

INTEGRATING INTERCULTURAL LEARNING IN ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC ACADEMIC PURPOSES

MICHAEL JOSEPH ENNIS

LANGUAGE CENTRE, FREE UNIVERSITY OF BOZEN-BOLZANO

Abstract

This chapter describes the application of an integrated approach to teaching foreign languages and intercultural competence to English for Specific Academic Purposes. The chapter summarizes how aspects of intercultural learning were integrated in an English for Tourism Studies course offered within the framework of a Bachelor's Degree program in Tourism, Sport, and Event Management at a trilingual university in northern Italy. After an overview of the most common approaches, models, and methods used to teach culture and intercultural competence in foreign language education in Europe and North America, the chapter discusses the reasons these tend to be ineffective in this unique learning context: namely due to their separate treatment of language and culture, which would require the reallocation of scarce instructional hours from language learning to intercultural learning. The chapter then briefly summarizes a fully integrated model of teaching language, culture, and communication as a more viable alternative. The chapter concludes with a description of a sample lesson as a demonstration of how intercultural learning was integrated without losing focus on learning specific language features, discourse patterns, and communication skills, which are necessary in all ESAP contexts.

Keywords: English for Specific (Academic) Purposes; English for Tourism (Studies); Integrated/Integrative Approaches to Language and Culture; Intercultural Competence; Intercultural Education

Integrated approaches to teaching language and culture in foreign language education

Culture has always been an important concept in foreign language teaching and learning. Yet the working definition of culture, the prominence of culture in syllabi and curricula, and the methods for integrating culture in language education have varied greatly across time and context. For example, when grammar translation dominated language teaching methodology in North America and Europe, well into the 20th Century, a primary objective was the transmission of *high culture* through the reading and translation of the *great works* of literature, history, and philosophy (see Kramsch, 1996). The use of contrastive analysis within the paradigm of behaviorism in the United States in the 1960s (see Lado, 1957) gave rise to the still prevalent comparative analysis of culture found in the so-called *culture corners* of textbooks and lesson plans, where a small portion of a unit or lesson is allocated to discussing a relevant cultural difference or cultural topic (often in the students' first language), including cultural artifacts and rituals still denounced by some scholars and educators as mere *popular culture* or *low culture*.

The social and cultural turns in second language acquisition theory since the 1970s and 1980s, which have inspired communicative and task-based approaches, have gradually led to a much broader conceptualization of culture in language teaching due to insights from fields such as sociolinguistics, sociocultural theory, cultural anthropology, and intercultural communication (e.g., Buttjes & Byram, 1991; Byram, Gribkova, & Starkey, 2002; Hinkle, 1999; Kramsch, 1993, 1998; Lange & Paige, 2003; McKay & Hornberger, 1996; Lantolf, 2000; Valdes, 1986). Especially since the 1990s, foreign language education in North America and Europe has embraced two fundamental ideas: that speakers of all languages simultaneously belong to multiple cultures (e.g., national cultures, organizational cultures, regional cultures, local cultures, various sub cultures, etc.) and that language and culture are inseparable in real-life communication and should therefore be more closely connected in formal instruction.

As the aim of language teaching has shifted from developing linguistic knowledge and awareness to developing communicative competence, the inclusion of culture has likewise shifted from developing cultural knowledge and awareness to developing *intercultural competence* (Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003; Byram, 1997, 2003; Hu & Byram, 2009). This shift has been repeatedly reaffirmed in national standards and policy statements since at least the 5 C's¹ published by the American Council on the Teaching of

Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 1996) and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) published by the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 2001). The shift has culminated in the emergence of manifold integrated approaches and, in many cases, a tendency to treat “culture as the core” of language teaching and learning (e.g., Lang & Paige, 2003).

Foundations of integrated and intercultural approaches

Most integrated approaches to teaching language and culture adopt their definition of culture from cultural anthropology, which distinguishes between *subjective culture* (the accumulation of one’s beliefs about the world and one’s place in it—past, present, and future—acquired through socialization) and *material culture* (all observable manifestations of subjective culture in the form of artifacts, rituals, norms, and social behaviors) (e.g., Geertz, 1973; E. Hall, 1989, 1990). Borrowing from sociolinguistics and sociocultural theory, culture is not viewed as a static set of beliefs and attributes, but as an elusive and dynamic process, whereby one’s many cultures and cultural identities are continuously constructed and reconstructed through each and every communicative act (see Camerer & Mader, this volume; Kramsch, 1993). Such a poststructuralist and postmodernist view of culture implies that it is impossible to “learn” or “acquire” a foreign culture. It is only possible to experience, understand, empathize with, cope with, and, perhaps over time, come to appropriate cultural difference. For this reason, integrated approaches tend to combine *culture specific* learning (i.e., exposing learners to and teaching them about cultural beliefs, artifacts, rituals, and behaviors typical of a particular target language community) and *culture general* learning (i.e., exposing learners to all forms of cultural difference and giving them opportunities to develop the intercultural competence necessary to engage in intercultural communication and intercultural learning beyond the formal classroom) (see Smith, Paige, & Steglitz, 2003). In addition to perceiving the other language and culture through their native cultural lens, integrated approaches further require students to practice critical self-reflection by challenging students to perceive their own language(s) and culture(s) from the perspective of another culture (e.g., Kramsch, 1993). In the case of the English language, given its status as a lingua franca and the world’s first truly global language, the need for such culture general learning is paramount (Camerer & Mader, this volume, Jenkins, 2008; Kroneder, this volume; Risager, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2009).

By including both culture general and culture specific learning in language teaching and learning, integrated approaches aim to develop four broad competence areas:

- 1) Linguistic awareness and competence in the L2;
- 2) Communicative competence in the L2;
- 3) Cultural awareness and knowledge of L2 cultures; and
- 4) Intercultural communication competence.

While some models compartmentalize the four competence areas by prescribing the use of the students L1 for deductive or reflective learning of language and culture and the L2 for inductive and experiential learning of language and culture (e.g., Byram, 1991, 1997), other models aim to combine all forms of learning within tasks and lessons conducted entirely or predominantly in the L2, especially at intermediate and advanced levels of language proficiency (e.g., Kramsch, 1993).

Some of the methods employed within integrated approaches include:

- a) Foreign exchange programs that permit structured contact with or immersion in the language and culture of an L2 community (e.g., Beaven, this volume; Bella Owona, this volume);
- b) The application of micro-ethnography and discourse analysis in the context of field trips and field projects in order to analyze real-life interaction of locally accessible L2 communities (e.g., Erickson, 1996; J. Hall, 1999; Riggenbach, 1999; Saville-Troike, 1996; Schiffrin, 1996);
- c) The use of textual and audio-visual materials in order to analyze cultural content and real or fictional interaction in the classroom (e.g., Camerer & Mader, this volume; Erickson, 1996; J. Hall, 1999; Judd, 1999; Schiffrin, 1996; Scollon, 1999);
- d) Face-to-face tandem learning involving native or more advanced L2 speakers present in the educational context (e.g., Calvert, 1999);
- e) Online tandem learning involving native or more advanced L2 speakers from other educational contexts around the world (e.g., Helm, this volume; Little & Brammerts, 1996);
- f) Telecollaboration or online intercultural exchange with native or more advanced L1 speakers linked via an international network of learners (e.g., Helm, this volume);
- g) Formal instruction in intercultural communication within language courses and/or parallel intercultural training workshops (e.g.,

Anderson & Boylan, this volume; Beaven, this volume; Camerer & Mader, this volume; Chick, 1996; Kroneder, this volume).

Teaching English for specific academic purposes at the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano

The Free University of Bozen-Bolzano (unibz) is located in the trilingual province of South Tyrol in northern Italy, which has three de jure official languages of governance and public administration: German, Italian, and Ladin. The university, in turn, has three official languages of instruction: English, German, and Italian.² The degree program in Tourism, Sport, and Event Management (TSE), the subject of this chapter, is offered on a separate campus in the predominantly German-speaking town of Bruneck-Brunico. Approximately 50% of the courses in the TSE program are taught in English, 25% are taught in Italian, and 25% are taught in German. Slightly less than half the students speak German as a first language and slightly less than half speak Italian, while only a small minority speak Ladin or another language as their first language (see Ennis, 2015b).

This unique context implies, on one hand, that English is primarily taught and learned as a foreign language (EFL) at unibz and primarily serves as a lingua franca (ELF) and medium of instruction (EMI) for communication between speakers of especially German and Italian. On the other hand, the learning context also demands that students learn the norms of standard academic English in order to successfully complete the significant portion of their coursework and exams which is conducted in English. Within the TSE curriculum, this challenge is met by offering an English for specific academic purposes (ESAP) course.

If English for specific purposes (ESP) can be understood as any teaching context in which a syllabus must be designed to meet the specific needs of learners who have common interests, motivations, and goals, and if English for academic purposes (EAP) can be understood as any context where the specific needs of the learners are defined by an educational context, then ESAP would be any context in which the learners have *even more specific* common needs by virtue of studying the same subject or field of study (see Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998, pp. 53–73; Jordan, 2005, pp. 228–270). From 2011 to 2016, the *English for TSE* course at unibz was, thus, conceptualized as a course that adapted customized learning material to foster the learning of specific language features (grammar and vocabulary), discourse patterns (cohesion, organization, and coherence), and communicative skills (writing and speaking), as applied to

the composition of the specific genre (generic academic texts and formal presentations) common to the TSE Management curriculum.

English for TSE offers 30 hours of ESAP instruction and three *crediti formativi universitari*³ (university credit hours) to as many as 130 students at the B2+ level according to the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) during the first semester of study. The instructor of the course is a *professore a contratto* (“contract professor”) with the status of an *esperto esterno* (“external expert”), who therefore has multiple teaching obligations at other campuses and other institutions. The advantages of teaching this course at unibz include the above average English proficiency⁴ and high level of intrinsic and instrumental motivation⁵ of students upon entry, the fact that the students are part of a small and relatively cohesive learning community with many common academic interests, and the decidedly multilingual and intercultural classroom. The challenges for the language instructor include a very large class size with a wide range of underlying English proficiency, students with little field-specific language or experience with academic English upon entry, high language proficiency expectations imposed by the degree program and university,⁶ too few contact hours given the objectives, sporadic attendance,⁷ and a general reluctance to complete ungraded homework within Italian university culture (see Ennis, 2015b). In short, the greatest limitation of the course is that it is impossible to *fully* meet even the students’ most immediate needs.

Limitations of an integrated approach to teaching language and culture at unibz

Another important challenge of the *English for TSE* course is that the context precludes the application of the aforementioned methods for integrating cultural and intercultural learning into the syllabus, especially due to the time constraint, the EFL/ELF context, the reluctance of students to complete “optional” assignments at home, and the primary objective of teaching toward the norms of formal academic English. Field trips and field projects are difficult—though perhaps not impossible—to organize due to the absence of English-speaking communities in South Tyrol, while face-to-face tandems are difficult due to the rarity of native and near-native speakers of English enrolled in the degree program. In-class assignments or graded homework involving the analysis of video recordings or texts for cultural content, face-to-face tandems, online tandems, online intercultural exchanges, or intercultural instruction and training would require the reallocation of already scarce instructional hours and coursework from developing linguistic and communicative

competence, which is perceived to be the primary objective of the course institutionally.⁸ Optional assignments are rarely completed. The students do have numerous foreign exchange options, but relatively few students are accepted to programs, only a small percentage of the study places are at English-speaking universities, and it is institutionally challenging for a *professore a contratto* to integrate such experiences into a language course and offer the structure necessary to ensure and validate positive intercultural experience and learning. Adopting a lingua franca approach is without doubt appropriate in this context, and in fact must be adopted to some extent, but there is an institutional expectation that the students learn to produce native-like texts in their content courses, which implies that the instructor must demonstrate a degree of intolerance for language use which native speakers might recognize as an error.

It would seem that the only way to integrate language and culture in this particular ESAP course is to adopt a fully integrated approach, that is, to design tasks, lessons, and a syllabus that aim to develop all four competence areas concurrently: linguistic awareness and competence, communicative competence, cultural awareness and knowledge, and intercultural competence. In other words, cultural and intercultural learning must be embedded in traditional language learning tasks conducted primarily in the target language, if any cultural and intercultural learning is to occur at all.

Integrating intercultural learning in ESAP

After becoming the instructor of the *English for TSE* course in 2011, I quickly recognized the need to produce customized teaching and learning material in order to meet the specific needs of learners in this unique context (see Ennis, 2011). As I began to write a course book based upon a formal needs analysis from 2012 to 2014 (Ennis, 2012-2016), I strove to integrate cultural and intercultural learning into lessons in such a way as to avoid reducing the amount of time dedicated to the language and communication skills students would require for study at unibz and beyond (Ennis, 2015b). To this end, I relied primarily upon an integrated approach to teaching language and culture which I had initially developed as a graduate teaching assistant for German at the University of Cincinnati (Ennis, 2015a).

The model serves as a flexible set of guidelines for integrating language and culture in individual tasks, lessons, syllabi, and curricula. Intercultural learning within the model is primarily based upon Bennett's (1993, 2004) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS)—a psychometric scale of intercultural competence which distinguishes

between three *ethnocentric* stages (*denial*, *defense*, and *minimization*) and three *ethnorelative* stages (*acceptance*, *adaptation*, and *integration*) (see Appendix 1) of emotional and cognitive development, as well as the types of experiences and formal training individuals must undergo in order to progress to each subsequent stage. Language learning within the model is primarily based upon the ACTFL (ACTFL, 2012) and CEFR language proficiency scales—both of which consist of a set of descriptors indicating the language features and communication skills that distinguish respective proficiency levels (*novice*, *intermediate*, *advanced*, and *superior* in the case of ACTFL and A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 in the case of the CEFR), where especially the CEFR offers numerous recommendations for learning tasks and learning objectives at each level. The model aligns the two scales into parallel columns based upon personal experience teaching languages at the university level in the United States and Central Europe, but it is not conceived as a rigid scale representative of the natural interdependence of intercultural learning and language acquisition. Rather it is an adaptive model in which the columns can be realigned based on the requirements of the learning context.

In the case of students in the TSE program at unibz, the majority join the course with documentation of B2 proficiency according to the CEFR—though, as stated above, many enter at the B1 or C1 level—and the course offers instruction at the B2+ level. According to the model, this would imply that students need to focus on improving grammatical accuracy, improving discourse management in both speaking and writing, and, especially, developing learner autonomy so that they can maximize the language learning benefits from language exposure during their academic careers and thereafter. Based on the multilingual and multicultural backgrounds of the students and the international profile of unibz—not to mention the field of study chosen by the students, which by definition implies a desire to come into contact with other languages and cultures—it can further be assumed that the majority of the students have at least reached the developmental stage of *acceptance* of cultural difference. In order to progress to the stage of *adaptation*, the learners especially need to be challenged to perceive the world from the perspective of people who possess different values and different beliefs about the world. This essentially entails the careful selection of themes and content and the adaptation of traditional language learning tasks so that students are challenged to analyze and appropriate cultural perspectives within a structured and supportive learning environment.

A sample lesson: *The role of government in tourism*

The *English for TSE* course—as taught from 2011 to 2016—was informed by a “weak” task-based,⁹ communicative teaching methodology founded upon the input-interaction-output model of second language acquisition (e.g., Ellis, 2003; Gass, 1997; Lee & VanPatten, 2003; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). This implied a dual focus on the meaning and form of relevant lexis and grammatical structures as well as the development of both fluency and accuracy across three of four language skills (reading, writing, and speaking) by means of student-centered activities and tasks that were collaborative, meaningful, relevant, and authentic. The course was organized into thematic units consisting of 1) a theme, 2) a set of target language features, discourse patterns, and communication skills, and 3) a series of tasks that required the students to learn and practice the target language while engaging the theme similar to the manner in which their content courses would engage such themes. The themes and tasks were defined through an analysis of the syllabi and teaching material adopted by content courses taught in English, while the language content was in part informed by the CEFR and in part informed by the subjects taught and language skills required across the curriculum of the degree program, but was determined by the selected themes and tasks.

Each unit was constructed around a text adopted from an authentic source with relevant thematic content, such as textbooks, academic publications, institutional reports, media sources, and websites related to tourism studies. Each lesson progressed from top-down to bottom-up processing of the thematic and linguistic content (see Carrell, Devine, & Eskey, 1998; Chaudron & Richards, 1986). During the top-down phase, students were required to complete a pre-reading activity that served as an advance organizer, before engaging the thematic content of a given text by reading for the purpose of summarizing or discussing, for example. The bottom-up phase consisted of both inductive and deductive learning activities. Inductive learning activities urged learners to formulate their own definitions of new lexical items and their own rules to explain grammar and conventions of speaking and writing by completing various “mini” text, genre, and linguistic analyses of samples extracted from the reading text, especially input processing activities—which require making a connection between form and function (see VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993). This was followed by a series of deductive learning activities involving explicit explanations of the rules and conventions and drills with corrective feedback (see Long, 2000; Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Each unit culminated in a capstone output task¹⁰ which required the students to apply the new language and language skills to write about or speak about the new thematic content. Within the syllabus, the writing tasks progressed from sentence writing, to paragraph writing, to basic expository writing (essays and reports), while speaking tasks progressed from micro skills such as summarizing, expressing opinions, making predictions, and making recommendations, to giving brief formal presentations. Each unit was therefore designed according to the concept of reading-for-writing/speaking (Hirvela, 2004), and was intended as a simulation of content learning, where a central aim was to develop autonomous learning skills necessary for learning languages across the trilingual curriculum (e.g., scaffolding or learning new lexis, collocations, and grammatical structures in context).

In this ESAP context, the integration of cultural and intercultural learning in lessons was accomplished by simply a) exposing the students to texts and perspectives from diverse English-speaking contexts—including from the inner, the outer, and the expanding circles of English (Kachru, 1996)—and b) ensuring that the readings in each unit confronted the students with at least two perspectives on a particular theme or two conflicting views on a particular issue. This ensured that students were not only exposed to new perspectives but would also have to understand opposing perspectives in order to complete the unit. More importantly, this content offered the possibility for students to practice appropriating aspects of both views in the formulation of their own opinions during the capstone output task, which is not only a critical thinking skill associated with intercultural competence, but one that is associated with academic honesty.

Exemplary of this—deceptively subtle—integrated approach to language and culture is a unit that discusses the role of government in tourism (Ennis, 2012-2016, pp. 46-55). The texts, which are taken from three university-level textbooks on tourism economics written by Australian and British academics, describe national tourism authorities and organizations, the effects of taxes and subsidies on tourism markets, and the interventionist versus the non-interventionist position on the role of government in the tourism market. The target grammar is the zero, first, and second conditionals, and the communication skills include reviewing and practicing paragraph writing as well as making evaluations and giving recommendations. The original output task for this unit required the students to work in groups to consolidate the information and language in the texts by either adopting the position of interventionists or non-interventionists:

The local tourism office is considering a hotel tax during the winter so that it can subsidize the provision of summer tourist activities. They have asked you for your expert advice. Write a brief paragraph in favor of or against this proposal. Support your opinion with your position on the government's role in the market (i.e. interventionist vs. non-interventionist), a brief explanation of the effects of taxes and subsidies, and what would happen if the plan were implemented. (Ennis, 2012-2016, p. 55)

Although the competing ideologies of interventionists and non-interventionists may not be immediately recognized by students as “cultures”, they fit the broad definition of the term adopted by integrated approaches in that they represent distinct values, beliefs, and languages (i.e., competing discourses). Because the students work in groups, they are implicitly required to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of both perspectives and reach a compromise in order to complete the task, in consideration of their own (still forming) opinions on the role of government in the tourism market. This is not an easy task for all groups, and often necessitates input and guidance from the instructor.

A variation of this task, which I began to assign to select students who were observably more motivated, more proficient in English, and/or more open to such activities than other students were, involved first dividing the students into groups based on their stated positions as an interventionist or non-interventionist. Each group would then be required to complete the same task from the opposite perspective. This variation ensured that all group members had to adopt a position that was different from their own in a meaningful way. Such an exercise entails both critical self-reflection and the (at least temporary) appropriation of the beliefs and values of others, and is precisely the form of culture general learning in which students must engage in order to progress from *acceptance* to *adaptation* according to the DMIS.

The following are sample responses submitted by two groups of three or four students during the 2015-16 academic year:

The local tourism office should not introduce a hotel tax during the winter in order to **subsidize the provision of summer tourist activities**. A new tax **would increase** the room prices. As a consequence tourists **may spend** their holiday in another ski-resort, where there is no additional tax. The government should therefore **create favourable conditions for the service providers in tourism**, [sic] this **would make** it possible for them to decrease prices and to **attract more tourist[s]** in [sic] our area.

In our opinion the proposal of **levying a hotel tax** during winter is not convenient [sic]. In fact, on one hand the government **would earn** more

money thanks to this winter tax but on the other hand it **would be** a damage [sic] for hotels, because people **would spend** less money on rooms and local economies **would be** dramatically affected. However, governments [sic] investments play an important role also in the area of tourism, using some for **public services, infrastructures** [sic] and advertising and ensuring a **minimum wage** in order to permit workers to have a holiday. Although government investments are good, **hotel taxes should be imposed** both winter [sic] and summer season, since **subsidies** are needed during the whole year. Some hotels work more during the winter while others during the summer. For this reason, not only winter hotels should **be taxed**, because all hotels should receive **subsidies**.

These two sample paragraphs are not yet of the quality necessary for inclusion in a senior thesis, for example, as they are marked by a number of typographical errors, transfer errors (e.g., “convenient”; the preposition “in” used for direction), comma splices, somewhat superficial comprehension of the content, and/or superficial task completion. However, there are numerous signs of the initial steps in the learning process: *noticing* and, perhaps, *uptake*. The students are clearly making an attempt to write purposeful paragraphs with clear topic sentences (“The local tourism office...”, “In our opinion the proposal...”) and linkers (“as a consequence”, “therefore”, “in fact, on one hand... but on the other hand”). The paragraphs are also marked by clear attempts to scaffold both language and content from the input texts and tasks. Not only do the responses incorporate ideas, vocabulary, and collocations from the input, but the students have correctly used the second conditional on multiple occasions (see chunks marked in **bold**).

Unsurprisingly, most of the students who completed this task in 2015-16 argued that a hotel tax was not a good idea—many of their families, after all, own and operate local hotels or other businesses dependent on winter tourism. However, the majority felt that the government should invest in tourism. The following response comes from a group of students who had mixed opinions about the tax, but were united in their “interventionist” perspective. Thus they were instructed to write their paragraph from the opposing perspective of a “non-interventionist”:

From our point of view the introduction of a hotel tax during the winter is not a good idea. In fact it is not the governments [sic] **duty to ensure market equilibrium** through imposing taxes and providing subsidies. Therefore [sic], if the government levies [sic] hotel taxes during the winter season, hotels have to raise [sic] their prices. As a consequence the amount [sic] of bookings and potential winter tourists decrease and this might **lead**

to market instability. We believe that the tourism sector will grow, if we **trust the market to regulate itself.**

Although this response is marked by errors that suggest that the students are struggling with some of the input (e.g., incorrect conditional and incorrect adverbial linker), which might be due to the added cognitive load of expressing an opposing position, the paragraph also offers ample evidence of noticing and scaffolding, the difference being that these students have also focused their attention on non-interventionist language and content that does not appear in the interventionist paragraphs above (“ensure market equilibrium”, “lead to market instability”, “trust the market to regulate itself”), implying that students have clearly made some effort to understand and articulate a view with which they do not fully agree. Whereas in the first two sample responses above the intercultural dimension is an assumed outcome of the task completion, the third response using the amended version of the task offers empirical evidence. The students may not have changed their mind about the role of government in tourism (which of course is neither the point of the exercise nor a measure of intercultural competence), and this paragraph will not be appearing in *The Economist* anytime soon, but I do believe that incorporating such tasks across the syllabus of an ESAP course makes a contribution to students’ intercultural learning.

Conclusion

One of the greatest challenges of teaching ESAP in any context is coping with limited resources. There simply is never enough time within the context of formal instruction to teach and learn all of the language and skills students will require for successful study and, eventually, employment. Moreover, the combination of field-specific language and challenging academic content is an added burden on the limited *cognitive resources* (especially short-term memory) of students (Ennis, 2015b). The addition of an intercultural dimension only stretches these resources further. Nonetheless, contemporary university students must learn to use language to communicate relevant content while maintaining a critical perspective of all their interlocutors’ cultural frames if they are to be successful in their increasingly multilingual and multicultural learning contexts and if they are to be successful in their increasingly multilingual and intercultural lives beyond the university. Moreover, they must *learn to learn* new language, new communication skills, new cultural information, and new intercultural skills from the process of intercultural communication

in their additional languages *across the curriculum* and as *lifelong learners*. For this reason, my personal experience integrating intercultural learning in the *English for TSE* course at the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano may be informative to similar contexts at other institutions.

Appendix 1: Bennett's DMIS (Bennett, 1993, 2004)

Ethnocentric Stages

Denial: a result of little to no contact with other cultures, either by coincidence or choice

A. Isolation: has "benign stereotypes" and needs exposure to cultural difference

B. Separation: has erected physical or social barriers and needs exposure to "Big-C" to facilitate differentiation (1993, pp. 32-34)

Defense: difference has been acknowledged, but one seeks to maintain one's worldview

A. Denigration: forms negative stereotypes and "a derogatory attitude toward difference"

B. Superiority: emphasizes the positives of one's own culture and needs to focus on these positives, followed by the equally positive aspects of the foreign culture(s)

C. Reversal: Denigration of own culture and Superiority of foreign culture(s) is a possible outcome; needs to see the "commonality of cultures", the "generally good in all cultures" and "the value and vulnerability that all human beings share" (1993, pp. 40-41)

Minimization: while cultural diversity is accepted and not negatively evaluated, it is dangerously trivialized as being less important than universals

A. Physical Universalism: assumes that physical and biological similarities results in mutually understandable verbal, nonverbal and mental behavior, but ignores "the culturally unique social context that enmeshes such behavior in a particular worldview" (1993, p. 43) and needs to be made explicitly aware of the necessity of social context

B. Transcendent Universalism: assumes that "all human beings, whether they know it or not, are products of some single transcendent principle, law or imperative" (1993, p. 43) and needs to develop cultural self-awareness, followed by an illustration of substantial cultural differences, preferably with the help of members of other cultures

Ethnorelative Stages

Acceptance: “cultural difference is both acknowledged and respected” (1993, p. 47)

A. Respect for behavioral difference: takes note of the cultural context of foreign behavior and an attempt is made to evaluate behavior within its cultural context

B. Respect for value difference: values of other cultures are realized and accepted as equally valid, at least in their own cultural context; values are not viewed as universals or something that is possessed, but as the process of “assigning worth”; needs practical application of ethnorelativism in simulations

Adaptation: one accepts that “one does not have culture, one engages in it” (1993, p. 52); accumulates a “repertoire of cultural alternatives” (1993, p. 52) and develops the ability to shift frames of reference

A. Empathy: possess the ability to shift frames of reference from context to context and adopt other’s perspectives; development proceeds from constant gathering of knowledge about another culture and practice of IC

B. Pluralism: becomes bi- or multicultural and demonstrates “Natural Empathy”; (Accidental pluralism does not result in intercultural sensitivity/competence, as it does not guarantee a positive attitude toward difference nor conscious ethnorelativism.); Actual face-to-face interaction will result in continued development

Integration: implies coming to grips with a multiplicity of realities, with internal culture shock and cultural marginality; realizes that “identity emerges from the act of defining identity itself” (1993, p. 60); ≈ “Third Culture” “Marginal Man”, etc.

A. Contextual Evaluation: can pick and choose from “many cultural options” in order to adapt to a given situation

B. Constructive Marginality: can step outside of all cultural frames of reference due to a complete acceptance of cultural relativism and the notion of subjective reality, and can therefore assume the role of mediator between cultures. NOT “**Encapsulated Marginality**”: the “state of being stuck on the margins of two or more cultures without a conscious choice” (1993, p. 64).

Appendix 2: An integrated model of language and intercultural learning (Ennis, 2015)

	INTERCULTURAL LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY	LANGUAGE LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF LINGUISTIC AND COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE
1	<p>Starts at DENIAL, or is unaware of the fundamental differences between C1 and C2</p> <p><i>Quickly</i> moves to DEFENSE as encounters superficial differences between C1 and C2, solidifies stereotypes of the people of C2 and becomes aware of the stereotypes people of C2 have of the people of C1</p>	<p>Starts with NO COMPETENCE (A0) in FL</p> <p><i>Quickly</i> moves to NOVICE (A1) as is exposed to and pushed to produce words and chunks in very simplistic, but meaningful tasks, engages in rote memorization and learns strategies for negotiating meaning in FL</p>
2	<p>Starts at DEFENSE, or believes that both C1 and C2 are homogenous and static, and that C1 is fundamentally superior to C2</p> <p><i>Systematically</i> moves to MINIMIZATION as encounters the many positives of both C1 and C2, and begins to rationalize cultural differences and critically analyze the validity of stereotypes from both sides</p>	<p>Starts at NOVICE (A1), or can produce memorized chunks in highly structured communicative tasks, and can begin to negotiate for meaning in FL</p> <p><i>Systematically</i> moves to INTERMEDIATE LOW-MID (A2+/B1) as is exposed to and pushed to produce simplified examples of FL in highly structured communicative tasks intended to emphasize both the meanings of words and the significance of forms</p>
3	<p>Starts at MINIMIZATION, or believes people of C1 and C2 are inherently similar, in spite of the differences experienced and comes to view stereotypes as being erroneous beliefs about others</p> <p>-----</p> <p><i>Struggles</i> to move to ACCEPTANCE as encounters the most profound differences between C1 and C2 (especially underlying value systems) and the plurality of C2s (subcultures) within all language communities, comes to understand the experiential causes for those</p>	<p>Starts at INTERMEDIATE LOW-MID (A2+/B1), or can start to creatively produce complete sentences with varied grammatical accuracy, demonstrating at the very least an awareness of grammar and the presence of a developing linguistic system, and can negotiate meaning and begin to notice meaning and form in context</p> <p>-----</p> <p>-</p> <p><i>Systematically</i> moves to INTERMEDIATE HIGH (B1+/B2) as is exposed to and pushed to produce grammatical sentences in gradually more authentic, complex and open-ended tasks—still with an explicit focus on</p>

	<p>differences and the role of context, develops a broader conception of self and other and begins to form more complex and stereotypes to compensate</p>	<p>form—, learns to pay attention to both the linguistic features and the role of context, and starts to learn how to self-correct mistakes and errors via communicative interaction with more advanced and NSs</p>
4	<p>Starts at ACCEPTANCE, or views C1 and <i>all</i> C2s as equally valid ways of perceiving and reacting to the world, at least in their own contexts, and accepts stereotypes as “necessary evils” that need to be kept flexible in dealing with others</p> <p><i>Systematically</i> moves to ADAPTATION as encounters C2s on their own terms and begins to consciously and unconsciously appropriate various features thereof in order to better understand, communicate and/or integrate</p>	<p>Starts at INTERMEDIATE HIGH (B1+/B2) or has at least begun to “learn how to learn” via interaction in order to better communicate and begins to produce strings of sentences in coherent, connected discourse during interaction</p> <p><i>Systematically</i> moves to ADVANCED (B2+/C1) as exposes self to and pushes self to produce strings of grammatical sentences in a range of authentic contexts, actively attempts to self-correct and acquire FL via interaction with more advanced and NSs, and, begins to intensely study the formal rules of FL</p>
5	<p>Starts at ADAPTATION, or comes to realize the emergent and transitional nature of culture; can empathize with the perspectives of C2s, and can begin to apply explicit and implicit knowledge of appropriate C2s to interactions with NSs of the FL</p> <p><i>Might</i> move to INTEGRATION as a result of a dedication to life-long intercultural and language learning in virtually every interaction with others</p>	<p>Starts at ADVANCED (B2+/C1) or is capable of sustaining discourse and making up for limited mistakes and errors by self-correcting and actively recycling new features of FL during interaction with advanced and NSs</p> <p><i>Systematically</i> moves to SUPERIOR (C1+) by continuing to interact with other advanced and NSs and making a conscious effort to improve all linguistic aspects</p>
6 7	<p>Has reached INTEGRATION if can bring multiple valid cultural frames to every situation, maintains a critical distance to all forms of behavior and utterances, while still capable of successfully interacting with others, i.e. embraces the true nature of identity and culture</p>	<p>Starts at SUPERIOR (C1+), or the ability to comfortably interact with and learn from natives</p> <p><i>Might</i> move to DISTINGUISHED (C2), or native-like competence, as a result of a dedication to life-long intercultural and language learning in every interaction with others</p>

Notes

¹ The Five C's are the national standards for foreign language education adopted by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) and associate organizations in the early 1990s in the United States. The standards called for focusing on *communication* in foreign languages, developing knowledge and understanding of other *cultures*, establishing *connections* to other disciplines, making *comparisons* between students' L1s and cultures and their foreign languages and cultures, and fostering participation in multilingual *communities*.

² Though Latin is often used as a language of instruction in the Primary Education degree program.

³ Each credit hour entails approximately 25 hours of coursework, including assessment tasks.

⁴ For instance, 74% of students enrolled in the course had documentation of B2 general English proficiency upon matriculation in 2014 (Ennis, 2015b).

⁵ During a needs analysis conducted in 2012, 84% of students indicated having high levels of intrinsic motivation for learning English (Ennis, 2015b).

⁶ At unibz, students must certify their language proficiency in all three languages of instruction in order to matriculate, progress in their degree programs, and graduate. At that time, the entry requirements were C1 in the first language and B2 in the second language to matriculate, B1 in the third language to progress to the second year of study, and B2+ in the second language and B2 in the third language to graduate.

⁷ For instance, during the 2013-14 academic year, attendance ranged from 20 to 97 students per lesson (Ennis, 2015b).

⁸ There is also no computer lab on the Bruneck-Brunico campus.

⁹ It should be noted that this course is not being presented as a model of TBLT, per se. The structure of the sample lesson below clearly exhibits elements of the *present-practice-produce* approach and involves more structure and input than is typically associated with TBLT. I would, however, note that even “strong” forms of TBLT provide a model of the task and instructor support upon which students scaffold their own work, and “weak” forms permit prior input and instruction of language and skills students might require to complete the task. I would further argue that TBLT—like all forms of CLT—is based on the input-interaction-output model of SLA, the difference merely being that in TBLT the most substantial input tends to come in the form of feedback, instruction, and practice *after* the completion of an assigned task. That input, however, still serves as the basis for subsequent interaction and output during the completion of subsequent tasks. The design of this lesson was informed by TBLT in that it began with the identification of an authentic task which students have to complete in their immediate university context: a reading-for-writing task in which they must synthesize the opinions of experts in order to express their own informed opinion. All other tasks in the lesson are merely sub-tasks necessary to complete the main task. Moreover, with the exception of the deductive grammar instruction—which is actually more accepted in TBLT than other CLT approaches—each sub-task is authentic to the context. In order to complete such a reading-for-writing task in their EMI context,

the students must consciously process both the information and the language, they must both comprehend the information and deduce the meaning and function of new language from the context, and they must choose how to scaffold upon this input in their own writing. If they are expected to also improve their English from the process, which is the case at unibz, then they must develop the ability to do so inductively and autonomously. Thus, the lesson, from start to finish, is designed as a simulation of the entire process of integrated content and language learning in a higher education context and my role as the instructor during the lesson was that of a facilitator who merely guided the students and responded to their inquiries as the students completed the series of sub tasks.

¹⁰ The term “capstone” is borrowed from the North American educational system, where secondary or tertiary students are often required to complete a “capstone project” or “capstone assignment” in order to complete a course, a year of study, or even an entire curriculum. The theory behind the capstone project is that it gives the students an opportunity to apply all the knowledge and skills they have acquired during the course, academic year, or study program. In the case of the *English for TSE* course, each unit culminated in capstone task and the course culminated in a final exam involving elements of all the capstone tasks.

References

- ACTFL. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning*. Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.
- . (2012). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines: Speaking, writing, listening and reading*. Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-72). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- . (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J.S. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (pp. 62-77). Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- Bennett, J. M., Bennett, M. J., & Allen, W. (2003). Developing intercultural competence in the language classroom. In D. L. Lange & R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. 237-270). Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.
- Buttjes, D., & Byram, M. (Eds.). (1991). *Mediating languages and cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of foreign language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (1991). Teaching culture and language: Toward an integrated model. In D. Buttjes & M. Byram (Eds.), *Mediating languages and*

- cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of foreign language education* (pp. 17-30). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- . (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (Ed.) (2003). *Intercultural competence*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2003.
- Byram, M., Gribkova, B. & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Calvert, M. (1999). Tandem: A vehicle for language and intercultural learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 19(1), 56-60.
doi:10.1080/09571739985200111
- Carrell, P., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C., & Richards, J. (1986). The effect of discourse markers on the comprehension of lecture. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 112–127.
doi:10.1093/applin/7.2.113
- Chick, J. K. (1996). Intercultural communication. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 329-348). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Ennis, M. (2011). Review of Oxford English for careers: Tourism 3. *TESL-EJ*, 15(3). Retrieved from
<http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume15/ej59/ej59r1/>
- . (2012-2016). *English for tourism studies*. Retrieved from
https://www.acad.emia.edu/30114993/English_for_Tourism_Studies
- . (2015a). Toward an integrated approach to language, culture, and communication in the foreign language classroom. In E. Nash, N. C. Brown, & L. Bracci (Eds.), *Intercultural horizons volume III: Intercultural competence: Key to the new multicultural societies of the globalized world* (pp. 3-33). New Castle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars.
- . (2015b). “Do we need to know that for the exam?” Teaching English on the CLIL fault line at a trilingual university. *TESOL Journal* 6(2), 358-381. doi:10.1002/tesj.199

- Erickson, F. (1996). Ethnographic microanalysis. S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 283-306). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures* (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books.
- Hall, E. T. (1989). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor Books.
- . (1990). *The hidden dimension*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence. In S. L. McKay & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 137-151). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinkle, E. (1999). *Culture in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hu, A., & Byram, M. (Eds.) (2009). *Intercultural competence and foreign language learning*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Jenkins, J. (2008). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, R. R. (2005). *English for academic purposes*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Judd, E. L. (1999). Some issues in the teaching of pragmatic competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 152-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1996). The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes*, 15(3), 241-255. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971x.1996.tb00112.x
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (1996). The cultural component of language teaching. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 1(2), 1-13.
- . (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lange, D. L., & Paige, R. M. (Eds.). (2003). *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.
- Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.) (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Little, D., & Brammerts, H. (Eds.) (1996). *A guide to language learning in tandem via the Internet*. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.
- Long, M. H. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. H. Lambert, & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy* (pp. 179-92). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- McKay, S. L., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.) (1996). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riggenbach, H. (1999). *Discourse analysis in the language classroom. The spoken language*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1996). The ethnography of communication. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 351-70). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffirin, D. (1996). Interactional sociolinguistics. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 307-329). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scollon, R. (1999). Culture codes for call: The use of commercial television for teaching culture in the classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 181-195). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, S. L., Paige, R. M., & Steglitz, I. (2003). Developing intercultural competence in the language classroom. In D. L. Lange & R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. 237-270). Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.
- Valdes, J. M. (Ed.) (1986). *Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 225-241. doi:10.1017/S0272263100011979.