English School Teachers with a Background in Translation Studies: Exploring Multiculturalism in School Curriculum

Farzane Ehsani[1*]

[1] Department of English Translation Studies, Payam-e-Noor University, Fasa, Shiraz, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the status of multiculturalism in the English curriculum in Iran from the viewpoint of high school teachers and students. To this aim, a quantitative survey method was used. The participants recruited for this study consisted of two groups. The first group included 250 high school students who were selected through convenience sampling from a representative sample of high schools in Fars Province in Iran. The second group consisted of 150 EFL teachers with a background in translation studies who were selected through convenience sampling. They were selected from the EFL teachers at high schools in Fars Province in Iran. There were two instruments used in this study. The first instrument involved a questionnaire with 20 5-Point-Likert items, which was developed for eliciting the students' perspectives about the application of multicultural education in teaching English to Iranian high school students. The second instrument consisted of 40 -point- Likert items, which was developed for measuring the teachers' perspectives about the application of multicultural education in teaching English to Iranian high school students. Data analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics and one-sample t-tests. The results of data analysis showed that multicultural education is not appropriately applied in the English curriculum of Iranian high schools. Teachers may need more information and training regarding the positive effects of a multicultural education on all learners. Thus, multicultural education should be implemented in the ELT curriculum, introducing students to an excellent and challenging range of world literature.

Keywords: English Curriculum; High school; Multiculturalism; Multicultural Education

[1] Corresponding Author`s Email:

ehsani.farzane@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has turned English Language Teaching and Learning (ELT/ELL) into an inevitable element in today's life. In the so-called global village, individuals should learn to adapt themselves to cultural and social changes. Under such conditions, to enhance students' communication abilities within the socio-cultural environment, to help the individual better interact in a global setting, and to help the individual find new solutions for common human problems, meaning and knowledge should be constructed and exchanged through focusing on multiple symbolic systems (Motamed, Yarmohammadian, & Yousefy). In fact, human societies have changed remarkably in many aspects and Iranian societies is not an exception. One of the manifestations of the changes of societies is the emergence of multicultural societies which necessitates using multicultural education elements in education systems. As put by Stika (2012), societies have experienced a paradigm shift towards multiculturalism or the idea that there are multiple competing and conflicting value systems/ moralities and no value system is superior to the other. He believes that the aim of multicultural education is to create new modes of thought and bodies of knowledge in which diversity is an essential resource. Moreover, a new generation of learners would be created with diverse needs that education systems must satisfy. Students and their conditions, in all over the world including Iran, have changed profoundly over the last 10-15 years. The new conditions are characterized by more complexity

and diversity in learners' needs, wants, expectations, aims, ambitions, ideals, etc. Furthermore, as stated by Giselbrecht (2009) , in response to the new needs of the new generation, attitudes towards cultural tolerance and openness has been changed, multicultural views towards education have been established, and a multicultural understanding of multicultural social environment has been considered in education. In the context of education, multicultural ideas can be applied through developing a global view of language/culture learning and teaching. To him, multicultural approaches to languages and cultures are democratic concepts which appreciate the need to diversity of all linguistic and cultural varieties, support attitudes of openness, and tolerance and understanding towards the cultures, social structures and values of other communities. Multicultural approach puts emphasis on the social changes and social justice and is aimed to educate a global citizen, a critical analyst, a political participant, a proponent of cultural interaction and a well-informed individual (McConnell, 2008; Motamed et al.) believed that in multiculturalism, difference is not considered as a liability that must be managed, but it is a crucial resource, a positive marker of identity which productively challenges universals with contingencies and is not merely the opposite of norms. It is the result of intentional social practices wherein difference is preferred to similarity. To him, multiculturalism is a model of social engagement in which any particular social configuration is regarded as finite and limited rather than open and unending. The belief is that multicultural approaches to

efficient response to new educational needs and demands of the multicultural and multilingual world and schools should address multiculturalism through focusing on the cultural identifications of students, parents and communities (Taylor, Kumi-Yeboah, & Ringlaben, 2016).

However, in spite of the trend observed in many developed countries, Iranian education system shows that multiculturalism has not found its own way into its ELT system. In other words, although proponents of multicultural pedagogy believe that for the educational systems to be synchronized with the rapidly changing contemporary social, political, and cultural developments, and for students to become prepared for living in today's global village, inevitably multicultural principles should be incorporated into curriculums (Motamed et al.), Iranian education and ELT system have not yet reacted to such a paradigm shift. More specifically, current ELT textbooks at the high school level have not yet included multicultural concepts.

This is while proponents of multicultural education believe that multicultural principles should be incorporated into curriculums to guarantee that educational systems do not fall behind the social, political and cultural developments (Sadeghi, 2010). The importance of multiculturalism is added with a view to the fact that Iran is a country wherein diverse cultures with different languages, dialects, accents, customs, and worldviews co-exist. Moreover, the review of the related literature shows that seemingly the status of multiculturalism in English curriculum in Iran

has not been evaluated yet, at least to the best knowledge of the researchers. To partially bridge this gap, this study aimed to examine the status of multiculturalism in English curriculum in Iran from the viewpoint of high school teachers and students. More particularly, the following research questions were addressed in this study:

1) What is the status of multiculturalism in English curriculum in Iran from High school students' viewpoints?

2) What is the status of multiculturalism in English curriculum in Iran from High school teachers' viewpoints?

LITRATURE REVIEW

Stilwell (2006) noted the four reasons why using multiculturalism in economics teaching, using a basic interpretive method. To him, multiculturalism should be used in teaching economics as a response to the underdeveloped state of economics knowledge, as a tool for recognizing the political nature of the field, as a prerequisite for improvement in economic analysis and research, and as a pedagogy aimed at enhancing students' capacities for critical thinking. Sadeghi (2010) analyzed the content of Iran's National Curriculum to see whether it reflects the components of multi- cultural education. To this aim, he benefited from content analysis method. The results showed that while multi-cultural components have been taken into account in methods of the assessment of educational achievement, philosophical and scientific foundations, principles governing the educational programs and goal descriptions of educational levels sections, teaching- learning

strategies section has ignored the components. Colombo (2013) presented a comprehensive introduction to multiculturalism and pluralism in education and its implications, using a descriptive method. He has mentioned the rise of socialism, multiculturalism and pluralism as major challenges for education systems. To him, multiculturalism could be used in education systems as a way to manage today's classrooms replete with increased diversity. Daryai-Hansen et al. (2015) addressed how recently multicultural approaches have been employed in curriculum transformations at national and regional levels. To this aim, they illustrated cases of Austria, French-speaking Switzerland and Spain. This study concluded that incorporating multicultural approaches at the macro-level may lead to reducing discrepancy between theory and practice. Sharma (2005) focused on theory and practice in multicultural education as it pertains to the preparation of preservice teachers.

The literature reviews the history and definition of multiculturalism and investigates multiple theoretical frameworks around the ongoing debate and issues of multicultural education. Teachers' perceptions of multicultural education and various approaches to multicultural pedagogy and curriculum were examined. The finding indicates that thorough and balanced courses preparing preservice teachers to teach culturally diverse students are essential to supporting teachers' awareness, knowledge, and skill in providing equal education for all students. Bangura (2018) examined whether preservice teachers' self-efficacy is related to

their cultural awareness when teaching multicultural students, and to further investigate whether the level of experiences/interactions with multiculturalism predicts preservice teachers' self-efficacy when teaching multicultural students. Results on question 1 indicated that cultural awareness has a strong, significant, and positive relationship with preservice teachers' self-efficacy, while results on question 2 indicated that three variables are significantly predictors of preservice teachers' multicultural self-efficacy.

METHODS

Design

In line with the objectives of the present study, a quantitative survey method was selected using questionnaires.

Participants and Sample

Participants recruited for this study consisted of two groups. The first group consisted of 250 high school students who were selected through convenience sampling from a representative sample of high schools in Fars Province in Iran. The second group consisted of 150 EFL teachers with a background in translation studies who were selected through convenience sampling. They were selected from the EFL teachers at high schools in the same Province. The criteria for recruiting EFL teachers was teaching experience at high school and familiarity with multicultural education and its principles and contents.

Instruments

Two-researcher developed instruments were used in this study. The first instrument consisted of 20 items. This instrument was developed for eliciting the students' perspectives about the application of multicultural education in teaching English to Iranian high school students. The items were measured through a 5-point-Likert scale. Instrument was developed in Persian language. The reliability of the instrument was estimated through running Cronbach's alpha. The second instrument consisted of 40 items.

This instrument was developed for measuring the teachers' perspectives about the application of multicultural education in teaching English to Iranian high school students. The items were measured through a 5-point- Likert scale. The language of the instrument was Persian. The reliability of both instruments is presented in the following table.

Table 1

Internal Consistency of the Instruments

Questionnaire	Number of items	Cranach's alpha
Teachers' scale	40	0.712
Students' scale	20	0.780

As it is seen in the above table, both instruments enjoyed acceptable level of reliability.

Data Collection

The data needed for this study were collected in the following ways. At first, the research questionnaires for students and teachers were developed. Then, the required samples of students and teachers were selected. The developed questionnaires were administered to the students and teachers while they were in English classes. The returned questionnaires were coded numerically and then entered into SPSS. Finally, the data were analyzed through running appropriate data analysis techniques.

Data Analysis

The data gathered from the two instruments were analyzed through both descriptive and inferential statistics. For each, the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of measurement were estimated. In addition, one sample-t-test was run to compare the mean scores of the students and teachers on each item with the hypothetical mean of the population which was set as 2.5. For all items, the p-value was set to be 0.05.

The first research question was an attempt to see to what extent the elements of multiculturalism are used in the current English curriculum at the high-school level from the high school students' perspectives. In so doing the mean scores of the students were compared with a hypothetical mean of the population through running one sample t-test for all items and the sum of the all items. The descriptive

statistics as well as one sample t-tests are presented in the following sections.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of the Students' Scores on the Items of Scale

	N	Mean	SD	SEM
q1	250	1.32	.46	.02
q2	250	1.51	.50	.03
q3	250	1.61	.55	.03
q4	250	1.58	.55	.03
q5	250	1.44	.49	.03
q6	250	1.57	.49	.03
q7	250	1.51	.53	.03
q8	250	1.52	.50	.03
q9	250	1.72	.49	.03
q10	246	1.59	.49	.03
q11	250	1.65	.47	.03
q12	250	1.54	.53	.03
q13	250	1.55	.49	.03
q14	250	1.46	.49	.03
q15	250	1.60	.53	.03
q16	250	1.51	.56	.03
q17	250	1.55	.52	.03
q18	250	1.52	.50	.03
q19	250	1.57	.52	.03
q20	250	1.41	.52	.03
student	250	1.54	.15	.009
Student	250	30.78	3.11	.19

As it is seen the above table, the mean scores of the students on all items and the sum of the items are lower than the hypothetical mean(2.5). That is, the students' mean scores fall below the mean score (2.5). To see whether, the mean scores of the students are statistically different from the population or not, the data were submitted to one sample t-tests. Results are presented in the following table.

Table 3
One Sample t-tests for Comparing the Mean of the Students with Hypothetical Mean of Population

					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
q1	-39.652	249	.001	-1.17	-1.2	-1.1
q2	-31.070	249	.001	-.98	-1.04	-.92
q3	-25.189	249	.001	-.88	-.95	-.81
q4	-26.175	249	.001	-.92	-.98	-.85
q5	-33.382	249	.001	-1.05	-1.1	-.98
q6	-29.504	249	.001	-.92	-.98	-.86
q7	-28.958	249	.001	-.98	-1.05	-.92
q8	-30.724	249	.001	-.97	-1.03	-.90
q9	-25.041	249	.001	-.78	-.84	-.71
q10	-28.888	245	.001	-.90	-.96	-.84
q11	-28.092	249	.001	-.84	-.90	-.78
q12	-28.007	249	.001	-.95	-1.01	-.88
q13	-30.081	249	.001	-.94	-1.01	-.88
q14	-32.636	249	.001	-1.03	-1.09	-.96
q15	-26.839	249	.001	-.90	-.96	-.83
q16	-27.374	249	.001	-.98	-1.05	-.91
q17	-28.208	249	.001	-.94	-1.0	-.87
q18	-30.838	249	.001	-.97	-1.03	-.91
q19	-27.742	249	.001	-.92	-.98	-.85
q20	-32.783	249	.001	-1.08	-1.1	-1.02
student 1	143.559	249	.001	28.2	27.8	28.6

As it is seen the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the sample and population on almost all items, favoring the population (e.g. in item 1, t (249) = -39.652, p= 0.001<0.05). Results also show that the mean score of the students and the hypothetical mean of population are statistically significant (t (249) = 143.55, p= 0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, the related hypothesis was safely rejected and it could be argued that students believe that multiculturalism is not appropriately applied in English curriculum of Iranian high school. The second research question was an attempt to see to what extent multiculturalism are used in the current English curriculum at the high-school level from the EFL teachers' perspectives. In so doing the mean scores of the teachers on the four sections of the questionnaire (i.e., goals, content, teaching methods and evaluation methods) were compared with a hypothetical means of the population through running one sample t- tests for all items of each section. The descriptive statistics as well as one sample t- tests are presented in the following sections. Results of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (One sample t-tests) of teachers' scores on goals are presented in the following tables.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Scores on Goals

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q1	150	1.5000	.50168	.04096
q2	150	1.2333	.42437	.03465
q3	150	1.3333	.53928	.04403
q4	150	1.5333	.56363	.04602
q5	150	1.7667	1.96758	.16065
q6	150	1.5333	.50056	.04087
q7	150	1.3333	.53928	.04403
q8	145	1.3793	.48690	.04043
q9	150	1.5667	.49720	.04060
Goals	148	13.2027	2.24050	.18417

As it is shown in the above table, the teachers' means on all items are between 1.2 and 1.7, while the hypothetical mean is 2.5. Therefore, the hypothetical mean of population exceeded the means of the sample. It can also be seen that the hypothetical mean of (22.5) is greater than the mean of sample on the goals (13.2). Although the difference between the sample and populations is different, to be on the safer ground the scores were submitted to One sample t-tests (Table 5):

Table 5
Results of One Sample t-test for the Goals

		Test Value = 2.5/				
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
q1	-24.4	149	.000	-1.0	-1.08	-.9
q2	-36.5	149	.000	-1.26	-1.33	-1.1
q3	-26.4	149	.000	-1.16	-1.25	-1.07
q4	-21.0	149	.000	-.96	-1.05	-.87
q5	-4.5	149	.000	-.73	-1.05	-.41
q6	-23.6	149	.000	-.96	-1.04	-.88
q7	-26.4	149	.000	-1.16	-1.25	-1.07
q8	-27.7	144	.000	-1.12	-1.2	-1.04
q9	-22.9	149	.000	-.93	-1.01	-.85
goals	58.1	147	.000	10.70	10.3	11

As it is seen the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers and population on almost all items, favoring the population (e.g. in item 1, t (149) = -24.652, p= 0.001<0.05). Results also show that the mean score of the teachers on goals and the hypothetical mean of population are statistically significant (t (149) = 58.11, p= 0.001 < 0.05).

Therefore, it could be argued that EFL teachers believe that multicultural goals are not appropriately met by English curriculum of Iranian high school. Results of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (One sample t-tests) of teachers' scores on the content are presented in the following tables.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Scores on the Content

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q10	150	1.6000	.49154	.04013
q11	150	1.5000	.50168	.04096
q12	150	1.5667	.56064	.04578
q13	150	1.5667	.49720	.04060
q14	150	1.5333	.56363	.04602
q15	150	1.5000	.50168	.04096
q16	150	1.4000	.49154	.04013
q17	150	1.5000	.50168	.04096
q18	150	1.5000	.50168	.04096
q19	150	1.4000	.55563	.04537
q20	150	1.5667	.49720	.04060
q21	150	1.4667	.50056	.04087
q22	150	1.6000	.49154	.04013
q23	150	1.5000	.50168	.04096
q24	150	1.5333	.50056	.04087
q25	150	1.3333	.47298	.03862
q27	150	1.6667	.53928	.04403
q28	150	1.5333	.56363	.04602
q29	150	1.4667	.50056	.04087
q30	150	1.6333	.48351	.03948
q31	150	1.6	.59828	.04885
contents	150	45	4.4	2.3

As it shown in the above table, the teachers' means on all items are between 1.2 and 1.66, while the hypothetical mean is 2.5. Therefore, the hypothetical mean of population exceeded the means of the sample. It can also be seen that the hypothetical mean of (22.5) is greater than the mean of sample on the goals (13.2). Although the difference between the sample and populations is different, to be on the safer ground, the scores were submitted to one sample t-tests.

Table 7

One Sample t-test for Teachers' Scores on the Content

	T	df	Sig.	Test Value = 2.5 Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper
q10	-22.4	149	.001	-.900	-.97	-.82
q11	-24.4	149	.001	-1.00	-1.08	-.91
q12	-20.3	149	.001	-.93	-1.02	-.84
q13	-22.9	149	.001	-.93	-1.01	-.85
q14	-21.0	149	.001	-.96	-1.05	-.87
q15	-24.4	149	.001	-1.00	-1.08	-.91
q16	-27.4	149	.001	-1.10	-1.17	-1.02
q17	-24.4	149	.001	-1.00	-1.08	-.91
q18	-24.4	149	.001	-1.00	-1.08	-.91
q19	-24	149	.001	-1.10	-1.18	-1.01
q20	-22	149	.001	-.93	-1.01	-.85
q21	-25	149	.001	-1.03	-1.11	-.95
q22	-22	149	.001	-.90	-.97	-.82
q23	-24.1	149	.001	-1.00	-1.08	-.91
q24	-23.65	149	.001	-.96	-1.04	-.88
q25	-30.2	149	.001	-1.16	-1.2	-1.09
q27	-18.9	149	.001	-.83	-.92	-.74
q28	-21.00	149	.001	-.96	-1.057	-.87
q29	-25.28	149	.001	-1.03	-1.114	-.95
q30		149	.001	-.86	-.94	-.78
q31		149	.001	-.83	-.92	-.73
contents		149	.001	-2.2	-4.4	-4.3

As it is seen the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers and population on almost all items, favoring the population (e.g. in item 1, t (149) = -22.4, p= 0.001<0.05). Results also show that the mean score of the teachers on content and the hypothetical mean of population are statistically significant (t (149) = 58.11, p= 0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, it could be argued that EFL teachers believe that multicultural contents are not appropriately taken into account by EFL curriculum of Iranian high school. Results of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (One sample t-tests) of teachers' scores on teaching methods are presented in the following tables.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Scores on Teaching Methods

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q32	150	1.50	.50	0.04
q33	150	1.53	.53	0.04
q34	150	1.41	.49	0.04
Teaching method	150	4.4	1.1	0.08

As it is shown in the above table, the teachers' means on all items of teaching methods are between 1.41 and 1.53, while the hypothetical mean is 2.5. Therefore, the hypothetical mean of population exceeded the means of the sample. It can also be seen that the hypothetical mean of teaching methods (7.5) is greater than the mean of sample on the teaching methods. Although the difference between the sample and populations is different, to be on the safer ground the scores were submitted to one sample t-tests.

Table 9

One Sample t-tests for Comparing EFL Teachers' Mean Scores on Teaching Method

	Test Value = 2.5					
	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
q32	-24.4	149	.001	-1.00	-1.08	-.91
q33	-21.0	149	.001	-.96	-1.05	-.87
q34	-26.5	147	.001	-1.08	-1.16	-1.0
Teaching method	-46.5	147	.001	-11.6	-1.16	-1.0

As it is seen in the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers and population on almost all items of teaching methods, favoring the population (e.g. in item 32, t (149) = -24.4, p= 0.001<0.05). Results also show that the mean score of the teachers on teaching methods and the hypothetical mean of population are statistically significant (t (149) = -46.5, p=0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, it could be argued that EFL teachers believe that multicultural teaching methods are not appropriately met by EFL curriculum of Iranian high school. Results of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (One sample t-tests) of teachers' scores on evaluation methods are presented in the following tables.

Table 10
Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Scores on Evaluation Methods

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q35	150	1.70	.52	.043
q36	150	1.4	.56	.04
q37	150	1.5	.49	.04
q38	150	1.5	.56	.04
q39	150	1.6	.48	.03
q40	150	1.7	.49	.04
evaluation	150	9.4	2	.17

As it is shown in the above table, the teachers' means on all items of evaluation methods are between 1.41 and 1.7, while the hypothetical mean is 2.5. Therefore, the hypothetical mean of population exceeded the sample means on all items. It can also be seen that the hypothetical mean of evaluation methods (15) is greater than the sample's mean (9.4). Although based on the great difference between the mean scores of the sample and populations, it can argue that sample and population are different, to be on the safer ground the scores were submitted to One sample t-tests.

As it is seen in the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers and population on almost all items of evaluation methods, favoring the population (e.g. in item 36, t (149) = -22.4, p= 0.001<0.05).

As it is seen in the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers and population on almost all items of teaching methods, favoring the population (e.g. in item 32, t (149) = -24.4, p= 0.001<0.05). Results also show that the mean

score of the teachers on teaching methods and the hypothetical mean of population are statistically significant (t (149) = -46.5, p=0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, it could be argued that EFL teachers believe that multicultural teaching methods are not appropriately met by EFL curriculum of Iranian high school. Results of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (One sample t-tests) of teachers' scores on evaluation methods are presented in the following tables.

As it is seen in the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers and population on almost all items of teaching methods, favoring the population (e.g. in item 32, t (149) = -24.4, p= 0.001<0.05). Results also show that the mean score of the teachers on teaching methods and the hypothetical mean of population are statistically significant (t (149) = -46.5, p=0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, it could be argued that EFL teachers believe that multicultural teaching methods are not appropriately met by EFL curriculum of Iranian high school. Results of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (One sample t-tests) of teachers' scores on evaluation methods are presented in the following tables.

Table 10
Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Scores on Evaluation Methods

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
q35	150	1.70	.52	.043
q36	150	1.4	.56	.04
q37	150	1.5	.49	.04
q38	150	1.5	.56	.04
q39	150	1.6	.48	.03
q40	150	1.7	.49	.04
evaluation	150	9.4	2	.17

As it is shown in the above table, the teachers' means on all items of evaluation methods are between 1.41 and 1.7, while the hypothetical mean is 2.5. Therefore, the hypothetical mean of population exceeded the sample means on all items. It can also be seen that the hypothetical mean of evaluation methods (15) is greater than the sample's mean (9.4). Although based on the great difference between the mean scores of the sample and populations, it can argue that sample and population are different, to be on the safer ground the scores were submitted to One sample t-tests.

As it is seen in the above table, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers and population on almost all items of evaluation methods, favoring the population (e.g. in item 36, t (149) = -22.4, p= 0.001<0.05).

Table 11

One Sample t-tests for Comparing Sample and Population Mean Scores on Evaluation

				Test Value = 2.5		
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Mean		
	T	df	Sig.	Difference	Lower	Upper
q35	-18.55	149	.001	-.80	-.88	-.71
q36	-22.4	149	.001	-1.03	-1.1	-.94
q37	-22.9	149	.001	-.93	-1.01	-.85
q38	-21.5	149	.001	-.96	-1.05	-.87
q39	-21.9	149	.001	-.86	-.94	-.78
q40	-18.06	149	.001	-.733	-.81	-.65
evaluation	-48.06	149	.001	2.1	-1.6	-1.2

Results also show that the mean score of the teachers on evaluation and the hypothetical mean of population are statistically significant (t (149) = -48.06, p= 0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, the related hypothesis was safely rejected and it could be argued that EFL teachers believe that multicultural evaluation methods are not appropriately observed in EFL curriculum of Iranian high school.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

The first and second research questions examined the elements of a multicultural education are used in the current English curriculum at the high-school level from the high school students' and teachers' perspectives. Results showed that the mean scores of the students and teachers on all items and the sum of the items were lower than the hypothetical mean (2.5). Therefore, it could beargued that the students' and teachers' mean scores fell below the cutoff point. Results also showed that the difference between the mean scores of the sample and population on almost all items was significant, favoring the population. Accordingly, it could be concluded that multicultural education is not appropriately applied in English curriculum of Iranian high schools.

Findings of this study supported the results of the study by (Hamidizadeh, Fathi Vajargah, Arefi, & Mehran, 2018) that analyzed multicultural education in Iran, and reported Iranian teachers believed that the multicultural

curriculum situation in Iran is lower than the average for each of the four main elements and the additional elements compared to the desired multicultural desirability of the program. Additionally, results of this study are in accordance with (Mohammadzadeh, 2009) who analyzed the ways of incorporating multicultural literary texts in English language teaching curriculum to meet the needs of culturally diverse students. The outcomes showed that the teachers were not able to encourage their students to admit uncritically challenging representations of various cultural groups as they encounter these representations in their literary texts. On top of that, more studies with larger samples are needed to see whether the same findings are achieved or not. In addition, a kind of follow up study is needed to see why the principles and elements of multicultural education are not sufficiently used in English curriculum. Given that some students from different and diverse cultural backgrounds seek quality education in Iran, it is necessary to implement a multicultural education system so that an engaging and socialization classroom climate is created so that students' cultural diversity is addressed (Alghamdi, 2017). Such a system provides a ground for developing confidence and friendship between students and their teacher and this in turn can lead to improvement in students' performance as a result of teachers' showing care and respect to their students' ethnic and racial backgrounds (Gay, 2004) . Furthermore, as a result of implementing multicultural education racial attitudes among students are reduced and diverse students

learning is improved (Okoye-Johnson, 2011). In addition, multicultural education could promote students' cognitive thinking and critical thinking skills and creativity (Reed, 2010). More importantly, it is recommended that the issue of multicultural concept be part of whole language teaching curriculum. Curriculum designers and policy makers should be sensitive to such issues particularly in language teaching and learning context.

CONTRIBUTION TO NEW KNOWLEDGE

To reduce the achievement gap between students from the dominant society and those from diverse cultural backgrounds (Okoye-Johnson, 2011), multicultural principles and elements should be incorporated in English curriculum. As a result of implementing multicultural education, the curriculum content can produce fundamental changes in the total school climate through reflecting voices of different cultures, classes, races and ethnicities without humiliating a specific culture, class, race or ethnicity, different accents and dialects, and linguistic, religious, environmental and ethnic diversity (Ngo, 2010), as cited in (Ahmadi & Sadeghi, 2016) . However, it is worth mentioning that implementing multicultural education needs some substrates including professional and diverse teachers (Gollnick & Chinn, 2013) , quality high schools equipped with modern technology (Danzi, Reul, & Smith, 2008) , teacher education programs which can prepare pre-service teachers for a multicultural

education system (Cochran-Smith, 2003), etc. Regarding the role of multicultural concept in language achievement, the status of multiculturalism in English curriculum from teachers and students' views has been highlighted. Another issue highlighted in this study was the relationship between language and culture and how language can possibly contribute to the formation of culture. Several studies targeting aspects of multiculturalism and language achievement were available, but it became evident that none of them concentrate directly with the topic of the present work especially in the Iranian context. Therefore, this study is worthy in terms of filling the gap in the current literature and its contribution to the literature on language and multiculturalism.

References

Ahmadi, J. A. S., & Sadeghi, A. (2016). Designing and validating multicultural curriculum model in Iran public educational. *Journal of Curriculum Studies (JCS), 10*(39), 71-108.

Alghamdi, Y. (2017). Multicultural education in the US: Current issues and suggestions for practical implementations. *International Journal of Education, 9*(2), 44-52.

Bangura, Y. (2018). *Multicultural Education: The relationship between preservice teachers' multicultural self-efficacy and cultural awareness when teaching in multicultural classrooms.* Bowling Green State University,

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Standing at the crossroads: Multicultural teacher education at the beginning of the 21st century. *Multicultural perspectives, 5*(3), 3-11.

Colombo, M. (2013). Introduction. Pluralism in education and implications for analysis. *Italian Journal of sociology of education, 5*(2).

Danzi, J., Reul, K., & Smith, R. (2008). Improving Student Motivation in Mixed Ability Classrooms Using Differentiated Instruction. *Online Submission*.

Daryai-Hansen, P., Gerber, B., Lörincz, I., Haller, M., Ivanova, O., Krumm, H.-J., & Reich, H. H. (2015). Pluralistic approaches to languages in the curriculum: The case of French-speaking Switzerland, Spain and Austria. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 12*(1), 109-127.

Gay, G. (2004). The importance of multicultural education. *The curriculum studies reader, 315,*320.

Giselbrecht, M. (2009). Pluralistic approaches– A long overdue paradigm shift in education. *Scottish Languages Review, 20*, 11-20.

Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (2013). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*: Pearson Higher Ed.

Hamidizadeh, K., Fathi Vajargah, K., Arefi, M., & Mehran, G. (2018). The Systematic Analysis of Multicultural Education in Iran.*jiera, 12*(42), 25-38.

McConnell, K. F. (2008). *Inventing pluralistic*

education: Compulsory schooling as technique of democratic deliberation. IndianaUniversity,

Mohammadzadeh, B. (2009). Incorporating multicultural literature in English language teaching curriculum.*Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1*(1), 23-27.

Motamed, H. R., Yarmohammadian, M. H., & Yousefy, A. PresentingPluralistic model for curriculums of Iranian Higher Education.

Ngo, B. (2010). Doing "diversity" at Dynamic High: Problems and possibilities of multicultural education in practice. *Education and Urban Society, 42*(4), 473-495.

Ogletree, Q., & Larke, P. J. (2010). *Implementing multicultural practices in early childhood education.* Paper presented at the National Forum of Multicultural Issues Journal.

Okoye-Johnson, O. (2011). Does multicultural education improve students' racial attitudes? Implications for closing the achievement gap. *Journal of Black Studies, 42*(8), 1252-1274.

Reed, M. (2010). Multicultural music: A partner for 21st century skills. *Illinois Music Educator, 71*(2), 94-95.

Sadeghi, A. (2010). REVIEWING THE NATIONAL CURRICULUM OF THE IR OF IRAN USING A MULTI-CULTURAL APPROACH.

Sharma, S. (2005). Multicultural education: Teachers perceptions and preparation. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC), 2*(5).

Stika, P. (2012). The role of values in teaching. In: Bachelor thesis, Masaryk University. Retrieved from http://is. muni. cz/th ….

Stilwell, F. (2006). Four reasons for pluralism in the teaching of economics. *Australasian Journal of Economics Education, 3*(1-2), 42-55.

Taylor, R., Kumi-Yeboah, A., & Ringlaben, R. P. (2016). Pre- Service Teachers' Perceptions towards Multicultural Education & Teaching of Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Learners. *Multicultural Education, 23*, 42-48.

Biodata

Ms Farzane Ehsani is a lecturer in the English Translation Studies Department of Payam Noor University of Fasa, Shiraz. She has been involved in teaching English for some years at universities and language institutes. She has published some papers in international and national academic journals. Her main areas of interest include methods and techniques of language teaching, innovative teaching methods, translation, quality assessment, and teaching translation.

Email: ehsani.farzane@yahoo.com