International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications
January 2017 Volume: 8 Issue: 1 Article: 02 ISSN 1309-6249

# THE PLACE OF CULTURE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION: UNDERGRAD INSIDE

Assist. Prof. Dr. Meliha R. ŞİMŞEK
Mersin University
TURKEY

**Abstract**
With the ever-increasing globalisation of education, acquisition of cultural skills has established its place as a gold standard for defining competent communicators. Varied frameworks in the famous hubs of ELT require both language teachers and learners to know a foreign language, use it for introducing home culture and getting to know other cultures, and ultimately develop cross-cultural understanding and awareness for a more peaceful global community. However, a comparative analysis of ten undergraduate course contents outlined by language teacher training programs in the UK and Turkey indicated that unlike their British counterparts, Turkish programs paid only sporadic attention to the cultural component of foreign language teaching, because (i) courses related to intercultural communication, language varieties, culture and identity remained elective and marginal; and (ii) culture teaching could receive focus as another topic area in only four compulsory courses thanks to its mention in CoHE's framework for ELT programs.

**Keywords:** Cross-cultural awareness, undergraduate course contents.

## INTRODUCTION

The digital revolution has made the world an even smaller place, where perfect strangers from its opposite ends can come into contact with diverse communities and communicate in the global language of the world, English. Cultural encounters are a part of everyday practice and success in communicative settings involves something more than the knowledge of grammar rules, mastery of four language skills or appropriate choice of functions. Today, competent communicators are identified by their ability to "interact with people from another country and culture in a foreign language" and also "to act as mediator between people of different cultural origins" (Byram, 1997: 71). In foreign language education, this capacity has come to be known as intercultural communicative competence (ICC). As its name implies, ICC is an expanded form of communicative competence, incorporating intercultural competence as well, because two interlocutors with different native languages do not merely exchange meaningful messages through the use of a lingua franca but as people of different social identities, they maintain a shared understanding (Byram, Gribkova & Starkey, 2002; Sercu, 2005).

Having rejected the unattainable ideal of the native speaker, ICC model offers the more down-to-earth role of the "intercultural speaker" for foreign language learners and uses the "sojourner" metaphor to indicate the mutuality of change brought about in both the host society and individual himself as a result of challenging each other's beliefs, behaviours and meanings (Byram, 1997). Similarly, House (2007: 19) stressed the importance of cross-cultural comparisons and remarked that immigrants as successful intercultural speakers have managed to develop their own "third way" between the cultures they are familiar with. Consequently, foreign language learners are expected to develop five different types of knowledge and skills in order to become interculturally competent communicators: (i) *savoirs*, concerning knowledge of products, practices and social groups in one's own and his interlocutor's country; (ii) *savoir comprendre*, relating to one's ability to interpret a text from a foreign culture and relate it to another from his own; (iii) *savoir apprendre*, referring to skills

of acquiring and operating new knowledge and practices in real-time communication; (iv) *savoir s'engager* (critical cultural awareness), corresponding to the ability to critically evaluate products, practices and perspectives of home and other cultures; and finally (v) *savoir être*, meaning one's dispositional curiosity and openness (Byram, 1997). Byram's ICC model has also been adopted by varied frameworks in the famous hubs of ELT. In the USA, *the Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21 st. Century* was developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and determined five goal areas: communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities. Within these five C's of foreign language education, they want to enable their students to: (i) communicate in a language other than their own, (ii) gain cultural knowledge and understanding, (iii) connect with other disciplines and broaden perspectives, (iv) demonstrate a deeper understanding of language and culture through comparisons, and (v) join in multilingual/global communities for continued learning (Cockey, 2014). The Standards view language as "the primary vehicle for expressing cultural perspectives and participating in social practices"; therefore, the content of the foreign language course shifts from the target grammar and vocabulary to the cultures expressed by that language in the 21 st. century (Cutshall, 2012: 32).

On the other hand, *the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) was devised in Europe and similarly built upon Byram's savoirs for defining the competences learners need to demonstrate during communicative events. Unlike the *language-related* communicative competences, the *culture-related* general competences consist of four major components: (i) declarative knowledge (savoir), embodying knowledge of the world (new knowledge of the target country), sociocultural knowledge (everyday living, interpersonal relations, cultural values, social conventions, rituals of the target community), intercultural awareness (awareness of the relationship between target and home cultures); (ii) skills and know-how (savoir-faire), concerning practical skills (social/living/vocational/leisure skills) and intercultural skills (cultural sensitivity and mediatory skills between target and home cultures) along with the necessary know-how; (iii) existential competence (savoir-être), referring to the learner's attitudinal and personality factors like their openness, ethical values, religious beliefs, motivations etc., and (iv) ability to learn (savoir-apprendre), including language and communication awareness, general phonetic skills, study skills as well as heuristic abilities (CEFR, 2001: 101-108).

According to Piasecka (2011), the general competences are valid for both learners and teachers as language users; as a result, teachers like learners must as well possess the relevant savoirs in order to be able to educate the intercultural speakers that Byram and Zarate (1997: 11) had described: someone "who crosses frontiers, and who is to some extent a specialist in the transit of cultural property and symbolic values". In the same way, Kramsch (2004) conceptualised the language teacher as a "cultural go-between" and listed the following savoirs they need to have developed: understanding language and culture as discourse, using the language as both insider (native-speaker) and outsider (non-native speaker), distinguishing the multiple meanings of texts, seeing oneself as one of many, and appreciating the political dimensions of language teaching. This reciprocal necessity of developing intercultural skills for teachers has also been acknowledged by two other frameworks for setting teacher standards in foreign language education. The first of these, ACTFL's (2013: 2) *Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* described "the knowledge, skills and dispositions" teacher candidates must possess in order to "enable their students to learn to communicate in a foreign language". The second of the six content standards in ACTFL's (2013: 20) document concerns "cultures" and requires pre-service teachers to "demonstrate target cultural understandings and compare cultures through perspectives, products and practices of those cultures". In the realm of cultural knowledge, candidates should be able to (i) describe how their home, target and other foreign cultures resemble and differ and use the cultural framework of the Standards in their own teaching, whereas in the realm of cultural experience, they should be able to expand their cultural awareness through personal experiences (living/studying/working in the target country) or observations from cultural informants (ACTFL, 2013). The second one, EAQUALS' (Evaluation and Accreditation of Quality in Language Services) *Framework for Language Teacher Training and Development*, too, has a culture strand ("Language, Communication and Culture") distinguishes

competent teachers by their knowledge of: (i) the interconnectedness between language and culture, (ii) types of learning and teaching cultures, and (iii) intercultural problems possible in the class (EAQUALS, 2013). As for the skills such teachers display, they can: (i) design materials for promoting "pluricultural understanding", (ii) expand their own and students' understanding of intercultural issues through web searches, projects and presentations, (iii) systematically develop their learners' and less experienced colleagues' capacity for analysing and discussing cultural similarities and differences, and also (iv) predict and effectively manage intercultural conflicts (EAQUALS, 2013: 29).

Although American and European frameworks have put culture at the heart of learner's language and teacher's professional development, the MONE-approved key competencies for Turkish teachers of English concentrate on the desirable practices for materials design, lesson organisation, assessment, skills development, school-parent collaboration and sustained professional development (MONE, 2008). Unfortunately, they made no mention of intercultural communicative competence, cultural awareness, cross-cultural understanding or global citizenship. However, it is "teacher education" that "should provide student teachers with both theoretical and practical support for the responsibilities that intercultural language teaching entails" (Larzen-Östermark, 2009: 402). For this reason, ten undergraduate course contents outlined by language teacher training programs in the UK and Turkey were subjected to comparative analysis in terms of the following: foreign language courses offered, years of study, ratio of culture teaching courses to total courses and course status, so that how much focus intercultural language teaching receives in Turkish and British programs of language teacher training can be estimated. In brief, this study aims to investigate what is taught for intercultural language teaching in Turkish and British undergrad programs, and how Turkish and British teacher candidates are prepared to teach interculturally in their teacher training institutions.

## METHOD

In the current study, ten course contents from British and Turkish undergraduate programs of ELT were examined with the purpose of identifying the significance of culture teaching in two different contexts. The research questions of this study can therefore be worded as follows: (i) What kind of courses include culture teaching in British and Turkish undergraduate programs? (ii) What is the ratio of culture courses to total course package in British and Turkish undergraduate programs? (iii) Which context is more conducive to ICC development in preservice English teachers: the UK or Turkey? As a result, ten undergraduate programs from Britain were determined with the help of British Council's search engine at *EducationUK.org*, whereas another ten were purposively selected among the top ELT departments of ten state universities in Turkey. Ten course contents from each context were compared in terms of their offer of foreign language courses, years of study, course ratio and course types (E: elective, C: compulsory) by using descriptive analysis. The results were tabulated for frequencies and thick description was applied for the validity of data analysis.

## FINDINGS

When ten course contents from British and Turkish undergraduate programs of ELT were analysed with respect to the status of foreign language courses offered, years of study and weight of culture courses in the overall program, the results in Table 1 were obtained in British context. According to Table 1, British universities highly valued the knowledge of foreign languages other than English, as they provided their candidates with a wide range of courses teaching not only European languages like German, French, Italian and Spanish but also other world languages like Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Russian in order for their trainees to develop proficiency in prospective students' native languages. For instance, the course entitled *Language Carousel* in York St. John University gives the opportunity to learn three languages in 12 weeks' time.

Table 1:The Significance of Culture Teaching in British Undergraduate Programs

| University | FL Courses Offered | Years of Study | Course Ratio (Culture Courses/Total Courses) | Courses |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Manchester Metropolitan** | E | 3 | 5/13 (0.38) | Language in Society (C)<br>Intercultural Communication (E)<br>Language Acquisition (E)<br>Language, Image, Media (C)<br>Issues in Language Teaching and Learning (C) |
| **York St. John** | C | 3 | 5/14 (0.35) | Multilingualism (C)<br>World Englishes (C)<br>Introduction to Language and Society (E)<br>Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching (C)<br>Language and Identities (C) |
| **Essex** | C | 3 | 2/22 (0.09) | Language Rights (E)<br>Language Variation and Change (C) |
| **Bangor** | E | 3 | 4/23 (0.17) | English and Society (C)<br>Language and Culture (E)<br>Integrated English Skills I (C)<br>Academic Speaking and Writing II (E) |
| **Sheffield Hallam** | C | 4 | 1/17 (0.05) | Cross-Cultural Awareness (C) |
| **De Montfort** | C | 3 | 1/15 (0.06) | Crossing Cultures (C) |
| **Sunderland** | C | 3 | 1/8 (0.12) | Language Learning and Intercultural Competence (C) |
| **Central Lancashire** | C | 4 | 3/24 (0.12) | Language and Society (C)<br>ESOL and World Englishes (E)<br>Intercultural Communication (E) |
| **Bedfordshire** | UA* | 3 | 3/22 (0.13) | Intro to Communication and Culture (C)<br>Language in Society (C)<br>English and Social Context (E) |
| **Cardiff Metropolitan** | UA | 3 | 1/15 (0.06) | Learners, Teachers and the Teaching-Learning Context (C) |

*UA: unavailable

Although the number of years they spend on a BA degree varies between 3-4 years, student teachers in British undergraduate programs are required only one third of Turkish course load; that is, the number of courses they are expected to take amounts to 20 on average. The concentration of culture courses in six British universities were still higher than the highest of all Turkish universities. Being more abundant in British context, culture-focused courses also differed in status. Intercultural communication and skills received individual attention in both elective and compulsory courses like *Intercultural Communication* and *Language Learning and Intercultural Competence*. In one of these specialized courses, Manchester Metropolitan University requires student teachers to carry out

empirical research in the field of intercultural communication, i.e. analysis of intercultural communication from a language perspective, feature determination of effective communication with people from diverse cultural contexts. In Bangor University, the elective course, *Language and Culture* deals with the study of the relationship between language, culture and identity as well as cultural, political and anthropological issues around multilingualism, minority languages and language policy. Despite not being in the form of an individual course, topics related to the spread of English, its international varieties, effects on other cultures and languages, social and cultural identities, linguistic imperialism were also taken up in courses with almost identical titles: *Language in Society*, *World Englishes*, *Language Variation and Change*, *English and Society*, *English and Social Context*.

The third pattern in which culture was observed in British undergraduate programs was, too, incidental. Language courses like *Integrated English Skills* and *Academic Speaking and Writing* in Bangor University used cultural themes, cross-cultural issues for backgrounding communicative practice. In general methodology courses like *Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching* (York St. John) and *Learners, Teachers and the Teaching-Learning Context*, cultural contexts/backgrounds of English language learners and the differences between their native and target languages found a place on British undergraduate curriculums. Finally, in six of these ten institutions (Manchester Metropolitan, York St. John, Sheffield Hallam, De Montfort, Central Lancashire, Cardiff Metropolitan), preservice English teachers had the chance to spend a year abroad and gain international experience. As a by-product of this teaching placement abroad, they intended to develop their trainees' linguistic, communicative and intercultural skills simultaneously. In point of fact, it is this kind of *internationalisation* in foreign language teacher education that has become the hallmark of British undergraduate programs in comparison with the Turkish understanding of it.

Table 2 below displays the findings from the analysis of course contents in Turkish departments of ELT. According to Table 2, nine out of the top ten undergraduate programs in Turkey offered a second foreign language as part of the four-year process of preservice teacher education, which was indicative of how much they cared about plurilingualism. As for the ratio of culture courses to the total courses on their menu, it was only in one case (İstanbul University) that the attention paid to the teaching of culture approximated British examples. It was evident from Table 2 that although Turkish preservice teachers of English were required to take greater number of courses for graduation, culture teaching methodology courses were of little concern to the majority of the curriculum-makers. Being limited in number, these courses also lacked variety. Four compulsory courses; namely, *Approaches to ELT II*, *Literature and Language Teaching I & II*, *Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development*, made occasional mentions of: the relationship between language and culture, comparisons between home and target cultures as well as ICC development. Unlike British context, where individual courses were provided for building up both cultural knowledge and intercultural skills, Turkish undergraduate programs tended to do with these few general methodology courses, which only referred to the teaching of culture as any other topic area to be studied along with others in the same course time.

It also appeared that if it hadn't been for CoHE's imposition in the framework for all ELT programs, there might even have been no trace of culture teaching in Turkish ELT departments. In only three of the course contents (in METU, İstanbul, Gazi University), culture could be raised as an issue in the course, *Approaches to ELT*, while in the rest of the ten course contents, instructors avoided culture teaching altogether, possibly due to lack of time, interest, and pedagogical content knowledge or for their own convenience. Apart from CoHE's four common compulsory courses across universities, traces of culture teaching and ICC development were found in some other methodology and applied linguistics courses, the majority of which were taken in the compulsory status: e.g. in Marmara University, the course, *Second Language Acquisition* dealt with sociocultural factors, communicative and intercultural competence, whereas in İstanbul University, the course, *Specialization in Teaching Methods II* focused on training candidates in developing related knowledge and skills for intercultural competence. There was one compulsory course, *Sociolinguistics and English Language Education* in

Bosphorus University that included topics of intercultural communication, language contact and sociocultural contexts.

Table 2: The Significance of Culture Teaching in Turkish Undergraduate Programs

| University | FL Courses Offered | Years of Study | Course Ratio (Culture Courses/Total Courses) | Courses |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **BOUN** | E | 4 | 3/48 (0.06) | Sociolinguistics and English Language Education (C)<br>Varieties of English (E)<br>ELF-Aware Teacher Education (E) |
| **METU** | C | 4 | 2/50 (0.04) | Approaches to ELT (C)<br>Language and Culture (E) |
| **Hacettepe** | E | 4 | 4/60 (0.06) | *CoHE's Course Structure<br>Approaches to ELT II (C)<br>Literature and Language Teaching I-II (C)<br>Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development (C) |
| **İstanbul** | C | 4 | 6/61 (0.09) | Approaches to English Language Teaching (C)<br>Specialization in Teaching Methods I (C)<br>Applied Linguistics (C)<br>Cultural Studies (E)<br>Literature and Language Teaching I-II (C) |
| **Marmara** | E | 4 | 4/38 (0.10) | Second Language Acquisition (C)<br>Material and Coursebook Evaluation in ELT (C)<br>Course Design and Planning in ELT (E)<br>Language and Culture in ELT (E) |
| **YTU** | C | 4 | 4/61 (0.06) | *CoHE's Course Structure<br>Approaches to ELT II (C)<br>Literature and Language Teaching I-II (C)<br>Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development (C) |
| **DEU** | C | 4 | 2/67 (0.02) | Literature and Language Teaching I-II (C) |
| **Gazi** | C | 4 | 3/58 (0.05) | Approaches in ELT II (C)<br>Literature and Language Teaching I-II (C) |
| **Anadolu** | UA | 4 | 2/60 (0.03) | *CoHE's Course Structure<br>Approaches to ELT II (C)<br>Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development (C) |
| **Uludağ** | E | 4 | 4/58 (0.06) | Language and Culture I-II (E)<br>Pragmatics (E)<br>Discourse Analysis (E) |

Table 2 indicated that culture-related courses in the elective status were restricted in terms of quantity and variety. For example, METU offered 76 different elective courses in total but the majority

of these electives related to the poetry, drama, novel, short story, mythology, historical and literary periods of the target cultures, mainly British literature. Yet, one elective course, *Language and Culture* on METU's list embodied aspects of the reciprocal relationship between language and culture, i.e. language and world view, language policies etc. Similarly, İstanbul University provides candidate teachers of English with another elective called *Culture Studies*, in order to: (i) familiarize them with other world cultures through the use of English, (ii) raise their awareness of cross-cultural interactions and cultural globalisation, and (iii) to develop an intellectual view of the world. Culture received focus in Uludağ University's two elective courses, *Pragmatics* and *Discourse Analysis*, which aimed to inform student teachers of the variability speech acts may display with respect to language and culture, and sensitize them to cultural features in discourse.

In conclusion, much of the attention culture methodology and ICC could earn in the course contents of top ten Turkish universities tended to come from CoHE's four common compulsory courses. Topics of special interest like intercultural competencies for foreign language learners, culture teaching through varied literary genres, and comparisons of products (history, institutions), practices (rituals, traditions, social roles/relationships), perspectives (beliefs, values, superstitions) between the native and target cultures did not occupy much space in their overall study, whereas second foreign language lessons served to enable preservice teachers to experience themselves language and culture learning through authentic materials. Yet, it was clear that tomorrow's foreign language teachers needed a better cultural background and a more in-depth training in the teaching of culture in order to fulfil the role of cultural mediator in modern foreign language classes of the 21st. century.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Although the earliest studies on the place of culture in EFL class dated back to the late 1970s, the need for more culture-focused education has not been met yet (e.g. Moskowitz, 1976; Nerenz, 1979). Not only in the current study but also in most previous studies, the teaching of culture remains a neglected issue in the curriculum of pre-service teacher education. The comparison between Turkish and British course contents revealed that unlike their British counterparts, Turkish undergraduate programs paid only sporadic attention to the cultural component of foreign language teaching, because (i) courses related to intercultural communication, language varieties, culture and identity remained elective and marginal, while (ii) thanks to its mention in CoHE's framework for ELT programs, culture teaching could receive focus as another topic area in only four compulsory courses, though not necessarily present in the given course contents of all institutions. These findings were in line with the previous literature because Grosse (1993), having analysed 157 FL methods course syllabi from 144 colleges and universities, too, found that not even half included culture and less than one week was spared for the teaching of culture in their L2 methods courses. Similarly, Byrd (2007) analysed 20 and Wilbur (2007) 32 methodology course syllabuses at universities and discovered that although the cultural component was not non-existent, there was little guidance on how to teach culture in the curriculums of the colleges. While Lazar's (2006) promising study in Hungary acknowledged the presence of some compulsory and elective courses for teaching the cultural dimension of foreign language instruction, a more recent examination of the ten methods course syllabi by Byrd (2014) indicated that the content failed to reach the level of professional requirements candidates were supposed to be prepared for in order to teach culture in the USA.

The course contents in Turkish teacher education programs showed incompatibility not just with the aforementioned international standards for foreign language learning and teaching, but they were found incongruent with the newly-introduced English curriculum for 9-12th. graders in terms of cultural objectives. It is openly stated in the rationale for curriculum revision that Turkish learners of English need to use English for "shar[ing] their ideas and culture with other people from different cultures and countries" and in order "to communicate internationally", they must learn to communicate "interculturally" (MONE, 2016: 4, 20). Therefore, curriculum-makers in Turkey have already come to the understanding that "understanding a language involves not only the knowledge of grammar, phonology, and lexis but also certain features and characteristics of the culture" (MONE,

2016: 20). However, it was seen in the current analysis that the course contents Turkish candidate teachers of English were provided with cannot be claimed to prepare them for the new English curriculum they will be working with in the very near future. If these student teachers are not provided with the necessary means for becoming intercultural speakers themselves or taught how to teach Tomalin's (2008) "fifth language skill" (culture), it is then worth questioning how their prospective students will be able to develop "cultural awareness" as dictated by MONE's (2016) new curriculum. It was in Atay's (2005) study of Turkish student teachers' ideas about the cultural dimension of language teaching that the same inconsistency had already been identified among the objectives of the national curriculum, coursebooks in use, practice at schools and the training teachers received.

Another problem with the course contents of Turkish ELT departments related to the adopted approach towards the teaching of culture. Because Turkish candidates were mainly exposed to British and American literature during their teacher training, their cultural knowledge can be criticised for being one-sided. Besides this "Big C/achievement culture" of English-speaking countries, it might have been more useful if their course contents were broadened to include culturally-conditioned beliefs and behaviours (little c/behaviour culture), as these are the elements that reflect the living side of a community: traditions, daily routines, leisure activities, festivities, superstitions, idiomatic language uses, and interactional patterns etc. (Tomalin & Stempleski, 1994). When Schulz and Ganz (2010: 177, 189) explored classroom teachers' perceptions about the preparation they received for teaching cultural aspects in the language classroom, they likewise found that most courses devoted to the teaching of culture could easily be labelled "big-C culture courses", as "their coursework focused mainly on literary analyses from critical theory or historical perspectives" and lacked the necessary "examples of daily life products, practices and perspectives" for teaching the target culture. In two other investigations into student teachers' views about the treatment of culture in their undergraduate programs, similar results were obtained. In Larzen-Östermark's (2009) study in Finnish context, it was high culture, "the civilization of the target language culture" being promoted, even though "social practices, customs and lifestyle in the foreign culture" and comparisons between the students' own "values, beliefs and norms" and those of the foreign culture were in need of more attention. Columbian student teachers in Olaya and Rodriguez's (2013: 49, 57) study "lacked full understanding of intercultural competence" and they also wished to learn more about the behaviours, life styles of other people or the "deep culture" during their teacher training.

Nevertheless, if we expect our candidate teachers to act as "cultural mediators" in the foreign language classroom, the given course contents need modification in another aspect other than the kinds of culture being presented. According to Byram (1989), it is not "culture learning" in the true sense of the word, when learners are simply depositing factual knowledge about the target culture because the real experience involves change in learners' attitudes towards other cultures and their own cognitive structures. Therefore, the mode of culture treatment in the given course contents had better be switched from knowledge transmission to empathy and respect building, where student teachers can be enabled to develop a bicultural perspective through third-positioning (Larzen-Östermark, 2008). In the same way, Olaya and Rodriguez (2013: 62) considered it among the responsibilities of teacher education programs to make prospective English teachers realise that culture learning/teaching is not just about giving touristic information but they must be led to know that culture is "part of their teaching career", so that they can "instruct their students on ICC" and help them to face globalisation.

The problems with the treatment of culture did not end here, as Turkish course contents only appeared to have four compulsory courses for training candidates in the teaching of culture. But in fact, even in these few courses CoHE required from all ELT departments in Turkey, the amount of focus culture teaching received depended on the willingness and expertise of the course instructor. While some seemed to comply with CoHE's predetermined content, others omitted ICC from their contents. However, Lazar (2006) advocated that cultural awareness-raising and ICC development must be immediately integrated into language classes as soon as preservice teachers of foreign

languages start their freshman year at their universities. Therefore, the following recommendations can be made for improving the status of culture teaching initially in Turkish ELT programs and subsequently in future foreign language classes: (i) existing course contents need revision, so that culture can no longer be addressed implicitly, peripherally, and supplementarily but systematically; (ii) because culture has become the fifth skill/dimension of foreign language education, compulsory methodology courses must be provided for instructing candidate teachers in how to teach culture; (iii) courses related materials design should be reorganised in such a way as to equip them with critical evaluation and adaptation skills for dealing with the cultural content of EFL coursebooks, especially the local ones with nationwide circulation; and (iv) utopian as it may sound, they can be sent abroad; i.e. to English-speaking countries, as in British example, in order for them to experience cultural immersion; or instead of this seemingly costly alternative, Eramus student teaching practicums may be encouraged for developing ICC in the genuine sense.

**IJONTE's Note:** This article was presented at 5th World Conference on Educational and Instructional Studies**-** WCEIS, 27- 29 October, 2016, Antalya-Turkey and was selected for publication for Volume 8 Number 1 of IJONTE 2017 by IJONTE Scientific Committee.

## BIODATA AND CONTACT ADDRESS OF AUTHOR

Dr. Meliha R. SIMSEK is currently an assistant professor of foreign language education at the Faculty of Education, Mersin University (Mersin, Turkey), and was previously a teacher trainer at the Faculty of Education, Middle East Technical University (Ankara, Turkey). Born in Mersin, Dr. Simsek was educated at Buca Faculty of Education in İzmir, and graduated with a BA in ELT from Dokuz Eylul University in 2004. She completed her MA (2006) and PhD (2009) in ELT at the Institute of Educational Sciences, Dokuz Eylul University (İzmir, Turkey). Her research interests include applied linguistics, ELT methodology, materials evaluation and development, and teacher education.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Meliha R. ŞİMŞEK
Mersin University, Faculty of Education
Department of Foreign Language Education
Yenişehir, 33000 Mersin- TURKEY
E. Mail: malliday@gmail.com

## REFERENCES

ACTFL. (2013). Program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers. Retrieved August 23, 2016, from https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/ACTFL-Standards20Aug2013.pdf

Atay, D. (2005). Reflections on the cultural dimension of language teaching. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *5(3-4)*, 222-236.

Byram, M. (1989*). Cultural studies in foreign language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1997). *The sociocultural and intercultural dimension of language learning and teaching*. Strasbourg: COE.

Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: A practical introduction for teachers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Byrd, D. R. (2007). *Investigating how second language teachers are prepared to teach culture: An analysis of methods course syllabi*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Byrd, D. (2014). Learning to teach culture in the L2 methods course. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *11(1)*, 76-89.

CEFR. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching and assessment*. Strasbourg: COE.

Cockey, S. (2014). *Teaching world languages: A practical guide*. Washington, DC: NCLRC.

Cutshall, S. (2012). More than a decade of standards: Integrating 'cultures' in your language language instruction. *The Language Educator*, *7(3)*, 32-37.

EAQUALS. (2013). The EAQUALS framework for language teacher training and development. Retrieved June 30, 2016, from http://clients.squareeye.net/uploads/eaquals/EAQUALS_TD_FRAM_-_November_2013.pdf

Grosse, C. U. (1993). The foreign language methods course. *Modern Language Journal*, *77*, 303-312.

House, J. (2007). What is an intercultural speaker? In E. A. Soler & M. P. S. Jorda (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 7-21). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kramsch, C. (2004). The language teacher as go-between. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, *13(3)*, 37-60.

Lazar, I. (2006). *The role and status of intercultural communication training in English language teacher education in Hungary*. Budapest: Eötvös Lorand University.

Larzen-Östermark, E. (2008). The intercultural dimension in EFL-teaching: A study of conceptions among Finland-Swedish comprehensive school teachers. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *52(5)*, 527-547.

Larzen-Östermark, E. (2009). Language teacher education in Finland and the cultural dimension of foreign language teaching – A student teacher perspective. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *32(4)*, 401-421.

MONE. (2008). İngilizce öğretmeni özel alan yeterlikleri. Retrieved July 12, 2016, from http://otmg.meb.gov.tr/alaningilizce.html

MONE. (2016). Hazırlık sınıfı bulunan ortaöğretim kurumları İngilizce dersi (Hazırlık, 9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflar) öğretim programı. Retrieved August 5, 2016, from http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx?islem=1&kno=260

Moskowitz, G. (1976). The classroom interaction of outstanding foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, *9*, 135-157.

Nerenz, A. (1979). Utilizing class time in foreign language instruction. In D. Bensler (Ed.), *Teaching basics in the foreign language classroom: Options and strategies* (pp. 78-89). Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company.

Olaya, A., & Rodriguez, L. F. G. (2013). Exploring EFL preservice teachers' experience with cultural content and intercultural communicative competence at three Colombian universities. *Profile*, *15(2)*, 49-67.

Piasecka, L. (2011). Sensitizing foreign language learners to cultural diversity through developing intercultural communicative competence. In J. Arabski & A. Wojtaszek (Eds.), *Aspects of culture in second language acquisition and foreign language learning* (pp. 21-34). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Schulz, R. A., & Ganz, A. (2010). Developing professional consensus on the teaching of culture: Report on a survey of secondary and postsecondary German teachers. *Teaching German*, *43(2)*, 175-193.

Sercu, L. (2005). Teaching foreign languages in an intercultural world. In M. Byram & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Foreign language teachers and intercultural competence: An international investigation* (pp. 1-18). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Tomalin, B. (2008). *Culture - The fifth language skill*. Retrieved September 9, 2016, from http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/culture-fifth-language-skill

Tomalin, B., & Stempleski, S. (1994). *Cultural awareness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilbur, M. L. (2007). How foreign language teachers get taught: Methods of teaching methods courses. *Foreign Language Annals*, *40*, 79-101.