

应用语言学习丛书

Developing Critical Languaculture Pedagogies in Higher Education

Theory and Practice

在高等教育阶段发展批判性语言
文化教学法：理论与实践

Adriana Raquel Díaz

Developing Critical Languaculture Pedagogies in Higher Education

Theory and Practice

在高等教育阶段发展批判性语言
文化教学法：理论与实践

Adriana Raquel Díaz

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

在高等教育阶段发展批判性语言文化教学法: 理论与实践/迪亚兹 (Díaz, A. R.) 著.
—上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2016

(应用语言学研习丛书)

ISBN 978-7-5446-4321-4

I. ①在… II. ①迪… III. ①高等教育—文化语言学—教学法—研究—英文
IV. ①H0-05

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字 (2016) 第063233号

图字: 09-2015-540号

© Adriana Raquel Díaz 2013.

This edition of *Developing Critical Languaculture Pedagogies in Higher Education* is published by arrangement with Multilingual Matters and is for sale only in the following territories: China.

本书由Multilingual Matters出版社授权上海外语教育出版社有限公司出版。
仅供在中华人民共和国境内销售。

出版发行: 上海外语教育出版社

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编: 200083

电 话: 021-65425300 (总机)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

网 址: <http://www.sflep.com.cn> <http://www.sflep.com>

责任编辑: 张亚东

印 刷: 上海叶大印务发展有限公司

开 本: 700×1000 1/16 印张 13.75 字数 368千字

版 次: 2016年6月第1版 2016年6月第1次印刷

印 数: 2 500 册

书 号: ISBN 978-7-5446-4321-4 / H · 1977

定 价: 38.00 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题,可向本社调换

出版说明

对于中国这样一个英语教学大国，和语言教学相关的话题一直受到语言学界的关注。应用语言学作为一个涵盖范围十分广泛的研究领域，尤其受到我国学者及语言学方向师生的重视。本世纪初，外教社陆续引进出版了“牛津应用语言学丛书”、“剑桥应用语言学丛书”等国际优秀学术成果，因其内容权威、选择精当而受到外语界的好评。

近年来，应用语言学研究取得了很多新的进展，如何引导我国语言学方向的研究生快速便捷地了解这一领域的发展全貌和研究热点，成为我国语言学界老师面临的一个重要问题。有鉴于此，我们又从爱丁堡大学出版社、Multilingual Matters 等国际知名出版社精选了一批图书，组成“应用语言学研习丛书”，以更好地满足广大师生和相关学者的需求。

本丛书的各分册主题均为近年来应用语言学研究领域的热点话题，其中既有对所论述主题的理论回顾和梳理，也有对较新的发展和应用所做的阐释和分析，脉络清晰，语言简洁，共同反映了这一领域过去三四十年间的成果和积淀。

相信本套丛书的出版将为国内应用语言学研究带来新的启示，进一步推动我国语言学研究的的发展。

Developing Critical Languaculture Pedagogies in Higher Education

Theory and Practice

Adriana Raquel Díaz

Foreword

This book emerges at a time when language education is confronting a period of change and it seeks both to document and contribute to that change. New forms of communication, greater mobility and the emergence of language as a critical form of capital in the knowledge economy have all placed pressure on language educators and language programmes to develop learners with intercultural capabilities. This represents a challenge for language educators as they respond to new needs and new contexts in their practice.

The idea that language learning prepares students to understand and communicate with members of other cultures is hardly new. Language educators have long included the development of intercultural capabilities as a rationale for language teaching. However, although intercultural capabilities may have been an aim for language education, teaching approaches have not typically focused on these, seeing them rather as implicit in any form of successful language learning. The recognition that language education is to be successful in developing intercultural capabilities is much more recent and has led to a radical rethinking of the nature and processes of language teaching and learning. Central to this rethinking is the idea that intercultural capabilities need to be foregrounded in language teaching and learning at all points in language education programmes.

The reason for this rethinking has been a realisation that language learning without a specific intercultural focus has not developed the sorts of capabilities that language educators have claimed. Negative attitudes, problematic stereotypes and limited abilities to adapt to the languages, cultures and perspectives of others may persist throughout the learning of a language and, in some cases, may intensify through the processes of learning. This is because the development of intercultural capabilities is not inherent in the acquisition of communicative competence as represented by the grammar and vocabulary of a language. Rather it is something additional to these.

The realisation that language teaching needs to be adjusted to achieve what language educators have claimed as a goal of teaching and learning has led to rapid changes in the ways in which culture is integrated into language education. Although culture has long been present in language programmes, the cultural component of teaching has usually been separated from the language itself and has been seen as an additional dimension of learning, either communicated outside the target language or reserved for advanced level students whose language abilities were considered adequate for dealing with complex content. This separation of language and culture has effectively limited what can be achieved in language programmes in terms of intercultural learning. Recent thinking has called for a more integrated approach to language and culture in language education.

Revising language education programmes to integrate language and culture has not proved to be easy. This is because such integration does not simply involve a revision of language curricula but a complete reconceptualisation of the nature of language teaching and learning. This reconceptualisation involves new understandings of some of the fundamentals of language education, notably how we understand the core concepts of language, culture and learning.

The reconceptualisation of language has involved a shift from seeing language only in terms of code (grammar and vocabulary) to a view that integrates the code with social practices of meaning making and interpretation. Language is therefore not simply understood as the building blocks of communication, but as the processes and products of that communication. Understanding a language is therefore not simply a feature of proficiency, but a complex interpretative act that recognises language as constituting and constituted by the social actions of communicators. Learning a new language therefore involves more than the acquisition of new grammar and vocabulary as it requires the language learning to engage with the culturally positioned nature of language in use. In such a view of language the learners' first language and the target language do not operate independently – the practices and processes of meaning making and interpretation in each language are always potentially present in communication. A new language therefore needs to be understood in relation to the practices of meaning making and interpretation that are already available for the learner.

The impact of this reconceptualisation has been significant for understanding the nature of language, however, it can be argued that it more significant for how language educators have come to understand the nature of culture. The typical way of dealing with culture in language programmes has been to focus on culture as artefacts and information developed by another culture, typically understood and a monolithic national culture. Culture has

been presented as uniform and immutable. Understanding a culture has meant knowing about cultural products of others. The shift to interculturally oriented language education has entailed a shift in views of culture from artefacts and information, to a view of culture as symbols and practices that are constituent elements of the social world. Learning in relation to such an understanding involves engagement with practices in processes of meaning making and interpretation. Concomitant with this shifting focus in the nature of culture has been a realisation that language learning needs to engage with culture as situated, variable, plural and contested – a dynamic creative processes of human social interaction rather than a static representation of undifferentiated national representation.

As languages do not exist in isolation from each other, so too are cultures brought into the relationship through language teaching and learning. The learners' own cultures are a powerful component of the ways that they make sense of their world and communications about it. These cultures cannot be excluded from the communicative practices of second language users, but need to be brought into relationship with them. The learning of culture cannot therefore be isolated from the symbolic and interactional practices that constitute the learners' existing cultural repertoires. For this reason, language education has come to emphasise processes of decentring – stepping outside existing cultural assumptions to view the world from different perspectives – and mediation – interpreting cultural realities across cultural boundaries.

Finally, the view of learning involved in language education has been enlarged. Since the 1980s, language education has favoured the idea of acquisition – the unconscious development of language through comprehensible input – over conscious learning. However, such a view of learning does not allow for the development of the more complex needed to develop intercultural capabilities. Interculturally oriented language education has, therefore, developed an expanded theory of learning that integrates acquisition and learning in mutually supporting ways. The focus on learning allows for a sophisticated involvement of language learners in reflection on processes of meaning making and interpretation.

The reconceptualisation of language learning found in interculturally oriented forms of language education has resulted from an ongoing consideration of theoretical concepts in language teaching and learning, but the development of practice has tended to lag behind theoretical development. The introduction of any new way of working in education requires dissemination among those whose experience, both as teachers and as learners, has been developed in different contexts. Developing practice, therefore involves working with practitioners to engage in change both in conceptualisation and practice.

In interculturally oriented language education, developing practice is complex because intercultural language teaching and learning does not provide a methodology for teaching that can be adopted into practice to transform education. The fact that intercultural language teaching and learning is not a methodology results from a view of practice that maintains that there is no ready-made, one-size-fits-all way of developing intercultural capabilities through language education. Rather teaching and learning processes need to be understood in context. Therefore it is more appropriate to consider intercultural language teaching and learning in terms of a perspective on, or stance towards, learning in which the conceptualisation of the nature and purpose of language education leads to practical responses. The emphasis on stance or perspective entails the development, by individual teachers, of a comprehensive approach driven by reflective practice informed by theory, which can be used to scaffold the systematic integration of a coherent language and culture pedagogy.

This book represents an early investigation of the complexities of developing practice in intercultural language teaching and learning. It presents a coherent framework for approach curriculum and pedagogy, and documents the experiences of a group of teachers in developing their practice in response to emerging ideas of interculturally oriented language teaching and learning. In so doing, it addresses the pervasive theory/practice gap in language education by providing a comprehensive conceptual discussion of emerging critical themes in intercultural language teaching and learning supported by empirical accounts and case studies from the classroom. By evaluating theoretical and practical issues, this book identifies viable, sustainable innovation strategies for systematically integrating critical pedagogies in university language programmes.

Anthony J. Liddicoat
University of South Australia

Preface

This book was born of a desire to articulate the perceived gap between theory and practice in language and culture pedagogy. This gap, which seems unbridgeable at times, surely needs to be narrowed if we are effectively to address what is widely acknowledged to be one of the key competences for the 21st century: the development of intercultural competence. This has been the subject of countless scholarly publications, from monographs to journal articles, textbooks and conference proceedings. Many of these have become seminal works that serve as the foundations for this book. And yet, this subject continues to mystify theorists (i.e. linguists and applied linguists) and practitioners (i.e. teachers, teacher trainers and curriculum designers) alike. The volume of work available is all but testament to this.

In my own case, this gap continues to manifest itself as a chasm in personal and professional interactions. Earlier it was through my experiences as a learner of the English language in Argentina and subsequently, for over a decade now, as a foreign language teacher living in Australia. At the core of my concerns and frustrations has always been a fascination with language and culture, how they co-relate and how this relationship manifests in interaction.

This book has been, therefore, a way for me to pursue my own quest to help bridge the theory/practice gap in language and culture pedagogy. In so doing, I seek to help other language teachers and curriculum developers, like myself, to rethink their language and culture teaching practices and develop ways to articulate these into principles that may be adapted to the diverse and imperfect nature of the everyday language classroom. Principles that may also be relevant beyond the classroom, to best serve us in the increasingly globalised world in which we live. Indeed, because of the global shift in higher education and the consequences of this for pedagogy, these principles also need to be embedded in the international context that is currently shaping the higher education policy agenda, and, in turn, ineluctably shaping our practices.

I could not have completed this book without the support of a number of people and I extend my most sincere gratitude to all of them. This book draws from the empirical research I conducted as part of my doctoral dissertation, so I begin by acknowledging the guidance provided by my supervisors Dr Susana Eisenclas and Dr Sue Trevaskes. I sincerely thank them both for being devoted mentors to me in my career as a beginning academic. I am also indebted to Ms Maureen Todhunter, who edited and proofread this manuscript diligently, and provided invaluable support in conceptualising this book as a coherent whole. I would also like to thank the editorial staff at Multilingual Matters, as well as the reviewers of the book proposal and final manuscript, their input and suggestions were invaluable to completing this work.

I thank all the participants in my empirical study for the time, ideas and support they provided in our meetings and interviews. I am particularly indebted to the teacher-participants, who by sharing insights into their experiences and teaching practices were instrumental in enabling me to bring this investigation to fruition.

Last but not least I acknowledge the valuable contributions of my loved ones. My parents, Sofia Luna de Díaz and Carlos Daniel Díaz, enabled me to make my dream of studying in Australia a reality and continue to encourage me in my academic endeavours. Above all, I thank my husband, Fabio Caruso, for always being there for me, for motivating me and inspiring me to never give up on my dreams.

Introduction

In many ways it is a truism that the world is more globally interconnected than even before. The last few decades in particular have witnessed profound changes in population mobility, technology enabling instant international communication and the ever-increasing frequency of intercultural encounters. These changes impact significantly on the employment market, where many prospective employees are expected to have skills and knowledge to enable them to deal competently in a wide range of situations and with people who have diverse language and cultural experiences and communication styles. In this context, higher education has become central to developing these skills and to providing graduates with competitive advantage in the international labour marketplace (Paige & Goode, 2009). Yet despite this imperative and the opportunities it presents, as Lee *et al.* point out, institutions 'are not doing an adequate job' (Lee *et al.*, 2012: 1).

According to the latest Global Survey conducted by the International Association of Universities in 2010, the top rationale driving internationalisation processes in higher education institutions is 'improving student preparedness for a globalised world'. The second is 'internationalising the curriculum' (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010). Many educators acknowledge that preparing students for this globalised world hinges largely on integrating students' intercultural competence across disciplines, course curricula and degree structures (*cf.* Lee *et al.*, 2012). This approach extends to the study of languages (Dlaska, 2000, 2003), which is widely acknowledged as integral to raising awareness and understanding about underlying cultural values and beliefs reflected in communication (*cf.* Byram, 2009b; Della Chiesa *et al.*, 2012; Risager, 2006b; Sercu & Bandura, 2005; UNESCO, 2009).

However, strategies responding to internationalisation have largely overlooked the role of foreign language education¹ in preparing graduates for engaging in an intercultural dialogue with and in this globalised world (*cf.* Bergan & van't Land, 2010; Byram, 2012b; Dlaska, 2012; Klee, 2009; Warner,

2011). This is clearly reflected at the macro-level of policy statements at transnational, intergovernmental levels (Bergan & van't Land, 2010; Chambers, 2003; Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010; Tudor, 2005) and in numerous reports and scholarly publications at national level – particularly in the United States (AACU & National Leadership Council, 2007; CIGE, 2012; Modern Language Association, 2007), the United Kingdom (Coleman, 2011; Worton, 2009) and Australia (Nettelbeck *et al.*, 2007; Pauwels, 2007; White & Baldauf, 2006) to name but a few. These reports and publications paint a paradoxical picture: a firmer focus on internationalisation of higher education against reduced offering of foreign language education.

At the core of this paradox we find a field in transition. Over the last few decades the field of languages education has changed significantly, especially through redefinition of the underlying goal of language learning. Leading scholars in the field (*cf.* Byram, 1997, 2001; Feng *et al.*, 2009; Kramsch, 1993, 1998a; Liddicoat *et al.*, 2003; Risager, 2006b; Sercu, 2004) claim the underlying goal of language learning is no longer primarily defined in terms of the acquisition of *communicative competence* (CC) (Hymes, 1972) in a foreign language, but rather, the development of *intercultural communicative competence* (ICC)² (Byram, 1997). The latter encompasses the skills, knowledge and attitudes that may help learners to communicate effectively across languages and cultures and thus become 'interculturally competent speakers' (Sercu, 2005: 2). This transformation has in turn called for reconceptualising teaching approaches and syllabi to address the development of students' intercultural competences, and above all has called for teachers to revisit their role in promoting the development of these competences in the context of higher education.

Overall, despite widespread agreement at macro policy and discipline level that languages education should seek to develop interculturally competent speakers, how to achieve this goal at the micro-level of curriculum development is still under debate (Houghton, 2012; Parmenter, 2010). This discrepancy between expected goals, and teaching approaches and practices in place to achieve them, is reflected in the failure of both theorists (*i.e.* linguists and applied linguists) and practitioners (*i.e.* teachers, teacher trainers and curriculum designers) to traverse the theory/practice divide. Theorists continue to advance models of language, culture and their interrelationship, along with ways of conceptualising intercultural communicative competence and all-encompassing teaching approaches to address it in practice. Yet practitioners continue to struggle to translate these models and teaching approaches into actual classroom practice. While theoretical models for language and culture teaching have been made ever more sophisticated over the last few decades, implementation of these models still fails to address the imperfect nature and limitations of the everyday language classroom.

Published research into reconceptualising language and culture pedagogies in theory and practice serves as the springboard for this book. This research can be broadly grouped into three interrelated areas of inquiry: (1) the vexed relationship between language and culture (*cf.* Byram & Morgan, 1994; Kramsch, 1998a; Risager, 2006b); (2) potential pedagogical manifestations of this relationship (*cf.* Byram, 1997, 2001; Liddicoat & Crozet, 2000; Liddicoat *et al.*, 2003; Risager, 2007; Sercu *et al.*, 2005); and (3) implications for language and culture learning goals in the internationalised context of adult education (Byram, 2009b, 2012b; Trevaskes *et al.*, 2003). However, these areas of inquiry are sometimes not articulated in a complementary manner or with a view to offering explicit practical guidance in the current context of higher education. Since current developments in the internationalisation of higher education globally underscore the importance of developing intercultural communicative competence, these aspects need to be addressed as part of a complex whole with their inter-relationships clearly understood and articulated.

The stage is set for a clarion call. Higher education institutions (HEIs) around the world face imperatives to rethink their approaches to internationalisation *vis-à-vis* their stated vision of developing interculturally competent graduates. As part of this rethink, institutions need to reconsider their commitment to revising the internationalised curriculum that currently neglects the integral role of language studies in the development of intercultural competence. Similarly, the field of language education needs to revisit what is now widely acknowledged to be its ultimate goal – the development of interculturally competent speakers – *vis-à-vis* emerging research on how to realise this goal in practice.

This book sets out to engage in this critical examination and, in so doing, to identify avenues conducive to narrowing the gap between how this goal is conceptualised and the practices pursued to achieve it. I argue that to reconcile everyday practices with top-down forces at both policy (international, national and institutional) and discipline (theoretical and conceptual as well as practical) levels, we need to formalise and scaffold strategies to reform the current language and culture curriculum in higher education. This entails generating a comprehensive curriculum development framework driven by *praxis* – reflective practice informed by theory. Engaging in development of this framework may help both theorists and practitioners to traverse the perceived theory/practice divide for the benefit of all involved.

Main Features and Aims of This Book

The title of this book, *Developing Critical Language Culture Pedagogies in Higher Education: Theory and Practice*, encapsulates its main features and aims. The

three main features of the book are interrelated. One is its *critical* approach. Criticality, that is, critical thinking, critical self-reflection and critical action is emerging as an integral force traversing every aspect of language and culture pedagogy in adult education (cf. Byram, 2012a; Guilherme, 2002; Houghton, 2012; Johnston *et al.*, 2011; Levine & Phipps, 2012; Yamada, 2010). In this book, it manifests as an underlying thread woven into conceptualisation of (1) the proposed curriculum development framework; (2) the language and culture learning goals; and (3) the very nature of research conducted in the classroom. The second feature is use of the portmanteau term *linguaculture*³ to conceptualise and refer to the relationship between language and culture. In the field of language pedagogy, this term has been extensively examined and used by Risager (2005, 2006b); I use it as an overarching term to include Risager's and other relevant language and culture conceptual frameworks that reflect linguistically mediated cultural meaning and behaviours in interaction.

The third feature is concerned with the principles of a curriculum development framework I have conceptualised as possible *pedagogies*. Acknowledging 'pedagogy' as a contested term, in this study it is understood as the purposeful articulation and enactment of the *why*, the *what* and the *how* of our teaching practices, that is: goals, content and methods as they relate to our specific educational context with all its structural, logistical and organisational limitations and possibilities. Above all, this understanding of pedagogy is underpinned by epistemologies of practice as *praxis* – reflective practice informed by theory – to promote innovation (Murphy, 2008). Indeed, according to Guilherme, 'the articulation between reflection and action provides for the nullification of the dichotomy between theory and practice, thus changing the educational practice ... into a *praxis* ...' (Guilherme, 2002: 37).

As a guide to practice, this book takes the perspective of teachers and foregrounds their paramount role as curriculum developers and potential agents of educational innovation. It is thus primarily intended to help university language teachers in developing and implementing sustainable curriculum innovation, and above all, to inspire change in the academic community at large. Indeed, coherent articulation of the various elements involved in developing intercultural competences through language education requires action from policymakers as well as curriculum developers and theorists.

Here guidance is provided through a threefold process. The first critically re-examines discrepancies between the expected goals of languages education and higher education policies in relation to intercultural learning, and the teaching approaches and practices in place to achieve these goals. The

second articulates a curriculum development framework that aims to address these discrepancies. The third critically analyses the proposed framework's implementation, through four case studies of curriculum innovation in the Australian higher education context. These case studies are underpinned by a critical, constructive and transformative stance toward language and culture pedagogy, as well as professional development in higher education. As such, the case studies represent both 'units of study' as they embody the various educational contexts in which the framework was implemented, and 'end-products' as they comprehensively describe and analyse the findings from each unit.

The case studies included a Participatory Action Research (PAR) component, which enabled me as the researcher to engage collaboratively with the teacher-participants in innovation through a scaffolded cycle of inquiry within the context of their own subjects. The argument supporting this PAR component is that good practice is only as good as its potential to be transposed to other contexts, and this can be made possible only through collaboration. Qualitative data from interviews, field notes from classroom observations, as well as classroom-work samples offer a holistic view of the teachers' curricular innovations.

Rather than serving as yet another prescriptive model, this *praxis*-driven curriculum development framework presents a pedagogic blueprint. It is made up of interrelated building blocks that both theorists and practitioners should consider when engaging with processes of curriculum innovation to better develop interculturally competent graduates. While underpinned by current theoretical trends in language and culture pedagogy, these building blocks also address the intrinsic structural features of university degrees and, in particular, of their language programmes. Thus, in its overall conception, this framework considers both top-down and bottom-up perspectives on the limitations of sustainable curriculum innovation. Most importantly, it critically considers the conceptual, logistical and organisational features common to the everyday classroom reality. It recognises teachers in their key role of curriculum innovators while considering sustainable avenues for continuing professional development. Therefore, this framework should not be conceptualised as immutable, procedural or 'one-size fits all', but as a pedagogical blueprint and guiding compass for theorists and practitioners to consider the variables involved in the complex process of traversing the theory/practice divide in language and culture teaching.

Overall, the results of this study aim to contribute to the development of deeper reaching and more effective processes of internationalising the higher education curriculum through critical *linguaculture* awareness in knowledge and practice. By encouraging readers to reflect critically on their assumptions

about language, culture and their inter-relationship, and on their own teaching and learning practices, this study may help to generate the kind of personal and professional reflection that is at the heart of both intercultural learning and the development of intercultural competence.

Overview of the Book

This study is organised in three main parts, the first predominantly critical-theoretical, the second empirical, and the third a synthesis of the two. Part 1 opens with Chapter 1 where I examine the theory/practice gap from a top-down perspective. This perspective explores two paths – the current theoretical and conceptual concerns in the field of language and culture pedagogy, and the internationalised higher education context. They enable identification of the main ‘stumbling blocks’ or obstacles to narrowing the theory/practice gap, to enhance the development of intercultural speakers. In Chapter 2, I consider how to turn these obstacles or ‘stumbling blocks’ into the principles or ‘building blocks’ of a pedagogical framework. I group these building blocks into three categories: theoretical, pedagogical and institutional.

In Part 2, with its empirical focus, I present applications of this framework in practice. I explore the interface between theory, practice, reality and possibility, through four case studies of curriculum innovation in two language programmes at an Australian university. These case studies explore the challenges faced by language educators as they sought to enact the development ‘critical *language* awareness’ in the curriculum and in the classroom. Even though these case studies are set in an Australian context, as I explain throughout the book, they reveal processes that mirror trends common in the literature and in the international context. Chapter 4 takes up the empirical findings to extrapolate exemplars of good practice, while acknowledging recurrent limitations in the framework’s building blocks. Finally, this chapter articulates good practice *vis-à-vis* current demands in higher education.

Part 3 of the book is devoted to Chapter 5, which, on the basis on the empirical findings, explores the mechanisms at play in promoting and ensuring that the kind of *praxis*-driven pedagogical innovation proposed in this book can be sustained over time. It thus revisits the role of the teacher as curriculum innovator, the need to scaffold their professional development and the urgency of designing active dissemination and embedding strategies for the future of the field. This chapter also considers the role of HEIs in supporting these mechanisms and pays particular attention to the overall vision