

Towards Intercultural English Learning/Teaching (IELT): An Intercultural Approach to World Englishes

Kang-Young Lee

Chungbuk National University

Lee, Kang-Young. (2012). Towards intercultural English learning/teaching (IELT): An intercultural approach to world Englishes. *Modern English Education*, 13(2), 81-100.

This paper seeks to claim that intercultural English learning/teaching (IELT) can contribute significantly to the development of proficiency/competence among all varieties of Englishes in today's globalized world; thus, IELT needs to be listed as a requirement for English curricula in Korea. For this argument, the paper first addresses the current status of English language as a world Englishes (WEes) and its implication for the language/culture teaching. Then the study discusses what IELT is and it consists of, and how IELT components can be fitted into actual classrooms. At the end, this paper presents one example of classroom activity via a movie to achieve IELT. In turn, teachers of WEes in Korea, especially those from the inner circle countries (as in the Kachruvian term), will benefit by being equipped with the awareness and understanding of the main issues in IELT for his/her classrooms since students' progress towards intercultural competence is under 'threat' without the adequate development of teachers' intercultural competence and their active 'involvement and commitment' with/to learners.

[intercultural English learning and teaching/English as world Englishes/intercultural competence/
문화상호간 영어학습 및 교수세계영어들로서의 영어/문화상호간 능력]

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, second (L2)/foreign language (FL) pedagogy has been engaged gradually with theories of intercultural communication. This integration of an intercultural framework has indeed changed the way we understand today's language education. Two major transformations from the incorporation have stood out: (1) L2/FL instruction is interwoven closely with a number of disciplines and their methodologies; and (2) objectives in language education are expanded to include the development of plurilingual

and pluricultural competences. To make learners more competent both linguistically and [socio]culturally, L2/FL education finds itself at present at a crossroad with multiple models of disciplines.

This understanding, however, seems not to have been successful in Korea in clearly establishing the extent to which the customary boundaries of the nation's English education have been stretched. Since it becomes a fact that the status of English as a WEes has increasingly been popular and that linguistic and [socio]cultural variations among all varieties of Englishes are inevitable in any classrooms of Englishes, the proposed intercultural objectives and dimensions need to be unleashed into teaching practices by English teachers/practitioners in Korea. It is because “teachers’ are pivotal in helping them [learners] take an intercultural stance, as students explore the nature of language and communication across cultures” (Ware & Kramersch, 2005, p. 190).

II. ENGLISH LANGUAGE AS A WEes AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR THE LANGUAGE TEACHING

The English language has truly come a long way: it has developed from a native language of the small tribe, generally known as Anglo-Saxon, to "the most widely taught, read, and spoken language that the world has ever known" (Kachru & Nelson, 2001, p. 9). Through the processes of colonization, immigration, and globalization, the language has expanded virtually into every corner of the world and been used for internal, external, and international purposes. In fact, English is now being very much often used in geographically and historically remote settings from native speakers of the inner circle for purposes ranging from doing business and conducting professional discourses to carrying out everyday conversation, upon which no participation from the native speakers is required.

This rapid spread of the language in diverse sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts has also brought about the development of new recognized forms and norms of English in local contexts. Kachru (1985, 1991, 1992, 1998) systematically delineates the sociolinguistic profile of English under his term, World Englishes¹ within the three

¹ Kachru, since the early 1980s, has presented the global spread of English under his term, World Englishes (WEs), delineated within the three circles. The circles are formed concentrically as in the inner, the outer, and the expanding one. Countries where English is used as a 'primary' language such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, UK, and USA are referred to as the inner circle ('the norm providing Englishes'). The outer circle ('the norm developing Englishes') comprises countries where the language is 'institutionalized (or nativized)' such as Kenya, India, Malaysia,

concentric circles: the inner circle, outer circle, and expanding circle. Kachru evidences new legitimate local varieties of English in bi- or multi-lingual communities (i.e, countries in the outer circle) and that each recognized variety has been gradually used for international communication not just with native speakers but with non-native speakers. Then he contends for the irrelevance of the inner circle Englishes — saying that "the native speaker is not always a valid yardstick for the global uses of English" (Kachru, 1992, p. 358) — and throws doubts on the ownership of the language claimed by the inner circle speakers.

In addition, other researchers document that the expanding circle is the fastest growing circle. Graddol (1999) reports that the number of non-native speakers of English will grow from 253 million to around 462 million during the next 50 years. This will lead nonnative speakers of English to triple the number of native speakers worldwide (Pakir, 1999). According to Gnutzmann (2000), 80% of verbal exchanges in which English is used as a foreign or second language involve no native-speakers and are between non-native users of English. Rajagopalan (2004, p. 116) estimates that "...the native speaker's supremacy is already under threat from the currently attested native/non-native ratio of 1:2, imagine their lot when the ratio reaches 1:10 in the not-so-remote future, thanks to the millions of people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." This statistical dominance of non-native speakers of English, especially from the expanding circle, questions the periphery status of the circle Englishes and gives them a central/core position in the shaping and developing of English.

That has recently led many ELT scholars (Canagarajah, 2006; Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2003, 2006; Kang-Young Lee, 2010; Matsuda, 2003; McKay, 2002; Rajagopalan, 2004; Talebinezhad & Aliakbari, 2001; Widdowson, 1994) to follow the argument that English is truly universal in that the language has become "a heterogeneous language with multiple norms and grammars" (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 232). The language holds a status in both local and global contexts where the varieties of Englishes in the world relate to one another on a single level rather than on the three hierarchies as in Kachru's three circle model of English. It is functional (i.e., purely used as a tool for communication). It is descriptive (i.e, how it functions today throughout the world), not prescriptive (i.e, how the language should be used). It is multicultural (i.e., speakers of more than one country and culture are almost always involved). It is intercultural (i.e., no particular culture and political system is specified, but cultures and discourse patterns of all varieties of English are equally shared in intercourses). To the researchers, English language "belong[s] to everyone who speaks it, but it is nobody's mother tongue" (Rajagopalan, 2004, p. 111). No nation can have custody

Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Singapore. Lastly, countries in the expanding circle ('the norm dependent Englishes') includes China, Hong Kong, Israel, Mexico, Korea (South), and Russia where the language functions as a 'performance' variety without official status.

over the language, as Widdowson (1994) claims.

World Englishes (WEes) here reflects the above-argued international status of English and undergirds such recent models of English labeled by different terminologies as 'English as Lingua Franca' (Jenkins, 2000, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2004), 'English as an International Auxiliary Language' (Smith, 1983), and 'English as a Family of Languages' (Canagarajah, 2006). WEes is conceptualized as all the local varieties of Englishes used by people of different nations to communicate with one another. Unlike Kachru's WEs, WEes claims not only the legitimacy of the expanding circle Englishes among all the varieties of English but also the core position of the circle Englishes in developing contemporary/near-future English.

Regarding its pedagogy in WEes, it is clear that Englishes of the inner circle countries may no longer be the ultimate objective for the majority of learners. This means that the competence in WEes is rooted deeply in 'multidialecticism,' which requires being proficient in at least one variety of English in order to be able to understand different varieties and to be able to accommodate one's speech to be intelligible to the speakers of other varieties of Englishes. Thus, as all the above researchers urge, speakers/teachers of English should have necessary knowledge and skills to cope with variability in English and appropriate attitude toward WEes.

Although not many, with respect to culture teaching/learning in WEes, it has been suggested (Alptekin, 2002; Byram, 1997; Guest, 2002; Kilickaya, 2004; Kramsch, 1998; McKay, 2003; Ware & Kramsch, 2005) that learners of an international language do not need to internalize the cultural norms of native speakers of that language since the ownership of an international language has become denationalized. Then, what aspect of culture in WEes framework should be considered important and listed in WEes education curricula? For WEes, target culture does not need to be American or British but should include a variety of cultures. Kachru (1992, p. 362) emphasizes that "English represents a repertoire of cultures, not a monolithic culture." In fact, the diversification of cultures associated with the language is a fact, and learners/teachers of WEes have to be prepared to be competent in divergent range of cultural backgrounds. What is most urgently needed here in preparing learners from widely different L1 backgrounds to interact each other with his/her English is to raise awareness of IELT, so learners should be sensitive to the fact that people from different cultures tend to use English differently and that it is the responsibility that must be shared by anyone who take part in WEes community. Then, the following section will devote to what IELT is and it consists of.

III. WHAT IS IELT?

One starting point to understand IELT is a closer look at the notions of 'communicative competence' and 'intercultural competence.' Communicative competence is defined typically as "what a [competent] speaker needs to know in order to be able to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community" (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972, p. 7). Undeniably, an emphasis which has been placed upon for language teaching/learning is the 'need-to-know' phrase. Indeed, what is it that students in any [FL/L2] language classrooms need to know? To this rather problematic solution, many linguists (Buttjes & Byram, 1991; Kramsch, 1998; Liddicoat, 2002; Nostrand, 1991; Ware & Kramsch, 2005) have introduced such terms as 'cultural competence,' 'intercultural competence' or 'intercultural language competence' to make more explicit what is meant by "what a speaker needs to know" to participate in a speech community. In IELT context where communicative and cultural needs of students will be different among Englishes, a greater focus will have to be placed on the notion of interculturality and on the sociocultural competence of learners. Here, the psycholinguistic models of communicative competence will be of little use to the language teacher, as all those models have firmly held an idea that the communicative norm is the native speaker interacting with another native speaker. For example, Canale and Swain (1981) and Bachman (1990) ignore the interculturality that is a necessary part of any communication involving a non-native speaker.

IELT begins to ask learners/teachers to deny seeing a monolithic or unified view of culture. It is simply because focusing only on one culture leads students (or some teachers) to see only a unified and monolithic culture (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999). When speakers of more than one country or culture interact, more than one set of social and cultural assumptions will be in full operation. Risager (1998) stresses that including only one culture in language teaching associated with specific people, a specific language, and normally a specific territory should be replaced by an intercultural approach depending on more complex and expanding target cultures. In a study analyzing 11 Korean EFL high-school conversation textbooks to investigate what aspects of culture learning/teaching are included and how they are taught, Kang-Young Lee (2009) finds that all of the textbooks have neglected the teaching of both the culture-general aspect of culture learning and the small "c" target-culture² learning. Instead, the majority of the textbooks shows a strong preference for Big

² The small "c" target culture refers to the invisible and deeper sense of a target culture. It is the mainstream socio-cultural values, norms, and beliefs – taking into consideration such variables as age, gender, and social status. However, the Big "C" target culture represents a set of facts and statistics relating to the arts, history, geography, business, education, festival, and customs of a target speech community. It is by nature easily seen and readily apparent to anyone and memorized by learners, and has been utilized heavily by many L2/FL/ELT language practitioners.

“C” target-culture learning, which is mainly from the US, indicating a “hierarchical representation where the US variety among all English-speaking cultures was presented as the supreme source [for Korean high school students]” (p. 92). The author then calls for an immediate inclusion of the culture-general aspect of culture learning to develop intercultural English language competence in designing EFL textbooks.

IELT encourages learners/teachers to be exposed not only to a variety of cultures but to his/her own culture. Alptekin (2002), as a Turkish ELT professional, reports that there have been many instructional materials where cultural contents mainly come from the familiar and indigenous features of the local setting (i.e., Turkish culture). He stresses that although those materials can motivate students and enhance their language learning experience, they are not enough in a world where English is taught as an international language whose culture becomes the world itself, not only the home culture. Then, he calls for a new pedagogic model of the “successful bilinguals with intercultural insights” (p.63) in WEes community. Alptekin contends for both local and global need of intercultural English learners/teachers, as suggested by Byram (1997).

In IELT curriculum, learners are, thus, put into a position to see cultural contents at the level of both his/her own local and global context. Alptekin (2002), regarding the Turkish ELT textbook, states how irrelevant the cultural content focusing only on inner-circle cultural themes can be in teaching English. On the other hand, he exemplifies how relevant the following cultural content such as dealing with British politeness or American informality in relation to the Japanese and Turks is when doing business in English in IELT perspective. McKay (2003) also insists on teaching culture in both local and global context, so learners recognize that the use of language (e.g., pragmatic rules) reflected by sociocultural values and norms of an English speech community differ cross-culturally. She reports the advantages of using international culture by emphasizing that texts in which bilingual users of English interact with other speakers of English in cross-cultural encounters for a variety of purposes exemplify the manner in which bilingual users of English are effectively using English to communicate for international purposes. These texts include examples of lexical, grammatical, and phonological variations in the present-day use of English and could also illustrate cross-cultural pragmatics in which bilingual users of English draw on their own rules of appropriateness. These texts, according to McKay, could then provide a basis for students to gain a fuller understanding of how English today serves a great variety of international purposes in a broad range of contexts.

Based upon the understanding of both his/her own culture and other varieties existing in the world, IELT encourages learners/teachers to make an attempt to raise the awareness of their own culture (i.e., their own personal and social identity) in relation to other cultures. Unlike communicative language teaching approach in which language is seen as primary means of exchanging information; thus, the design of communicative activities is all the

authentic transfer of information, IELT sees language use as involving much more than information exchange. Language through IELT is viewed as the main instrument by which we construct and maintain our sense of person and social identity. It is the means by which we make and break our relationships. Language, in turn, is the tool with which we become aware of ourselves as one cultural being and of others equally as other cultural beings.

IELT is comparative. It is based on learning to notice differences, importantly through self-exploration of difference rather than the teaching of difference. As Robinson-Stuart and Nococon (1996) claim, no culture in IELT community stands alone as superior or inferior. There are indeed only differences among cultures. However, learners/teachers in IELT are encouraged actively to seek 'general empathy' toward other cultures and have a 'positive intention' to suspend any judgments and the possibility of cultural differences and see other cultures through the overlapped lens for better and effective communications (Hinkel, 2001). It is this 'intercultural stance' (Ware & Kramersch, 2005, p. 203) that "can help their students [learners in WEes community] develop a decentered perspective that goes beyond comprehending the surface meaning of the words to discovering the logic of their interlocutors' utterances." Being fully aware of the logic underlying language will help learners understand better their own reasoning and the cultural context from which it comes, as well as the others' viewpoints.

What comes next to prepare learners/teachers of WEes to be competent in IELT is to raise the level of knowledge on IELT mainstreams: that is, knowledge, behavior, attitude, and critical awareness of/toward IELT, as Byram (1997) outlines. The next section concentrates on what IELT mainstreams are in details and how the IELT components can be fitted into today's actual classrooms.

IV. WHAT ARE IELT MAINSTREAMS? HOW DO THE MAINSTREAMS FIT INTO WEes CLASSROOMS?

Attempts were made from the 1990's to delineate intercultural mainstreams in relation to the dimensions of language use, contextual knowledge, and attitudes. Cormeraie (1998) reports that the development of intercultural language competence needs to concern itself with knowledge, feelings, attitudes, and behaviors. This intercultural mainstreams learning (i.e., knowledge, behavior, and attitude) is more adequately described such French term as '*savoirs*' composing Byram and Zarate's (1997) model of intercultural competence. Categorically, there are the four mainstreams of *savoirs* (i.e., knowledge, behavioral, attitudinal, and critical awareness aspects):

1. *savoirs*: it is 'knowing' or knowledge of culture (both oneself and otherselves), including sociolinguistic competence; awareness of the small 'c' aspect of culture

- such as values, beliefs, meanings (knowledge aspect);
2. *savoir comprendre*: it is knowing how to understand via skills to interpret documents from other countries and explain and relate it to one's own culture (behavioral aspect);
 3. *savoir apprendre/faire*: it is knowing how to learn/to do (or integrate) via skills for discovering new knowledge and for interacting (or integrating the knowledge into interaction) to gain new ability (behavioral aspect);
 4. *savoir être*: it is knowing how to be via having equipped with attitudes involved in relativizing the self and valuing the other by setting aside ethnocentric attitudes and perceptions (attitudinal aspect);
 5. *savoirs' engager*: it is knowing how to commit oneself to the development of critical and political awareness to think about things actively and intelligently rather than just accept them (critical awareness aspect).

Byram (1997) later succinctly outlines in a figure the four mainstreams with some more specific explanations, in which he states that this is what ICC [intercultural communicative competence] requires learners to acquire.

The approach has been further elaborated by Clouet (2008), who stresses that intercultural competence is a combination of social and communicative skills to train as follows: (1) empathy, (2) ability to deal with conflict, (3) ability to work collaboratively, (4) flexibility, (5) foreign language awareness, (6) awareness that culture causes different discussion styles, speech speeds, interpretation and thought patterns, (7) techniques for handling interactional difficulties, (8) reflection on one's own cultural background, and (9) tolerance of ambiguity.

Geert Hofstede's (2001) research on cultural difference also sheds light not only on theoretical aspect (especially the knowledge feature) of intercultural language learning/teaching but also on practical application of it. He identifies and validates the two contrasting forces existing within the five independent dimensions of national culture: (1) power distance (large vs. small), (2) collectivism vs. individualism, (3) femininity vs. masculinity, (4) uncertainty avoidance (strong vs. weak) and (5) long- vs. short-term time orientation. This research gives us insights into understanding of cultural forces and dimensions not only within a culture but also across cultures so that learners can be more effective when interacting with people in/from other countries, so reducing the level of frustration, anxiety, and concern. In interaction, wrong decisions about an interlocutor of different culture very often seem to be based on cultural errors of judgment; thus, leading to misinterpretation and, eventually, culture-related problems.

The intercultural models discussed above feature dynamic elements interplaying one another in the intercultural mainstreams. In particular, those four intercultural mainstreams

(i.e., knowledge, behavioral skills, attitude, and critical awareness) along with the cultural dimensions within the two different forces are all necessary to facilitate success getting competence in IELT. Thus, when preparing their classes, WEes teachers should pay greater attention not only to knowledge (*savoirs*), but also to behavioral skills (*savoir-comprendre/faire*), attitudes (*savoir-être*), and critical awareness (*savoir-engager*).

Along with the intercultural mainstreams, another important challenge that should be identified is to understand the nature of intercultural language learning/teaching process. The starting point to do this lies in a closer look at the definition of culture learning/teaching. Paige, Jorstad, Siaya, Klein and Colby (1999) provide the following:

Culture learning is the process of acquiring the culture-specific and culture general knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for effective communication and interaction with individuals from other cultures. It is a dynamic, developmental, and on-going process which engages the learner cognitively, behaviorally, and affectively. (p. 50)

Along with the definition, the researchers infuse some more critical elements into their culture learning process. They are:

1. learning about the self as a cultural being,
2. learning about culture and its impact on human language, behavior, and identity,
3. culture-general learning, focusing on universal intercultural phenomena including cultural adjustment,
4. culture-specific learning, with a focus on a particular language and culture,
5. learning how to learn about language and culture.

Paige et al. (1999) sees culture as a dynamic and constantly changing entity interlinked with communication and interaction between individuals belonging to different intercultural contexts. The learning/teaching goal from this perspective shifts from a rote memorization of cultural facts (i.e., visible historical facts, arts, and literature) to the acquisition of the culture-general (i.e., intercultural) competence and learning how to learn about culture.

The process of IELT, therefore, is not static. It actively involves transformation of students (i.e., his/her ability) to communicate and to understand communication, and of his/her skills for ongoing learning through observation and participation inside and outside the language class. This will help students to acquire a deeper understanding of the concepts of culture, cultural adaptation and intercultural communication, to develop strategies for dealing with cultural differences in communication, and finally to become more autonomous in the process of learning and to position him/herself at an intermediate intercultural zone among cultures.

Obviously, all the aspects have to be taken into account in any language (including IELTS) classroom environment where learning can definitely rely not only on the acquisition of knowledge about culture(s) but also on involving reflection and comparison between two sets of practices or more. Although the amount of culture and actual socialization with other cultural beings that can be dealt with within the context of formal language classrooms are rather limited, there has been some amount of precious research on developing methodologies (Byram, 1988; Crawford-Lange & Lange, 1984; Crozet, 1996, 1998; Kramsch, 1993; Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001) for teaching intercultural language competence in language classrooms in a way that develops comparison, reflection, and integration of authentic intercultural experiences into the cultural identity of learner. For instance, Liddicoat and Crozet's (2001) model for intercultural language learning/teaching consists of four steps³: awareness raising, experimentation, production, and feedback. Notably, each step comes with roles which could be played by learners and teachers optimally in any classrooms along with materials and activities. Likewise, all of the models have common features which can be seen as the basis for a methodology known as 'intercultural language learning/teaching.' These common features are:

- cultural exploration;
- cultural comparison;
- cultural acquisition;
- negotiation (integration) of one's own third place between cultures.

Materials and contents⁴ should be employed in order to make learners aware of the IELTS mainstreams, encouraging them to compare and contrast foreign cultures with their own. Materials that do this will, as Valdes (1990) suggests, prove to be successful with learners.

Tomalin and Stempleski (1993) propose a range of tasks such as class discussions, research and role-plays using materials drawn from English-speaking countries that

³ 1) The awareness raising stage is the one where learners are introduced to new linguistic and cultural input. They are encouraged to compare the new culture with their own practices and language use; 2) the experimental stage is to help fix learners' newly acquired knowledge via experienced learning; 3) the production stage is to apply in the real life situation; and 4) the feedback stage is to reflect on the experience of acting like a native speaker in the production phase and to allow students to discover their place between their first language and culture and their second.

⁴ Coursebooks such as *New English File* (Oxenden & Latham-Koenig, 2000) and *New Interchange* (Richards, 2000) show good examples of materials/contents that provide plenty of opportunities for learners to examine other cultures and their own from a 'third place' perspective.

promote discussions, comparisons and reflection on the English cultures from the countries and the learners' own culture. These can be arranged around subjects such as cultural symbols and products (popular images, architecture, landscapes), cultural behavior (appropriate behavior, values and attitudes), patterns of communication (verbal and non-verbal communication), and exploring cultural experiences (looking at learners own feelings and experiences of the target culture). Moreover, English language materials from the learners' own culture such as local newspapers can prove an excellent source of cross-cultural materials. In order to get a comprehensive picture of the target culture from many angles, teachers need to present his/her students with different kinds of information. Besides, by using a combination of visual, audio and tactile materials, teachers are also likely to succeed in addressing the different learning styles of our students. As such, the following list displays some possible sources of information which could be used as materials for teaching culture in IELT classrooms: DVDs, CDs, TV, readings, the Internet, stories, students' own information, songs, newspapers, fieldwork, interviews, guest speakers, anecdotes, souvenirs, photographs, surveys, illustrations, literature, etc.

As far as activities are concerned, these should go beyond the traditional 'discussion' activities suggested in many textbooks. Quizzes⁵, for instance, may be useful in learning new information, testing materials that have been taught previously, sharing in pairs the students' existing knowledge and common sense, predicting information, introducing differences and similarities across cultures. Here, getting the correct answer is less important than thinking about the two cultures. Similarly, when watching a video or working with some other materials, students can be asked to identify particular features and note all the differences with their own culture.

Some more standard activities to engage students actively in the target culture and language can be role plays, reading activities, listening activities, writing activities, discussion activities, or even singing. All such activities and materials should be deliberately chosen to portray different aspects of culture, highlighting attractive aspects vs. shocking ones, similarities vs. differences, facts vs. behavior, historical vs. modern, old people vs. young people, and city life vs. country life, etc.

1. An Example of Classroom Activity

Bearing all the above-mentioned in mind, the present study presents one example of the

⁵ In my classes (College English Reading & Discussion) for the second semester of freshmen year, I have used quizzes many times to motivate students' intercultural insight. It has turned out effective from the interviews with each student.

classroom activity via a movie on video, *Angela's Ashes*⁶, directed by Alan Parker (1999). This activity was conducted within a regular semester (the Fall of 2011) for a college freshmen English course, titled College English Reading & Discussion (see Appendix). The current study believes that movie, among the possible sources for teaching IELTS, is the best source for promoting the IELTS mainstreams awareness. It reflects a social reality from authentic materials or realia of a target speech community to language teachers to help students not only to discuss the unique relationship of a language to the society studied but to establish the auditory, visual, and metal links they need for possible interaction with people from the speech community. Bringing native materials in the form of movie into my class indeed develops students' skills for analyzing and comparing key cultural elements in both their and the foreign cultures; in detail, the students seem to have reached not only at a perspective of how language and culture affect/interact each other, but also at a stage of getting sensitivity to cultural differences and intercultural negotiation.

From Alan Parker's *Angela Ashes*, I have given a particular importance to the following cultural input to the students: the fight for survival in the slums of Limerick in the 1930s and 1940s together with the socio-political situation of Ireland in those days. Thus, students would get the knowledge about the Irish culture and history from the Irish conflict and the distinctive accent and intonation of the Irish people.

All the activities seen from the worksheet of the appendix aim at training students' cultural exploration, comparison, cultural acquisition, and negotiation (integration) of one's own third place between cultures. The activities are divided into the following three parts: the previewing, viewing, and postviewing.

The previewing consists of the two parts. The first part concentrates on disseminating cultural input and encouraging students to compare the Irish culture and their own (Korean) by predictions and working with their own previous knowledge. The second part introduces the students to linguistic input: new colloquial words and expressions. All the previewing activities intend to assist the students to understand better about the film, and indeed, they seem to have helped them to develop their comprehension strategies and be ready to see the movie with some high amount of interest.

As they are watching the movie, the students in the third part of the worksheet are

⁶ Based on the memoir by Frank McCourt, *Angela's Ashes*, directed by Alan Parker (1999), is an alternately funny and heartbreaking look at growing up in Ireland. Born in Brooklyn, NY, young Frank (Joe Breen) moves at an early age to Limerick, Ireland, with his parents Angela (mother played by Emily Watson) and Malachy (father by Robert Carlyle), who have been unable to support their family in America and are hoping for better prospects in their home country, Ireland. But things hardly improve once they settle in Limerick; as McCourt puts it, "Worse than the ordinary miserable childhood is the miserable Irish childhood." Besides, Malachy's drinking and inability to hold a job make matters worse.

questioned of what they have noticed. After the viewing, the students are watching selected scenes again and encouraged to participate in some activities with the professor and students' peer to improve listening comprehension, the comprehension of the script (the selected scenes) and vocabulary including idioms and slangs. They are also asked to create conversations and discussions based on the contents and script dialog. From the discussions (mostly within a student group), the students are led to cultural comparison, and integration of their own third place between the cultures.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that IELT serves as a major contextual factor affecting success in getting competence/proficiency among WEes. IELT has become indispensable since intercoursing among many recognized varieties of Englishes are unavoidable in the postmodern globalization and the status of English as a WEes has become an increasingly popular discourse in the contemporary ELT environment and applied linguistics. This paper has exposed what IELT is and is composed of. Such IELT mainstreams as knowledge, behaviors, attitudes, and critical awareness have been put on the spotlight for learners/teachers of WEes to be equipped with. Then, the paper has addressed how the mainstreams can be achieved in actual classrooms via some methodologies entailing materials, contents, and classroom activities. At the end, the paper has presented one example of classroom activity through a movie called, *Angela's Ashes*.

It should be clear by now that IELT has a lot to offer⁷ – it is an exciting, demanding, often difficult but ultimately rewarding approach to WEes teaching/learning. The adequate development of learners' IELT competence cannot be achieved exclusively through policies, materials or living abroad (Byram & Zarate, 1996). Without teachers' awareness and understanding of the IELT mainstreams, students' intercultural knowledge, behaviors, and attitudes along with their critical thinking are all put into danger. Thus, appropriate training for teachers to be equipped with those intercultural mainstreams should be implemented. Of course, professional growth is essentially a question of time, struggle, commitment, and support. This can be done only through a combined effort from institutions and education agencies; that way, teachers of WEes in Korea will be able to fulfill their responsibilities for making IELT effectively possible with a greater confidence.

⁷ For the interested researchers and teachers, please check out the Languages and Intercultural Communication and Education series published by Multilingual Matters.

REFERENCES

- Alptekin, C. (2002). Globalization and language: English in Turkey. *Sosyal Bilimler*, 1; 2004 Cilt: 2, Say: 1 Celal Bayar Universitesi, Manisa.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buttjes, D., & Byram, M. (1991). Introduction. In D. Buttjes & M. Byram (Eds.), *Meditating languages and cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of foreign language education* (pp. 1-12). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (1988). Foreign language education and cultural studies. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 1, 15-31.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1996). *Young people facing difference*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1997). Defining and assessing intercultural competence: Some principles and proposals for the European context. *Language Teaching*, 29, 14-18.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(3), 229-242.
- Canale, M., & Swain, G. (1981). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Clouet, R. (2008). Intercultural language learning: Cultural mediation within the curriculum of translation and interpreting studies. *IBERICA*, 16, 147-168.
- Cormeraie, S. (1998). From theoretical insight to best practice for successful inter-cultural education: The crucial transmission. In D. Killick & M. Parry (Eds.), *Cross-cultural capability: The why, the ways & the means: New theories & methodologies in language education*. Paper presented at the conference at Leeds metropolitan University, December 1998, Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 7-19), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crawford-Lange, L. M., & Lange, D. L. (1984). Doing the unthinkable in the language classroom: A process for integrating language and culture. In T. D. Higgins (Ed.), *Teaching for proficiency: The organizing principle* (pp. 139-177). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.
- Crozet, C. (1996). *Teaching verbal interaction and culture*. Unpublished Master of Arts, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.
- Crozet, C. (1998). *Teaching verbal interaction and culture in the language classroom*.

- Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 37-58.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gnutzmann, C. (2000). Lingua franca. In M. Byram (Ed.), *The routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning* (pp. 402-429). London: Routledge.
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. *AILA Review*, 13, 57-68.
- Guest, M. (2002). A critical checkbook for culture teaching and learning. *ELT Journal*, 52(2), 154-161.
- Gumperz, J. J., & Hymes, D. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt.
- Hinkel, E. (2001). Building awareness and practical skills to facilitate cross-cultural communication. In M. Cele-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 443-458). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publication.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157-181.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1991). Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today*, 25, 3-13.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 355-365). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1998). English as an Asian language. *Link & Letters*, 5, 89-108.
- Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. (2001). World Englishes. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English in a global context* (pp. 5-17). London: Routledge.
- Kilickaya, F. (2004). Guidelines to evaluate cultural contents in textbooks. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10(2), Retrieved February 25, 2008, from the World Wide Web: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kilickya-Culturalcontent/>
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). Teaching along the cultural faultline. In R. M. Paige, D. L. Lange & Y. A. Yershova (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Interdisciplinary perspectives on culture teaching and learning in the second language curriculum* (pp. 15-32). Minneapolis:

- CARLA, University of Minnesota.
- Lee, Kang-Young. (2009). Treating culture: What 11 high school EFL conversation textbooks in South Korea do. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 8(1), 76-96.
- Lee, Kang-Young. (2010). Korea English: Its historical, educational, sociolinguistic, and sociocultural aspects. *The Journal of Modern British & American Language & Literature*, 28(4), 67-87.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). Static and dynamic views of culture and intercultural language acquisition. *Babel*, 36, 4-11.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatic development in instructional contexts* (pp. 125-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 719-729.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2003). EIL curriculum development. *RELC Journal*, 34(1), 139-146.
- Nostrand, H. L. (1991). Basic intercultural education needs breadth and depth: The role of second culture. In E. Silber (Ed.), *Critical issues in foreign language instruction* (pp. 131-159). New York: Garland.
- Oxenden, C., & Latham-Koening. (2000). *English files*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paige, R. M., Jorstad, H., Siaya, L, Klein, F., & Colby, J. (1999). Culture learning in language education: A review of the literature. In R. M. Paige, D. L. Lange & Y. A. Yeshova (Eds.), *Culture as core: Integrating culture into language curriculum* (pp. 47-113). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Pakir, A. (1999). Connecting English in the context of internationalization. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), 185-209.
- Parker, A. W. (1999, December). *Angels's ashes*. Paramount Picture.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of world Englishes and its implication for ELT. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 111-117.
- Richards, J. C. (2000). *New Interchanges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Risager, K. (1998). Language teaching and the process of European integration. In Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 271-290). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ronbinson-Stuart, G., & Nocon, H. (1996). Second culture acquisition: Ethnography in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(4), 431-449.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 133-158.

- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Smith, L. (Ed.) (1983). *Readings in English as an international language*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Talebinezhad, M. R., & Aliakbari, M. (2001). Basic assumptions in teaching English as an international language. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 7(7). Retrieved May 2005 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.iteslj.org/article/talebinezhad-EIL.html>.
- Tomalin, B., & Stempleski, S. (1993). *Cultural awareness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Valdes, J. M. (1990). The inevitability of teaching and learning culture in a foreign language course. In B. Harrison (Ed.), *Culture and language classroom* (pp. 20-30). Oxford: Modern English Publication/British Council.
- Ware, P. D., & Kramsch, C. (2005). Toward an intercultural stance: Teaching German and English through telecommunication. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(2), 190-205.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.

APPENDIX

Angela Ashes

I. PREVIEWING: Background to *Angela's Ashes* written by Frank McCourt

1.1. Ireland

- 1) What language do people in Ireland use? Do you like to visit the country? Why do you think people want to go to Ireland? Think of three different reasons.
- 2) The movie takes place in the 1930s and 40s in Ireland. What do you know about the political and social background of Ireland at that time?

1.2. Cultural references

- 1) Back in Ireland, Malachy wants to see the IRA (the Irish Republican Army). Why?
- 2) What do you know about St. Patrick?
- 3) What is the St. Vincent de Paul society?
- 4) What do you know about Eamon de Valera and Michael Collins?

1.3. Guess before you watch

- 1) Almost at the beginning of the film, Francis McCourt says: "We must have been the only Irish family in history to be saying goodbye to the Statue of Liberty instead of hello." What does that mean and why?
- 2) What could the following sentence mean? "We're not handing out money to support the Guinness family."
- 3) Angela's mother and sister don't greet Malachy when they arrive at Limerick station? Why?
- 4) Why can't they stay at Grandma's house? What did they do then?
- 5) The masters at Leamy's school hit their pupils for many reasons. Can you guess some of them?

1.2 VOCABULARY

1.2.1 Write the correct word in each space.

Filthy a docket the lingo rasher to sneer to jeer to sport

- a) A document entitling the holder to receive goods. b) To make rude and mocking remarks.
- c) To wear. d) The local dialect. e) Disgustingly dirty.
- f) A thin slice of bacon. g) To smile or speak in a mocking manner.

1.2.2 Explain the following colloquial words or expressions:

- a wee girl. - Go easy with the sugar! - To have a long face. - To be on the dole.
- Beggars can't be choosers. - He's the spitting image of his sister. - Money galore.
- The sour puss. - The odd look. - To know something like the back of one's hand.

II. WHILE WATCHING

2.1 Answer the questions below

- 1) How many children does Angela give birth to in New York? And in Limerick? What are their names?
- 2) How does Malachy change after Margaret is born?
- 3) Why does Mrs Liebowitz want to find Angela's cousins? What does she do?
- 4) Who pays for the McCourts to travel back to Ireland?
- 5) Who brought the fleas to Ireland according to Malachy?
- 6) Why does Malachy go to the Labour Exchange?
- 7) Why did they move into a new house?

2.2 Who says what? Uncle Pat, Aunt Aggie, Angela, Malachy or the Schoolmaster?

- This is the new Ireland: wee men in wee chairs with wee bits of paper.
- You're too grand to pick coal off the road.
- I don't think why we should be paying for her mistakes. Five born and one gone.
- Me dad said it was a good thing she didn't own the stable in Bethlehem or the Holy Family would be wandering the world still crumbling with hunger.

- I wouldn't want anything that was half Limerick and half North of Ireland.
- They didn't give a fiddler's fart about the Irish.
- My little Yankee Doodle Dandy.
- In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Toast.

2.3 Circle the correct answers.

- 1) Grandma Sheehan's house *is / isn't* a happy house.
- 2) Religion is *more / less* important in Limerick than in New York.
- 3) Angela *gets / doesn't get* help from the St Vincent de Paul Society.
- 4) They *want / don't want* to check that the family really *needs / doesn't need* their help.

III. POST-VIEWING

3.1 Accents

The Irish language under the country's constitution is the national language, English being the second. The Irish language is the Celtic branch of the Indo-European family of languages. But about 30 percent of the population in Ireland claims to have knowledge of Irish. Although Irish Gaelic is in decline, it has influenced Irish English. The Irish English in its accent is different from that of English. It is very musical and has a characteristic intonation. A distinctive English construction used in Ireland is to be "after doing" - e.g. "I'm after having lunch," meaning that I have just finished eating lunch. People in Ireland are noted for their great sense of humor

Listen to the following dialogue again and fill in the gaps with the appropriate word or expression.

Uncle Pat: Jesus, I said to meself. I have so much gas in my system, it is a great pity to waste it. So I shove a pipe up me arise, light a match to it, and there we have fine flame ready to boil water or anything. And the English came running from trenches all around to pay me to boil their water.

Aunt Aggie: That's no story

Grandma Sheehan: It is better than

Uncle Pat: I made so much money in the trenches that I was able the generals who didn't normally about the Irish to let me out of the Army and after I went to Paris where I had a fine time drinking wine with the models and artists and talking: "Oui, oui". You think that's funny, do you? I had a great time over there.

3.2. Practice

- 1) Choose three out of the following topics ad discuss them with your group. Which of these would you hate most and why?
 - Everyone in your street using your toilet.
 - Eating a pig's head for Christmas dinner.
 - Asking for money on the street.
 - Your father is spending the family's money on

alcohol.

- 2) Choose one situation right above and make a skit out of it using appropriate words and collocations. Suppose the day is X-mas day.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Elementary/Secondary/Tertiary

Kang-Young Lee
The Division of Basic/Core Studies
Chungbuk National University
52 Nasudong-ro, Heungdeok-gu,
Cheongju, 361-763, Korea.
Tel: (043) 261-3746/ H.P.: 018-232-3580
Email: kangyounglee@chungbuk.ac.kr

Received 15 March 2012

Revised 7 May 2012

Accepted 19 May 2012