The content analysis of the English as an international language-targeted coursebooks: English literature or literature in English?

Mehdi Solhi Andarab*, School of Education, English Language Teaching Department, Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

The integration of literature and literary works has always played an undeniable role in language education. Despite the existence of a wealth of literature in non-native English-speaking countries, in the majority of the coursebooks, the entire attention is devoted to literary works of the native English-speaking countries. In this study, five coursebooks claiming to be based on English as an international language (EIL) were randomly selected and analysed to investigate to what extent they have incorporated the literatures of native and non-native English-speaking countries. The criteria for the content analysis of the claimed EIL-based coursebooks were based on Kachru's Tri-Partide Model to categorise the countries, and culture with a small c and Culture with a capital C dichotomy. Results indicated that although the chosen coursebook purports to be based on EIL, less or nearly no attention is given to the literary works of the non-native speakers of English.

Keywords: ELT coursebooks, English as an international language, Kachru's Tri-Partide model, literature in English.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Mehdi Solhi Andarab,** School of Education, English Language Teaching Department Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Turkey. *E-mail address:* solhi.mehdi@gmail.com / Tel.: +9-212- 444 85 44

1. Introduction

Although the spread of globalisation has had a dramatic influence on all dimensions of individuals' life around the globe, it could not have achieved this status if there was not a common language to fulfil the interaction and communication among individuals. As Crystal (2003, p. 120) points out, English language 'happened to be in the right place at the right time' to take advantage of the contemporary economic, technological and socio-cultural world developments. When English as a foreign language first emerged as subject of study, its norms were developed by its initial proprietors, namely, the UK and the US. Drawing upon the legacy of Latin, building upon a focus on accuracy and developing into structural approaches and methodology such as Grammar Translation Method, it became established as a rule-based system, codified and endorsed by its native speakers. Recently, however, as a result of globalisation and the consequent need for a suitable language to cater to the communicative needs of speakers of a myriad of languages worldwide, the role of English has undergone fundamental changes and English has attained a new position. Once considered the sole property of the world's handful of Anglophonic nations, English has recently become a language of international communication and thus 'a world language' (Mair, 2003). This unique increase in the number of non-native speakers of English has led to a salient fact about English today: not only there are more non-native than native speakers of English, but they are also most likely to employ this language to communicate with other non-native speakers of English.

Prodromou (1997) similarly estimates that more than 80% of communication in English takes place between non-native speakers of English. Jenkins (2006) also stresses that, in English as an international language (EIL) settings, non-native speakers communicate mostly with other non-native speakers rather than native speakers of English. Hence, this fact brings up the controversial question of the ownership of English and challenges the hegemonic dominance of English of specific cultures (EofSC) (Solhi Andarab, 2014). EofSC refers to Anglo-American linguistic and cultural norms of native speaker countries, which are traditionally regarded as the ideal norms of English to emulate. Hence, that is believed that the closer the learners are to the native speaker norms, the better learners they are. This portrays cultural and linguistic hegemony of the native-speaker Englishes over the non-native varieties of English. However, as Modiano (2001) clarifies, the new status of EIL poses major challenges to the dominating power of British and American native-speaker norms in ELT practices. This paradigm shift has paved the way for the emergence of what Yano (2009) conceptualises as English for specific cultures (EforSC), pointing to an English language not bound to a particular territory. It refers to any culture-free English by which its speaker's world is reflected. Therefore, it advocates the belief that the speaker of English is the owner of it.

In fact, a significant number of studies have been conducted to systematically inspect the issue of ownership and that of native speakerism. However, with regard to the inevitable impression of EIL on the forthcoming materials development, particularly global coursebooks, there appear some gaps in need of exploration (McKay, 2002; Tomlinson, 2005). Echoing Tomlinson and McKay, a study conducted by Yi-Shin (2010) also indicated that there lies a break between EIL idealism in promoting EIL teaching materials, and the actual needs of the teachers and learners in learning English in non-native speaker countries. Despite the increasing attention given to the teaching of EIL, however, more studies can provide more insight regarding the question of how culture serves as context in EIL coursebooks. In this study, the process of coursebook development in EIL era and a sample group of such coursebooks were subject to a close scrutiny.

'English as a global language' (Crystal, 2003), 'English as a lingua franca' (Jenkins, 2003b), 'English as a world language' (Mair, 2003), 'World English' (Brutt-Griffler, 2002) and English as a medium of intercultural communication (Seidlhofer, 2003) have been used as general umbrella terms for uses of English, EIL, in different parts of the world. However, when English is chosen as the means of communication between people from different first language backgrounds, across linguacultural boundaries, the preferred term is 'English as a lingua franca' or 'EIL' (House, 1999; Seidlhofer, 2001).

According to Widdowson (1998, pp. 399–400), EIL can be regarded as 'a kind of composite lingua franca, which is free of any specific allegiance to any primary variety of the (English) language'.

In recent years, the emergence of EIL has paved the way for its global speakers to use it as a means of interacting globally and representing themselves and their cultures internationally. It is noteworthy that EIL does not suggest or support a particular variety of English and indeed, rejects the idea of any particular variety (Sharifian, 2009). As Sharifian (2009) asserts, instead of trying to explore how EIL could be turned into a 'nuclear' language or trying to turn the whole world into a homogenous speech community, it might be more helpful to offer a revised model of communication that makes the mutual understanding more feasible. Actually, Smith (1976) stated the similar idea more than four decades ago, arguing that English has become an international language and no longer needs to be linked to the culture of those who speak it as a first language. Rather, the purpose of an international language is to describe one's own culture and concerns to others. He highlights that only when English is used to express and uphold local cultures and values, it will truly represent an international language.

In EIL era, the exposure to different forms and functions of English is fundamental for learners, who may use the language with the speakers of a variety other than American and British Englishes. They also need to understand that American, British, or whatever variety they are learning is simply one of many Englishes that exist in the world and that the particular variety their future interlocutors will use may differ from what they are learning. McKay (2003a) also points out students do not need to depend on the cultural schemata of the native speakers of English to negotiate meaning and to communicate with other users of English. Alptekin (2002, p. 61) similarly points out that effective second language learning does not necessarily have to be supported by integrating the entire target culture; he asks: ' (H)ow 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'?

More than three decades ago, Kachru (1985) used three concentric circles to classify the speakers of English in the globe. The first, known as the Inner Circle (natives), includes countries where English is used as a native language, among them Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The second, the Outer Circle (nativised), includes countries where English is an institutionalised variety and is used as an official language. Former British colonies, such as India, Nigeria and Zambia, to list a few, belong in this category. The third, the Expanding Circle (nonnatives), consists of countries where English is traditionally used or learned as a foreign language and in which English played little or no administrative or institutional role. Some such countries include Japan, China, Turkey and Iran. In sum, the Inner Circle varieties are considered as norm-providing, the Outer Circle as norm-developing, whereas English in the Expanding Circle is seen as norm dependent. Despite the drawbacks contributed Kachru's Tri-Partide Model, this model to categorise English continues to serve as a useful initial stepping stone for the widely-accepted division of Englishes and can still be used as the most fundamental and pivotal model to classify speakers around the globe.

1.1. Culture with a capital C and culture with a small c

Considering the dynamic nature of the concept of culture, anthropologists prefer to distinguish between Culture with a capital C and culture with a small c. Kumaravadivelu (2003, p. 267) defines Culture with a capital C as a 'relatively societal construct referring to the general view of culture as creative endeavours such as theatre, dance, music, literature and art'. Hence, Culture with a capital C refers to the most overt forms of culture. It is sometimes referred as 'achievement Culture' and covers geography, history and achievements in science, as well as arts, movies, poems and so on (Tomalin & Stempleski, 1993). The latter, as Kumaravadivelu (2003, p. 267) defines, 'is a relatively personal construct, referring to the patterns of behaviour, values and beliefs that guide the everyday life of an individual or a group of individuals within a cultural community'. Therefore, this is comprised of

cultural beliefs, behaviours and values of a particular group of speakers. It is sometimes called 'behaviour culture'. Culture with a small c is subtler and more difficult to teach but can reveal important cultural differences. It encompasses culturally-influenced beliefs and perceptions, especially as expressed through language as well as through cultural behaviours that affect acceptability in any speech community. As Kumaravadivelu (2003) asserts, historically the cultural orientation regarding second language learning and teaching was mainly restricted to Culture with a capital C. It was only after World War II that learners and teachers equally began emphasising the significance of everyday aspects of cultural practices, that is, culture with a small c. It was the time when language communication became the primary goal of language learning and teaching.

1.2. Coursebooks and their cultural contents

It is generally assumed that materials have a significant role in structuring the English language lesson and continue to play a central role in foreign language education, especially at beginner and intermediate levels (Gray, 2002). Kramsch (1988) put forward a key role for the coursebook, suggesting that it provides a source of 'ideational scaffolding' for learning. In a similar vein, Hutchinson and Torres (1994, p. 319) have argued that the coursebook is crucial in 'pinning down the procedures of the classroom' and imposing a structure on the dynamic interaction characteristic of language teaching and learning. Roberts (1996) introduces coursebook materials as the fundament on which FL teaching and learning are based. Kramsch (1988, p. 1) in similar terms introduces coursebooks as 'the bedrock of syllabus design and lesson planning'. In sum, more than anything else, coursebooks continue to constitute the 'guiding principle' of many foreign language courses throughout the world (Davcheva and Sercu, 2005).

Language coursebooks often incorporate teaching of culture as part of their content and are considered as the best medium to present cultural contents to learners. To both teach the foreign language and to promote learners' familiarity with the foreign culture, teachers rely heavily on coursebooks, although many also use supplementary materials to a larger or lesser extent (Sercu, 2005). McKay (2003b) similarly argues that students can be assisted to understand a foreign culture through different means. According to her, coursebooks are paramount in the sense that they are the most commonly used teaching tools in the process of language learning. Cultural contents of the coursebooks, as McKay (2003b) highlights, determine the type and extent of the cultural knowledge students are likely to gain in the classroom and therefore they should be regarded as a distinctive element of the coursebooks as they are expected to trigger the intercultural competence of the learners. In a similar vein, Cortazzi and Jin (1999) view cultural learning as a dialogue between teachers, students and coursebooks. However, when coursebooks have only limited potential to promote the acquisition of intercultural competence in learners, either because of cultural contents of the coursebooks or deficient approach used in the coursebooks to include intercultural competence, teachers might be unable to use them for raising intercultural competence of the learners.

Victor (1999) emphasises that the issue of cultural content of the materials remains an unresolved issue. He questions the compatibility of the materials designed for learners in France and similarly used for teaching of English in, say, Gabon. According to him, such materials are incompatible with learners' needs from cognitive, linguistic and semantic points of view. McKay (2000) also points out that culture in English language teaching materials has been subject to discussion for many years. According to her, the reason for the use of cultural content in classroom is for the assumption that it will foster learner motivation. It is worth noting that the majority of the general English coursebooks are published by major Anglo-American publishers in the Inner Circle countries. However, coursebooks used in English-speaking countries are also used in countries where English is taught as a foreign language. These global coursebooks are Anglocentric or Euro-centric in their topics and themes, and they mainly depict non-European cultures superficially and insensitively (Tomlinson, 2008). In addition, general English coursebooks are criticised for portraying the idealised pictures of English-

speaking countries because the cultural content of such materials tends to lean predominantly towards American and British cultures.

Matsuda (2009) also criticises the current practices in ELT, which tend to give privileged status to the United States and UK, in terms of both linguistic and cultural contents, arguing that such traditional approaches may not adequately prepare future EIL users who are likely to communicate with English users from other countries. According to her, teaching materials and assessment need to be reconsidered to appropriately meet the needs of EIL learners. Prodromou (1988) is also critical of the cultural contents of the coursebooks but focuses more on what he sees as the 'alienating effects' of such materials on students, and how they can produce disengagement with learning. Echoing Prodromou, Canagarajah (1999) has described the cultural content of North American textbooks being used in Sri Lanka as 'alien and intrusive'. Garcia (2005) similarly believes that, today, coursebook design is a product of massive international marketing and is likely to incorporate elements that make the product attractive rather than focusing on sociocultural issues that promote cultural analysis and intercultural reflection.

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

As evident, in recent years, there has been a shift in cultural contents of the global coursebooks, as new coursebooks and new editions of older coursebooks include more and more references to an emergent global culture (Gray, 2002). Thus, if in the past the idea of culture in the global coursebook was linked to native speakers of English, more recent coursebooks have begun to integrate the culture of non-native speakers of English (Block, 2010). Despite the dominance of EofSC in the global coursebooks, in recent years, there has been a growing awareness among publishers that content which is appropriate in one part of the world might not be appropriate in another. As it has been mentioned in Matsuda (2006; 2012), some coursebooks targeted specifically at EIL learners have also been published (Honna & Kirkpatrick, 2004; Honna, Kirkpatrick, & Gilbert, 2001; Shaules, Tsujioka & Iida, 2004; Yoneoka & Arimoto, 2000) entitled 'Intercultural English' and 'English across Cultures', to mention a few. These global coursebooks claim to be in parallel with the objectives of EIL. In fact, a significant number of studies have been conducted to systematically inspect the issue of EIL, its ownership and that of native speakerism. However, considering the inevitable impression of EIL on the forthcoming materials development, particularly global coursebooks, there appear some gaps in need of exploration (McKay, 2002; Tomlinson, 2005).

2. Method

The purpose of the study is twofold: to contribute to the existing literature of research in the ELT coursebook analysis within the frame of EIL and to investigate the possible scope for EIL in these coursebooks. The focus of this study, therefore, was the analysis of the representation of literary contents and their references in the claimed EIL-based coursebooks to see to what extent they have incorporated the literature of the non-native speaker countries in an era where English is regarded as an international language.

The sample analysed in this study consists of five reportedly EIL-based coursebooks that are currently being used worldwide. The selection of these coursebooks was based on their central claims, which form the pivotal features of EIL, and can be listed as: international appeal, culturally appropriacy, understanding English across cultures by developing learners' intercultural literacy

through awareness of language, awareness of the needs of learners to speak to other non-native speakers as well as to native speakers, the perception of different varieties and speakers, and sensitivity towards different cultural and national backgrounds. To illustrate, on the cover page of Understanding English across Cultures coursebook, there is a claim underlining the focus of the coursebook, claiming it to be based on EIL. Similarly, on the cover pages of Global coursebook series, the motto of the coursebook appears to be in parallel with EIL.

The first analysed set was the Global series (elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate levels). The other coursebooks include English across Cultures, Intercultural English, Understanding Asia and Understanding English across Cultures. As aforementioned, all these coursebooks assert an alignment with the specifications of EIL. The details regarding the coursebook are listed in Table 1. In contrast to Global Coursebook series, which is quite well-known and commonly used in most of the language institutes in many countries, the other coursebooks are extensively used particularly in Asian countries.

Table 1. EIL-based coursebooks

Title	Author	Publisher	Date of Publication
Global Coursebook (four coursebooks)	Clandfield & Jeffries	Macmillan	2010
English Across Cultures	Honna, Kirkpatrick & Gilbert	Tokyo: Sansusha	2001
Intercultural English	Honna & Kirkpatrick	Ikubundo Press	2004
Understanding Asia	Honna & Takeshita		2009
Understanding English across Cultures	Honna, Takeshita & D'Angelo		2011

3. Results

To answer to the research question, the content of the EIL-targeted global coursebooks was examined to find out how the EIL-targeted global coursebooks differ in depicting literary works of Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle countries. In so doing, the cultural contents of these EIL-based coursebooks were closely examined. The criteria for the content analysis of the claimed EIL-based coursebooks were based on Kachru's Tri-Partide Model to categorise the countries, and culture with a small c and Culture with a capital C dichotomy. The literary contents of the coursebooks, as aforementioned, go under the category of Culture with a capital C and were the focus of the study. As aforementioned, Culture with a capital C refers to the most visible forms of culture, namely, literature, history, art, film, music, civilisation and so on. The references to the literature and literary works of the authors from all Kachruvian Circles in Global coursebooks series are indicated in Table 2.

As it is evident, in Global elementary coursebook, exactly 51% of the cultural contents targeting Culture with a capital C belong to Inner Circle cultures with frequency of 29. In this coursebook, history has the highest frequency (F = 14) among the Inner Circle cultures. Literature of the Inner Circle countries (F = 11) constitutes second mostly focused cultural elements of this coursebook. Among them are Shakespeare's tragic families (p. 31), Hungry Planet (p. 48), a book written by Peter Menzel, All the President's Men, a book written by Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward (p. 80) and a novel written by Ernest Wright (p. 123). The references to literary works of Inner Circle countries (F = 62) in all the books of Global English series comprise approximately 90% of the all literature, while those of Outer Circle countries (F = 2) make up less than 3% and those of Expanding Circle countries (F = 7) amount 7% of the literature.

In English across Cultures coursebook, there is no reference to capital C cultural products of Inner circle countries. In contrast, there is only one reference to a literary work of an Expanding Circle country: Remains of the Day, a novel by a Japanese writer on page 32 and a reference to that of Outer Circle country on page 32: Taximan's Story, a novel. The three other books, namely, Intercultural English, Understating English across Cultures and Understanding Asia coursebooks were also analysed to locate the literary products of the three Kachruvian Circles. However, there is no reference to any literary works of the countries in these coursebooks.

Andarab, M. S. (2019). The content analysis of the English as an international-targeted coursebooks: English literature or literature in English? *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *14*(1), 069-079.

Table 2. Frequency of all references to Culture with a capital C in Global coursebook series

Coursebook	Culture with big C	Cultural Content	F	Percentage
Global coursebook (elementary)		History	14	24.6
		Literature	11	19.3
	IC Culture	Film	1	1.8
		Others	3	5.3
		Film	2	3.8
	OC Culture	History	2	3.6
		History	18	31.6
	EC Culture	Film	6	10.5
Global coursebook (pre-intermediate)		History	33	37.1
		Literature	14	15.7
	IC Culture	Quote	6	6.7
		Others	5	5.6
		Film	4	4.5
	EC Culture	History	14	15.7
		Statue	5	5.6
		Literature	3	3.4
		Music	1	1.1
		Others	4	4.5
Global coursebook (intermediate)		Literature	23	30.3
		History	16	21.1
	IC Culture	Quote	8	10.5
		Film	1	1.3
		Others	4	5.3
		History	10	13.2
	EC Culture	Painting	4	5.3
		Literature	2	2.6
		Quote	3	3.9
		Film	1	1.3
		Others	4	5.3
Global coursebook (upper-intermediate)		Quote	16	29.6
	IC Culture	Literature	14	25.9
		History	5	9.3
		Film	2	3.7
		Others	5	9.3
	OC Culture	Literature	2	3.7
		Quote	1	1.9
		Quote	3	5.6
	EC Culture	History	2	3.7
		Painting	1	1.9
		Statue	1	1.9
		Others	2	3.7

4. Discussions

In this study, five coursebooks claiming to be based on EIL were randomly selected and analysed to investigate to what extent they have incorporated the literatures of native and non-native English-speaking countries and how they differ in depicting literary works of Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle countries in an era where English is regarded as a lingua franca. The criteria for the content analysis of the claimed EIL-based coursebooks were based on Kachru's Tri-Partide Model to categorise the

countries, and culture with a small c and Culture with a capital C dichotomy. As the results indicate, although the chosen coursebook purports to be based on EIL, less or nearly no attention is given to the literary works of the non-native speakers of English. In Global Coursebook series, the dominance and hegemony of native-speaker literature are seen all over the literary contents of the series. The literary works of the native speaker countries comprise nearly 90% of the all literature in Global coursebook series, while the cultural references to the both Outer and Expanding Circle countries only make up to 10%. In English across Cultures, Intercultural English, Understanding Asia and Understanding English across Cultures, the presence of literature is too few, or as the results indicate, there is no reference at all.

This heavy reliance on the Culture with a capital C of the native speaker countries is less likely to prepare the current speakers of English for intercultural communication. A large number of scholars argue in favour of including cultural contents that can activate the intercultural competence of the language learners (Jenkins, 2004; Matsuda, 2006; Sharifian, 2009). EIL speakers need to know about the cultural norms of the people they are likely to be communicating with. However, the analysed coursebooks with their heavy focus on the literature of the native speaker countries do not seem to fulfil the requirements of the 'global' coursebooks. Familiarising learners with the enlightening thoughts of the authors, influential poets and distinguished writers from non-native speaker countries, rather than mainly from native speaker countries, can dramatically pave the way for fostering the intercultural awareness of the learners. Being exposed to only the literary works of the native speaker countries is less likely to prepare the leaners for the communications whose participants are mainly non-native speakers interacting with other non-native speakers of English.

As indicated, despite the existence of a wealth of literature in Outer and Expanding Circle countries, little or none of this is seen in the global coursebooks. In the majority of the coursebooks, due attention is devoted to Inner Circle literature and language learners are being exposed to a canon of literature that encompasses works of English or American novelists, writers and poets. Global series is one of such coursebooks with heavy emphasis on Inner Circle literature. Throughout the entire series of the coursebooks, a bombardment of literary works by native-speakers of English is presented, with very few literary works from various Outer Circle authors (whose literary works have been written in English) are present. The heavy use of Inner Circle literature in the global coursebooks is not in parallel with the main objectives of EIL-based coursebooks.

5. Conclusion

As aforementioned, with the advent of discussions about EIL, the issue of cultural content of language learning coursebooks has recently become a contentious issue in the process of materials development. This is due to the fact that not only second language learners of English, but those who learn English as a foreign language also use English to communicate with mostly non-native speakers (Seidlhofer; 2001; Sharifian, 2010; Tomlinson, 2001). Therefore, developing the coursebooks with a perspective on EIL can pave the way for both native and non-native speakers of English to familiarise themselves with different linguistic and cultural norms that they are likely to encounter in the communications with speakers from different cultural backgrounds. Hence, while developing the language learning coursebooks, as Nault (2006) states, English educators ought to not only be more culturally and linguistically aware, but better able to design curricula with an international and multicultural focus.

In addition, in a globalising perspective, we should keep in mind to put equal value on both non-native and native speakers' cultural knowledge concerning both the target and local elements in teaching materials. Both ELT coursebooks and the ELT curriculum should provide an opportunity for learners to foster their cultural awareness by including global and multicultural perspectives (Shin, Eslami & Chen, 2012). The role of literature and the literary works of not only native speaker but also non-native authors of English in developing this intercultural competence and awareness need to be taken into close account.

Instead of solely integrating English literature into the coursebooks, the future global coursebooks should also insert Outer and Expanding Circle literary works accompanied by those of Inner Circle literature into the global coursebook. Being exposed to different kinds of literary works from different corners of the world can familiarise the learners with the ideas of different writers and can pave the way for the learners to become aware of the cultural conceptualisation of the different speakers of English, in Sharifian's (2009) term. In contrast to the coursebooks inundated with English literature, future coursebooks with the focus on literature in English can foster the intercultural competence of the learners by helping them take note of the cultural assumptions underlying writings from a different society and/or time and, in the meantime, help them become aware of their own cultures.

Kumaravadivelu (2011) similarly argues in favour of 'cultural library' rather than 'cultural literacy'. According to him, in our globalised world, as far as learning cultures is concerned, more attention should be given to learning 'from other cultures', rather than 'about other cultures'. Learning about other cultures leads to cultural literacy. In contrast, learning from other cultures leads to cultural liberty. The significance of literary works of different countries and learning from them can create such kind of cultural liberty by enlightening the learners and triggering their critical thinking abilities as they become able to move away from cultural literacy towards reasons behind the cultural ideas and beliefs represented in the coursebooks. This awareness and cultural liberty are more likely to help the learners go beyond the developed stereotypical perspectives towards a country and a community.

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

References

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56*(1), 57–64. doi: 10.1093/elt/56.1.57

Block, D. (2010). Globalization and language teaching. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 287–304). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. doi: 10.1002/9781444324068.ch12

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English: a study of its development*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Nonlinguistic roots, non-pedagogical results.
In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77–92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching* (pp. 196–219). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/ cbo9780 511486999

Davcheva, L. & Sercu, L. (2005). Culture in foreign language teaching materials. In Sercu et al. (Eds.), *Foreign language teachers and intercultural competence* (pp. 90–109). Multilingual Matters LTD. doi: 10.21832/ 9781853598456-008

Andarab, M. S. (2019). The content analysis of the English as an international-targeted coursebooks: English literature or literature in English? *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *14*(1), 069-079.

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

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 117–133). London, UK: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203193679

Gray, J. (2006). *A study of cultural content in the British ELT global coursebook: A Cultural studies approach*. (Doctorate dissertation). Institute of Education, University of London. doi: 10.1093/elt/54.3.274

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

Honna, N., Kirkpatrick, A. & Gilbert, S. (2001). *English across cultures.* Tokyo, Japan: Sansusha.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language* (pp.73–89). Tuebingen, Germany: Stauffenburg.

Hutchinson, T. & Torres, E. (1994). The Textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, *48*(4), 315–327. doi: 10.1093/elt/48.4.315

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

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics 16*(2), 137–162. doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2006.00111.x

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge, UK: CUP.

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

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Beyond methods: *Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press. doi: 10.5860/choice.41-1693

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Heaven and London.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2011). *Language teacher education for a global society*. Routledge Publication.

Mair, C. (2003). *The politics of English as a world language*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.

Matsuda, A. (2006). Negotiating ELT assumptions in EIL classrooms. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)Locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 158–170). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Matsuda, A. (2009). Desirable but not necessary? The place of world Englishes and English as an international language in English teacher preparation programs in Japan. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 169–189). UK: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

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

McKay, S. L. (2003a). *The cultural basis of teaching English as an international language, TESOL Matters*, *13*(4), 1–2. Retrieved from http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID= 192&DID=1000

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

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

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

Nault, D. (2006). Going global: Rethinking culture teaching in ELT contexts. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(3), 314–328.

Prodromou, L. (1988). English as cultural action. *ELT Journal, 42*(2), 73–83. doi: 10.1093/elt/42.2.73

Prodromou, L. (1997). Global English and octopus. *IATEFL Newsletter, 137*, 18–22.

Andarab, M. S. (2019). The content analysis of the English as an international-targeted coursebooks: English literature or literature in English? *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *14*(1), 069-079.

Roberts, J. T. (1996). Demystifying materials evaluation. *System, 24*, 375–389. doi: 10.1016/0346-251x(96)00029-2

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. doi: 10.1111/1473-4192.00011

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

Sercu, L. (2005). The Future of intercultural competence in foreign language education: recommendations for professional development, educational policy and research. In Sercu et al. (Eds.), *Foreign language teachers and intercultural competence* (pp. 160–181). Multilingual Matters LTD. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598456-012

Sharifian, F. (2009). English as an international language: An Overview. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 1–18). Multilingual Matters. doi: 10.21832/9781847691231-004

Sharifian, F. (2010). Glocalization of English in world Englishes: An Emerging variety among Persian speakers of English. In M. Saxena & T. Omoniyi (Eds.), *Contending with globalization in world Englishes* (pp. 137–158). Multilingual Matters.

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

Shin, J., Eslamia, Z. R. & Chen, W. (2012). Presentation of local and International culture in current international English-language teaching textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *24*(3), 253–268. doi: 10.1080/07908318.2011.614694

Smith, L. (1976). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC Journal, 7*(2), 38–42. doi: 10.1177/003368827600700205

Solhi Andarab, M. (2014). *English as an international language and the need for English for specific cultures in English language teaching coursebooks.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Tomalin, B. & Stempleski, S. (1993). *Cultural awareness*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.2307/329368

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

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

Tomlinson, B. (2008). Conclusions about ELT materials in use around the world. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials; a critical review* (pp. 319–322). London, UK: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Victor, M. (1999). Learning English in Gabon: The question of cultural content. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *12*(1), 23–30. doi: 10.1080/07908319908666566

Widdowson, H. G. (1998). EIL: squaring the circles. A reply. *World Englishes, 17*(3), 397–401. doi: 10.1111/1467-971x.00113

Yano, Y. (2009). The Future of English: Beyond the Kachruvian three circle model? In K. Murata & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian contexts current and future debates* (pp. 208–223). Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/9780230239531_13

Yi-Shin, L. (2010). Who Wants EIL? Attitudes towards English as an international language: a comparative study of college teachers and students in the greater Taipei area. *College English: Issues and Trends*, *3*, 133–157.

Yoneoka, J. & Arimoto, J. (2000). *Englishes of the world.* Tokyo, Japan: Sanshusha.