English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 21, No. 3 Fall 2015

World Englishes and Culture Teaching in the Korean EFL Context[*]

CheongminYook[**]
(Hallym University)
HoyeolRyu[***]
(Hankyong National University)

Yook, Cheongmin&Ryu, Hoyeol(2015).World Englishes and culture teaching in the Korean EFL context.*English Language &Literature Teaching, 21*(3), 195-211.

This paper attempts an overview of theoretical, methodological, pedagogical, and teacher-education-related issues of world Englishes (WE) in relation to culture teaching in the Korean English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Its main purpose is to introduce the WE concept into culture teaching by looking at the intersection of WE and culture teaching, and identifying the implications WE has for culture teaching in the Korean EFL context. For the purpose, the paper first traces the developmentalhistory of the WE concept briefly. It then discusses the challenges the WE paradigm has been mounting to the traditional culture teaching in the EFL context. The challenges discussed include those to the Standard English ideology,the privilege of the culture to which Standard English belongs, and the native speaker fallacy. Thediscussion is followed by adiscussion of the implications the introduction of the WE paradigm has for culture teaching in the Korean EFL context. This discussion of implications includes suggestions of changes in curriculum design, pedagogical methods, textbook development, teacher training in teacher education programs, and assessment system. The paper concludes with a reemphasis on the significance of the introduction of the WE paradigm into culture teaching in the Korean context.

[worldEnglishes/culture teaching/EFL context/curriculum/pedagogy/textbook/ teaching education/assessment]

---

[*] This research was supported by Hallym University Research Fund, 2015 (HRF-201504-001).
[**] First author, [***] Corresponding author

I.INTRODUCTION: INSEPARABILITY OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

A general consensus has been that a language and the culture it belongs to are two inextricably related entities and, as such, should be taught together. Wright (1996) argued that raising the awareness of the importance of culture should be a central concern in English language teaching (ELT). Seelye (1997) simply claimed: “It is evident that the study of language cannot be divorced from the study of culture” (p. 23). This notion of inseparability of language and culture has been widely accepted in the field of English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) education.Researchers and specialists have been emphasizing that ESL/EFL learners need knowledge and skill not just in the grammar of English but also in the culture to which the language belongs. Perhaps a definition of culture is in order here.Kramsch (1998) provides a useful definition of culture for the purpose of ELT. She associates culture with the “membership in a discourse community that shares a common social space and history, and a common system of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and acting” (p. 127).

Sybing (2011) suggests that “culture teaching and learning is an area that deserves greater study in EFL education”(p. 468). Accordingly, the topic of teaching culture has drawn much attention fromEFL specialists and teachers. Much has been written about the role of culture in EFL educationin general and in the Korean EFL context in specific. For example, in order to trace “the achievements in culture studies in Korea since 1980s” (p. 57), Park (2007) reviewed over 60 studies, dividing them into three groups: studies about culture as represented in English textbooks, those about culture teaching methods, and those about cultural comparisons for pedagogical purposes. Park’s review shows that there has been an increasing interest in culture teaching in EFL classes in Korea. The review also indicates that a majority of the studies on culture teaching in Korea assume that teaching (and learning) culture is related to specific nations in Kachru’s (1994) inner circle, especially the USA or England.

This traditional approach based on the tendency to correlate the English language with a particular inner-circle nation’s culturehas been considered problematic andchallenged recently. As Widdowson (1994) maintains, “no nation can have custody over English” (p. 368).One of such challenges to the traditional culture teaching has come with the concept of world Englishes (WE). The current study’s main purpose is to take alook at the intersection of WE and culture teaching, and see the implications WE has for culture teaching in the Korean EFL context.The study also intends to suggest guidelines that can be implemented in ELTin general and culture teaching in specificto raise Korean EFL learners' recognition of the existence of WE and related issues.

II. THE WORLD ENGLISHES PARADIGM

As McArthur (1998) observes, there is a growing consensus among scholars that there is not one English language anymore; rather there are many. These many English languages are often called WE. To put it differently, WE refers to "varieties of English used in diverse sociolinguistic contexts" (Bhatt, 2001, p. 527).This "shift in focus on 'English' to 'Englishes'" (Tanaka, 2006, p. 47) is the result of the three-stage global spread of English. The first stage of the spread of English, which took place in the early 18th century, refers to the movement of English-speaking populations to North America, Australia, New Zealand, the Caribbean, and South Africa. The second stage of the English spread, which was largely the result of British imperialism, brought English to Africa and South Asia. English gained official status in such West African nations as Gambia, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Nigeria and Cameroon, and in such East African nations as Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe. English was also introduced to South Asia, acquiring the status of official language in such nations as India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan, Singapore, Malaysia,Hong Kong. Papua New Guinea and the Philippines. English is also learnt in most of the other parts of the world these days.

This three-stage global spread of English relates to Kachru's (1994) three concentric circles of English: the inner, outer, and expanding circles. The inner circle refers to English as it originally took shape and was spread across the world in the first stage. The inner circle thus represents the traditional historical and sociolinguistic bases of English in regions where it is now used as a primary language. The outer circle of English was produced by the second-stage spread of English. In the outer-circle nations, English serves as an important lingua franca between ethnic and language groups. Finally, the expanding circle encompasses nations where English is widely used as a medium of international communication.

The three-stage spread of English has led to the pluralization or diversification of the language, resulting in the creation of many new varieties of English. These new varieties of English show their own structural norms, linguistic features, and communicative styles. The varieties are different from the English language used by native speakers from inner-circle nations in terms of phonology, lexis, grammar, pragmatics, and communication styles (McKay, 2002).They have been serving as a communicative tool not only for native-to-native or native-to-nonnative interactions but more importantly for interactions between nonnative speakers (Crystal, 1997; Graddol, 2007).In sum, when English entered nonnative contexts, it came into contact with genetically and culturally unrelated languages. As a result, many varieties of English were created, and these new varieties are often referred to by the term WE.WE thus refers to varieties of English used in diverse sociolinguistic contexts globally. In Kachru's (1997) terms, WE conceptualizes "the

function of [English] in diverse pluralistic context" (p. 67). The point here is that the conceptof WE highlights the diversity of varieties of English used around the world today.

The extensive use of WE by people with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds has attracted much research attention from scholars. A general consensus among these people is that, since the number of multilingual nonnative English users worldwide now far outnumbers native users, WE should be recognized and valued more than they typically are (Canagarajah, 2006).Consequently, a number of scholars have come to take WE as the key concept in their study and research.Bhatt (2001) characterizes this field of WE with "a paradigm shift" in research and pedagogy. This new paradigm,or WE paradigm, highlights varieties of English that represent diverse sociolinguistic histories, multicultural identities, and multiple forms of use and acquisition.In other words, the WE paradigm assumes the pluralization of linguistic and cultural norms (Tanaka, 2006) and honors the range of social functions and identities that varieties of English carry out in diverse sociocultural contexts.For example, scholars taking the WE paradigm study the process of nativization, or the creation of morphological, syntactic, and lexical variations of English that are culturally sensitive and socially appropriate in outer and expanding circles.Gilsdorf (2002)observes that "when people from different cultures use an English word both people recognize, the English word often carries different assumptions underlying the meaning and sometime an entirely different meaning" (p. 381). According to Gilsdorf, the word "guest" does not involve payment in Korea, and thus, the host will be offended if the guest is trying to pay for food.

III. CHALLENGES OF THE WE PARADIGM

The global spread of English has led to the WEparadigm, and this new paradigm challenges some of the traditional understanding of English uses and users (Kachru, 1998). First of all, the WE paradigmchallenges the Standard English ideology and the privilege of the culture to which Standard English belongs. McArthur (1999) remarks: "The nature and use of Standard English have been contentious for at least as long as the term itself has existed, and in a world where English at large is increasingly perceived as 'Englishes' … discussions about the nature, usefulness, and intrinsic worth of that crucial entity, the national-cuminternational standard variety, are likely to become more contentious and emotive still" (p. 169).The Standard English ideology refers to an ideology which sees everything related to Standard English as natural, normative, and essential, and judges the other varieties of English to be unnatural, inferior, and incorrect. Supporters of Standard English believe that Standard English must be adopted in educational systems and by people who want to be part of the English-speaking world because Standard English is the

highest and best form of the language. Davies (1999) argues for Standard English: Although it is problematic to define what Standard English is, Standard English is a necessary reality that we have to live with.

One of the rationales for those who follow the Standard English ideology is that they are concerned with intelligibility among the English users. They argue that different varieties of English are and will be mutually unintelligible and, thus, we need to teach and learn Standard English.Such a concern, however, has been challenged.Scholars who follow the WE paradigm (WE scholars hereafter) reject the Standard English supporter's monolithic view of intelligibility and suggest interpretability as a more viable concept. WE scholars argue that interpretability is at the core of communication and is more important than intelligibility. Brutt-Griffler (1998), for example, emphasizes: "I would suggest that the concerns of cross-cultural miscommunication stem more from problems of interpretability than intelligibility" (p. 392).

The Standard English ideology leads to the native speaker fallacy, a notion that a native-speaker model would best equip learners with the skills required to fare with reasonable success in the world (Modiano, 2000). The native speaker fallacy insists that the native speaker is the best teacher of English (Brutt-Griffler&Samimy, 2001). A number of WE scholars refute the native speaker fallacy. Theyargue diverse cultural identities of nonnative ELT professionals can serve to enrich English. Seidlhofer (1999) even believes that nonnative speakers are in a better position than native speakers in teaching English. For Seidlhofer, nonnative EFL teachers are double agents who can mediate between the different languages and cultures through appropriate pedagogy.

The Standard English ideology and the accompanying native speaker fallacy do not take into account the fact that interactions in English today do not take place exclusively among native English speakers from inner-circle nations or between native and nonnative English speakers (Widdowson, 1994). Rather, many interactions in English today take place exclusively among nonnative speakers of English, that is, among people from the outer and expanding circles,and these nonnative speakers have diversified English. "What this means," as Matsuda (2002) aptly puts, "is that the assumption that EFL speakers learn English in order to communicate with native English speakers and learn about their culture does not always hold true anymore" (p. 439). That is, the Standard ideology disregards the fact that the use of English is dominated by nonnative speakers, who actually outnumber native speakers by 4 to 1 (Kirkpatrick, 2007) and that, thus, the future interlocutors of EFL learners will more likely to be nonnative English speakers just like themselves.Therefore, WE scholars emphasize, the Standard English ideology and the native speaker fallacy have to berejected and instead the WE paradigm should be recognized.

The WE paradigm calls for changes in our way of thinking about culture teaching. Above all, the newparadigm calls for the separation of English from any particular

culture.WE scholars believe that English has become a denationalized language (Widdowson, 1994). It is not anymore tied to a particular inner circle nation.As Gilsdorf (2002) argues, “England and the U.S., and Australia do not own English. No one nation or culture is in charge of English now” (p. 368).English is no longer the property of a specific nation, and, therefore, culture teaching in conjunction with English language teaching is no longer teaching of the culture of a specific native-English-speaking nation.Teaching the culture of a specific inner-circle nation does not make much sense now.Instead, the WE paradigm requires a consideration of the wider cultural contexts of English acquisition and use. It highlights such concepts as cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence.In recent years, the concept of cultural awareness has been emphasized as an essential part of English language teaching and learning. Cultural awareness here refers to the “understanding of different cultures” (Tanaka, 2006, p. 55) or to the acknowledgement and acceptance of cultural diversity(Byram, 1997).The ultimate target of cultural awareness is to achieve what Sybing (2011) describes as the “respect for all cultures” (p. 469).Baker (2008) suggests six aspects of cultural awareness. Among them are (a) the ability to compare cultures for similarities and differences, (b) an awareness of the relative nature of cultural norms, and (c) the ability to employ these awareness and abilities in intercultural communication (p. 141).Intercultural communicative competence refers to the ability to adequately interact with people with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Byram, Gripkoba& Starkey, 2002).Intercultural communicative competence demands critical cultural awareness, which refers to an ability to compare one’s own culture and other cultures and appropriately interpret resulting similarities and differences.For EFL learners, the target language English becomes a tool to be used in interaction with people from all over the world. It is obvious then that, in order to successfully function in a culturally diverse environment, EFL learners need to develop intercultural communicative competence (Alptekin 2002).

In sum, the WE paradigm has led to the argument for a new way to conceptualize culture teaching, emphasizing that EFL learners need to be sensitized to the practices of a variety of other cultures in order to increase their cultural awareness and to develop their intercultural communication skills.In fact, this transition in culture teaching is reflected in the new national curriculum for English in Korea. The English curriculum published in 2011 by the Korean Ministry of Education proposes the development of cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence as key goals for EFL education in Korea. The national curriculum for English states that “English is playing an important role in enabling us to understand people with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and communicate with them” (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2011, pp. 2-3). That is, the Korean Ministry of Education proposes a curricular aim of EFL teaching and learning in Korea to be developing cultural awareness and intercultural competence for

communication with people with diverse cultural backgrounds.Accordingly, the national curriculum highlights cultural awareness (and intercultural communicative competence) it expands on culture teaching methods. As for the primary school English language education, for example, it suggests "to raise appropriate awareness of and to develop respectful attitudes toward diverse cultures" among students (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2011, p. 19). As for the secondary school, it suggests "to develop open attitudes toward diverse cultures and cultivate the sense of world citizenship" among students (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2011,p. 24).

IV. IMPLICATIONS OF THE WE PARADIGM FOR CULTURE TEACHING IN THE KOREAN EFL CONTEXT

According to Jindapitak and Teo (2013), the introduction of the WE paradigm into English language education has gained "more recognition worldwide especially in several expanding circles" (p. 195). The introduction of the WE paradigm into culture teaching in the Korean EFL context requires a radical change in curriculum and pedagogy, a radical restructuring of teaching materials and teacher education.The ultimate goal of such changesmust be to develop among learners' cultural awareness or the respect for all cultures in Sybing's (2011) terms and intercultural communicative competence or the ability to adequately interact with people with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. For this goal, several concerted efforts must be made.

One of the efforts culture teaching based on the WE paradigm should make is to make a substantial change in pedagogy.Petzold (2002) and Baumgardner and Brown (2003) emphasize that in the expanding circle the decision to select a pedagogical model must be a local decision. In other words, the pedagogical decision in the expanding circle should be sensitive to the local needs and context.What is needed in culture teaching in Korea is the promotion of cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence among learners, and pedagogy should take this into account.

Byram and Feng (2005) argued for the positive effects of incorporating cultural awareness in language classroom. DeCapua and Wintergerst (2004) outlined various principles in culture teaching and learning. Fundamentally, the principles require learners to be aware of and to understand differences between various aspects of cultures (e.g., semantics, pragmatics, and customs) without placing value judgments on one culture or another. Many of the principles can easily be adapted to any EFL curriculum.Here we need to listen to what Kachru (2008, p 316) has to say:

> This does not mean that every user of English everywhere has to seek familiarity with the sociocultural context of every variety of English used in the world, which would be an impossible task. It simply means those who interact more with each other have to make an effort to become aware of each other's sociocultural background in order to correctly interpret the verbal and non-verbal actions involved in their encounters.

A number of researchers have paid attention to the ways of promoting intercultural communicative competence and their effects. Some researchers have conducted empirical studies on the impact of activities designed to promote intercultural communicative competence. For example, Su (2008) investigated the impact of ethnographic interviews on the development of intercultural communicative competence among Taiwanese EFL learners.As these studies indicate, culture teaching based on the WE paradigm requires more attention to students' sensitivity to a variety of cultures around the world and their ability to function effectively in such a multi-cultural environment.It is,thus,important for culture teaching in the Korean EFL context to find pedagogic methods and strategies that contribute to the cultivation of such sensitivity by paying attention to cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence.

Closely related to this pedagogical effort is to minimize the effect of stereotyping. Intercultural interactions almost always involve the danger of bringing in stereotypes. A stereotype is an oversimplified, relatively fixed view or statement of a social group (Oakes, Haslam & Turner, 1994). Stereotyping is inevitable, and stereotypes can be positive or negative. Stereotyping becomes problematic when it causes prejudice and discrimination. Cultural stereotypes are always a critical hindrance to cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence. Thus, it is important to find ways to make Korean EFL learners have attitudes of withholding value judgment on cultural (linguistic as well) differences and instead enjoying the differences as they are exposed to varieties of English and the cultures to which the varieties belong. For this purpose, that is, to diffuse cultural stereotypes and promote cultural awareness, Abrams (2002) used internet-based culture portfolios, for example.

Equally important is a pedagogic effort to expose Korean EFL learners to diverse varieties of English and make them to recognize and appreciate their distinctive diversity in in terms of phonology, lexis, grammar, pragmatics, and communication styles. Modiano (2000) argues: "An understanding of the diversity of English, for production as well as for comprehension, makes one a better communicator" (p. 59). Many other scholars believe that exposure to varieties of English helps facilitate learners' communication abilities when being confronted with diverse types of English uses and users. Matsuda (2002, 2003), for example, argues that limited exposure to varieties of English may cause learners to resist

linguistic variations when they encounter different types of English uses and users in various social and cultural contexts.Brutt-Griffler (1998) and Gilsdorf (2002) even argue that, all English users, whether they are from the inner circle, outer circle, or expanding circle, need to transcend nationality-bound parameters and to learn tolerance for different pronunciation patterns and know how others structure information and argument when using English.

It is alsoimportant to revise English curriculum so that it can raise Korean English learners' appreciation of the existence of WE and the cultures to which WE belongs. Countries in the expanding circle such as China and Japan show several common characteristics regarding ELT. Therefore, studies on ELT in these countries provide insights for ELT in Korea. After reviewing the history of the spread of English into Japan, Kubota (1998) recommended that English curriculum should include more varieties of English and cultures from the outer and expanding circles.Yoshigawa (2005) presented a case of a Japanese university, which set up a department of WE with the aim to enhance students' recognition and appreciation of WE by exposing them to major varieties of English.Likewise, Korean EFL learners should be made familiar with varieties of English and the cultures to which the varieties belong. In fact, Korean EFL scholars and specialist have already started this kind of effort. To give just one example, Baik and Shim (2002)experimented with a 15-week plan for teaching world Englishes via the internet. During the 15 weeks, learners were exposed to more than 18 varieties of English obtained from various internet sources, and this experience changed their attitudes toward varieties of Englishes. This kind of effort to expose Korean EFL learners to WEand diverse cultures through various methods, materials, and activities must be continued and strengthened.

Another effort to be madeis to make a substantial change in cultural aspects of Korean EFL textbooks. Textbooksare critical for culture teaching for several related reasons. Textbooks play an important role in EFL classrooms. They areextensively used, functioning as instructional guide and determining topics. They usually decide the content and direction of the classroom instruction. They also influence the construction of learners' perceptions of and attitudes toward English uses and users and their cultures.Matsuda (2002) analyzed seven English textbooks for seventh graders that were approved by the Japanese Ministry of Education. She found that: a) the American variety of English is exclusively used, b) the majority of main characters are either from the inner circle or Japan, assigning marginal role to a few characters from the outer circle or expanding circles, c) featured pictures and texts refer to the customs and cultures of the inner circle, and d) the main texts exclusively represent uses between the native speaker and the nonnative speaker of English.In contrast, according to Park (2012), at least at the elementary school level, Korean EFL textbooks have been successfully providing cultural diversity. Park analyzed cultural contents of six different English textbooks for the 5th and

6th graders in order to measure the extent to which the textbooks reflected what the 7th national curriculum demanded in relation to culture teaching. The 7th national curriculums, just like the 2011 national curriculum discussed earlier, emphasized the significance of teaching cultural diversity. From the results of the analysis, Park found that the textbooks included balanced amount of cultures from the inner, outer, expanding circles, diverse nations worldwide, and various racial and ethnic groups.

Nevertheless, like the Japanese textbooks analyzed by Matsuda (2002), typical Korean English textbooks appear to legitimatize Standard English and codify the native-nonnative distinction.They tend to include more factual information on cultures of inner-circle nations. This is evidenced by Huh (2013), who investigated the variety of cultures represented in 33 middle school English textbooks used in Korea. What Huh found was that, even though Eurocentric perspectives were toned down, the representation of cultures was still predominantly geared to inner-circle nations. Moreover, Korean EFL textbooks in general lack contents that can cultivate cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence. For an effectivedevelopment of cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence, Korean EFL textbooks must expand the diversity of nationality and culture presented via characters, pictures, and texts. Korean EFL textbooks must also include more main characters from the outer and expanding circles and assign them more important roles in chapter dialogues than they currently have. According to Alptekin (2002), nonnative vs. nonnative discourse should be a pedagogical goal in the EFL context. Korean EFL textbooks must discard the current obsession with the interaction between native and native English speakers from inner-circle nations and instead increase the frequency of the interaction between nonnative and nonnative English speakers as well as of the interaction between native and nonnative English speakers. More importantly, they must provide opportunities to expose learners to major varieties of WE and cultures to which those varieties belong. One way to realize this is to provide more pictures and texts that refer to cultures of the concerned varieties of English. Most importantly, Korean EFL textbooks must include and increase activities that can contribute to the development of cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence.

According to Tedick (2005), “contextual factors are fundamental to second language teacher education” (p. 97). The existence of WEconstitutesan important contextual factor that EFL teacher education programs in Korea have to address. The contextual factor requires Korean EFL teacher education programs and the specialists who work within them to accept the WE paradigm and paya careful attention to related issues. To put it differently, teachers are at the center of education (Richardson, 1996). Teachers are particularly important in any educational innovation because a successful implementation of any educational innovation is contingent upon teachers’ perceptions of and attitudes toward that innovation(Li, 1998; Yook 2014). In addition, students consider teachers to be

their most important cultural resources. Therefore, Korean EFL teachers are an essential component in introducing the WE paradigm into culture teaching. This intimate relationship between the success of educational innovations and teachers' perceptions and attitudes toward those innovations points to the significant role of Korean teacher education programs in introducing the WE paradigm into culture teaching.

To introduce the WE paradigm into Korean ELT, pre- and in-service teachers must be aware of "the current landscape of the English language" (Matsuda 2003, p. 725). Consequently, the WE paradigm requires a substantial change in the EFL teacher education in Korea. Itdemands Korean EFL teacher education programs and the specialists who work within them to engage in a sustained search for ways to familiarize their students with the new paradigm and related issues such as the Standard English ideology, the native speaker fallacy, the excessive attention to cultures of inner-circle nation, to name only a few.Korean EFL teacher education programs must help their students understand that the Standard English ideology and other accompanying matters are counterproductive for the Korean context.

For that purpose, EFL teacher education programs in Korea should explore ways for introducing the WE paradigm into their curricula. Brown (1993) argued that the introduction of the WE paradigm would benefit greatly programs for preservice EFL teachers. A number of scholars and educators have tried to increase teachers' awareness of the theoretical, methodological, ideological, and pedagogical issues related to WE. For example, Brown (2002) suggests a WEcourse in the TESOL program: "In addition to familiarizing [TESOL] students with world Englishes materials … it is also appropriate in the world Englishes classroom to familiarize students with various debates and perspectives" (p. 448). Similarly, Korean EFL teacher education programs should develop innovative curricula and offer more finely tuned courses designed to prepare their students for the demands of the WE paradigm.

At the same time, EFL teacher education programs in Koreashould develop teaching methods and practices which take into consideration the reality that Korean EFL learners have to deal with many varieties of English and cultures to which those varieties belong.More research is needed on effective ways of training Korean EFL teachers in culture teaching methods. While the significance of culture teaching has been constantly emphasized, specific methods of culture teaching within EFL curriculum still remains unclear to EFL teachers. As Kramsch, Cain, and Murphy-Lejune (1996) point out, L2 teachers are usually trained to teach language, not culture. Without knowing how to conduct intercultural teaching in the EFL classroom, most teachers would feel uncomfortable to engage in culture teaching. Good methodological guidelines and practical trainings for culture teaching are a necessity for EFL teachers in Korea. It is thus important to do more research on possible effective and practical culture teachingmethods and on

ways of training Korean EFL teachers in those methods.To be more specific, Korean EFL teacher education programs need to develop and provide courses that aim to increase pre- and in-service teachers' cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence and, at the same time, to give them hand-on experiences of culture teaching based on the WE paradigm.In sum, more research based on the WE concept is needed, and such research should focus on what and how to do in order for Korean EFL teacher education programs to promote among their students cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence, and to provide them with training that is sensitive to the WE paradigm and related issues.

Perhaps the most important is to look into the (lack of) alignment between the overall curriculum aim, which is to promote cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence, and the assessment.Pressure of the test has well been documented (Gorschu, 2000). Many L2 specialist and teachers point to the washback effect of test. According to Shohamy (2005), for example, students learn to "play the testing game" as they comply with the demands of tests and change their behaviors and learn what is covered on tests, and teachers are forced to "teach to the test" (pp. 103, 107). To put it differently, the test influences the instructional decision about whether or not to include culture teaching and, if to include, what and how to include, and the motivation of learners in relation to what to study. This indicates the significant role that the test can play in culture teaching based on the WE paradigm.

Lowenberg (2002) observes that testing in the expanding circle remain exclusive to the variety of English used by native speakers in the inner circle. The testing system in Korea is no exception. It generally concerns with the norms of a specific inner-circle English and the culture to which the language belongs. In fact, typical tests in Korea seldom take culture seriously. Thistendency for inattention must change. Tests must change in such a way that they can adequately assess Korean EFL learners' respect for diverse varieties of English and cultures to which those varieties belong, their ability to adequately interact with people with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and the extent for them to be exposed to varieties of English. Not assessing them sends out a message that they are not important, and that message would be reflected in Korean EFL teachers and learners' indifference to or, even worse, disrespect for WE.

Finally, there should be more empirical research on the assessment of the impact of actual culture teaching on Korean EFL learners. Assessment of culture teaching and learning informs teachers about the nature of cultural understanding gained by their students and provides feedback to students as to the validity of their cultural understanding. Here lies the significance of research on the assessment in relation to culture teaching in the Korean EFL context. Future research on the assessment of the impact of culture teaching should be in two respects: what to assess and how to assess. The focus on discrete

elements of cultural knowledge is preferred by many teachers for practical purposes: it is easy to prepare, test, and score (Valette, 1986). This tendency should change. As mentioned before, tests should be geared to the concrete assessment of Korean EFL learners' cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence. At the same time, there should be more empirical research on methods and strategies that can effectively assess the impact of actual WE-paradigm-based culture teaching. In short, what is important is an effort to introduce the WE paradigm into the English testing system in Korea.

V. CONCLUSION

According to Shim (1999), the grip of the Standard (American) English ideology has been so firm that "99% of the Koreans [are] teaching and speaking American English" (p. 247). This means that ELT in Korea has been dominated by the Standard (American) English ideology. The Standard English ideology primarily trains learners to behave in accordance with a native-English-speaking nation's linguistic norms and have much knowledge of that particular nation's culture.This leads Korean EFL learners to a limited exposure to the world. With such a limited exposure, Korean EFL learners may grow disrespectful to varieties of English, their users, and their cultures. This in turn may limit Korean EFL learners'success in the age of globalization, which is an unavoidable reality for all Korean EFL learners.

For such an undesirable situation, the field of WE has a lot to offer. In order to make ELT in Korea more realistic, up-to-date, and supportive of globalization, there is an urgent need to accept the shift in focus on English to Englishes and introduce the WE paradigm into ELT in general and culture teaching in specific.The WE paradigm reevaluates culture teaching in the EFL context and provides a new direction. The newparadigm demands a radical change in culture teaching (Chamberlin-Quinlisk&Senyshyn, 2012). The careful introduction of the WE paradigm into ELTwill lead us to the provision of improved materials and better classroom instruction that are more effective, meaningful, and appropriate in terms of the current globalization and the local context.More importantly, the WE paradigm will make it possible to expose Korean EFL learners to varieties of English and cultures to which those varieties belong through learning English. Korean EFL learners may be able to further explore diverse Englishes and cultures using the English they acquire in the course. When Korean EFL learners become sensitive to and appreciative of the existence of WE and diverse cultures, they may actually become more tolerant, flexible, supportive, and strategic in their interactions with nonnative English speakers worldwide, which is the reality Korean EFL learners have to live with and, thus,

must be recognized in their learning of the English language.Culture teaching in the Korean EFL context must free itself from the Standard English ideology, overcome the current obsession with inner-circle variety of English, listen to what the field of WE has to say, and try further to reform its current curriculum, pedagogy,textbook, teacher education, and examination system in such a way that they gear more to the WE paradigm.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Z. (2002). Surfing to cross-cultural awareness: Using Internet-mediated projects to explore cultural stereotypes. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*, 141-160.

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT.*ELT Journal, 56*(1): 57-64.

Baik, M. J.,& Shim, R. J. (2002). Teaching world Englishes via the internet. *World Englishes, 21*, 427-430.

Baker, W. (2008). A critical examination of ELT in Thailand: The role of cultural awareness. *RELC Journal, 39*(1), 131-146.

Baumgradner, R., & Brown, K. (2003). World Englishes: ethics and pedagogy. *World Englishe, 22*, 245-251.

Bhatt, R. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 18*, 527-550.

Brown, K. (2002). Ideology and context: World Englishes and EFL teacher training. *World Englishes, 21*, 445-448.

Brown, K. (1993). World Englishes in TESOL programs: An infusion model of curricular innovation. *World Englishes, 12*, 59-73.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (1998). Conceptual questions in English as a world language: Taking up an issue. *World Englishes, 17*, 381-392.

Brutt-Griffler, J., &Samimy, K. (2001).Transcending the nativeness paradigm.*World Englishes, 20*, 99-106.

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

Byram, M., &Feng, A. (2005). Teaching and researching intercultural competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 911-930). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Canagarajah, S. (2006).Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca.*Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26*, 208-311.

Chamberlin-Quinlisk, C.,&Senyshyn, R. (2012).Language teaching and intercultural education: Making critical connection. *Intercultural Education, 23*(1), 15-23.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, A. (1999). Standard English: Discordant voices. *World Englishes, 18*, 171-186.

DeCapua, A.,&Wintergerst, A. C. (2004).*Crossing cultures in the language classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Gilsdorf, J. (2002). Standard English and world Englishes: Living with a polymorph business language. *Journal of Business Communication,29*, 364-378.

Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL educational policies and educational cultures: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(4), 675-710.

Graddol, D. (2007). *English next*. Plymouth: The British Council.

Huh, S. (2013). Cultural portrayal in middle-school English textbooks: insights for critical multiculturalism. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 19*(4), 1-30.

Jindapitak, N., &Teo, A. (2013). The emergence of world Englishes: Implications for English language teaching. *Asian Journal of Social Science & Humanities, 2*(2), 190-199.

Kachru, B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities.*Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 17*, 66-87.

Kachru, B. (1994). World Englishes and Applied Linguistics. In Agnihotri, R. K. and A. L. Khanna (Eds.),*Second language acquisition: Socio-cultural and linguistic aspects of English in India*(pp.13-40). London: Sage Publications.

Kachru, Y. (2008). Cultures, contexts, and interpretability.*World Englishes, 27*, 309-318.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C., Cain, A., & Murphy-Lejune, E. (1996). Why should language teachers teach culture? *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 9*(1), 99-107.

Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan.*World Englishes*, 17, 296-306.

Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(4), 677-703.

Lowenberg, P. (2002). Assessing English proficiency in the expanding circle.*World Englishes,21*, 431-435.

McArthur, T. (1999). On the origin and nature of standard English. *World Englishes, 18*, 161-169.

McArthur, T. (1998).*The English languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language.*TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 719-729.

Matsuda, A. (2002). "International understanding" through teaching world Englishes. *World Englishes, 21*, 436-40.

Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, the.(2011).*English Curriculum* (Notification No. 2011-361 of the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology). Seoul: Author.

Modiano, M. (2000).Rethinking ELT.*English Today, 16*(2), 30-34.

Oakes, P., Haslam, S.,& Turner, J. (1994).*Stereotyping and social reality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Park, O. (2012). A study on the analysis of culture of English as a global language: Focused on 5than 6th grade elementary school English textbooks under 7th revised national curriculum. *Primary English Education, 18*(1), 55-81.

Park, O. (2007). Cultural understanding in English education and consideration for cultural education in Korea.*American Studies,39*(2), 27-57.

Petzold, R. (2002). Toward a pedagogical model for ELT.*World Englishes, 21*, 422-46.

Richardson, V. (1996).The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach.In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Seelye, H. N. (1997). Cultural goals for achieving intercultural communicative competence. In A. E. Fantini (Ed.), *New ways in teaching culture* (pp. 22-27). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes, 18*, 233-45.

Shim, R. (1999).Codified Korean English: Process, characteristics, and consequence.*World Englishes18*, 247-58.

Shohamy, E. (2005). The power of tests over teachers: The power of teachers over tests. In D. Tedick (Ed.), *Second language teacher education: International perspective* (pp. 101-111). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Su, Y. (2008). Promoting cross-cultural awareness and understanding: Incorporating ethnographic interviews in college EFL classes in Taiwan. *Educational Studies, 34*(4), 377-38.

Sybing, R. (2011). Assessing perspectives on culture in EFL education.*ELT Journal, 65*(4), 467-469.

Tanaka, S. (2006). English and multiculturalism – from the language user's perspective.*Regional Language Centre Journal, 37*(1), 47-66.

Tedick, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Second language teacher education: International perspective.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Valette, R. (1986). The culture test. In J. Valeds (Ed.), *Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching* (179-197). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English.*TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 377-399.

Wright, M. (1996). The cultural aims of modern language teaching: Why are they not being met? *Language Learning Journal, 13*, 36-37.

Yook, C. (2014). The significance of teachers' perception of reforms in English language education. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 20*(1), 201-218.

Yoshigawa, H. (2005). Recognition of world Englishes; Changes in Chukyo University students' attitudes.*World Englishes 24*, 351-360.

Examples in: English
Applicable language: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary, tertiary

CheongminYook
Department of English
Hallym University
1 Hallymdaehak-gil, Chuncheon,
Gangwon-do200-702, South Korea
Tel: 033-248-1533
E-mail: cmyook@hallym.ac.kr

Hoyeol Rye
Department of English
Hankyong National University
Chungang-no Anseong-si
Kyunggi-do 456-749, South Korea
Tel: 031-670-5312
E-mail: hoyeol@hknu.ac.kr

Received in July 15th, 2015
Reviewed in August 26th, 2015
Revised version received in September 5th, 2015