**THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SPECIAL SECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN**

**GULISTAN STATE UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

# QUALIFICATION WORK

**on theme "Language learning in Intercultural Perspective "**

Prepared by: Student of group 1-41
Umurzoqova Nigina
_____

SUPERVISOR:
Tojiboyeva SH.
_____

**GULISTAN – 2014**

# CONTENTS

# I. Introduction

## 1.1. General Characteristics of the Work

The theme of my qualification work sounds as following: **"Language learning in Intercultural Perspective".** Nowadays teaching foreign language is one of the most important tasks set by our President before teachers. Our President constantly underlines that "a gifted youth is the youth which … masters foreign languages"[1]. And, if to paraphrase the famous saying, learning a language without paying attention to culture and competence is similar to live without breathing. New methods of teaching English premise the use of presentations both by teachers and students. In my qualification work I will try to investigate the balance and importance of intercultural awareness in learning concepts via some methods together with pedagogical techniques.

**Actuality of the theme**

In recent years language researchers and practitioners have shifted their focus from developing individual linguistic skills to the use of language to achieve the speaker's objectives. This new area of focus, known as communicative competence, leads language teachers to build the positive effect of cultural awareness and engage their students in creative language use. All types of learning and teaching skills, which are task-based and have a purpose beyond the production of correct speech, serve as excellent communicative activities. On the surface, the aim of all language acquisition is for students to "use the language"; however, during the process of learning language learners also use the target language to persuade and negotiate their way to desired results. This process involves to lead intercultural perspective and receptive skills simultaneously. Standing on such ground, I considered the theme of the work actual enough to make investigation.

---

1.     [1] Karimov I. A. Ilmiy – tadqiqot faoliyatini takominlashtirish to'g'risida //"Xalq so'zi gazetasi", 2002 yil, 15 mart.

**The subject** of the qualification work is to develop the usage of methods of teaching the language through cultural awareness in our educational system.

**The object** of the qualification paper is to study main methods of teaching reading, writing, speaking and listening and also the useful sides of these methods for the young pupils.

**The tasks and aim of the work**

Before the beginning of writing our qualification work we set the following tasks and aims before ourselves:

The aim of this qualification work is to describe the importance of intercultural perspective in oral and written speech. Beside these theoretical points we give practical approaches how to teach foreign language.

1. To investigate the peculiarities of communication approaches for learning English.

2. To investigate the question from both theoretical and practical sides.

3. To study the necessary literatures dedicated to the study of language teaching.

4. To evaluate the peculiarities of cultural awareness in language teaching and their functions.

5. To demonstrate the ways of using presentations in class on the basis of new education technologies.

**Scientific scrutiny of the research** Its essence of is to help language learners to interact with speakers of other languages on equal terms, and to be aware of their own identities and those of their interlocutors. It is the hope that language learners who thus become 'intercultural speakers' will be successful not only in communicating information but also in developing a human relationship with people of other languages and cultures.

The purpose of this qualification work is to analyzes this new Intercultural perspectives easily accessible in practical ways to those teachers who want to know what it could mean in practice for them and their learners in their classrooms. It does not ignore the need to explain the ideas and the theory, but it ensures that the reader can see from the beginning what is involved in the

Intercultural learning, and what they can do about it. It is for this reason that we have written the chapters in the form of 'Frequently Asked Questions', the questions and problems which we have met when working on frames in a case of learning foreign languages ourselves.

Secondly we have provided information about further sources of practical use, and examples of what other teachers have done to introduce an Intercultural Dimension into their work. Above all, we want to demonstrate that an Intercultural language learning perspectives for learners who are training on language acquisition.

**The novelty of the work**

The novelty of the qualification paper is defined by concrete results of the investigation about teaching and the ways of enlarging methods and strategies by the challenges of communication skills. It could be made an integral part of the foreign - language learners. There is general agreement that the possession of grammatical accuracy was counted to determine the subject. In the work that we identified that the necessity for appropriate communication can be carried out with intercultural awareness and perspective in receiving the knowledge.

**Practical significance of the work**

**Practical value** of the research is that the materials and the results of the given qualification paper can serve as the material for the practical courses of listening and speaking, reading and writing, as well as for practical lessons in translation, grammar and conversation practice.

The material includes the information from

a) the Internet    b) literary books of English and American authors c) frameworks for foreign languages d) methodic guides

In our opinion the practical significance of our work isn't hard to be overvalued. This work sums up the workouts made by teachers for effective teaching English on the base of Oxford and Cambridge topic based methodologies. We hope it would serve as a good manual for young teachers who are only going to become teachers.

**The theoretical importance of the qualification work** is in the necessity of detailed and complete analysis of learning language. And provision of necessary materials and outcomes of the paper concerning the educational materials and their peculiarities.

**Fields of amplification**

The present work might find a good way of implying in the following spheres:

1. In High Schools it can be successfully used by teachers as modern material for composing contemporary lesson plans on practical course of the English language.

2. It can be used by teachers of schools, lyceums and colleges by teachers of English as a practical manual for teaching English in class.

3. It can be useful for everyone who wants to gain the knowledge in English and in computer technologies as well.

The **structure of work of** the given qualification paper consists of an Introduction, two chapters, conclusions and the list of used literature in course of the research.

**Introduction** contains an introductory information about the research of the qualification work in general, and describes the aim of the research, methods used in the course of it, explains its actuality, novelty, practical and theoretical value of the investigation.

**Chapter 1** deals with the definitions of the culture and the approaches of learning language through intercultural acquisition. **Chapter 2** deals with the study of intercultural awareness in theoretical or practical conception, pronunciation and describes the connection between the reading rules and utterance of a word.

**Conclusions** present the results and recommendations of the investigation produced in the qualification paper.

As the base for my qualification work I used the works of such world-known linguists as Byram, Damen, L. Kramsch, C. Crozet , C., Liddicoat

In the conclusion to my qualification work I tried to draw some results from the scientific investigations made within the main part of my qualification work. In

bibliography part I mentioned more than 20 sources of which were used while compiling the present work. It includes linguistic books and articles dealing with the theme, a number of used dictionaries and encyclopedias and also some internet sources. The main methods for compiling our work are the method of comparative analysis and the method of statistical research.

**Linguists worked on the theme**

As the base for our qualification work we mainly used the materials of British teachers who taught the language in developing countries like Doyé, P. 1999, The Intercultural Dimension: Foreign Language Hinkel, E. (ed.) 1999, Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning. Kramsch, C., 1993, Context and Culture in Language Teaching. Lo Bianco, J., Liddicoat, A. & Crozet, C. (eds.) 1999, Intercultural Competence through Language Education. Robinson, G.L.N. 1985, Crosscultural Understanding. Seelye, H.N. 1984, Teaching Culture: strategies for foreign language educators. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Company.
Valdes, J.M. (ed.) 1986, Culture Bound: Bridging the Cultural Gap.

# I. CHAPTER I Intercultural competence as part of language proficiency

## I. 1. Principles of intercultural learning

Inter-cultural language learning perspectives contribute to the overall education of learners, developing in them the capabilities to: communicate, interact and negotiate within and across languages and cultures, understand their own and others' languages, thus extending their range of literacy skills, including skills in English literacy, understand themselves and others, and to understand and use diverse ways of knowing, being and doing further develop their cognitive skills through thinking critically and analytically, solving problems, and making connections in their learning. Such capabilities assist learners to live and work successfully as linguistically and culturally aware citizens of the world.

The term *intercultural* indicates a notion of an engaged exploration of difference between cultures. It implies a responsibility to recognize and reflect on the learner's 'home' culture as much as on the target culture. It has conceptualized the successful intercultural language user's identity as positioned in an independent 'third place'[1], a vantage point of critical observation and understanding of both first and second (or target) cultures.

Education in a global community highlights the need to develop students with knowledge of different cultures and languages, and an understanding of the relationships between cultures and languages, referred to as *intercultural* (Corbett, 2003; Moran, 2001; Seelye, 1994). Intercultural learning helps students to understand commonality and difference, to question the relative nature of their own cultural identity, and to develop multiple perspectives. Language assumes an important place in this notion. Much language learning today aims to develop communication skills and literacy, self understanding, and to develop cognitive skills through critical thinking.

---

[1] Kramsch, C. (1993a) *Context and Culture in Language Education*. Oxford:

Fundamental to intercultural language learning (ILL) is acknowledgement of an inex[1]tricable link between language and culture. Liddicoat (2002:5) noted "culture shapes what we say, when we say it, and how we say it from the simplest language we use to the most complex. It is fundamental to the way we speak, write, listen and read." Language has a central role in the transmission of cultural codes; language forms and the messages conveyed by them provide cultural knowledge.

Hence the impossibility of separating language and culture. Culture can be understood in a variety of ways and the ways in which culture is constructed will impact on how teachers teach and how learners learn. Consequently, ILL perspectives challenges language teachers to identify ways of appropriately incorporating culture into language learning and language into culture learning:

### Principles

ILL is developed through five general principles, which guide curriculum design and inform classroom pedagogy. These principles are:

• active construction

• making connections

• social interaction

• reflection

• responsibility.

**Active construction** explores language and culture through active engagement and developing a personal, multi-faceted intercultural space.

**Making connections** occurs when relevant bridges are built between home language / culture and target language / culture, with existing knowledge positioned in light of new input.

**Social interaction** involves communicating across linguistic and cultural boundaries, identifying the boundaries and why they are constructed.

---

[1] Liddicoat et al, 2003:50-54  Lo Bianco, A.J. Liddicoat, & C. Crozet (eds), *Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 1-20). Canberra: Language Australia.

**Reflection** involves engaging in critical, constructive analysis of linguistic and cultural similarity and difference; reflection on one's own intercultural behaviors and naming one's own identity.

**Responsibility** encourages learners to accept responsibility for contributing to successful communication across languages and cultures, and for the development of intercultural perspectives.

## Pedagogy

Meaningful implementation of ILL aligns classroom pedagogy with the philosophy and the principles of ILL (Liddicoat et al, 2003:67-68). Aligning principles with pedagogy means that for **active construction**, classroom pedagogy is task-oriented, highlighting particular linguistic and sociocultural considerations. It refers back to previous learning, foreshadows future learning, and allows learners to demonstrate learning by use of graphic organisers such as mind maps to make links across concepts. Pedagogy aligned with **making connections** incorporates learners' longitudinal development, builds on previous knowledge, combines learning of language and culture with learning across the curriculum, builds connections across texts and contexts and encourages learners to explain, integrate and inquire. **Social interaction** means that learners will be engaged in tasks that facilitate interaction, especially interactive talk. Teachers scaffold learning to extend the intercultural connections learners are making, drawing on multiple examples from different contexts.

Classroom interaction incorporating **reflection** asks learners to critically reflect on their own attitudes, beliefs and values and creates multiple pathways for bridging linguistic and socio cultural learning. **Responsibility** means that classroom pedagogy involves learners in setting personal goals, engaging positively with difference, taking a reflective stance, including self-monitoring, and developing an awareness of the ethical uses of knowledge.

## Philosophy

Crozet, Liddicoat & Lo Bianco (1999) categorise four broad approaches to culture in language teaching:

• traditional (high culture) approach

• culture studies or area studies approach

• culture as practices/societal norms

• intercultural language learning.

**Traditional approaches** treat cultural competence as being able to identify an established target country canon. The canon is often embodied in the arts, music and literature of a particular group within the target country. Links between language and culture are tenuous, with texts being the object of study, rather than the expression of cultural positions being explored through the text's language choices.

**Culture study approaches** treat cultural competence as knowledge about a target country (history, geography, institutions). It is possible to acquire this knowledge without engaging in the language. **Culture as societal norms** identifies cultural competence as knowing about what members of a particular cultural group are likely to do based upon known ways of acting or beliefs. The obvious limitation of this approach is culture being presented as static and homogenous.

**ILL** identifies culture as the lived experience of individuals. Interactions between people are context-sensitive, negotiated, mediated and variable. In terms of learning, students engage in developing cultural competence from the beginning of their language learning. Learners develop an intercultural perspective where the culture and language contexts in which the student live (the First Place) are made apparent alongside the target culture and language contexts (the Second Place). Using this knowledge, learners move to a position (the Third Place) in which their developing intercultural competence informs their language choices in communication. Learners engage in understanding their own language(s) and culture(s) in relation to the additional language and culture.

Learners engage in processes facilitating negotiation of meaning, involving the recognition, mediation and acceptance of different perspectives. ILL is more than merely learning about a culture and comparing it to one's own. Learners must

make choices about what to hold on to, what to adopt and what to let pass when engaging in meaningful communication in another language.

## A sociocultural perspective on language and learning

A **sociocultural** perspective on language and learning entails a particular view of how language and social interaction are involved in the processes of human development and learning. From that perspective, education and cognitive development are seen as cultural processes, whereby knowledge is not only possessed individually but shared amongst members of communities; and understandings are constructed by people jointly, through their involvement in events which are shaped by cultural and historical factors. Language acquisition and use is seen as having a profound effect on the development of thinking. This does not mean that sociocultural researchers boldly assert that social experience rather than heredity shapes children's development[1]. They may take different positions on that issue. But they share the view that we cannot understand the nature of thinking, learning and development without taking account of the intrinsically social and communicative nature of human life.

A sociocultural perspective sees education as taking place through dialogue, with the interactions between students and teachers reflecting the historical development, cultural values and social practices of the societies and communities in which educational institutions exist. The educational process which takes place within those institutions might thus be better described as 'teaching-and-learning', rather than there being separate processes of 'teaching' and 'learning'[2]. This implies that educational success, and failure, may be explained by the quality of educational dialogues rather than being just the result of the intrinsic capability of individual students (or the didactic presentational skill of individual teachers).

---

[1] Kaplan, R.B. (1966) Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*,

[2] Liddicoat , A. 2002, 'Static and dynamic views of culture and intercultural language acquisition', Babel, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 4-11, 37.

## II.2 The sociocultural and intercultural dimension of language learning and teaching

Language as a social phenomenon was first described by Ferdinand se Saussure who claimed that providing only historical description of languages (as it was done at his time) should not be the only approach to this complex entity. He maintained that crucial information about language can be obtained from its common users, who in most cases do not posses practically any theoretical knowledge about their native tongue and yet are competent speakers. Moreover, as Saussure assumed language use reflects the contemporary structure which should enable synchronic language analysis (language used at a given point in time) in addition to diachronic analysis concerned with the past linguistic forms. The social aspect of using language, or speech was called parole by Saussure, while the underlying knowledge of linguistic structure was known as langue.

Thus, developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching involves recognizing that the aims are: to give learners intercultural competence as well as linguistic competence; to prepare them for interaction with people of other cultures; to enable them to understand and accept people from other cultures as individuals with other distinctive perspectives, values and behaviours; and to help them to see that such interaction is an enriching experience. When two people talk to each other, they do not just *speak* to the other to exchange information, they also *see* the other as an individual and as someone who belongs to a specific social group, for example a 'worker' and an 'employer' or a 'teacher' and a 'pupil'. This has an influence on what they say, how they say it, what response they expect and how they interpret the response. In other words, when people are talking to each other their **social identities** are unavoidably part of the social interaction between them. In language teaching, the concept of **'communicative competence'** takes this into account by emphasizing that language learners need to acquire not just grammatical competence but also the knowledge of what is 'appropriate' language.

When two people in conversation are from different countries speaking in a language which is a foreign/second language for one of them, or when they are

both speaking a language which is foreign to both of them, a **lingua franca** they may be acutely aware of their **national identities.** They are aware that at least one of them is speaking a foreign language and the other is hearing their own language being spoken by a foreigner. Often this influences what they say and how they say it because they see the other person as a representative of a country or nation. Yet this focus on national identity, and the accompanying risk of relying on **stereotypes**, reduces the individual from a complex human being to someone who is seen as representative of a country or 'culture'. Furthermore, this simplification is reinforced if it is assumed that that learning a language involves becoming like a person from another country. Often in language teaching the implicit aim has been to imitate a **native speaker** both in linguistic competence, in knowledge of what is 'appropriate' language, and in knowledge about a country and its 'culture'.

The concept of 'culture' has changed over time from emphasis on literature, the arts and philosophy to culture as a shared way of life, but the idea of imitating the native speaker has not changed and consequently native speakers are considered to be experts and the models, and teachers who are native speakers are considered to be better than non-native speakers. In contrast the **'intercultural dimension'** in language teaching aims to develop learners as **intercultural speakers** or **mediators** who are able to engage with complexity and multiple identities and to avoid the stereotyping which accompanies perceiving someone through a single identity. It is based on perceiving the interlocutor as an individual whose qualities are to be discovered, rather than as a representative of an externally ascribed identity.

Intercultural communication is communication on the basis of respect for individuals and equality of human rights as the democratic basis for social interaction. So language teaching with an intercultural dimension continues to help learners to acquire the **linguistic competence** needed to communicate in speaking or writing, to formulate what they want to say/write in correct and appropriate ways. But it also develops their **intercultural competence** i.e. their ability to

ensure a shared understanding by people of different social identities, and their ability to interact with people as complex human beings with multiple identities and their own individuality.

"Being exposed to the target culture is an absolute must for any learner/teacher. How can a person acquire the competence.....?" This is the question which many teachers ask and if they have no opportunity to leave their own country and visit one where the target language is spoken they do not see how they can teach 'the target culture'. The first response to this is to say that the main aim of teaching the intercultural dimension is **not the transmission of information about a foreign country**. The intercultural dimension is concerned with:

- helping learners to understand how intercultural interaction takes place,

- how social identities are part of all interaction,

- how their perceptions of other people and others people's perceptions

of them influence the success of communication

- how they can find out for themselves more about the people with whom they are communicating.

So **a teacher does not have to know everything** about 'the target culture'. This is in any case impossible and in fact there are many cultures associated with a particular language, for example many countries where French is spoken as the first language, and within those countries many variations on beliefs, values and behaviours which people share, in other words many cultures[1]. So a teacher should try to design a series of activities to enable learners to discuss and draw conclusions from their own experience of the target culture solely as a result of what they have heard or read.

The teacher might provide some factual information related to the life-styles current in the culture(s) and patterns usually followed by members of these cultures, but the important thing is to encourage comparative analysis with

---

**1** http://www. Bankreferatov.ru

learners' own culture. For example, foreigners' views about the learners' country as represented in travel guides or in tourist brochures might be compared with the learners' own experience of and views about their own country; they will quickly discover there is a difference. They can then be asked to think whether their perceptions of the foreign country will be the same as those of the inhabitants themselves.

The methods of doing this can include simulations and role-play which will activate their schemata and background knowledge about other countries and cultures: learners act the role of visitors to their own country and meet with other learners acting as themselves and not as the stereotypes that the visitors are expecting. This kind of **experiential learning** is powerful in developing self-awareness as well as perceptions of other countries. The teacher can encourage learners to become more observant in terms of various subtleties of cultural behaviour. Learners are sure to emerge out of these experiences much better prepared to communicate with other intercultural speakers, tolerate the differences and handle everyday situations they are likely to encounter in a foreign country. There is in this kind of work no need for the teacher to be an expert about other countries.

The focus is on **how learners respond to others** and others' views of themselves, and how they interact with people from other cultures. Of course, there is some factual information which learners need about other countries where the target language is spoken, but this is available to teachers in reference books, through the internet and so on. This kind of information does not depend on having been to the countries in question, and in fact when one does visit another country it is not this kind of information that one acquires. In this respect the issue of cross-curricular dimension comes into focus to highlight the point that intercultural education need not be linked to language alone, but can extend to the exchange of information/experience on content subjects across the curriculum.

The **choice of topics** for comparative study is therefore partly determined by learners' existing perceptions of other countries and cultures, not by some

predetermined syllabus which is supposed to represent the 'correct' view of another country. This means that no curriculum for language education should or could be transposed directly from one national system to another. This is especially true about the cultural curriculum which should be set from within the particular educational system and, in particular, should not reflect the intentions of one or more of the target cultures.

The use of books produced in the countries in question is therefore not necessarily the best way to develop a syllabus and a choice of topics.

There is a danger of culture being limited to the all-too-familiar stereotypical icons of the target culture – the instantly recognizable pictures of the clichéd sights mentioned in a popular guide book. There is also a danger of believing that there is one authoritative account of another country and its cultures, that there is a 'real' account which only the native speaker can know. The question is often asked "Can an 'outsider' know the 'national identity of a country from a cross-cultural perspective, will the way one nation imagines the other from a distance be adequate?" The response to this is that the outsider's understanding of (a part of) another country's identities and cultures is just as valid as that of an insider. Of course, teachers have to simplify to match their learners' language level or their stage of intellectual development, but this can be overcome by returning to the same topics at a later stage with more subtle and complex materials.

Where direct encounters with a foreign culture are not available for either teacher or learners, the important issue is to prepare learners for asking questions of the appropriate kind. There may be people from one of the countries in question ready to talk with learners but the important thing is not for them to ask questions about facts, but about how the person perceives the learners' country and why they have these perceptions, before going on to asking about the target country. In this way, learners can be come aware of the power of perceptions.

The sociocultural approach offers 'an alternative paradigm in which to understand teaching and learning'[1]. In sociocultural theory of learning and

[1] Richards J.C. Communicative Language Teaching Today. – Cambridge Univ. Press. 2000. – 46 p.

development, thought and language reflect, and are created by, setting. The sociocultural approach connects the target language to everyday concepts and context. Baker (1993) writes that measurement alone 'fails to capture fully various conceptual dimensions and categorizations… [L]anguage tests and measurements are unlikely to fully represent an idea or theoretical concept'. Baker argues that measurement and testing need to be partnered by rich descriptions. Baker draws a connection with the complementary nature of measurement and description in sport:

The stark statistics of the football or ice hockey game and the colourful commentary are complementary not incompatible (Baker, 1993, p 32). Block (2003) argues for a 'social turn in second language acquisition' calling for interdisciplinary and socially informed language research. Striving towards a balance in methodologies, language research was influenced by the rise of ethnographic interpretative methods in education research from the 1980s (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). These methods are now being adopted in language research. Learning is recognized as 'not merely information processing carried out solo by an individual'

The changes in theoretical orientation in general education research briefly sketched above illustrate the pathway which has lead intercultural language research to address the perceptions of the student in his/her social and cultural setting, using a range of new methods.

# III. 3. Knowledge, skills, attitudes and values are involved in intercultural competence and the relevant importance

The **components of intercultural competence** are knowledge, skills and attitudes, complemented by the values one holds because of one's belonging to a number of social groups. These values are part of one's social identities. The foundation of intercultural competence is in the **attitudes** of the intercultural speaker and mediator: **Intercultural attitudes:** curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one's own This means a willingness to relativise one's own values, beliefs and behaviors, not to assume that they are the only possible and naturally correct ones, and to be able to see how they might look from an outsider's perspective who has a different set of values, beliefs and behaviours. Another crucial factor is **knowledge**, not primarily knowledge about a specific culture, but rather knowledge of how social groups and identities function and what is involved in intercultural interaction[1].

If it can be anticipated with whom one will interact, then knowledge of that person's world is useful. If it cannot, then it is useful to imagine an interlocutor in order to have an example – a specific country or countries and their social groups - to understand what it means to know something about other people with other multiple identities: **Knowledge:** of social groups and their products and practices in one's own and in one's interlocutor's country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction So knowledge can be defined as having two major components: knowledge of social processes, and knowledge of illustrations of those processes and products; the latter includes knowledge about how other people are likely to perceive you, as well as some knowledge about other people. No teacher can have or anticipate all the knowledge which learners might at some point need. Indeed many teachers have not had the opportunity themselves to

---

[1] Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A.J. (1999) The challenge of intercultural language teaching: Engaging with culture in the classroom. (pp. 113-126). Canberra

experience all or any of the cultures which their learners might encounter, but this is not crucial[1].

The teacher's task is to develop attitudes and skills as much as knowledge, and teachers can acquire information about other countries together with their learners; they do not need to be the sole or major source of information.

**Skills** are just as important as attitudes and knowledge, and teachers can concentrate as much on skills as upon knowledge. Because intercultural speakers/mediators need to be able to see how misunderstandings can arise, and how they might be able to resolve them, they need the attitudes of decentring but also the skills of comparing. By putting ideas, events, documents from two or more cultures side by side and seeing how each might look from the other perspective, intercultural speakers/mediators can see how people might misunderstand what is said or written or done by someone with a different social identity. The acquisition of intercultural competence is never complete and perfect, but *to be a successful intercultural speaker and mediator does not require complete and perfect competence*. The first reason for this is the more obvious: it is not possible to acquire or to anticipate all the knowledge one might need in interacting with people of other cultures.

Those cultures are themselves constantly changing; one cannot know with whom one will use a specific language since many languages are spoken in more than one country. Similarly there are in any one country many different cultures and languages. And thirdly any language can be used as a lingua franca with anyone from any country. So it is not possible to anticipate the knowledge language learners need and this has been the main failure of the emphasis on knowledge in *civilisation*, *Landeskunde* etc, because whatever is taught it is inevitably insufficient.

The second reason why complete and perfect competence is not required is less obvious but just as important: everyone's own social identities and values develop, everyone acquires new ones throughout life as they become a member of

---

[1] Kramsch, C. (1991c) The order of discourse in language teaching. B.F. Freed (ed.), *Foreign Language Acquisition Research and the Classroom* (pp. 191-204). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

new social groups; and those identities, and the values, beliefs and behaviors they symbolize are deeply embedded in one's self. This means that meeting new experience, seeing unexpected beliefs, values and behaviors, can often shock and disturb those deeply embedded identities and values, however open, tolerant and flexible one wishes to be. Everyone has therefore to be constantly aware of the need to adjust, to accept and to understand other people - it is never a completed process. This also means that there is no perfect 'model' to imitate, no equivalent of the notion of a perfect 'native speaker'. There is no question, either, of expecting learners to imitate or attempt to acquire the social identity of a native speaker, such as a new national identity.

The **components of intercultural competence** are knowledge, skills and attitudes, complemented by the values one holds because of one's belonging to a number of social groups.

Intercultural language learning, Ill, is a significant development from some traditional and current pedagogies for teaching languages. It connects the study of culture to language and linguistics learning and sees them as integrated and holistic. Ill requires students to reflect on the knowledge and assumptions they make about their own cultures as well as of those of the target language. They also reflect on the ways that languages embody cultures and manifest culturally significant attitudes and behaviors. Ill enables greater student participation in the direction the learning takes as well as in advising on its content and processes. Ill may require a significant pedagogical shift for some Languages teachers.

Intercultural language learning involves the fusing of language, culture and learning into a single educative approach. It begins with the idea that language, culture and learning are fundamentally interrelated and places this Interrelationship at the centre of the learning process. This not only reformulates what it means to teach a language, but also provides new and richer ways of linking Languages to other learning areas. The concepts of 'language', 'culture' and 'learning' are therefore central to the design of the Languages curriculum, and importantly, of the

curriculum as a whole. Intercultural language learning involves developing with learners an understanding of their own language(s) and culture(s) in relation to an additional language and culture. It is a dialogue that allows for reaching a common ground for negotiation to take place, and where variable points of view are recognised, mediated and accepted.

The use of English as well as the target language is more evident in IcLL classrooms to support processes such as analysing, making connections between and reflecting on one's own and others' cultures. Its purpose is to support target language learning and the extent of its use varies with different levels of language acquisition.

**Social identities** are related to **cultures**. Someone who is 'foreigner' will have acquired that identity through being brought up surrounded by other foreigner, unconsciously learning their beliefs, values and behaviors. Similarly someone whose social identities include being 'a teacher' will have acquired the knowledge, values and behaviors they share with other teachers through a process of socialization. But this is still a simplification because students and teachers have many other identities and every individual and there are many different ways of being student or a teacher. So to see only one identity in a person is a simplification. An intercultural speaker is aware of this simplification, knows something about the beliefs, values and behaviors which are 'foreigner', but is also aware that there are other identities hidden in the person with whom they are interacting, even if they do not know what the associated beliefs, values and behaviors are.

Therefore an intercultural speaker needs some **knowledge**, about what it means to be foreign student or a teacher or indeed a teacher, for example. However, an intercultural speaker also needs an awareness that there is more to be known and understood from the other person's perspective, that there are **skills**, **attitudes** and **values** involved too (see following section), which are crucial to understanding intercultural human relationships. As a consequence, the **'best' teacher** is neither the native nor the non-native speaker, but the person who can

help learners see relationships between their own and other cultures, can help them acquire interest in and curiosity about 'otherness', and an awareness of themselves and their own cultures seen from other people's perspectives.

There are many kinds of assessment of which testing is just one. Tests too are of many kinds and serve many functions – diagnosis, placement on courses, achievement, proficiency for example – but are often associated with examinations and certification. Examinations and certification are highly sensitive issues to which politicians, parents and learners pay much attention. As a consequence, the examination of learners' competence has to be very careful and as 'objective' - meaning valid and reliable - as possible. It seems not difficult to assess learners' acquisition of information. There can be simple tests of facts, but the difficulty comes in deciding which facts are important. Shall they, for example, learn 'facts' about social etiquette and politeness in a particular country? But then whose social etiquette, that of the dominant social class, or that of the social class or ethnic group or gender group to which they belong? Shall they learn historical 'facts', but whose version of history? It is also possible to assess learners' **knowledge and understanding**. In the teaching of history for example, rather than testing recall of historical 'facts', historical understanding and sensitivity is assessed in essays where learners discuss events. A similar approach is familiar to many language teachers who have also been learners or teachers of literature, where the testing of recall of literary history or plots of novels has largely given way to assessment of critical understanding of and sensitivity towards literary texts.

The problem lies however in the fact that knowledge and understanding are only part of intercultural competence. Assessing knowledge is thus only a small part of what is involved. What we need is to assess ability to make the strange familiar and the familiar strange, to step outside their taken for granted perspectives, and to act on a the basis of new perspectives. Most difficult of all is to assess whether learners have changed their attitudes, become more tolerant of difference and the unfamiliar. This is affective and moral development and it can

be argued that even if we can test it, we should not be trying to quantify tolerance. But quantification is only one kind of assessment.

If however, assessment is not in terms of tests and traditional examinations, but rather in terms of producing a record of learners' competences, then a portfolio approach is possible and in fact desirable.

The Council of Europe has developed a European Language Portfolio. It has three parts: the Passport section provides an overview of the individual's proficiency in different languages at a given point in time; the overview Promoting the intercultural dimension requires a framework of accepted classroom procedures that allows for the expression of and recognition of cultural difference. These procedures should be based on human rights – equal dignity and equal rights. They should be explicit and discussed with and agreed by the group.

Procedural ground rules need to be established and adopted for discussion and debate in class. Whether the context is pair work, group work or whole class discussions, agreements such as the following apply:

a) Participants are expected to listen to each other and take turns.

b) Where a discussion is chaired, the authority of the chair is respected.

c) ☐Even heated debates must be conducted in polite language.

d) Discriminatory remarks, particularly racist, sexist and homophobic discourse and expressions are totally unacceptable at any time.

e) ☐Participants show respect when commenting on and describing people portrayed in visuals or texts.

f) All involved have the responsibility to challenge stereotypes.

g) A respectful tone is required at all times.

It goes without saying that, **teachers are party to these agreements** and will not use sarcasm, irony and disparaging judgments.

Learners and teachers will expect to examine and challenge generalizations or stereotypes, and suggest or present other viewpoints. This is an essential part of developing intercultural competence. In oral work, learners can expect to discuss in pairs and small groups, as well as in plenary. They should have opportunities for

making a personal response to images, stories, case-studies and other materials. Tasks set should be carefully formulated and include explorations of opinion gaps as well as information gaps. Learners bring considerable knowledge of their familiar culture and some knowledge of cultures being studied. However, they do not necessarily share the same knowledge, the same values or the same opinions.

Language learning to promote an intercultural dimension encourages a **sharing of knowledge and a discussion of values and opinions**. Many intercultural and antiracist educational programmes, such as the Council of Europe's *All Different, All Equal* campaign, are based on the principle of peer education. That means that learners learn from each other as much as from the teacher or text-book.

An intercultural dimension involves learners in sharing their knowledge with each other and discussing their opinions. There need to be agreed rules for such discussions based on an understanding of human rights and respect for others. Learners thus learn as much from each other as from the teacher, comparing their own cultural context with the unfamiliar contexts to which language learning introduces them.

It's known that person becomes person only when he acquires language and culture of his nation. All refinements of nation's culture reflect in language, which is specific and unique. Huge part of information about the World comes to person through linguistic channel that's why person lives rather in the world of concepts, created by him for intellectual, spiritual and social needs, than in the world of objects and things; enormous information comes to him through a word and human's success in society depends on that how good he possessed the language, and not so much on possession of cultural speech, but rather on his abilities to understand secrets of language. Philosophers even say that understanding thoroughly a word which names any object or event, it's possible to say that it become easier to capture the real world.

One of the most valuable source of the information about the culture and mentality of the nation are phraseological units, metaphors, symbols and others,

because they keep the myths, legends and traditions of the target culture. Well-known Russian linguist B.A.Larin wrote: "Phraseological units always indirectly reflect the nation's outlook, social system, and ideology of its epoch". The same can be said about metaphors, symbols and others.

For native speaker the mother tongue represents a form of the conceptualization of the world, characteristic for the given culture. The system of values, created within the culture, has its reflection in the language. Moreover, according to W. von Humboldt, each language reflects some definite worldview. Consequently 'to the extent perception and activities of a person depend on his views'; person's attitude towards "objects" is completely defined by the language. The same can be said about the famous statement of H. G. Gadamer 'the tradition in which we live', as it comes from the correspondence of Gadamer with V. Malakhov, implies, first of all 'linguistic tradition'. Namely V. Malakhov comments the thesis in the following way: 'Our reasoning and superstitions are determined by the language we think at. That means that, firstly, our thoughts – at pre-predication level – are defined by the inner structures of the native language. Secondly, our reasoning – 'the experience of reasoning' is determined by 'the experience of the language' – by the history of the culture created in that language'. Similarly, according to the so called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, language and mode of thinking are closely interconnected. As 'there are no symbols before the speaking man, though the symbol itself has much deeper roots; and the language is the instrument where the universe, desires, imagination find their expression; we inevitably need a word to reproduce the world and make it sacred', the cultural values, ideals, guidelines, the opinion of a man about the universe and its role in this universe find their realization in the language: the language reflects the fundamental values of the given culture and at the same time forms them. Thus, for the native speaker the mother language represents a form for the conceptualization of the world, characteristic for that given culture.

## II. CHAPTER     Developments of education in Intercultural language learning

## II. 1. Intersection of culture and language: Intercultural Language Learning Theory

The imprecise nature of definitions of intercultural language learning is a factor affecting effective communication of its goals to teachers. Intercultural language learning is a language learning which develops an insider perspective on the target culture

• skills in contextual knowledge of the target language and culture

• a view of culture as embedded in the language

• reflective critical understanding of one's own primary language(s) and culture(s).

In practice, this may be, for example, designing learning experiences where classroom time is spent in deliberate exploration of cultural values implied in spoken or written texts, and consideration of how these values may differ from the home culture.

Language learning topic areas, such as homes, schools, leisure, food, festivals, social problems, are approached by considering the relevant practice of both the home culture and the target culture, making active connections in reflecting on similarities and differences in practice[1]. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their progressive understanding in language learning tasks. Their understanding is validated and rewarded in assessment strategies.

In the English as a Foreign Language field, writers such as Corbett (2003) describe a wide range of intercultural teaching strategies such as developing critical visual literacy (the reflective interpretation of images and media), ethnographic approaches, awareness of genres and conversation modes.

Scarino et al. (2007) situate intercultural language learning not as a new pedagogy, but as a new 'stance' or orientation in teachers. Through both demonstration of their own interculturality and deliberate program design, teachers

---

[1] http://www.twirpx.com

facilitate critical thinking and development of perspective in their students. He describes the innovations of intercultural language teaching as:

• positioning the student in authentic situations, not pseudo or 'pretend' roles

• the development of teacher questions which elicit student analysis of usage and of meaning

• a shift from purely descriptive use of language to conceptual use.

The researcher similarly suggests that better definition of this term will be for teachers an important element in more effectively describing and recognizing the desired student outcomes of intercultural language learning.

The concept of the native speaker is used primarily with respect to linguistic competence. It is argued that the native speaker 'knows' the language of a country intuitively and is an authority on the language in a way which a non-native speaker can never hope to attain. There can be debate about this view of the native speaker as an authority whom learners must try to imitate even though they can never quite reach the same level of intuitive knowledge. Whatever the merits of this view, however, it cannot be transferred to the culture(s) of a country,

for two main reasons:

- people who live in a particular country do not know intuitively or otherwise the whole of 'the culture' of that country because there are in fact many cultures within a country

- unlike language which is largely acquired by the age of 5, cultural learning goes on throughout life as individuals pass from one section of a society to another or from one social group to another, or as they move into new social groups each with their own beliefs, values and behaviours, i.e. their own culture. So an individual native speaker cannot be an authority on the cultures of a country and cannot give authoritative views on what is 'right' or 'wrong' as might be possible with language. Furthermore, intercultural competence is only partially a question of knowledge, and it is the other dimensions which must be given importance in the teaching and learning process. These *dimensions* are however not automatically acquired by the native speaker since they focus on how people interact with other cultures. So a

native speaker who has never ventured out of their country or even out of their restricted local society, does not have these other *perspective* which are crucial to intercultural competence. What the teacher should ask is not how much more information about a country and its cultures can I include in the syllabus, but how can I develop those other competences which will help learners to interact successfully with people of other cultures and identities. There is therefore a shift from the information based approach to an approach which involves analysing cultural products. This has an advantage of teaching analytical skills which are much less 'perishable' than just facts, and which are flexible enough to keep up with constant cultural change, and can be applied to a

wide range of 'cultural products'. Thus information only becomes 'food for thought' whose importance may be temporary and transitory.

The set programme of study is likely to be based on themes as well as grammatical structures. Textbooks can be presented in a way that suggests that the materials are authoritative and definitive or in an intercultural and critical perspective. When developing intercultural skills, teachers can start from the theme and content in the text-book, and then encourage learners to ask further questions and make comparisons. Themes treated in text-books can lend themselves to development in an intercultural and critical perspective. The key principle is to get learners to compare the theme in a familiar situation with examples from an unfamiliar context. For instance the theme of sport can be examined from many perspectives, including:

a) Gender – are there sports that are, in the familiar context or in the unfamiliar context, predominantly played by men or by women? Are things changing?

b) Age – are there sports for younger people and older people?

c) Region – are there local sports? Do people, including the learners, identify with local teams? Do some teams have a particular cultural tradition?

d) Religion – are there religious objections to playing sport, or days when some people choose not to do sport because of religious observance?

e) Racism – is this found in spectator sports? are the players of foreign teams, or foreign players in local teams always treated with respect? Are there incidents of racist chants or insults? Other themes e.g. food, homes, school, tourism, leisure, can receive a similarly critical perspective.[1]

Grammatical exercises can reinforce prejudice and stereotypes or challenge them. For instance female subjects may be linked to stereotypically female activities or actions (Mary likes cooking; John likes football); stereotyping generalizations may be encouraged about groups (The French like…; Germans are…..; Older people…..). Teachers can encourage learners to comment on such statements and challenge them. Similar exercises can be proposed, which include a broader view of culture (e.g. use a wider range of names; include activities more likely to be enjoyed by minority groups, or clothes worn by minorities; include a wide range of names of countries and peoples, not just European and North American). Starting from the exercises proposed by the text-book, **learners can devise further exercises**, reinforcing the same grammatical structures, but using a different range of contexts and examples. They can then swap exercises and work on examples provided by other learners. One important contribution to an intercultural perspective is the inclusion of **vocabulary that helps learners talk about cultural diversity**. This can include terms such as: human rights; equality; dignity; gender; bias; prejudice; stereotype; racism; ethnic minority; and the names of ethnic groups, including white groups.

A set curriculum or program of study can be modified and challenged by simple techniques which make learners aware of the implicit values and meanings in the material they are using.

## Language and culture: problems of interaction.

Language is that problem of interrelation which lays on the surface of person's culture life, therefore since XIX century (J.Grimm, R.Raek, V.Humboldt, A.A.Potebnja) and to this day, language and culture interactions is one of central in linguistics. The first attempts of the decision of this problem have shown in

---

[1] Byram, M., & Morgan, C., (1994) *Teaching and Learning Language and Culture*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

V.Humboldt's (1985) works which substantive provisions of the concept can be reduced to the following:

1) material and spiritual culture are embodied in language;

2) any culture is national, its national character is expressed in language by means of special vision of the world; internal specific view of the world is inherent for every language;

3) language is an expression of "national spirit», its culture;

4) language is a mediating link between the person and the world surrounding it.

The best minds of XIX century (V.Humboldt, A.A.Potebnja) treated language as spiritual force. Language is such environment surrounding us, out of which and without which participation we cannot live. As V.Humboldt wrote, language is «the world lies between the world of the external phenomena and private world of the person». Hence, being the environment of our dwelling, language does not exist out of us as an objective reality, it is in ourselves, in our consciousness, our memory; it changes the outlines with each movement of thought, with each new welfare role.

Within the limits of the second approach Sapir and Whorf School, various schools of neogumbolts, developed a so-called hypothesis of a linguistic relativity investigation of this problem.

At the heart of this hypothesis the belief lays, that what people see the world differently - through a prism of the native language. For its supporters the real world exists so far as it is reflected in language. But if each language reflects the reality in the way inherent only for it, hence, languages differ with their «language pictures of the world».

However, as a society's economy and technology increase in complexity, the number of color terms usually also increases. That is to say, the spectrum of visible light gets subdivided into more categories. As the environment changes, culture and language typically respond by creating new terminology to describe it.

In hypothesis of Byram following substantive provisions are allocated: 1. Language causes a way of thinking of the people speaking on it. 2. The way of

knowledge of the real world depends on in what languages learners think. «We dismember the nature in a direction prompted by our language. We allocate in the world of the phenomena those or other categories and types at all because they are axiomatic, on the contrary, the world appears to us as a kaleidoscopic stream of impressions which should be organized in our consciousness, and it means basically - the language system stored in our consciousness. We dismember the world, we will organize it in concepts and we distribute values so, instead of differently, basically because we are participants of the agreement ordering similar ordering. This agreement is valid for certain language collective and is fixed in system of models of our language».

Verbal illusions play the big role in creation of social stereotypes, for example, national stereotypes of "German", «Chukchi», "Caucasians" who form national prejudices. Verbal stamps which paint the world in the necessary color take root in minds of people: the light future, great indestructible friendship of the people, great accomplishments etc. It is not casual that governors of the totalitarian states paid special attention to language: Lenin's struggle for language "clearing", Stalin's article about language, Brezhnev's struggle against "infection" of language with foreign lexicon etc.

There are many ways of theorizing the relationship between the social and the cultural. In this limited context, we just want to stress that all societal life may be considered as both social and cultural.

The analysis of social life typically deals with relational, temporal and spatial aspects of activities, institutions and structures, whereas the analysis of cultural life typically deals with the production and reproduction of meaning and representations of various realities. The two sides cannot be separated from each other. All social life carries meaning, and all exchanges and negotiations of meaning are embedded in more or less shifting social structures and relations of power.

When we focus on language as a means of forming meaning, we enter an intellectual tradition very different from the sociolinguistic approach we have

just outlined. The intimate connections between (specific) languages and (specific) cultures has been a fundamental theme in the nation building process in Europe since the late 18th century, not least in the German form of national romanticism. Foreign language studies since the 19th century have been deeply influenced by this figure of thought, and are just beginning to question the national paradigm and look for alternative ways of conceptualizing the study of language, literature and culture.

Nowadays, the most usual and easy way of dealing with the relationship between language and culture is to state that it is a complex relationship, thus verbalizing the difficulties of coming to grips with this thorny question. Those who do formulate an opinion on the issue may largely be characterized as holding one of two opposite positions:

· language and culture are inseparable

The first view is associated with the cultural turn in linguistics since the 1980s, and is maintained in various forms in research disciplines such as linguistic anthropology, translation studies, and studies of intercultural communication. This is of course also a popular belief among people in general, not least in Europe in the present process of political integration of nation states in a larger union. The second view is mostly associated with the study of English as an international language. In this case it is maintained that languages - and especially English - should be seen as flexible instruments of communication that may in principle be used with any subject matter by anybody anywhere in the world.

The first one emphasizes that language is culture-bound, and one is not far from a conception of a closed universe of language, people, nation, culture, history, mentality and land. This position is totally at odds with the social and transnational view of language. The other position claims that language is culturally neutral. Language is seen as a code, and one is not far from a reconstitution of the classical structuralist conception of the autonomy of language. To this we would say that no language is culturally neutral. All natural languages (i.e. their users) constantly produce and reproduce culture (i.e. meaning).

For many people, language is not just the medium of culture but also is a part of culture. It is quite common for immigrants to a new country to retain their old customs and to speak their first language amid fellow immigrants, even if all present are comfortable in their new language. This occurs because the immigrants are eager to preserve their own heritage, which includes not only customs and traditions but also language. This is also seen in many Jewish communities, especially in older members:  Linguistic differences are also often seen as the mark of another culture, and they very commonly create divisiveness among neighboring peoples or even among different groups of the same nation. A good example of this is in Canada, where French-speaking natives of Quebec clash with the English-speaking majority. This sort of conflict is also common in areas with a great deal of tribal warfare. It is even becoming an issue in America as speakers of standard American English - mainly whites and educated minorities - observe the growing number of speakers of Black English vernacular. Debates are common over whether it is proper to use "Ebonics" in schools, while its speakers continue to assert that the dialect is a fundamental part of the "black culture".

L.Elemsev expressed an idea that language and reality are structurally similar and language structure can be equating to the structure of the reality or can be regarded as its deformed reflection.

E.F.Tarasov notices, that language is included in culture as sign "body" (meaning) is a cultural subject, in which language and communicative ability of the person are featured, value of a sign is also cultural formation which arises only in human activity. As well culture is included into language, because it is shaped in text.[1]

At the same time, language and culture interaction is needed to be investigated extremely cautiously, remembering, that they are different semiotics systems. For the sake of justice it is necessary to tell, that, being semiotics systems, they have much in common:

---

[1] Kramsch, C. (1993a) *Context and Culture in Language Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

1) culture, no less than language, are the forms of consciousness displaying outlook of the person;

2) culture and language exist in dialogue between themselves;

3) the subject of culture and language is always the individual or society, the person or a society;

4) norm is general for language and culture line;

5) a historicism is one of intrinsic properties of culture and language;

6) "dynamic-static" is inherent for language and culture.

Language and culture are interconnected: 1) in communicative processes; 2) in ontogenesis (formation of language abilities of the person); 3) in phylogenesis (formation of the patrimonial, public person).

These two essences differ in following: 1) language as a phenomenon installation on the mass addressee while in culture the elitism is prevailed; 2) though culture is a sign system (like language), but it is incapable for self realization; 3) as it was already marked by us, language and culture are different semiotics systems.

These reasoning allow drawing a conclusion that culture is not isomorphic (absolutely corresponds), and homomorphic to language (is structurally similar). The picture which shows a language and culture parity, is extremely difficult and multidimensional. For today some approaches were outlined in the decision of this problem.

Other approaches were developed basically by Russian philosophers. The meaning of this approach in the following: the interrelation of language and culture appears movement in the same side; as language reflects the reality, and culture is the integral component of this reality which faces the person, also language is a simple reflection of culture. Reality changes, cultural-national stereotypes vary also, language changes also. One of the attempts to answer a question on influence of separate fragments (or spheres) cultures on language functioning was issued in functional stylistics of the Prague school and modern sociolinguistics.

Thus, if culture influence on language quite obviously (it is studied in the first approach) the question on return influence of language on culture while remains opened. It makes essence of the second approach to a problem of a parity of language and culture.

There are many ways in which the phenomena of language and culture are intimately related. Both phenomena are unique to humans and have therefore been the subject of a great deal of anthropological, sociological, and even memetic study. Language, of course, is determined by culture, though the extent to which this is true is now under debate. The converse is also true to some degree: culture is determined by language - or rather, by the replicators that created both, memes.

Extreme cultural relativism of this type has now been clearly refuted. Eskimos use at most twelve different words for snow, which is not many more than English speakers and should be expected since they exist in a cold climate. The color-relativity hypothesis has now been completely debunked by more careful, thorough, and systematic studies which show a remarkable similarity between the ways in which different cultures divide the spectrum.

Of course, there are ways in which culture really does determine language, or at least certain facets thereof. Obviously, the ancient Romans did not have words for radios, televisions, or computers because these items were simply not part of their cultural context. In the same vein, uncivilized tribes living in Europe in the time of the Romans did not have words for tribunes, praetors, or any other trapping of Roman government because Roman law was not part of their culture.

Our culture does, sometimes, restrict what we can think about efficiently in our own language. For example, some languages have only three color terms equivalent to black, white, and red; a native speaker of this language would have a difficult time expressing the concept of "purple" efficiently. Some languages are also more expressive about certain topics. For example, it is commonly acknowledged that Yiddish is a linguistic champion, with an amazing number of words referring to the simple mind.

We carry the further reasoning on interrelation of language and culture to the third approach. Language is the fact of the culture because: 1) it a component of culture which we inherit from our ancestors; 2) language is the basic tool by means of which we acquire culture; 3) language is major of all phenomena of a cultural order, if we wish to understand essence of culture - a science, religion, the literature we should consider these phenomena as the codes developed model. Therefore the conceptual judgment of culture can occur only by means of a natural language.

According to our concept, as far as each native speaker is simultaneously the culture bearer and language, signs get ability to carry out function of signs on culture and by that serve as means of representation of the basic installations of culture. For this reason language is capable to display cultural-national mentality of its speaker. The culture is correlated with language through the concept of spaces.

So, language is a component of culture and its tool is the reality of our spirit, a culture face; it expresses bared specific lines of national mentality.

## II. 2. Linking teacher interculturality and the student's intercultural competence

The teachers' perceptions of their own interculturality and the extent of their own reflective ability may be facilitating influences on learner development. Kramsch (1987) questions whether teachers possess enough meta-awareness of their own culture to be able to engage with their students in more than superficial comparisons across cultures. De Mejia (2002) and Scarino (2007) both hold that teachers need awareness of their intra and interculturality, and of 'how they feel about using their two languages in the classroom

Intercultural competence involves attitudes, knowledge, skills and values. Language teaching classrooms are usually places where knowledge and skills are the focus, and where attitude change or re-consideration of values happen only incidentally. Attitudes and values are not usually the focus of teachers' planning or the explicit objectives of a lesson and there is very little pedagogical theory to help teachers plan for the affective aspect of learners' development. In a study visit or exchange however, it is the affective aspect of the experience which is likely to be the most important. Learners experience some degree of **'culture shock'**. Young children can feel homesick and even physically ill as a consequence of suddenly being in an entirely unfamiliar environment - and so can adults!

So teachers have a responsibility to prepare for this reaction, and to take advantage of the opportunity it gives to help learners to decenter, *to make the strange familiar and the familiar strange*. In other words, the study visit or exchange is an opportunity to promote.. This is best done through **experiential learning**, where learners can experience situations which make demands upon their emotions and feelings and then reflect upon that experience and its meaning for them, thus combining the affective and the cognitive. The teacher's role is to structure the learning experience, to ensure that the 'culture shock' is productive and positive, and not overwhelming and negative, and to help learners to analyse and learn from their responses to a new environment.

The major opportunity offered by the study visit or exchange is the development of the skills involved in the 'discovery' of a new environment. Learners can be trained in simple or complex skills, depending on their maturity and language skills, with which they can investigate the environment, look for what is unfamiliar and for explanations which help them to understand. The explanations may come from analysis of documents or from interviewing, formally or informally, those who live in that environment. This is also the opportunity for **cooperation with teachers of other subjects**, especially geography, history, and other social and human sciences, since learners acquire skills of social investigation in those subjects too: doing surveys, analyzing statistics, reading historical and contemporary texts, both factual and fictional. It is important to remember that there are **three phases** for any study visit or exchange:

– in the **preparatory phase**, learners need to externalise their thoughts, anxieties and excitements about their visit. For example, ask everyone in a class to stand around a very large piece of paper and write or draw the first thing that comes into their mind when they think about the place they are going to. Later they can look back at this and compare and contrast expectation and experience, but it also helps the teacher to know during this in the **fieldwork phase**, learners are surrounded by and immersed in a new environment and learn consciously and unconsciously through all the senses. There should however be opportunity for withdrawal from the demands of being in a new environment, an opportunity for reflection alone and together with others. Learners should keep a diary as a safe metaphorical 'room' where they can express feelings and reactions. They should also be brought into a 'classroom' atmosphere with their teachers so that each individual can compare and contrast their experience and interpretation of it with that of others, and their teachers can help them with misunderstandings or other problems. This has to be done during the visit because the emotional involvement is very deep and needs to be handled immediately;

– in the **follow-up phase**, after return home, the emphasis should be on further reflection on individuals' experience during the visit and, by sharing and

comparing, on an attempt to analyse and conceptualise what has been experienced as a basis for understanding (some aspects of) the other environment and the people who live there. One very effective way of doing this is for them to prepare a presentation of their visit - both a factual account and their reactions and interpretations - to friends and family. This obliges them to de-centre, to take the perspective of their audience and think about what they need to explain to those who do not know. Much of this work can be done with the aid of **visual representations** because this removes the constraints of foreign and first language in expressing what is unfamiliar. Learners can draw, take photographs, make diagrams to capture experience and to express their feelings. It is also important to remember that, for many children, and also some adults, the study visit or exchange is the first time that they leave home, live with someone not of their family - even though they may have known them as classmates - and have to be independent. The 'shock' may be more than the new environment. It may be a in part the effect of **living in a group**, and although this is an issue which all teachers leading school groups have to meet, the responsibility for language teachers is heightened by the travel 'abroad'[1].

When two people talk to each other, they do not just *speak* to the other to exchange information, they also *see* the other as an individual and as someone who belongs to a specific social group, for example a 'worker' and an 'employer' or a 'teacher' and a 'pupil'. This has an influence on what they say, how they say it, what response they expect and how they interpret the response. In other words, when people are talking to each other their **social identities** are unavoidably part of the social interaction between them. In language teaching, the concept of **'communicative competence'** takes this into account by emphasising that language learners need to acquire not just grammatical competence but also the knowledge of what is 'appropriate' language.

---

[1] http://www.britannica.com

When two people in conversation are from different countries speaking in a language which is a foreign/second language for one of them, or when they are both speaking a language which is foreign to both of them, a **lingua franca** they may be acutely aware of their **national identities.** They are aware that at least one of them is speaking a foreign language and the other is hearing their own language being spoken by a foreigner. Often this influences what they say and how they say it because they see the other person as a representative of a country or nation. Yet this focus on national identity, and the accompanying risk of relying on **stereotypes**, reduces the individual from a complex human being to someone who is seen as representative of a country or 'culture'.

Furthermore, this simplification is reinforced if it is assumed that that learning a language involves becoming like a person from another country. Often in language teaching the implicit aim has been to imitate a **native speaker** both in linguistic competence, in knowledge of what is 'appropriate' language, and in knowledge about a country and its 'culture'. The concept of 'culture' has changed over time from emphasis on literature, the arts and philosophy to culture as a shared way of life, but the idea of imitating the native speaker has not changed and consequently native speakers are considered to be experts and the models, and teachers who are native speakers are considered to be better than non-native speakers.

In contrast the **'intercultural dimension'** in language teaching aims to develop learners as **intercultural speakers** or **mediators** who are able to engage with complexity and multiple identities and to avoid the stereotyping which accompanies perceiving someone through a single identity. It is based on perceiving the interlocutor as an individual whose qualities are to be discovered, rather than as a representative of an externally ascribed identity. Intercultural communication is communication on the basis of respect for individuals and equality of human rights as the democratic basis for social interaction. So language teaching with an intercultural dimension continues to help learners to acquire the

**linguistic competence** needed to communicate in speaking or writing, to formulate what they want to say/write in correct and appropriate ways.

But it also develops their **intercultural competence** i.e. their ability to ensure a shared understanding by people of different social identities, and their ability to interact with people as complex human beings with multiple identities and their own individuality.

Although it is not new in itself, the concept of "interculturality" has been flourishing in recent decades in language education and has led to "intercultural talk", i.e. an often uncritical, doxic ("taken for granted", cf. Maffesoli's criticism supra) and systematic use of the term intercultural This chapter is to examine how it is understood and worked upon in the field of language learning and teaching and reflect on how it could be used in higher education. Despite impulsion from the work carried out by the Council of Europe, physical and virtual hypermobilities and the internationalization of higher education; regardless of the multiple research projects and publications on the topic, interculturality does not seem to have been entirely integrated into language teaching and learning in this precise context.

High levels of criticality and reflexivity are expected from university students philological traditions, along with the academic freedom, which allows departments to decide upon their curricula and teachers to introduce objectives which seem best suited for their educational context and which are close to their own research interests, seem to have slowed down the expansion of a critical and reflexive conception of interculturality and the development of intercultural competence in higher education. In most language departments, the concept of interculturality has not had as much success as it deserves. Moreover, even when some departments include interculturality in their programmes, there is no guarantee that the concept is understood in thesame way by teachers themselves and learners: i n fact, interculturality is often confused with cultural, trans-cultural or multi-cultural approaches, which do not take on the same goals. Some teachers even assert that they incorporate "interculturality" while in fact what they

incorporate is culturalism, i.e. "grammars of cultures" or unfounded facts/stereotypes about the other.

The variety of approaches in these initiatives is so wide and eclectic that it seems difficult to provide a real synthesis.Yet, as the concept of interculturality is complex and tends to receive manifold interpretations, an archaeology of its understanding is necessary more than ever, if we wish to consider its assessment.

Intercultural competence, which is the expected outcome of the insertion of interculturality in language learning and teaching, is a vital competence in our contemporary world, especially (but not exclusively) for specialists involved in mediating between people (diplomats, language teachers, consultants, journalists, translators… ). If one introduces this competence in one's teaching, one needs to develop ways of making sure that it is developed.[1]

This chapter is theoretical and exploratory in nature. It aims to delineate different ways of working with interculturality and reflect on its assessment in language learning and teaching in higher education. Yet, most scholars who have worked on intercultural competence have warned against its assessment (Byram 1997; Kramsch 1993; Zarate & Gohard 2004): how could we possibly achieve the four criteria of reliability, validity, fairness and consistency (Tagliante 1994) for interculturality? Many scholars and practitioners have tried to implement methods for assessing intercultural competences in their teaching. First of all, there are standard cultural tests which consist of multiple-choice questions that are easy to administer and correct but which cannot provide information or evidence on somebody's intercultural competence because they only test factual knowledge, which is sometimes generalised and stereotypical – especially when it refers to anthropological culture.

### Intercultural development of teachers

Many foreign language teachers are non-native speakers of the language they are teaching and may have limited exposure to the target culture (Paige et al., 1999). Kramsch (1987b) has further questioned whether teachers have an adequate

---

[1] Byram, M., Esarte-Sarries, V., Taylor, E., & Allat (1991) Young people's perception of the other culture*s*

meta-knowledge of their own culture to be able to engage in meaningful comparisons with the other culture.

Kramsch (1993a)[1] reports that, in an intensive training seminar for language teachers, participants found that the greatest difficulty in presenting culture lay in dealing with culture-internal diversity. In part this problem derived from an inability among participants from the same national culture to be able to agree on what constituted the national culture for language teaching purposes. Kramsch argues that the important learning for teachers is that an identification of relevant culture is subjective, and no objective selection of a national culture can ever be made for pedagogical purposes. Teachers needed to realise the subjective nature of their own cultural understandings in order to begin working with culture in the classroom. Kramsch further points out that the learnings that participants gained from the process of dealing with cultural difference were:

- the notion of cultural relativity;

- a heightened awareness of the semantic mismatches which occur in translation equivalents between languages;

- an awareness of the importance of discussion and reflection in dealing with intercultural issues to prevent stereotypical representations of cultures.

The necessary learnings here are all culture-general learnings and it appears that such understandings of culture are central to the professional development of language teachers as mediators of interculturality. An exclusive focus on culture-specific learnings is likely to produce the same problems for teachers as a culture-specific focus presents for learners and result in essentialised and stereotypical views of culture which presented as accumulated facts for future recall without possibilities for intercultural exploration. As such, culture-specific professional development may increase a teacher's store of cultural facts, but may not contribute to their ability to facilitate effective cultural learning in their classrooms.

---

[1]

R. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (eds), *Foreign Language Research in a Cross-Cultural Perspective*

From a slightly different perspective, Holliday (1995) argues that for adapting one's cultural framework to those of one's learners, it is necessary to develop a conscious, reflective knowledge of one's own culture as a prerequisite for developing others' understanding of the culture. This has implications for the training of teachers who are native speakers of the languages they are to teach. The teachers have an implicit, but not necessarily explicit, understanding of their own culture and may not be able, therefore, to mediate this knowledge to learners who do not have the same cultural background. A native-speaking member of a culture is not, simply by virtue of the fact he/she belongs to that culture, adequately equipped to transmit that culture to others.

Papademetre and Scarino (Papademetre, 2000; Papademetre & Scarino, 2000) have developed an approach to in-service professional development of language teachers, which explicitly focuses on creating awareness of the nature of the relationship between language and culture. The emphasis here is not on developing specific knowledge about the target culture but rather on coming to understand the culturally determined and culturally variable nature of language and communication. This approach to professional development is an attempt to overcome the problems inherent in culture-specific professional development by dealing explicitly with the problem of essentialised and stereotypical views of culture as the starting-point of the professional development to which culturally specific information can be assimilated.

Their work clearly demonstrates that appropriate professional development for language teachers is an extended process of reflection rather than a short-term process of presenting cultural information. An appropriate model of professional development for language and culture teachers involves the development of teachers' intercultural awareness as a context for dealing with sociocultural knowledge. As such, approach to professional development involves developing in teachers the skills that they need to instill in learners rather than simply upgrading teachers' factual knowledge of the target culture.

## III. 3. The role of the teacher in intercultural development

This section briefly reviews research literature offering insight into how teacher behaviour, choice of pedagogy, and understanding of interculturality may effect the development of intercultural competence in students. It also briefly reviews three key some documents which have been used in the current research. Liddicoat et al. (2003)[1] assert that intercultural language learning begins with the teacher's understanding of 'his/her primary enculturation in relation to his/her target language(s) and culture(s)' (2003, p. 63) – that is, the teacher's own intra- and interculturality, cultural curiosity, sense of purpose, and how they represent this intercultural stance to students. It is described as 'the construction, together, of their knowledge, understanding values, and their identity, both in the present and over time' (Liddicoat et al., 2003, p. 62).　One of the few research projects in this area, Ryan (1998) has studied how teacher beliefs about culture affect classroom interaction. It may be challenging for both teacher and students to engage in learning about cultural context, meaning of culture, and in critical reflection. Ryan asserts that teachers and their 'knowledge to offer' are very closely connected with intercultural competence in students. Sercu's (2006) extensive study of language teachers showed that teachers' profiles did not meet expectations of the knowledge, skills and attitudes associated with intercultural competence. Sercu (2006) proposes that teachers require a new professional identity and skills in their role as teachers of intercultural competence. Along with the research on identity in language learners, research in language teacher identity and behaviour may become a focal point for the importance of the intercultural dimension is that it is a vision of language teaching and learning which is goes beyond the concept of language learning as just acquiring skills in a language, accompanied by some knowledge about a country where the language is spoken. Intercultural competence is different from factual knowledge about another country. So along with the linguistic competence teachers should be able to

---

[1] Lo Bianco, A.J. Liddicoat, & C. Crozet (eds), *Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 1-20). Canberra

develop in their learners the intercultural competence which enables them to interact with people of different cultural backgrounds, multiple identities and a specific individuality.

This has a lot of implications for the priorities in teacher training. However, even if the curriculum for initial teacher education institutions is revised (which will certainly take time), many parents, learners, teachers, and other professionals feel the need to change the ways of teaching/learning now. The question teachers ask themselves is: "How can a conscientious teacher keep a sense of direction and survive in a situation when you have to do both – teaching and learning?" The issues which need to be given priority are not the acquisition of more knowledge about a country or countries, but how to organise the classroom and classroom processes to enable learners to develop new attitudes, new skills and new critical awareness.

*Priority 1*

Developing skills of **group communication** and group work in the classroom: this includes knowing how to set procedural ground-rules and determine ways in which learners can make personal responses - not just acquire skills and information. In some countries this is familiar territory for teachers of social studies/citizenship education and similar subjects, and language teachers can learn from them. In other countries, there has been a lack of this kind of pedagogy throughout the last 70-80 years, and there is a need for innovation and experimentation which will not always be easily accepted, although experiments which have been carried out show that young people are very open to this kind of pedagogy. Teachers will need to seek **new kinds of materials** which allow learners to explore and analyse them rather than learn the information in them. Sources include the internet where it is available.

Where it is not, a challenging way of obtaining materials is to have an exchange by post with a school in another country, where for example learners choose a topic and put real objects which they think will explain the topic -

accompanied by comments written carefully to suit the language level of the recipients. The class can be in a country other than

a target language country, provided the learners are learning the same foreign language Thus even if teachers' own knowledge might be limited, their proper role is not to impart facts, but **help learners to attain the skills** that are necessary to make sense out of the facts they themselves **discover** in their study of the target culture.

Classroom procedures of team-building and project work are some of the important features of teacher education, for the objectives that are to be achieved in intercultural understanding involve **processes rather than facts**.

*Priority 2*

Since the focus is on processes and some of these involve the learners in taking risks by talking about their attitudes and views, teachers may need more opportunities to discuss psychological **self-awareness and awareness of others**. Teaching for intercultural competence involves dealing with learners' attitudes, emotions, beliefs and values. This does not imply that foreign language teachers should aim at becoming psychologists, but they should try to acquire the basic **principles of teaching when emotions and risk-taking are involved**. This may be a new area to language teachers who traditionally focus on cognitive knowledge and skills but in some countries there are other teachers who are more accustomed to this. Co-operation with such teachers or group discussions among language teachers themselves can be very helpful. It is not question of taking a course in psychology.

*Priority 3*

Taking part in international projects, professional associations, governmental initiatives, exchanges will promote all the aspects of intercultural dimension in language teaching. Such experience involves teachers in being intercultural learners themselves, in taking risks, analysing and reflecting on their own experience and learning - and drawing consequences from this for their work as teachers. International projects are sponsored by the Council of Europe, in

workshops in the European Centre for Modern Languages, and by other national and international institutions, including the European Union. The value of being involved in professional networks of this kind is as much in the experience of working with people of other professional, cultural and national identities as in the products and information acquired. Teacher should see this work as significant in their professional development.

What language teachers need for the intercultural dimension is not more knowledge of other countries and cultures, but skills in promoting an atmosphere in the classroom which allows learners to take risks in their thinking and feeling. Such skills are best developed in practice and in reflection on experience. They may find common ground in this with teachers of other subjects and/or in taking part themselves in learning **experiences which involve risk and reflection.** Teachers are not just professionals but also human beings with their own experiences and histories through which they may have acquired prejudices and stereotypes about other cultures and peoples just like any other human being. We are not always conscious of these feelings and how we express them, but a brief remark in the classroom is often remembered by learners for many years afterwards.

These remarks may be **negative or positive**. Some teachers are positively prejudiced about the countries where their target language is spoken and wish to pass this enthusiasm on to their learners. This might seen to be the role of the teacher but it is debatable whether teachers should try to influence attitudes or not[1]. So this is one of the first issues teachers need to think about. The response to this problem may be different in different countries according to their education traditions. In some countries teachers believe that they should not attempt to influence attitudes towards other countries and in fact should be careful only to deal the cognitive dimension of learning. Teachers in other countries may feel that it is part of their pedagogical responsibility to influence attitudes. Neither of these positions excludes the development of  because this is not a question of developing

---

[1] Kaplan, R.B. (1966) Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*,

particular positive (or indeed negative) attitudes towards a country or people but rather of creating curiosity and a sense of openness. People can make judgements and act upon them quickly if they use stereotypes whatever the context, not just in connection with other countries. This makes them **attractive but deceptive**. Knowledge of a more differentiated and accurate kind depends on recognizing the variation in people, but this requires more effort and is easily avoided. This is by no means to say that we can do without any stereotypes at all in foreign language teaching – after all identities are often defined in stereotypes, even by people defining themselves! The way one nation sees another is at least partly dependent on how it thinks about itself. Stereotypes are there to be challenged, for this is the only way to develop an individual who is ready to discover the essence of "others" in members of other cultures and understand the complexity they embody.

On the other hand, it is inevitable and proper that learners have views on other cultures and the values, beliefs and behaviors they embody. The question for teachers is how they respond to learners' views. Do they take a neutral position? Do they take a clear and explicit position in favour of the values in other cultures which their learners may reject? Do they allow learners' views to go unchallenged?

The concept of *savoir iterculturality* suggests that teachers should first challenge learners to make explicit the basis on which they make judgements about others, and to encourage them to be aware of the culturally-determined nature of their basis for making judgements. This not the same as challenging and criticizing learners' beliefs and basis for judgement about other cultures. It is simply an encouragement to them to see how others might consider their position, whether it is religious, secular, ethical, philosophical or pragmatic. The consequence for teachers is that they need to be aware of and decide consciously about the issues raised by their own feelings about their languages and associated cultures. Do they wish to influence their learners' attitudes? Do they wish to take a neutral position? Do they challenge their learners to make their own position explicit and if so how?

Teachers cannot be neutral on cultural issues since they respond to other cultures as human beings and not just as language teachers. They need therefore to

consider how their own stereotypes and prejudices may influence their teaching subconsciously, and what the effects of this may be on learners. They also need to reflect upon how they respond to and challenge their learners' prejudices not only as teachers but also as human beings subconsciously influenced by their experience of otherness.

## Approaches to intercultural teaching

Classrooms have been criticized as environments for culture learning, and in particular it has been argued that, because classroom teaching and learning have relied very heavily on the acquisition of knowledge about the culture, the resulting learning is superficial and does not involve reflection or the integration of new cultural knowledge with existing cultural knowledge[1]. A common motivation for including cultural knowledge in language programs is to capture students' interest in learning the target language.

The result is usually culture programs which focus on cultural themes which are of value in the cultural context of the learner, rather than those which are valued in the target culture, and often have an element of exoticism which emphasises cultural difference rather than presenting cultural differences and cultural similarities as part of a legitimate cultural comparison.

Moreover, such programs tend not to develop a consistent approach to culture and rather assemble a random collection of cultural facts which cannot be assembled into a coherent overview of culture and cultural practice. Demorgon (1989) argues that it is educationally important that the cultural identity of the learner be challenged through the education process so that it does not become too rigid, but at the same time acknowledges that this identity is fundamental and cannot be rejected even while it is being challenged. Because of this, he argues that intercultural learning must focus not only on the discovery of difference, but also on the realisation of similarity at various levels of abstraction.

---

[1] Damen, L. (1987) *Culture Learning: The Fifth Dimension in the Language Classroom*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

For example, the fact that language behaviour is culturally determined is a form of similarity between cultures at a high level of abstraction, while identical practices in the same context is a similarity at a lower level of abstraction. At very high levels of abstraction it is usually the case that cultural similarities are more noticeable than cultural differences, while at lower levels of abstraction cultural differences may be more noticeable. The instructional challenge is to deal with a range of levels of abstraction during the course of language teaching, beginning with more concrete cultural comparisons in the early stages of teaching and moving to more abstract comparisons at later levels

All learners have perceptions about their own culture which are usually to some degree stereotyped and which differ from the 'reality' of their own culture. That is, people do not experience their own culture directly, but rather through an interpretative framework in which aspects of the culture are mythologised. An example of such a mythology is the predominance of images of the bush in perceptions of Australian culture, in spite of the very high level of urbanisation that exists in  cultural 'reality'. In addition, learner are likely to have some perceptions of the target culture, again often the result of stereotypes.

 In addition, learners will also have perceptions of themselves as individuals and perceptions of others which have been developed through their socialisation in their primary culture. When learners begin to engage with another culture, these levels of culturally determined perceptions are replicated in the target culture, whose members have culturally determined perceptions of their own culture and the culture of the learner (which for them is a foreign culture) and also perceptions of self and others.

Any pedagogical approach to teaching language-and-culture requires some direct experience of the culture. At the same time, the amount of culture that can be dealt with within the context of formal language learning is limited, and there are problems in maintaining the authenticity of the contact with the culture in the classroom environment.

In spite of the difficulties of teaching culture in language classrooms, it is nonetheless important that such learning occur. In particular, it is not the case that cultural teaching can be held over until a later time. Given that language is fundamentally contexted and that a context of culture is always present in language use, failure to expose learners to appropriate cultural input leads to the development of incorrect assumptions about the target culture and the replacement of target culture norms with first culture norms (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Kramsch, 1993a; Liddicoat, 1997a). Moreover, the classroom provides advantages for culture learning in that it is a protected environment in which learners can explore culture without risking lasting repercussions from their errors.

Given the limitations and potential problems of the classroom as a culture learning environment, the potential benefits of classroom culture learning and the necessity of culture learning as a fundamental part of language learning, there has been much recent focus on developing methodologies for teaching culture in the language classroom in a way that develops reflection on authentic intercultural experiences and their integration into the cultural identity of the learner. A number of models have been developed for intercultural teaching in the context of languages education (for example, Barraja-Rohan, 1999; Byram, 1988; Byram, 1989; Crawford-Lange & Lange, 1984; Crozet, 1996; Crozet, 1998; Kramsch, 1993a; Seelye, 1994); however, all of these models have a number of common features, which can be seen as the basis for a methodology known as 'intercultural language teaching'. These common features are:

• exploration by the learners of the target language and culture and of their own language and culture;

• discovery of the relationship between language and culture;

• developing conceptual and analytic tools for comparing and understanding cultures; Such learning implies that there are interactive opportunities for learners to explore the culture they are learning through exposure to the practices and understandings of members of the target culture (Jurasek, 1995).

Existing pedagogies within the communicative framework will not achieve the sorts of learning that are being proposed by these models, instead a new pedagogy is being developed at present to enable such learning to take place in classroom contexts.

In order to teach culture as a dynamic set of practices, intercultural approaches to language teaching have established four main activities as a core set of principles for language and culture acquisition (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Liddicoat, 2002b)[1]:

• acquisition about cultures

• comparing cultures

• exploring cultures

• finding one's own 'third place' between cultures.

An important dimension of intercultural language teaching is that it is possible to understand another culture only by comparing it with one's own. Intercultural language teaching, however, does not assume that students know their own culture, in fact, because our cultural practices are largely invisible to us, we do not usually see them as cultural and constructed. As a result in order to learn about another culture we need to learn about our own culture at the same time by comparing our own culture with the target culture. In order to achieve this, intercultural language teaching argues for a set of principles for developing an overall approach to teaching culture within language. The principles include:

1. Culture is integrated into language macroskills not a separate macroskill and the culture needs to be taught simultaneously with and integrated into language teaching.

2. Culture is taught from the beginning of language learning and is not delayed until learners have acquired some of the language. The key concern here is

---

[1] Crozet , C., Liddicoat , A.J. & Lo Bianco, J. 1999, 'Interculturalcompetence: From language policy to language education'. In J. Lo

- 54 -

that delaying input about culture does not delay culture learning, but rather leads to false culture learning as a result of a lack of awareness of difference and does not begin the process of thinking about one's own culture.

3. The bilingual speaker is the norm and learners are expected to become competent users of a complex linguistic repertoire involving multiple languages.

4. Language acquisition involves intercultural exploration: it is an active interaction with other attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours, not a passive reception of facts. Intercultural learning comes through interaction, not simply through exposure and analysis (Bolten, 1993; Knapp & Knapp-Potthof, 1990).

5. Culture learning primarily involves learning how to discover new information about the culture while engaging with the culture. No program of teaching culture can ever cover a whole culture and, as a result, factual approaches to culture teaching are of limited future benefit for the learner.

On the basis of these principles, Liddicoat and Crozet (Crozet, 1996; Crozet, 1998; Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999; Liddicoat, 2002b; Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001) have proposed a model for intercultural language teaching which consists of a four-step process of awareness raising, experimentation, production, and feedback.

**Awareness raising**: The awareness-raising stage is where the learners are introduced to new input about language and culture. New input should be introduced through participative tasks which encourage the learner to compare the new culture with their own practices and language use.

Ideally learners should have an opportunity to notice differences between the new input and their own culture, with the teacher supporting them in noticing differences. Schmidt (1993) has made the argument that language learning happens most readily when students themselves notice things about the language, and this applied equally to language and culture learning (Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001). It is especially important that students have the opportunity to think about and talk

about what they notice, either in their first language or, if their proficiency is adequate, in the second language.

Students' noticings should be followed up wherever possible with an explanation of the function of particular actions in the target language to assist them in developing an explanatory framework for understanding what the speaker is doing. This explanation does not have to be deep, nor does it have to be detailed. Most importantly, it needs to be seen as being a normal way of acting and being. Some teachers may worry that as non-native speakers, they do not have enough insight into the other culture to teach it. However, being a native speaker is not always an advantage, because in an intercultural approach the teacher needs to know something about both cultures. Because ILT is comparative and it is based on learning to notice differences, the important element is the exploration of difference rather than teaching difference, and this is something that teachers and students can do together. In particular, teachers' experiences of intercultural communication, especially of problems, can lead to insights about language and culture.  For awareness raising, authentic video materials are particularly useful, as are cartoons and stories.

**Production**: In this stage students put together the elements they have been trying out in the experimentation phase and integrate the information they have acquired in actual language use. The best way to achieve this is through involvement in a focused language task. For spoken language this can be done through role-plays, preferably unscripted role plays if the students are at a stage to be able to do these. In the role-plays they will need to act out the cultural and linguistic information that they have been practising. In essence, they try out being a native speaker of the language. The aim is for them to experience culturally different ways of interacting. In part this involves the students in experiencing the impact of using a different set of cultural rules on their identity and experiencing the comfort or discomfort this can bring.

**Feedback**: This is an important part of the activity and involves reflecting on the experience of acting like a native speaker in the production phase. During this

phase the student discusses with the teacher how he/she felt about speaking and acting in a particular way. This allows the teacher to comment on the language use of the student, but also allows the student to express how he/she felt. Some aspects of using a new language and culture are difficult or uncomfortable, others can be liberating. In the feedback it is important to recognise the positives and negatives students express and to acknowledge the validity of these feelings. The feedback should allow the student to work towards discovering a 'third place': a place of comfort between their first language and culture and their second.

The use of the Internet as a source of cultural learning highlights a central problem in the use of any authentic materials as cultural input. While authentic materials are undeniably constructed within a culturally rich environment, simple exposure to such materials does not and cannot constitute cultural learning. Kramsch (1991c) and Robinson (1981) have shown that the use of authentic materials must be accompanied by an understanding of how one derives meaning from them and the possibility of inaccurate or monocultural interpretations of the materials is always present. Approaches using authentic materials (for example Crozet, 1995; Kramsch, 1993b) have shown that in using authentic materials for culture teaching, a careful, reflective analysis is needed to ensure that culturally useful learning does occur.

## EXPLICIT TEACHING OF CULTURE IS A CENTRAL PART OF LANGUAGE TEACHING

The ultimate goal of Languages teaching and learning is to be able to communicate in another language. Cultures shape the way language is structured and the ways in which language is used.

Cultural knowledge is not something that learners can just pick up. In fact, cultural differences may often go unnoticed by learners until they actually create a problem. If learners are going to develop their cultural knowledge about the target language group, they need to be helped, through explicit teaching, to notice when their culture is similar to or differs from that of others. Languages teaching has

usually aimed at making the learner as much like a native speaker as possible. This is both an unrealistic goal, because we hardly ever achieve it, and an inappropriate one because it does not reflect the social and cultural reality of using a second language.

When someone speaks in their second language, they do not abandon their own thoughts, feelings and values and assimilate themselves to the other culture. Instead of aiming for a native speaker norm, language teaching can more profitably aim for a bilingual norm: that is developing a speaker who is comfortable and capable in an intercultural context.

Most learners have not had opportunities to learn about the way in which their own culture works and how their own language reflects their culture, and without this knowledge it is difficult to come to terms with a different culture. The most important cultural learning that can come about in the Languages classroom is that cultures are relative, not absolute. Exposure to another culture provides an opportunity for comparison with one's own culture, just as learning another language provides opportunities to develop metalinguistic awareness. A deeper understanding of one's own culture and the ways in which cultures vary may be a long-lasting outcome of Languages learning.

## LEARNING HOW TO KEEP LEARNING

It is true that we cannot teach everything about culture. Cultures vary from person to person, from group to group, and over time. There is no way to transmit something as complex and dynamic in a classroom. What we can do in the classroom is help learners develop ways of finding out more about the culture they are learning by analyzing their experiences and developing their awareness

# CONCLUSION

In the present qualification work we attempted to investigate the stimulus of intercultural teaching and using it at English language lessons, one of the main problems in theory of English language teaching. We chose the theme of our qualification work because we interested in it. We used different kind of references to investigate the role of culture in teaching language. There is a match between the student and the students' intelligences. Intercultural learning should be an integral part of a lesson, providing the possibility of intensive practice while at the same time immensely enjoyable for both students and teachers. The material in between those anchors covered the theory and research on the brain and intercultural and the extensive literature on how videos have been used in specific disciplines over four decades. The research investigation of learning provides an empirical foundation for their use in teaching, especially with introductory courses and novice learners, to increase memory, comprehension, understanding, and deeper learning.

Examples of research in a variety of content areas were identified. Draw on your creativity, imagination, and artistic gifts in applying these methods and those of your own choosing to your teaching. That will inevitably make the greatest difference in your classroom.

Language and culture are so intricately intertwined; we should concern ourselves with culture because learning the cultural knowledge and skills is required for being a competent L2 language learner. Intercultural awareness, learning perspectives, knowledge and skills are the key components for an effective cross-cultural communication. To teach in intercultural communication is not only about developing cross-cultural understanding, but also has a great impact on the way we think, feel  and above all, on the way we act.

This review of contemporary TEFL principle, aims to provide a framework for considering the context in which future intercultural awareness may take place in cross-cultural communication, A review of the issues in English language learning and the classroom context highlights the particular and distinctive

English-specific approaches to addressing the issues of effective teaching and learning in school based multicultural contexts. Moreover, Language teachers ought to receive both experiential and academic training, with the aim of becoming 'mediators in culture teaching. That is, how these manifest themselves in linguistic categories and forms. Teaching and learning cultural communication based on the interactive way is the perspectives and exchanging. Language educators should contribute to learners' understanding that begins with awareness of self and leads to awareness to others There is certainly room for improvement in order for things go well for the future.

# LIST OF USED LITERATURE

**The articles in the magazine and in the newspaper.**

1. [1]Karimov I. A. Ilmiy – tadqiqot faoliyatini takominlashtirish to'g'risida //"Xalq so'zi gazetasi", 2002 yil, 15 mart.

2. Forum English teaching . July 2002. Volume 40. Number 3 page 40.

**Uzbek and Russian literatures**

3. Ў. Хошимов, И. Ёқубов. Инглиз тили ўқитиш методикаси. 2003 Тошкент.

3. Ишмухаммедов Р, Абдуқодироа А. (2008) Таълимда инновацион технологиялар. Тошкент .

4. Пассов Е.И. Коммуникативный метод обучения иноязычному говорению. – Москва: Просвещение. 1991. – 323 с.

5. Рогова Г.В. Верещагина И. Н. Методика обучения английскому языку на начальном этане средней школы. – М: Просвещение. 1988. – 185 с.

**Foreign literatures**

6. Byram, M. (1999) Questions of identity in foreign language learning. J. Lo

7. Byram, M., Esarte-Sarries, V., Taylor, E., & Allat (1991) Young people's perception of the other culture*s* (pp. 103-119). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

8. Byram, M., & Morgan, C., (1994) *Teaching and Learning Language and Culture*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

9. Carroli, P., Hillman, R., & Maurer, L. (1999) Australian perspectives on (inter)national narratives. J. Lo Bianco, A.J. Liddicoat, & C. Crozet (eds), *Striving for the third place Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 155-166). Canberra: Language Australia.

10. Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of a Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

11. Crawford-Lange, L.M., & Lange, D.L. (1984) Doing the unthinkable in the language classroom: A process for integrating language and culture. T.V.

Higgins (ed.), *Teaching for Proficiency: The Organising Principle* (pp. 139-177). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

12. Crozet, C. (1996) Teaching verbal interaction and culture in the language classroom. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 2:37-58.

13. Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A.J. (1999) The challenge of intercultural language teaching: Engaging with culture in the classroom. (pp. 113-126). Canberra: Language Australia.

14. Damen, L. (1987) *Culture Learning: The Fifth Dimension in the Language Classroom*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

15. Davies, A. (1991) *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

16. Gipps C. 1999. Socio-cultural aspects of assessment. In A. Iran-Nejad and P. D. Pearson (eds) *Review of Research in Education*. Washington. American Educational Research Association.

17. Gumperz, J.J. (1982b) *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

18. Hannigan, T.P. (1990) Traits, attitudes and skills that are related to intercultural effectiveness and their implications for cross-cultural training: A review of the literarture. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14,2:89-111.

19. Holliday, A.R. (1995) Handing over the project: An exercise in restraint. *System*, 23,1:57-68.

20. Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J.D. (1992) *A Framework for Testing Cross-Cultural Pragmatics*. Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Centre, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

21. Hymes, D. (1987) Communicative competence. U. Ammon, N. Dittmar & K.J. Mattheier (eds), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (pp. 219-229). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

22. Kaplan, R.B. (1966) Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16:1-20.

23. Kramsch, C. (1991b) Culture in language learning: A view from the United States. K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (eds), *Foreign Language Research in a Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 217-240). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

24. Kramsch, C. (1991c) The order of discourse in language teaching. B.F. Freed (ed.), *Foreign Language Acquisition Research and the Classroom* (pp. 191-204). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

25.  Kramsch, C. (1993a) *Context and Culture in Language Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

26. Crozet , C., Liddicoat , A.J. & Lo Bianco, J. 1999, 'Interculturalcompetence: From language policy to language education'. In J. Lo

27. Lo Bianco, A.J. Liddicoat, & C. Crozet (eds), *Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 1-20). Canberra: Language Australia.

28. Richards J.C. Communicative Language Teaching Today. – Cambridge Univ. Press. 2000. – 46 p.

29. Kaplan, R.B. (1966) Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*,

**Internet materials.**

29.http://www.durov.com

30.http://www.britannica.com

31.http://www.en.wikipedia.org/auxiliary_verbs

32.http://www.twirpx.com

33. http://www.online-english-grammar.com

34. http://www.uz-translations.net

35.http://www. Bankreferatov.ru