Advancing Intercultural Learning in World Language Education: Recent Developments in Pre-Service Teacher Education in the U.S.

PAULA GARRETT-RUCKS [a]

[a] Georgia State University, USA
Email: prucks@gsu.edu

Abstract

Intercultural understanding is increasingly prioritized in the teaching and learning of world languages. Empirical evidence reveals the ways in which an intercultural communicative approach to foreign language instruction can foster learners' intercultural competence (Garrett-Rucks, 2016). Yet, in the U.S., there remains a disconnect in the distribution of federal funds for internationalization efforts to foster learners' intercultural understanding and the support given for world languages study, in which enrollment continues to fall (MLA, 2018). This position paper is intended to raise awareness of the crucial role of foreign language (FL) learning in fostering learners' intercultural understanding in order to put into question the underestimated role of FL learning in U.S. educational policies and internationalization efforts. Despite the lack of financial, political and educational policy support, current World Language teacher certification practices in the U.S. require candidates to provide evidence of their intercultural approach to language instruction. This paper describes the emphasis on cultural reflection in current U.S. World Languages teacher certification practices and provides a review of meaningful culture learning projects to encourage all language instructors to take an intercultural communicative approach to their instruction.

Keywords: world language education, foreign language education, global competence, global literacy, intercultural competence, teacher certification, culture instruction

Introduction

People of diverse nationalities are frequently being asked to communicate and work together in an increasingly mobile and global society. In fact, the ability to work collaboratively and construct positive interpersonal relationships with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds has become essential to the functioning of many industries within the global economy and to the creation of

harmonious multicultural societies (Williams, 2010). The field of Foreign Language Education plays a particularly important role in the development of such abilities, particularly when intercultural goals are overtly supported by institutions, such as by being explicitly incorporated into curriculum, classroom practice and teacher training. Building on the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages' (ACTFL) 2014 Position Statement on Global Competence, defined as "the ability to communicate with respect and cultural understanding in more than one language (p. 1)," there is particularly strong movement within the world language profession to train pre-service teachers to be able to actively promote cultural reflection in their classrooms. More specifically, pre-service teachers are now required to show evidence that they are fostering students' understanding of other cultures in a national certification portfolio called edTPA, adopted in 41 of the 50 states in the U.S. (SCALE, 2018).

Despite these changes, the general public and many monolingual U.S. policy makers often fail to recognize the very important role that world language instruction plays in the development of citizen's global competence. Even universities themselves, despite their internationalization initiatives, often underestimate the transformative potential of the language learning experience to contribute to institutional internationalization goals (Warner, 2011). As evidenced in the U.S. Modern Language Association enrollment reports (2018), U.S. foreign language enrollment continues to fall despite tremendous efforts and funding to support higher education internationalization efforts. U.S. internationalization efforts have attempted to foster intercultural exchanges, both in real and virtual settings, yet the support of second language learning remains neglected.

Accordingly, this position paper puts forth the argument that it is vitally important for language teachers to recognize the importance of taking an intercultural approach to language instruction and to be able to communicate this importance to students and other stakeholders. As a field, we will not be recognized for our important contribution to society, nor have access to the governmental funding for internationalization in the U.S. context, until the majority of world language teachers can implement interculturally oriented language instruction and help raise the profile of world languages more broadly. This paper discusses the shift towards an intercultural approach in pre-service teacher training as well as other best practices in an attempt to encourage policy makers and experienced teachers alike to understand the value of world language instruction taught with an intercultural approach. Particular attention is paid to the role of instructional practices that promote genuine cultural reflection that prepares students to compete in a global market with responsible global citizenship.

Internationalization and the Role of Language Learning

Without a doubt, newcomers to today's job market will inevitably "find themselves interacting with others who are different, perhaps different in their values, perhaps in the simple ways in which they prefer to enact their lives, perhaps in the choices and freedoms they have" (Killick, 2017, p. 1). Many graduates will find that most business leaders now demand linguistically and culturally astute employees who possess not only a specialized skillset for the job but also critical thinking skills, a broad and diverse world view, and working knowledge of at least one language other than English (American Academy of Arts & Sciences, 2013, 2016; Joint National Committee for Languages, 2015). This is particularly evident in the growing number of U.S. job postings that explicitly seek bilingual candidates (American Academy of Arts & Sciences, 2017). In addition to showing a "demonstrated capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems" (Hart Research Associates, 2013, p. 22), employers are increasingly seeking candidates with intercultural skills and global knowledge.

Across industrialized cultures, post-secondary institutions have understood that by internationalizing

their course offerings, extra-curricular opportunities, and curricula they have the power to make their students better prepared for life and work in the current globalized society and workplace (Rumbley, Altbach, & Reisbert, 2012; Soria & Troisi, 2014; Yeaton, Garcia, Soria, & Huerta, 2017). The need to prepare students with intercultural skills in contemporary education extends beyond the workforce. The Council of Europe (2016) has found such an approach to be crucial for building and maintaining the "values, attitudes, skills, knowledge and critical understanding which enable an individual to participate effectively and appropriately in a culture of democracy" (p. 11). Due to the socio-political dimension of an international mindset, Kirk and colleagues (2018) posited that *global citizenship* constitutes a vital graduate attribute that involves social and civic responsibilities and can be achieved through strategic and concerted internationalization of the curriculum. Similarly, in the U.S., the former then U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, discussed the importance of a global approach to education in a 2010 speech to the Council on Foreign Relations where he stated:

> We have an important responsibility to provide opportunities for those who want to master other languages and prepare them to support America's economic and strategic interests as diplomats, foreign policy analysts, and leaders in the military. This is a high-stakes issue. For too long, Americans have relied on other countries to speak our language. But we won't be able to do that in the increasingly complex and interconnected world. To prosper economically and to improve relations with other countries, Americans need to read, speak and understand other languages. It's absolutely essential for the citizens of the United States to become fluent in other languages—and schools, colleges and universities must include producing bilingual students as a central part of their mission. (Duncan, May 26, 2018)

Contrary to the extant scholarship that underscores the significance of second language learning in internationalizing colleges and universities (American Academy of Arts & Sciences, 2017; Davies, 1992; Hudzik, 2011, 2015), foreign language enrollments in the U.S. continue to fall (MLA, 2018). This is partly due to the fact that despite political claims to support language learning in internationalization efforts (see the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations, 2012), U.S. educational policy has long neglected the role of world language learning in internationalization policies. For instance, in 2007, the United States Congress enacted the America COMPETES Act which stipulated the development and implementation of academic programs for both language learning and teacher education in the interest of maintaining national competitiveness. However, when the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act passed in January of 2011, it included no mention of languages and presented a singular focus on the STEM disciplines. An additional example is Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA)—the latest re-authorization of the 1965 U.S. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)—which did little to afford the study of non-English languages greater prominence in U.S. education policy.

Despite repeated claims of the importance of language learning in internationalization efforts, U.S. institutions are frequently compelled to internationalize by rationales solidly anchored in a neoliberal profit-centered agenda, such as the need to generate increased external funding through international research collaborations and enhancing status in global rankings in hopes of attracting more international students and benefitting from the influx of tuition revenue (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Busch, 2017; Green, 2012; Knight, 2012; Levin, 2017). Over a decade ago, Stromquist (2007) described internationalization to be closely associated with *entrepreneurialism* and *academic capitalism* in higher education. In such an environment, language learning is seen by many as an elitist undertaking that yields little return for the language learner, a view likely shared by many monolingual policy makers. Further exacerbating the problem is the general lack of awareness of current changes in foreign language teaching away from methods that may have previously frustrated policy makers,

leaving them unable to use the language or appreciate unfamiliar cultural perspectives.

Although U.S. internationalization efforts commonly do emphasize study abroad experiences for students, these often involve very little language or culture training prior to crossing cultures. Over the past ten years, there has been increased funding and emphasis on universities to provide short-term study abroad experiences to U.S. university students, emphasizing the importance of cross-cultural experience. Yet, short-term study abroad experiences more often than not provide only a superficial view of the local culture, which limits students' opportunity to develop a deep understanding of cultural differences. In fact, Magnan and Back (2007) found a lack of pre-program intercultural sensitivity development to be an obstacle to students' growth in language learning and intercultural competence development during their time abroad. Other research has demonstrated a relationship between the acquisition of intercultural competence and language learning (Brecht, Davidson, & Ginsberg, 1993; Martinsen, 2008).

Internationalization efforts that exclude language learning risk perpetuating monolingualism, which has been called the "illiteracy of the twenty-first century" (Roberts, Leite, & Wade, 2017, p. 116). Therefore, it is crucial for the field of world languages that we are able to understand and articulate the important role of language learning in developing insights into cultural diversity, the ability to effectively manage communication across cultural boundaries and ultimately, the kind of intercultural sensitivity that "builds up trust and understanding, can bridge the gap between peoples, and promotes peace and international trade" (Tochon, 2009, p. 656). This means reminding ourselves of the intercultural mission of our language work and considering how to move forward in terms of preparing teachers for promoting intercultural engagement through language learning.

Intercultural Learning and Foreign Language Study

In the field of World Language Education, many have agreed that teaching methods should emphasize the beliefs, behaviors, and values of target culture groups (Omaggio-Hadley, 2001). Recognizing the importance of cultural understanding in communicative competence, Omaggio (1986) advocated that the study of culture be an integral part of FL study if students were to derive lasting benefits from their FL learning experience. Byram (1988) furthered the notion of communicative competence adding that language is envisioned as a social practice carrying the meanings and values of a community, a social group, and as such language refers to the cultural context.

Over time, however, recognition emerged of the importance of learners' own subjective understandings in the process of engaging with a range of cultural products, practices and perspectives. When viewing culture as "shared patterns of behaviors and interactions, cognitive constructs, and affective understanding that are learned through a process of socialization" (CARLA, 2018), it becomes clear that cultural knowledge cannot be handed to students; rather there is a process of active meaning construction that must take place in the classroom as students explore boundaries between self and other (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013). Moreover, as culture is a dynamic entity rather than a static system, learning too is an ongoing process that requires constant noticing, comparison and reflection in the space between pre-existing knowledge and newly encountered cultural input (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013). This is one of the reasons why culture learning in foreign language education has come to increasingly emphasize learners' *intercultural learning* over discrete knowledge about target culture facts.

The promotion of intercultural learning emerged in the 1990s in response to increased interest in *how* to develop cultural understanding into foreign language learning. Byrnes (1991) had long suggested an emphasis on the subjective component of culture, serving as a precursor to current pedagogical

approaches of intercultural learning. Also recognizing the learner's identity in cultural instruction, Kramsch (1993) suggested that the process of cultural reflection take place in a negotiated space, which she refers to as a *third place*, the location between the C1 (first culture) and the C2 (target cultures) where all behavior (both that of others and that of oneself) is seen as being grounded in a particular cultural context. Similarly, Byram (1997) described the process of intercultural learning as reflective, internal, and individual.

The broad concept of intercultural learning has led to a range of definitions and models that have served as the basis for different approaches to its assessment. In a review of 238 publications, Fantini (2006) extrapolated commonalities on intercultural communicative competence and provided a comprehensive list of related terms used across the literature including *intercultural competence* (IC)*, cross-cultural awareness*, *intercultural sensitivity, ethnorelativity,* and *global competencies* which all essentially account for the ability to step beyond one's own culture and function with individuals from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds. As also highlighted by intercultural scholars such as Byram (1997), Bennett (1993), and Deardorff (2006), the ability to become aware of one's own assumptions and naturalized ways of viewing the world is crucial to opening up to alternative perspectives. Such a process necessitates reflection.

World Language educators instinctively understand the important role of learning a second language in fostering intercultural understanding, particularly due to the cultural meanings and affective power that surfaces whenever language is put to use for real communicative purposes (Agar 2004). In 1999, U.S. FL educators concurred that cultural understanding needed to start in FL classes as evidenced in the addition of the Cultures Standards to *National Standards for Foreign Language Education* (ACTFL, 1996, 1999, 2006), currently rebranded as the *World-Language Readiness Standards* (ACTFL, 2015) with increased emphasis on cross-cultural exploration and reflection to promote intercultural learning. As language is the mediator of all human experience, reflecting and affecting one's view of the world (Fantini, 2012), reflection on how language works to construct social meanings is an important entry point into broader exploration of underlying assumptions and values (McConachy, 2018).

Accordingly, language learning provides opportunities for learners to: (1) gain an insider's perspective toward target cultures' traditions, customs, beliefs, and ways of behaving; (2) expand their own worldviews; (3) build intercultural sensitivity toward alternate perspectives and cultural differences; and (4) strengthen, as well as expand their identity as a global citizen (Byram, 1997; Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2003; Norton, 2006; Risager, 2006). The intensity of focus that accompanies grappling with a language that is not one's own offers great potential for the emergence and development of attitudes that move beyond ethnocentric thinking and skills and behaviors that promote productive and effective communication among and across cultures (Byram, 1997; Garrett-Rucks, 2014, 2016). Crucial to this kind of intercultural development is the inclusion of the learners' own cultural knowledge and identity in processes of reflection (Byram, 1997; Fantini, 2011; Garrett-Rucks, 2013; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013; Kramsch, 1993, 2009; McConachy, 2018).

Despite recognizing the powerful role of language learning in, many educators remain confused by how to infuse meaningful cultural instruction into their lessons (Garrett-Rucks, 2016) and consequently, World Language Education remains a low priority in internationalization efforts, and arguably in the public eye. It is not until World Language instructors understand diverse ways of fostering learners' self-reflection with language learning starting at beginning levels of instruction that we will receive increased stature and importance in internationalization efforts. This brings us to the issue of best practices and teacher training, which will be dealt with in the next section.

Changes in the Teaching of Second Languages and Best Culture Teaching Practices

Putting intercultural theory into practice has been a challenge, and instructional models remained sparse in the literature (Garrett-Rucks, 2016). None-the-less, the teaching and learning of world languages has seen a paradigm shift in recent years in the U.S. Primarily, language teaching has moved from a traditional focus on preparing students for higher academic pursuits to that of honing valuable skills for everyday use (American Academy of Arts & Sciences, 2017). Furthermore, there has been a shift away from the traditional "four skills" (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking) to instruction and assessment that is now conceptualized in the communicative language teaching approach that focuses on the three modes of communication: interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational (ACTFL, 2015). To this end, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has reconceptualized the *National Standards for Foreign Language Learning* into actionable learning outcomes in the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015). For example, a learner's ability to *use, interact, understand, interpret, reflect, relate, investigate, present,* and *explain* is embedded within five goals: effective and appropriate *communication,* embracing the perspectives of different *cultures,* forming cross-disciplinary *connections,* drawing linguistic and cultural *comparisons,* and participating in multilingual and multicultural *communities.* The express purpose of this approach is to expose learners at all levels to a "curriculum with richness and depth [and] provide a broad range of communicative experiences and content knowledge" (p. 11).

Best practices in language teaching for proficiency in the target language places an emphasis on developing and demonstrating proficiency through performance-based assessments in the three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational). Performance-based assessments reflect the tasks and challenges language learners will face in real world scenarios. The Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) serves as an evaluation of student ability in the target language that is used as a cluster assessment featuring three tasks with one task in each of the three modes of communication (Adair-Hauck, Glisan, Koda, Swender, & Sandrock, 2006). The IPA is a multi-task assessment conceptualized within a single thematic context. In IPA tasks, language learners commonly complete an interpretive task (e.g., reading or viewing a video). Afterward they discuss the information from the interpretive task in an interpersonal task (e.g., conversation) before they summarize their learning with a presentational task (either written or spoken).

U.S. world language teacher certification now requires teacher candidates to provide evidence of the development of student communicative proficiency (with at least two of the three aforementioned modes of communication) in a meaningful cultural context during a capstone performance assessment called edTPA that is used for teacher licensure in 41 of the 50 states. The edTPA World Language exam requires teachers to show evidence of Second Language Acquisition theory in their lesson planning and video recorded evidence of research-supported, best teaching practices that are taught in university programs. Evidence of these skills needs to be provided to the external, national reviewers. The assessment is designed with a focus on student learning and principles from research and theory based on findings that successful teachers (1) develop knowledge of subject matter, content standards, and subject-specific pedagogy, (2) develop and apply knowledge of varied students' needs, (3) consider research and theory about how students learn, and (4) reflect on and analyze evidence of the effects of instruction on student learning. Implementation of edTPA began in fall 2013 after extensive, multi-year pilots and field tests with thousands of candidates with an increasing number of states participating each year.

EdTPA was created by and delivered to support and assess programs for teacher candidates by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). According to the SCALE website, edTPA was developed

by teachers and teacher educators nationwide with an emphasis on state College and Career Readiness Content standards to assess teaching behaviors that focus on student learning. The design of edTPA is based on theory and research on effective teaching. The two primary components of edTPA are described by as a (1) teaching-related performance tasks embedded in clinical practice that that focus on planning, instruction, assessment, academic language, and analysis of teaching; and 2) a 3-to-5 day documented learning segment to develop students' communicative proficiency in the target language within meaningful cultural context(s) (SCALE, 2018).

The national portfolio assessment, edTPA measures world language teacher candidates' teaching effectiveness by thirteen 5-point Likert-scale rubrics, many of which require evidence of cultural comparisons in the learning segment for the candidate to be rated ready to teach. The thirteen rubrics are designed around three tasks: (1) Planning, (2) Instruction, and (3) Assessment. In order to receive a higher score on edTPA, there must be evidence provided from the teacher-candidates lessons that the instructional material is situated in a meaningful cultural context. *Meaningful cultural contexts* are defined as sociocultural practices in the world language classroom, in the students' home and community, as well as in the target societies and/or cultures that speak the target language.

The four rubrics of Planning Task 1 (Planning for Instruction and Assessment, Rubrics 1-4) each address the candidate's ability to incorporate meaningful cultural contexts in their lesson plans while fostering learners' communicative proficiency. The highest score (a 5 on the Likert scale) sets the target goal for teacher candidates to show evidence of planning for all three modes of communication, such as an IPA task, in a meaningful cultural context while creating cross-cultural reflections by drawing on the students' personal, cultural, or community assets and experiences compared to the those within target cultures. For example, to earn the highest score on Rubric 2, Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs, teacher candidates must provide evidence of their use of strategies to identify and respond to common errors and misunderstandings about the target language and/or cultural practices in the target language in their lesson plans.

The five rubrics of Instruction Task 2 (Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning, Rubrics 5-9) assess candidates' ability to create a positive learning environment that provides opportunities for learners to express varied perspectives (Rubric 5) while deepening students' communicative proficiency. Teacher candidates are assessed on their submitted short video recordings of their instruction and a write up in which they analyzed their teaching effectiveness while making connections to Second Language Acquisition Teaching research and/or theory (Rubric 9). The highest score (a 5 on the Likert scale) sets the target goal for teacher candidates to show evidence of facilitating interactions among students to use the language in meaningful cultural contexts (Rubric 7) and to provide purposeful opportunities for students to demonstrate their reflection on cultural products, practices and perspectives of the culture(s) studied and their own experiences and knowledge (Rubric 8). For example, to earn the highest score on Rubric 6, Engaging Students' Target Language Communication, teacher candidates must provide evidence of learners' cultural reflection in cooperative language tasks in meaningful cultural contexts in which students link their personal, cultural, or community assets to new learning.

The four rubrics in Assessment Task 3 (Assessing Student Learning, Rubrics 10-13) assess candidates' ability to provide constructive feedback to guide the development of student proficiency in meaningful cultural contexts. Teacher candidates are assessed on the feedback they provide on three samples of student work from the learning segment and a write up in which they analyze their teaching effectiveness and plan the next steps in their instruction (Rubric 13).

In sum, the goal of the edTPA portfolio, as described by the World Languages handbook, is for teacher

candidates to show evidence in a short learning segment that they can "provide students with multiple opportunities to effectively use the target language to communicate with others. The ability to successfully communicate with others includes linguistic knowledge (e.g., grammatical forms and vocabulary) as well as interpersonal and sociocultural knowledge of the target language and its cultural practices" (SCALE, 2018. p. 2). As a performance-based assessment, edTPA requires candidates to demonstrate their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways. Consistent with the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and the ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers, world language instruction should "afford students opportunities to develop cultural competence" (SCALE, 2018, p. 02). This cultural competence comes from encouraging learners to use the language to investigate, explain and reflection "on the relationship between practices, products, and perspectives of the cultures and languages studied and the nature of language and culture through comparisons of the languages and cultures studied and their own" (SCALE, 2018, p. 02).

Moving the Profession Forward

As demonstrated by the implementation of edTPA in 41 of 50 states, it increasingly important to train world language educators to include cultural reflection in their instruction. Infusing humanistic perspectives in World Language education serves in building cultural bridges for our students to access, and ideally cherish target cultures in addition to preparing learners to enter the competitive, entrepreneurial workforce of the capitalistic societies, epitomized in the current geopolitical environment of the United States. In support of such goals, U.S. national standards for language and intercultural learning, such as the ACTFL/NCSSFL Can-Do Statements (ACTFL, 2017; Moeller & Yu, 2015), are based on the understanding that intercultural competence and language proficiency are two sides of the same coin—separate but inseparable, mutually dependent, and both crucial to global awareness. Insights from the professional literature can provide FL instructors and internationalization policy makers with examples of intercultural learning projects and their assessments of second language (L2) learner's ability to understand diverse worldviews and cultural perspectives.

Common aspects of intercultural learning include: 1) how students exchange perspectives, opinions, and views with target language speakers in virtual intercultural encounters (e.g., Chun, 2011; Furstenberg et al., 2001; Hanna & de Nooy, 2003; Schenker, 2012); 2) how native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) co-create cultural impressions in discussions (Byram, 1997; Lee, 2011; Johnson, 2008; Woodin, 2001) how learners reflect on their own cultural beliefs in cross-cultural projects (Furstenberg *et al.*, 2001; Ware, 2005; Corbett, 2010; Holmes & O'Neill, 2012; Garrett-Rucks, 2013).

The professional literature provides examples of how to assess student culture learning in performance assessment (Byram, 1997), portfolio assessment (Byram, 1997; Jacobson et al., 1999), interviews (Straffon, 2003; Fantini, 2006), and intercultural virtual communication projects (Corbett, 2010; Chun, 2011; Furstenberg *et al.*, 2001; Holmes & O'Neill, 2012; Schenker, 2012; Garrett-Rucks 2013). Additionally, more extensive projects could involve oral history or digital storytelling. In the United States, such projects need not be done abroad, as one could often find native speaker (NS) informants who may well be eager to share their experiences. NS informants in the U.S. can be found quite easily for Spanish (Lee 2011), or with somewhat more effort for French (Hoyt, 2012b). Both Lee and Hoyt found that ethnographic interviews with native speakers in combination with reflective writings can be quite effective in facilitating IC development.

Students need opportunities and time to explore and cultivate their understanding of target culture products, practices, and perspectives from classroom instruction outside of the class. Schulz (2007)

recommended providing learners with opportunities to record their "emerging awareness" (p. 18) as she discussed objectives and approaches to promote the development of cross-cultural understanding. Reflective journals, blogs, online classroom discussions, or wikis could play this role. Reflective journals offer a means for learners to analyze their experiences and feelings toward alternate cultural practices and perspectives. Providing students with examples of blogs or journals, particularly from students who have completed a successful study abroad experience could also provide helpful modeling, to encourage learners to move beyond simplistic descriptions and superficial reactions. Online classroom discussions provide learners the opportunity to situate their personal perspectives toward their own cultural norms compared to their peers' diverse perspectives prior to exposure to alternate cultural perspectives. Garrett-Rucks (2013) recommended exposing learners to pre-recorded videos of target-language informants' discussing their impressions of U.S. culture for learners to step back and view their own culture through the eyes of another culture. In her study, beginning French language learners collectively discussed alternate cultural products, practices and perspectives in online classroom discussions outside of classroom instruction time, in English. Given the emotional investment when dealing with cross-cultural perspectives, it may be advisable to give students the choice of writing in their native language, while suggesting that they gradually move to more target language use (Garrett-Rucks, 2013; Schulz 2007).

Flexibility in language use must be considered in cultural instruction. Kramsch (2009) pointed to the benefits of learners engaging in playful, creative use of language that may involve a period of code-switching in the transition from English use to TL use. In this same vein, cultural instruction could encourage students to write a poem or a story to express their thoughts and feelings about imagined cross-cultural encounters, or in reaction to their exposure to alternate cultural perspectives toward their own native culture norms as well as target culture norms. Likewise, use of proverbs and idiomatic expressions could be encouraged. As always, the learning outcomes must be considered—whether the goal of the activity is cultural reflection or perfected presentational communication.

These types of suggested activities encourage students to explore the cultural representations present in their own culture as well those in the target culture as they begin to understand how language and culture are interrelated. Researchers and foreign language (FL) educators alike have investigated changes in learners' intercultural competence in response to pedagogical interventions aimed at preparing learners for cross-cultural encounters. In the U.S., edTPA, the national World Language Teaching Portfolio Assessment assures that all instruction of language forms (vocabulary and grammar) and functions (uses) takes place in a cultural context for new teacher candidates seeking certification in 40 of the fifty states (SCALE, 2018).

We are living in an increasingly mobile and global society, and FL educators understand that relationship building, both across and within cultures is a critical element to peace-making efforts. Requiring pre-service teachers to provide evidence of the cultural reflection in their lesson plans for certification helps assure our field is reaching the goal of ACTFL Global Competence Position Statement –to foster learners' ability to communicate with respect and cultural understanding in more than one language (2014). With meaningful cultural reflection that validates the intersection of alternate cultural perspectives toward practices and products, within and across cultures, FL instructors can help prepare learners to recognize our global interdependence and encourage learners to accept responsibility for world citizenship. An internationalized curriculum that includes the study of additional language in addition to intercultural components has the power to provide graduates with a mental toolkit highly sought-after in today's job market (Jones, 2013; Rizvi, 2017), while world language educators assure our students are taught responsible global citizenship in our course. Marketing our world language programs in a way that affords us the opportunity to attach language learning to internationalization efforts can bring attention to the need for more learners to enroll in our

programs, and ideally to one day make second language learning a compulsory element in K–12 instruction as our European counterparts in this increasingly global economy.

References

Adair-Hauck, B., Glisan, E. W., Koda, K., Swender, E., & Sandrock, P. (2006). The integrated performance assessment (IPA): Connecting assessment to instruction and learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, *39* (3), 359–382.

Agar, M. (2004). We have met the other and we're all nonlinear: Ethnography as a nonlinear dynamic system. *Complexity, 10* (2), 16-24.

America COMPETES Act. (2007, August 9). 20 U.S.C., Pub. L. No. 110-69

America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (2011, January 4). 20 U.S.C., Pub. L. No. 111-356.

American Academy of Arts & Sciences. (2013). *The heart of the matter: The humanities and social sciences for a vibrant, competitive, and secure nation*. Cambridge, MA: AAA&S.

American Academy of Arts & Sciences. (2016). The state of languages in the U.S.: A statistical portrait (Commission on Language Learning). Retrieved from http://tinyurl.com/zdrthbk

American Academy of Arts & Sciences. (2017). *America's languages: Investing in language education for the 21st century.* Cambridge, MA: AAA&S.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1996, 1999, 2006). *National Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1st-3rd eds.). Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2014). Global Competence Position Statement. Retrieved from https://www.actfl.org/news/position-statements/global-competence-position-statement

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2015). *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2017). NCSSFL/ACTFL can-do statements: Intercultural Communication Novice-Superior. Retrieved from https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/CanDos/Intercultural%20Can-Do_Statements.pdf

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2017). NCSSFL/ACTFL can-do statements: Performance indicators for language learners. Retrieved from https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/CanDos/Intercultural%20Can-Do_Statements.pdf

Bennett, J. M. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural.

Brecht, R. D., Davidson, D., & Ginsberg, R. B. (1993). *Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Busch, L. (2017). *The knowledge for sale: The neoliberal takeover of higher education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Byram, M. (1988). Foreign language education and cultural studies. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 1* (1), 15-31.

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

Byrnes, H. (1991). Reflections on the development of cross-cultural communicative competence in the foreign language classroom. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research* (pp. 205-218). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. What is culture? http://www.carla.umn.edu/culture/definitions.html [retrieved May 26, 2018].

Chun, D. (2011). Developing intercultural communicative competence through online exchanges.

CALICO Journal, 28(2), 392–419.

Corbett, J. (2010). *Intercultural language activities*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Council of Europe. (2016). Competences for democratic culture: Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806ccc07

Council on Foreign Relations. (2012). U.S. education reform and national security (Independent Task Force Report No. 68). Retrieved from https://www.cfr.org/report/us-education-reform-and-national-security

Davies, J. (1992). Developing a strategy for internationalization in universities: Towards a conceptual framework. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 177-190). Chicago, IL: AIEA

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10* (3), 241-266.

Duncan, A. (2010). Education and the language gap (Secretary Arne Duncan's remarks at the Foreign Language Summit). Retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/education-and-language-gap-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-foreign-language-summit

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Pub. L. No. 114-95, 1177 Stat. (2015, December 10).

Fantini, A. E. (2006). *Exploring and assessing intercultural competence*. Retrieved June 8, 2008, from http://www.sit.edu/publications/docs/feil_research_report.pdf

Fantini, A. E. (2012). Language: An essential component of intercultural communicative competence. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 263-278). New York, NY: Routledge.

Furstenberg, G., Levet, S., English, K., & Maillet, K. (2001). Giving a virtual voice to the silent language of culture: The CULTURA Project. *Language Learning and Technology, 5* (1), 55-102.

Garrett-Rucks, P. (2013). A discussion-based online approach to fostering deep cultural inquiry in an introductory language course. *Foreign Language Annals, 46* (2), 191-212.

Garrett-Rucks, P. (2013). Maximizing cross-cultural understanding, minimizing stereotypes: Three case studies. *The French Review, 86* (5), 14-33.

Garrett-Rucks, P. (2014). Measuring instructed language learners' IC development: Discrepancies between assessment models by Byram and Bennett. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 41* (July), 181-191.

Garrett-Rucks, P. (2016). *Intercultural competence in instructed language learning: Bridging theory and practice*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Green, M. F. (2012). *Measuring and Assessing Internationalization.* NAFSA Association of International Educators. Retrieved 10/2018 http://www.usask.ca/secretariat/governing-bodies/council/committee/international/reports-archive/NAFSAMeasuringInternationalization.pdf

Hanna, B., & de Nooy, J. (2003). A funny thing happened on the way to the forum: Electronic discussion and foreign language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, *7* (1), 71-85.

Hart Research Associates. (2013). It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success. *Liberal Education, 99* (2), 22-29.

Holmes, P. & O'Neill, G. (2012). Developing and evaluating intercultural competence: Ethnographies of intercultural encounters. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36* (5), 707-718.

Hoyt, K. (2012). Developing intercultural competence via semi-directed cross-cultural interviews. *NECTFL Review, 69* (1), 94-117.

Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action*. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Hudzik, J. K. (2015). *Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Jacobson, W., Schleicher, D., & Maureen, B. (1999). Portfolio assessment of intercultural competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23* (3), 467-492.

Johnson, N. (2008). Postcards from the (turbulent) edge (of chaos): Complexity theory and computer mediated communication. In S. Sieloff Magnan (Ed.), *Mediating discourse online* (pp. 73-92). Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Joint National Committee for Languages. (2015). The contributions of language to the economic interests of the United States (Briefing paper for the Commission on Language Learning of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences). Retrieved from: https://www.amacad.org/multimedia/pdfs/TheContributionsofLanguagetotheEconomicInterestsoftheUnitedStates.pdf

Jones, E. (2013). Internationalization and employability: The role of intercultural experiences in the development of transferable skills. *Public Money and Management, 33* (2), 95-104.

Killick, D. (2017). *Internationalization and diversity in higher education: Implications for teaching, learning and assessment.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan

Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. De Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 27-42). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lee, L. (2011). Blogging: Promoting learner autonomy and intercultural competence through study abroad. *Language Learning & Technology, 15* (3), 87–109.

Levin, J. S. (2017). *Community colleges and new universities under neoliberal pressures: Organizational change and stability*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Liddicoat, A.J., & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural language teaching and learning.* New York: Wiley.

Magnan, S. S., & Back, M. (2007). Social interaction and linguistic gain during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 40* (1), 43-61.

Martinsen, R. A. (2008). Short-term study abroad: Predicting changes in oral skills. *Foreign Language Annals, 43* (3), 504-530.

McConachy, T. (2018). *Developing intercultural perspectives on language use: Exploring pragmatics and culture in foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Modern Language Association. (2018). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education. Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Enrollments-in-Languages-Other-Than-English-in-United-States-Institutions-of-Higher-Education

Moeller, A. J., & Yu, F. (2015). NCSSFL-ACTFL can-do statements: An effective tool for improving language learning within and outside the classroom. *Dimension,* 2015, 50-69.

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning, 53* (1), 33-64.

Norton, B. (2006). Identity as a sociocultural construct in second language education. *TESOL in Context (Special Issue)*, 22-23.

Omaggio, A. (1986) *Teaching language in context.* Heinle & Heinle Publishers, Inc. Boston MA.

Omaggio-Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: Global flows and local complexity*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.

Rizvi, F. (2017). School internationalization and its implications for higher education. In H. De Wit, J. Gacel-Ávila, E. Jones, & N. Jooste (Eds.), *The globalization of internationalization: Emerging voices and perspectives* (pp. 18-26). New York, NY: Routledge.

Roberts, G., Leite, J., & Wade, O. (2017). Monolingualism is the illiteracy of the twenty-first century. *Hispania, 100* (5), 116-118.

Schenker, T. (2012). Intercultural competence and cultural learning through telecollaboration. *CALICO Journal, 29* (3), 449–470.

Schulz, R. (2007). The challenge of assessing cultural understanding in the context of foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*, 9–26.

Soria, K. M., & Troisi, J. (2014). Internationalization at home alternatives to study abroad: Implications for students' development of global, international, and intercultural competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18* (3), 261-280.

Straffon, D. A. (2003). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 487–501

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity. (2018). *Teaching Performance Assessment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Retrieved from https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity. (2018). *edTPA World Language Assessment Handbook*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53* (1), 81-105.

Tochon, F. (2009). The key to global understanding: World Languages Education. Why schools need to adapt. *Review of Educational Research, 79* (2), 650-682.

Ware, P. (2005). "Missed" communication in online communication: Tensions in a German-American telecollaboration. *Language Learning and Technology, 9* (2), 64-89.

Warner, C. (2011). Rethinking the role of language study in internationalizing higher education. *L2 Journal, 3* (1), 1-21.

Williams, G. (2010). *The knowledge economy, language and culture*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Woodin, J. (2001). Tandem Learning as an intercultural activity. In M. Byram, A. Nichols, & D. Stevens (Eds.), *Developing intercultural competence in practice* (pp. 189-202). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Yeaton, K. E., Garcia, H. A., Soria, J., & Huerta, M. (2017). Cultivating global citizens for the global good. In H. C. Alphin, R. Y. Chan, & J. Lavine (Eds.), *The future of accessibility in international higher education* (1st ed., pp. 1-20). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Author Biodata

Dr. Paula Garrett-Rucks (Ph.D. in Second Language Acquisition, UW-Madison) is Associate Professor of Foreign Language Education at Georgie State University. She is an active researcher on the formation of learners' cultural perceptions and stereotypes, the role of affect in second language learning, and digital L2 literacy. Dr. Garrett-Rucks has served on the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) as an officer of the Cultures SIG and an invited member of the ACTFL Interculturality Task Force to design national rubrics for assessing the development of intercultural competence in language instruction.