion from the interviews was that the realization that some teachers had no objectives of teaching culture as they simply viewed it as a tool that facilitated the realization of other language-related goals. This would have been impossible to discover solely with the administration of questionnaires.

One important finding in this section was that although encouraging students to reflect on cultural differences was regarded as an important objective of teaching culture, an essentially connected objective, promoting increased understanding of students’ own culture, was ranked a lot lower (See Table 4). This shows that the teachers either assume that their students already have a full understanding of their home culture, or they do not think that it is their duty to help students to develop that awareness. This can be regarded as problematic from an EIL point of view, as it highly values a thorough awareness and understanding of one’s own culture in order to be able to critically evaluate the foreign cultural concepts and elements, and not to reduce the comparison of the target culture and home culture to a low-level comparison of facts (Kramsch, 1987). However, the emphasis on the skills dimension with objectives such as promoting the ability to handle intercultural contact situations or promoting the ability to empathize with people living in other cultures is an indicator that the teachers do not see culture teaching as a simple transfer of cultural information. The fact that objectives from the knowledge dimension have occupied the lowest ranks confirms this conclusion.

The data collected through the observations, on the other hand, seem to both confirm and disconfirm the findings of the questionnaire and interviews. As
mentioned above, some teachers had stated that they did not have any specific
culture teaching objectives as they just saw culture as an instrument that facilitated
language learning. This was also demonstrated in section *Teachers’ Uses of Culture*,
and Table 11, which shows that the first three most frequent uses of cultural elements
could not be matched with one of the objectives in the skills, knowledge or attitudes
dimension of intercultural competence. Instead, the teachers used cultural elements
and concepts simply to stimulate interest, illustrate the meaning of a lexical item or
to increase the performance of the students in a given task. Only the fourth, fifth and
the sixth uses of culture, namely , could be associated with a more global culture-
teaching objective. It is striking to see that none of the uses observed in the
classroom could be linked to the attitudes dimension, which had been ranked highest
in the questionnaire.

Another focal point of the research was teachers’ beliefs with regard to the
appropriate cultural subject matter to be covered in the classroom. Adaskou et al.’s
(1990) classification of culture was used for data collection and analysis in this
section. This framework suggested that culture manifested itself in four senses,
namely, the aesthetic, sociological, semantic and pragmatic senses of culture. The
findings from the questionnaire and interviews indicated that sociological and
pragmatic senses of culture enjoyed the highest priority among teachers. Teacher
attitudes towards the semantic sense of culture displayed a certain level of difference
in the questionnaire and the interviews, while the aesthetic culture received the least
attention in both sets of data. The observations, on the other hand, revealed a slightly
different picture (See Tables 12, 13 & 14). While the importance that was attributed
to the sociological sense of culture in the questionnaire and interview was also
reflected in practice, the use of pragmatic culture, which was attached the highest importance in the questionnaire and considerable emphasis in the interviews, was almost non-existent in actual classroom practice. The aesthetic culture, unexpectedly, had the second highest occurrence in the combined statistics of all teachers (See Tables 12, 13 & 14).

The dominance of sociological culture elements in both the belief and practice findings is expected considering the wide array of subjects that this sense of culture encompasses. Examples in this domain include daily life, family relations, customs and traditions, or institutions. On the other hand, the high level of importance that was placed on pragmatic culture might be linked to the wording of the questionnaire item which describes it as “conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting.” One section in the English Proficiency Exam (EPE) administered for the students at METU NCC is designed so as to test students’ ability to respond to certain hypothetical situations with a single statement. The questions in this section frequently require students to use the above-mentioned speech acts such as thanking, complimenting or requesting. This might be the reason why the teachers attributed a high-level of importance in the questionnaire. However, during the interviews and the observations, not many examples of pragmatic culture were provided by the teachers. This could be resulting from teachers’ perception of these, especially the norms in speech acts, as language points, but not elements of culture.

The investigation of teacher beliefs and practices concerning the appropriate source of culture to be used in the classroom was another goal of the study. The responses to the related questionnaire items 12, 13 and 16, which were
presented in Tables 6, 7 and 8, indicate that the teachers believe the cultural content of the instruction should mainly come from the target culture. In other words, teachers favored cultural content from inner circle countries such as US or UK, where English is spoken as a native language. Table 7 specifically demonstrates that teachers thought target culture should make up the cultural content of the classroom regardless of subject matter. These perceptions of the teachers were also reflected in the classroom practices of the teachers. Observations revealed that it was the target culture elements that the teachers mainly depended on in their instruction (Tables 12, 13 & 14). The reasons teachers stated for such a perspective included an EIL-wise misguided notion that the English language was still directly linked to those who spoke the language as NSs and that their cultural norms, especially the Anglo-American norms, as the standards that should be recognized by those who learn it as a foreign language. A second assumption was that the learners would eventually need to use English in communication with NSs, and therefore, their cultural norms and standards should be taken into account. This suggests that the teachers are either unaware of the statistics of the use of English as an international language and their resulting implications discussed previously, or they simply believe that regardless of the circumstance, context and the background of the interlocutors involved, speakers must adopt a NS perspective of the cultural dimension of communication.

One certain discrepancy between teachers’ beliefs and practices in terms of the source of culture was that in the beliefs phase of the study, the use of home culture elements in instruction ranked below the international culture elements in almost every aspect of culture (Table 7). However, in the classroom observations it was found that the teachers made a lot more use of home culture than the
international culture (Table 14). This fact could be attributed to the classroom uses of home culture. Table 11 reveals that home culture was mostly used for illustrating the meaning of a lexical item. This might lead to the conclusion, as discussed before, that home culture is mainly used as a teaching facilitating instrument in the classroom, but not to increase students’ awareness of their own culture. This is further validated by the second most common usage of home culture in provided in Table 11, which is to stimulate interest and maintain the attention of the students.

The research also provided findings related to the role of the textbook in terms of cultural content in the classroom. Findings presented in Table 10 indicate that the textbook, LLINT, is an important factor that controls the characteristics of the cultural content in the classroom as 63.2% of all cultural references come from the textbook. Additional evidence for the textbook’s potential in determining the content is presented in Tables 12 and 14. According to Table 14, home culture ranks as the second most frequently used culture source by the teachers. However, with the addition of the textbook references to the teacher references, it is replaced by the international culture elements (Table 12). The significant role in determining the cultural content that the learners were exposed to was also confirmed by teachers in the interviews.

5.3. Implications of the Study

The results of the study present several implications for ELT in especially the expanding circle countries. The study reveals that teachers either cannot or simply prefer not to allocate enough time to teaching culture in the classroom. The main culprits are curricular limitations, and dominance of linguistic goals caused by testing anxiety, neither of which can directly be addressed by the teachers. Therefore,
stakeholders, administrators and curriculum developers should take on an active role in the promotion of culture teaching in the classroom.

The most important finding of the study from an EIL perspective was that teachers, as revealed by both their stated beliefs and practices, regarded the introduction of target culture elements more important than international culture and home culture. The chief reason behind such a perception may be the fact that the teachers are not well-informed on the implications of the status of English as an international language on the cultural dimension of language teaching and learning. This highlights the importance of incorporating the relatively new principles and theories arising from the international status of English into both pre-service and in-service teacher training curriculums. Only then can teachers be expected to have an improved awareness of the increasingly different contexts and purposes English is used for international and intercultural communication, and their implications on ELT in general, and the treatment of culture as part of ELT in specific.

The data collected also had an important function in terms of determining the cultural content in the classroom. From an EIL standpoint, this reveals the importance of selecting textbooks which emphasize the multicultural character of the English speaking global community, and the international/intercultural function of the English language inside this community, rather than textbooks which expose learners to the biased, simplified and hugely Anglo-Americanized and westernized cultural representations of the English speaking world.
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This study is being conducted by Instructor Engin Kaça, at the School of Foreign Languages, Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus (METU NCC SFL). The aim of the study is to examine the teacher beliefs and practices of cultural content in the ELT classroom in an Intensive English Program at a university located in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). You are kindly asked to fill in a survey, which will be used to reveal the beliefs and preferences of the teachers at METU NCC SFL regarding appropriate cultural content in the classroom. Participation is on a voluntary basis and participants are free to withdraw at any time.

It is not obligatory to state your name, however doing so could contribute to the later stages of the research (Some participants might be asked if they are willing to participate in classroom observations and interviews). Providing your name will also ensure that you are informed of the results of the study. Your identity will not be revealed in any publications that result from this study. The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential and no reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link you to the study.

The questionnaire takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. For further information you can contact Instructor Engin Kaça at METU NCC SFL (Room No: P117; Tel: 0392 661 2828; E-mail: ekaca@metu.edu.tr). Thank you in advance for your participation.

_I understand the aim of the research, and I indicate my voluntary agreement to participate by completing and returning this survey._

Name  Date  Signature  

----/--/--/-----
APPENDIX B – Questionnaire

Culture in the classroom survey

This study is being conducted by Instructor Engin Kaça, at the School of Foreign Languages, Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus (METU NCC SFL). The aim of the study is to examine the cultural content in the ELT classroom in an Intensive English Program at a university located in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). To this end, the study focuses on the two major sources of culture in the classroom: the textbook and the teacher. You are kindly asked to fill in a survey, which will be used to reveal the beliefs and preferences of the teachers at METU NCC SFL regarding cultural content in the classroom. Participation is on a voluntary basis and participants are free to withdraw at any time.

It is not obligatory to state your name, however doing so could contribute to the later stages of the research (Some participants might be asked if they are willing to participate in interviews). Providing your name will also ensure that you are informed of the results of the study. Your identity will not be revealed in any publications that result from this study. The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential and no reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link you to the study.

The questionnaire takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. For further information you can contact Instructor Engin Kaça at METU NCC SFL (Room No: P117; Tel: 0392 661 2828; E-mail: ekaca@metu.edu.tr). Thank you in advance for your participation.

I understand the aim of the research, and I indicate my voluntary agreement to participate by completing this survey.

Yalnızca bir şıkı çıkalırsanız.

☐ Start the survey  2. soruya geçin.
☐ Decline       Bu formu doldurmayı bırakın.

Culture in the classroom survey

SECTION 1 - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your name?
   Although stating your name is not obligatory, it will add me in later stages of my research

2. What is your gender? *
   Uygun olanın tümünü işaretleyin.

   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female

3. What is your nationality? *
4. What is/are your native tongue(s)? *

- [ ] Turkish
- [ ] English
- [ ] Diğer: ________________________________

5. Do you speak any foreign language other than English?
(Please indicate the language and the appropriate level)
Her sütunda yalnızca bir şirk işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Your educational background
Please indicate your BA, Ma and PhD degrees (if applicable).
Her sütunda yalnızca bir şirk işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>English Language Teaching</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Linguistics</th>
<th>Other (Social Sciences)</th>
<th>Other (Humanities/Arts)</th>
<th>Other (Physical Sciences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Your experience in English language teaching *

- [ ] 0-4 years
- [ ] 5-8 years
- [ ] 9-12 years
- [ ] 13-16 years
- [ ] 17 years or more

8. Have you ever resided in a country (other than your home country) for more than 3 months?
Yalnızca bir şirk işaretleyin.

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
SECTION 2 – CULTURAL CONTENT IN THE CLASSROOM

9. How important do you consider the inclusion of cultural information (culture as a general concept) in foreign language teaching? 
Yalnızca bir şikik işaretleyin.

- [ ] Not important at all (Choosing this will end the questionnaire) Bu formu dolduruneyi
- [ ] Slightly important
- [ ] Moderately important
- [ ] Very important
- [ ] Extremely important

10. How important do you consider the following objectives when teaching culture in a foreign language teaching context? 
Below, nine possible objectives of culture teaching have been listed. Please indicate how important you think each objective is.
Her satırdı yalnızca bir şikik işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Provide information about daily life and routines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Provide information about shared values and beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Promote reflection on cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Promote increased understanding of students’ own culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. How important do you consider the inclusion of the following types of information when teaching culture in a foreign language teaching context? Below, 9 possible types of cultural information have been listed. Please indicate how important you think each type of information is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Daily life and routines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Values and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Non-verbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Which source of cultural content would you prefer to use in your class? 

Please rank the following items in order of priority by assigning each source a number between 1 and 3, number 1 representing the culture that has the most priority and number 3 representing the least. You must assign a numerical ranking to each source of cultural content listed.

**NOT ASSIGN THE SAME NUMBER MORE THAN ONCE**

(PLEASE DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Home Culture: The local culture in which English is taught as a foreign language. (Turkish culture or Turkish Cypriot culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Target Culture: English speaking Western cultures such as Britain, US, Australia, or Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. International culture: A variety of non-English speaking (as a first language) cultures from Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. When using the following specific aspects of culture in your teaching, what do you think should be the main source of cultural content?

Please rank the following items in order of priority by assigning each source a number between 1 and 3. Number 1 represents the culture that has the highest priority and number 3 represents the lowest. You must assign a numerical ranking to each source of cultural content listed.

Sources of cultural content:
- **Home Culture**: The local culture in which English is taught as a foreign language. (Turkish culture or Turkish Cypriot culture
- **Target Culture**: English speaking cultures such as Britain, US, Australia, or Canada.
- **International culture**: A variety of non-English speaking (as a first language) cultures from Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

a. **Literature**
   1 = The highest priority, 3 = The lowest priority
   Her saticıda yainizca bir şikki işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Film, music, drama and arts**
   1 = The highest priority, 3 = The lowest priority
   Her saticıda yainizca bir şikki işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. **Daily life and routines**
   1 = The highest priority, 3 = The lowest priority
   Her saticıda yainizca bir şikki işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. **Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals)**
   1 = The highest priority, 3 = The lowest priority
   Her saticıda yainizca bir şikki işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. **Values and beliefs**
   1 = The highest priority, 3 = The lowest priority
   Her saticıda yainizca bir şikki işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. Idiomatic expressions *
1=The highest priority, 3=The lowest priority
Her satırda yalnızca bir şişki işaretleyin.

Home Culture |  |  |
Target Culture |  |  |
International Culture |  |  |

---

g. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words) *
1=The highest priority, 3=The lowest priority
Her satırda yalnızca bir şişki işaretleyin.

Home Culture |  |  |
Target Culture |  |  |
International Culture |  |  |

---

h. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting *
1=The highest priority, 3=The lowest priority
Her satırda yalnızca bir şişki işaretleyin.

Home Culture |  |  |
Target Culture |  |  |
International Culture |  |  |

---

i. Non-verbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. *
1=The highest priority, 3=The lowest priority
Her satırda yalnızca bir şişki işaretleyin.

Home Culture |  |  |
Target Culture |  |  |
International Culture |  |  |
14. Please read the quotation below and then indicate your level of support for the statement that follows the quotation.

“It has been estimated that 80% of communication in English occurs between non-native speakers.” (Graddol, 2006)

This estimate, if reasonably accurate, should influence the cultural content of English lessons and textbooks:

Yalnızca bir şikliği işaretleyin.

☐ strongly agree
☐ agree
☐ not sure
☐ disagree
☐ strongly disagree

Please briefly explain your choice in the provided area below (optional).

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

SECTION 3 CULTURAL CONTENT IN THE TEXTBOOK

15. If you could choose your own textbook, what criteria would you observe when selecting a textbook? *

Below, a number of textbook characteristics that may affect your choice against or in favour of a particular textbook have been listed. Please tick the FOUR criteria that appear most important to you.

Uygun olanların tımlını işaretleyin.

☐ a. The fact that additional materials come with the book (workbook, listening materials, tests, video, etc.)
☐ b. The layout
☐ c. The price
☐ d. The quality of the teacher’s manual
☐ e. The degree to which the book is attuned to the level and the age of my students.
☐ f. The degree to which the book can motivate my students.
☐ g. The textbook authors’ nationality
☐ h. The amount and type of cultural information the book offers
☐ i. The publisher
16. Which source of cultural content do you think textbooks should mostly be covering? *

Please rank the following items in order of priority by assigning each source a number between 1 and 3, number 1 representing the culture that has the most priority and number 3 representing the least. You must assign a numerical ranking to each source of cultural content listed.

(PLEASE DO NOT ASSIGN THE SAME NUMBER MORE THAN ONCE)

Her satırda yalnızca bir şıklık işaretleyin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Home Culture: The local culture in which English is taught as a foreign language. (Turkish culture or Turkish Cypriot culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Target Culture: English speaking Western cultures such as Britain, US, Australia, or Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. International culture: A variety of non-English speaking (as a first language) cultures from Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Does the cultural content of the textbooks used at METU NCC SFL (Language Leader series) meet your expectations for teaching cultural aspects of communication in English? *

Yalnızca bir şıklık işaretleyin.

- [ ] Yes, very much so.
- [ ] Yes, up to a certain extent.
- [ ] Not sure
- [ ] No, not really.
- [ ] No, not at all.

Please briefly explain your choice in the provided area below (optional).

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Lesson</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Reference to a Cultural Element in Textbook</th>
<th>Teacher's Purpose for the Reference</th>
<th>Teacher's Action with the Reference (ignoring, comparing, highlighting, explaining, supplementing, modifying, etc.)</th>
<th>Reference to a Cultural Element Not Included in Textbook</th>
<th>Teacher's Purpose for the Reference</th>
<th>Teacher's Action with the Reference (ignoring, comparing, highlighting, explaining, supplementing, modifying, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX C - Classroom Observation Protocol**
APPENDIX D - Sample Post-Observation Interview

Observed Teacher: _____________

Date of the observations: _____________

Date of the interview: _____________

1. During the warm-up stage of the lesson, you opted to ignore the following quote (p.112) in the book: *In the future everyone will be famous for 15 minutes*. Andy Warhol, 1928-1987. Was there a specific reason behind this?

2. You made no use of the picture of the French actress Audrey Tatou on page 112. Was there a specific reason behind this?

3. While explaining the word *genre*, you said “For example, *Die Hard* is an action movie.” What was the reason behind choosing that movie as an example?

4. While giving the instructions for exercise 4a and 4b on page 113, you explained what *Psycho* (a movie), and *ER* (a tv show) were, and you shortly described these to the students.

   - Was there a specific reason behind this?

   - Do you think students’ knowing or not knowing these items had any effect on:

      a. students’ performance during this task,

      b. the motivation of the students at the time,

      c. the overall communicative and linguistic capacities of the students.

5. Do you think the cultural content of this lesson is appropriate for your students? Why/ Why not?
6. Did you feel that they had difficulty to understand cultural references?

7. Would you change the cultural content of this lesson if time, resources and curriculum were not constraints? If yes, how? Would you change the subject matter? Would you change the source of the cultural references?
APPENDIX E - General Interview

1. What do you think about the role of culture in teaching and learning a foreign language? Do you think it is important? If yes, in what ways is it important?

2. What do you understand from “culture teaching” in a foreign language teaching context? What may be the objectives in teaching culture?

3. What aspects of culture and what types of cultural information do you think language teaching should include?

4. Are there specific purposes for which you use cultural information/knowledge in the classroom? E.g. to motivate students, to attract students’ attention, to illustrate the meaning of a word or expression, to explain a human behavior or other phenomena in the textbooks or other materials etc.

5. Which of the following sources of cultural content would you prefer to use in your class predominantly? Why?
   
   a. Home culture (The local culture in which English is taught as a foreign language. (Turkish culture or Turkish Cypriot culture)
   
   b. Target Culture (English speaking Western cultures such as Britain, US, Australia, or Canada.)
   
   c. International culture (A variety of non-native English speaking cultures from Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America)

6. In the language classroom, how extensively do you deal with particular cultural aspects? Do you think you can allot sufficient time to teaching culture? If not, why not?

7. What do you think about the role of Textbook in teaching culture? Is it important?
8. How do you make your decisions regarding the selection of cultural content in the text to cover or not?

9. Are you familiar with the following concepts/perspectives in English language teaching:
   a. EIL (English as an International language)
   b. ELF (English as a Lingua Franca)
APPENDIX F – SPSS Paired Sample T-test Results for the Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 2. Promote reflection on cultural differences.</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations.</td>
<td>2.914</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures.</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs.</td>
<td>5.214</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5 1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 6. Provide information about daily life and routines.</td>
<td>4.647</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 7. Promote increased understanding of students’ own culture.</td>
<td>5.382</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 8. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td>6.306</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>1. Develop attitudes of openness and tolerance towards other peoples and cultures. - 9. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.61  7.86  .137  1.327  1.886  11.71  32  0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9</td>
<td>2. Promote reflection on cultural differences. - 3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30  7.26  .127  -2.28  .289  2.39  32  0.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 10</td>
<td>2. Promote reflection on cultural differences. - 4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30  6.37  .111  -1.95  .256  .273  32  0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 11</td>
<td>2. Promote reflection on cultural differences. - 5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.394  8.84  .150  0.08  .700  2.620  32  0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.24  6.53  .115  1.18  .659  3.677  32  0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 13</td>
<td>2. Promote reflection on cultural differences. - 7. Promote increased understanding of students' own culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.15  1.25  .218  0.071  .959  2.362  32  0.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 14</td>
<td>2. Promote reflection on cultural differences. - 8. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.36  9.62  .168  2.95  9.78  3.799  32  0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 15</td>
<td>2. Promote reflection on cultural differences. - 9. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.27  8.01  .139  .989  1.557  9.125  32  0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 16</td>
<td>3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations. - 4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00  7.50  .131  -2.66  .266  .000  32  1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 17</td>
<td>3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations. - 5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.364  8.85  .156  0.046  .601  2.334  32  0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 18</td>
<td>3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations. - 6. Provide information about daily life and routines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.394  8.84  .150  0.088  .700  2.620  32  0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 19</td>
<td>3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations - 7. Promote increased understanding of students' own culture.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>2.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 20</td>
<td>3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations - 8. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>3.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 21</td>
<td>3. Promote the ability to handle intercultural contact situations - 9. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>6.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 22</td>
<td>4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures - 5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>2.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 23</td>
<td>4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures - 6. Provide information about daily life and routines.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>2.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 24</td>
<td>4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures - 7. Promote increased understanding of students' own culture.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>2.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 25</td>
<td>4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures - 6. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>3.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 26</td>
<td>4. Promote the ability to empathise with people living in other cultures - 9. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>7.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 27</td>
<td>5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs - 6. Provide information about daily life and routines.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 28</td>
<td>5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs. - 7. Promote increased understanding of students' own culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.121 .850 .113 -.109 .352 1.071 32 .292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 29</td>
<td>5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs. - 8. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.242 .830 .145 -.082 .537 1.677 32 .103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 30</td>
<td>5. Provide information about shared values and beliefs. - 9. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.879 .820 .143 .588 1.170 6.157 32 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 31</td>
<td>5. Provide information about daily life and routines. - 7. Promote increased understanding of students' own culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.091 1.16 .201 -.319 .501 .452 32 .654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 32</td>
<td>5. Provide information about daily life and routines. - 8. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.212 1.08 .189 -.172 .596 1.125 32 .269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 33</td>
<td>6. Provide information about daily life and routines. - 8. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.848 9.96 .158 .527 1.170 6.382 32 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 34</td>
<td>7. Promote increased understanding of students' own culture. - 8. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.121 .820 .143 -.170 .412 .849 32 .402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 35</td>
<td>7. Promote increased understanding of students' own culture. - 9. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.758 9.99 .169 .414 1.101 4.430 32 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 36</td>
<td>8. Provide experiences with a rich variety of cultural expressions (literature, music, theatre, film, etc.). - 9. Provide information about the history, geography and political conditions of the foreign culture(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.636 6.99 .122 .369 .884 5.230 32 .600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Paired Samples T-Test for Types of Cultural Information that the Teachers Consider Important (Table 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 2. Daily life and routines</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc.</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 4. Values and beliefs</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals)</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 6. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words)</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 8. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>1. Conversational norms and patterns in a variety of situations such as greeting, thanking, complimenting, apologizing, or requesting - 9. Literature</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>2. Daily life and routines - 3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc.</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>2. Daily life and routines - 4. Values and beliefs</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>2. Daily life and routines - 5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals)</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>2. Daily life and routines - 6. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>2. Daily life and routines - 7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words)</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>2. Daily life and routines - 8. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>2. Daily life and routines - 9. Literature</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. - 4. Values and beliefs</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. - 5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals)</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. - 6. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. - 7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words)</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value1</td>
<td>Value2</td>
<td>Value3</td>
<td>Value4</td>
<td>Value5</td>
<td>Value6</td>
<td>Value7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 20</td>
<td>3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. - 8. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 21</td>
<td>3. Nonverbal communication norms in eye contact, gestures, personal space etc. - 9. Literature</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>1.744</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 22</td>
<td>4. Values and beliefs - 5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals)</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 23</td>
<td>4. Values and beliefs - 6. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 24</td>
<td>4. Values and beliefs - 7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words)</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 25</td>
<td>4. Values and beliefs - 8. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 26</td>
<td>4. Values and beliefs - 9. Literature</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 27</td>
<td>5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals) - 6. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 28</td>
<td>5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals) - 7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words)</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 29</td>
<td>5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals) - 8. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 30</td>
<td>5. Customs and traditions (Celebrations and Festivals) - 9. Literature</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 31</td>
<td>6. Idiomatic expressions - 7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words)</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 32</td>
<td>6. Idiomatic expressions - 8. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 33</td>
<td>6. Idiomatic expressions - 9. Literature</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 34</td>
<td>7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words) - 8. Film, music, drama and arts</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>7. Cultural semantics (cultural references in the meanings of words) - 9. Literature</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 30</td>
<td>8 Film, music, drama and arts - 9. Literature</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Source of Cultural Content (Table 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-.696</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>-.572</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>-.572</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture - Literature (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>-.553</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.545</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.862</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>-1.018</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture - b. Film, music, drama and arts (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.679</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>-.925</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.406</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>-1.040</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.394</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.940</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Paired Samples Test Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture - 1. Daily life and routines (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>- .989 - .101</td>
<td>-2.502</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.636</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-1.104 - .189</td>
<td>-2.772</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>- .611 - .429</td>
<td>-3.56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture - 2. Customs and traditions (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-1.121</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>- .525 - .293</td>
<td>-5.11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>1.362</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>- .816 - .149</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>- .812 - .388</td>
<td>-7.21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture - 3. Values and beliefs (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>- .852 - .106</td>
<td>-1.466</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>- .732 - .368</td>
<td>-6.74</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>- .472 - .684</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture: 1. Idiomatic expressions (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-.879</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-1.292 - 0.465</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.939</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-1.364 - 0.515</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.521 - .399</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture: 2. Cultural semantics (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-.879</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>-1.292 - 0.466</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.758</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>-1.201 - 0.314</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>-.362 - .505</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture: 3. Nonverbal communication norms (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-.485</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>-1.511 - 0.050</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>-1.951 - 0.080</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>-.615 - .564</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paired Samples Test for Teacher Beliefs on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content while Teaching Certain Aspects of Culture - R.Conversational norms (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>-0.818</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>-1.189 -0.448</td>
<td>-4.503</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.909</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>-1.356 -0.463</td>
<td>-4.148</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>-0.587 0.406</td>
<td>-0.373</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paired Samples Test for Teacher Opinions on the Appropriate Source of Cultural Content in Textbooks (Table 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Target Culture - International Culture</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>-0.498 0.387</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Target Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-1.47 -0.581</td>
<td>-4.472</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 International Culture - Home Culture</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-1.25 -0.698</td>
<td>-2.200</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>