Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching: Enhancing awareness and practice through cultural portfolio projects

Joanne Maree Oranje

-----

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

March 2016
ABSTRACT

Recommended in language education curricula around the world, intercultural communicative language teaching (ICLT) is also promoted by the New Zealand Ministry of Education for teaching and learning languages at secondary school. However, research in New Zealand and abroad has shown that language teachers do not have a sound understanding of ICLT and most do not practice the approach. Studies have suggested universal tensions that give rise to shortcomings in ICLT awareness and/or practice; this study takes a view to remedy them.

The overall research concern of this thesis is to support the practice of ICLT in New Zealand secondary school language classes, grounded in two aims:

1. To ascertain the status quo of New Zealand secondary school language teachers’ awareness and practice of ICLT; and

2. To develop, implement, and evaluate an in-class intervention of an activity grounded in ICLT, namely cultural portfolio projects. This aim expressly sought to resolve tensions described by teachers internationally as hindering ICLT awareness and practice.

The aims were achieved in a two-phase project based on a theoretical framework of the philosophical theory of pragmatism (specifically, Dewey’s worldview) and the psychological perspective of sociocultural theory. Phase 1 explored language teachers’ cognitions with respect to culture in language education generally, and to ICLT specifically. A questionnaire was administered to language teachers of 121 secondary schools. Quantitative analysis of the data from the 76 questionnaires returned provided a fresh understanding of New Zealand language teachers’ awareness of ICLT and revealed a range of factors as influencing their cognitions, awareness, and practice of the approach. Phase 2 was an in-class intervention involving teachers and students of three secondary school language classes (2 x German, 1 x French) in a term-length student-centred activity called cultural portfolio projects (CPPs). The CPPs embodied ICLT principles and demonstrated the theory of ICLT in practice. Data gathered from observations, interviews, and group discussions were analysed using qualitative methods.
Results across phases showed that New Zealand language teachers continue to demonstrate low levels of awareness of ICLT, chiefly due to tensions related to curricular documents, teacher education, and apparent conflict in subsets of teachers’ beliefs. As a consequence, mediating tools that could empower the practice of ICLT were inaccessible, flawed, or ineffectively used. The CPPs were evaluated positively as a culture teaching tool by teachers and students alike, and their step-wise nature raised the teachers’ consciousness of ICLT to the extent that all of the tensions were reduced.

The thesis culminates in the presentation of a heuristic model of an intercultural communicative language teacher. The model is a mediating tool for teachers and teacher educators to illuminate the extent to which their cognitions, practices, and aims reflect an ICLT approach, to enable focused development to assist their trajectory towards being an ICLT practitioner.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

It is intuitive to think of language and culture as intertwined, each playing their part in any interaction. Language and culture both come acutely to the fore in interactions between people from different linguistic and social backgrounds. For those learning a language, culture knowledge, in particular, is recognised as being interesting, motivating, and necessary to avoid or mitigate misunderstandings when engaging with others. It is, therefore, counter-intuitive that international research has shown language education to sacrifice teaching the cultural dimension in favour of teaching the linguistic dimension.

1.1 The Research Territory

*Intercultural communicative language teaching* (hereafter, ICLT) is a language teaching approach—or as Newton prefers, a “stance” (2012, p. 31)—that integrates language and culture at all stages. With the objective of developing learners’ intercultural communicative competence, ICLT encourages the exploration, reflection, and comparison of languages and cultures, including the learner’s (and the teacher’s) own.

The New Zealand Ministry of Education (hereafter, the Ministry) recommends the use of ICLT for secondary school language education. Although ICLT is not explicitly named in the national curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007a) (hereafter, the curriculum), it is specified in the online curriculum guide for Learning Languages (Ministry of Education, 2013). The curriculum guide also describes an ICLT-based teaching method built on six principles, developed by Newton, Yates, Shearn, and Nowitzki (2010). Furthermore, since the 2007 revision of the curriculum that established Learning Languages as a learning area in its own right, the Ministry has emphasised the significance of teaching culture in language education. The equally-weighted strands of language knowledge and cultural knowledge support the sole objective of Learning Languages, communication.

This thesis has the overall research concern of supporting New Zealand language teachers in the practice of ICLT. The preceding paragraphs introduced the context of ICLT in New Zealand. In the following sections, key research in the field is summarised to provide background and to reveal the niche that this study set out to fill (Bitchener, 2010). Then, the rationale is given for the theoretical approach taken, before the
methodological procedures are introduced. The later sections of the chapter describe and clarify key terms used, explain the organisation of the thesis, and comment on a publication and a number of presentations that have drawn from the project.

1.2 The Niche

The notion of teaching towards intercultural communicative competence (ICC) originated in the 1990s, chiefly in the work of Byram and Zarate (1996, 1997). As could be expected, it took time for the associated approach of ICLT to feature in language teachers’ practices. However, research has shown the practice of some aspects of the approach to still be limited (e.g., Sercu et al., 2005; Peiser & Jones, 2013; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Woodgate-Jones, 2009; Young & Sachdev, 2011). Some studies emphasised an apparent mismatch between beliefs and practices, with teachers commonly revealing beliefs that accorded with ICLT but demonstrating teaching practices that did not (e.g., Díaz, 2013; Han, 2010; Han & Song, 2011; Sercu et al., 2005). Various reasons were suggested for low levels of ICLT practice. These include:

(i) A lack of time to teach culture (e.g., Sercu et al., 2005; Yeganeh & Raessi, 2015);
(ii) Insufficient teacher education in ICLT theory, practice, and assessment (e.g., Byrd, Hlas, Watzke, & Valencia, 2011; Kelly, 2012; Peiser & Jones, 2013; Scarino, 2010; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Woodgate-Jones, 2009; Young & Sachdev, 2011);
(iii) Teachers’ lack of familiarity with the target culture (Byram & Risager, 1999; Ghanem, 2014; Han, 2010);
(iv) Teachers’ low exposure to cultural diversity (Czura, 2013; Jedynak, 2011; Youngs & Youngs, 2001);
(v) A lack of resources to support teachers’ practice of ICLT (e.g., Han, 2010; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Luk, 2012; Moeller & Osborn, 2014; Young & Sachdev, 2011); and
(vi) The absence of reference to ICLT in education policy and curricular documentation (e.g., Castro, Sercu & Méndez García, 2004; Scarino, 2014).

The small amount of New Zealand-based ICLT research reported that New Zealand language teachers did not have a sound understanding of ICLT and, consequently, most
did not practice the approach. Reports have described New Zealand teachers as being aware of the benefits of culture education but uncertain about how to integrate culture in the language class and confused by the perception of a language focus in assessment (e.g., Conway, Richards, Harvey, & Roskvist, 2010; East & Scott, 2011; Richards, Conway, Roskvist, & Harvey, 2010).

The regularity with which studies in New Zealand and abroad have raised the same tensions suggest that what would be more helpful now is research that takes a view to remedying the resulting shortfalls in awareness and practice of ICLT. This study seeks to fill that niche.

1.3 Occupying the Niche

The project was grounded in a research paradigm comprising the philosophical theory of pragmatism (specifically, Dewey’s worldview) and the psychological perspective of sociocultural theory (hereafter, SCT). Pragmatism sits especially well with language education with its emphasis on the need for classroom content to be relevant and useful (Prawat, 2009), both of which are necessary to facilitate effective communication in the target language and culture. Pragmatism also connects language education with ICLT, endorsing experiential learning through genuine interactions and with authentic materials. In this way, learners can make new discoveries and, consequently, make unique and meaningful contributions to the classroom community’s shared understanding (Dewey, 1909/2009, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1938).

Particularly relevant to a study that seeks to review teachers’ practices is SCT’s notion of mediation. As is explained in greater detail in section 2.3, chapter 2, in an SCT perspective, all activities are mediated, by others, tools, or both. Tools can be physical—such as a computer or a national curriculum—or intangible—such as a language or a theoretical construct. In order for tools to empower an activity, as opposed to hindering it, they must be appropriate for the task, accessible, and used properly (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wertsch, del Río, & Alvarez, 1995). The use of tools to assist learning is also a feature of pragmatism, and this common ground supports the joint application of these two theories of development in this study.

The majority of extant research on culture teaching and ICLT was grounded in constructivism. From a constructivist perspective, development occurs as a result of a
learner’s experiences as they manipulate the world (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000; Scott & Palincsar, 2009) and the individual remains “fundamentally unchanged by the construction of knowledge” (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000, p. 228). In contrast, SCT focuses on learning as an act of socialisation (e.g., Cobb, 1994; Duff & Talmy, 2011; Packer & Goicoechea, 2000), where knowledge is co-constructed in a mediated interaction and the interactants are transformed as a result (Edwards, 2007; Johnson, 2006; Shuh & Barab, 2007). The knowledge is internalised by the learner, that is, controlled and able to be applied in future situations (Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011; Vygotsky, 1978; Zuengler & Miller, 2006). Of particular value in this study, is the power of SCT to consider the whole context of a situation, and consequently, the influence on development of all social, cultural, historical, and institutional factors.

This thesis explores mediation of the activity of teaching language with an ICLT approach. It will be seen that SCT makes a valuable contribution in revealing ways in which the mediating tools, and teachers’ access to them, would benefit from development to enhance teachers’ understanding and practice of ICLT.

The study had two primary aims:

1. To ascertain the status quo with respect to New Zealand language teachers’ understanding and practice of ICLT. This was germane to the research concern given the passing of time since (i) the revision of the curriculum and the Ministry’s promotion of an ICLT method, and (ii) the significant review of New Zealand teacher’s ICLT awareness carried out in 2008 (Harvey et al., 2010). It also created the possibility of comparing the position of New Zealand teachers with that of their peers in similar studies conducted internationally, especially the multi-national study by Sercu et al. (2005).

2. To develop, implement, and evaluate an activity grounded in ICLT, namely cultural portfolio projects (CPPs). This aim expressly sought to resolve some of the tensions reported internationally as hindering ICLT awareness and practice, with a view to making CPPs available as a resource to support teachers’ ongoing development in ICLT.

These aims were best addressed in a two phase project.
Phase 1 addressed the first aim by using a questionnaire to gather data from practising language teachers about culture teaching and their awareness and practice of ICLT. The data were analysed using chiefly quantitative methods to explore teacher cognitions about culture-teaching, that is, what teachers believe, know, and practice (Borg, 2006) with respect to development of cultural knowledge. Teacher cognition research supports an understanding of not only what teachers do—as the first aim set out to achieve—but why they behave that way (Borg, 2009). As mentioned, studies have recognised an apparent mismatch between beliefs and practices. A number of reasons for the discord were suggested, the majority of which were external to the individual (e.g., insufficiencies of time, training, or supporting resources) or otherwise related to a belief, such as feeling unfamiliar with the target culture. In this study, deeper and wider investigation was carried out on beliefs and practices that appeared not to correspond. This revealed that it was not a matter of contradiction between beliefs and practices (i.e., thinking one thing but practising another) but a matter of competition between an individual’s subsets of beliefs (i.e., thinking two things and practising one of them) (Agee, 2004; Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009; Birello, 2012; Sercu, 2006).

The results of Phase 1 of the study have provided a fresh understanding of New Zealand language teachers’ awareness of ICLT and revealed a range of factors as influencing their cognitions, awareness, and practice of the approach. This phase involved testing hypotheses based on the existing research; the hypotheses also guided the construction of the questionnaire. It was expected that New Zealand language teachers would not demonstrate cognitions and practices that aligned with ICLT, and that they would show low levels of awareness of the approach. The chiefly quantitative research of Phase 1, centring on the questionnaire, sought to test the following hypotheses:

1. Teachers’ cognitions about language and culture teaching do not reflect an ICLT approach.

2. Teachers’ reported language and culture classroom practices do not reflect an ICLT approach.

3. Teachers do not demonstrate awareness of ICLT as an approach to teaching language and culture.
To address the second aim, Phase 2 of the study engaged three secondary school language classes in an activity designed to demonstrate an ICLT approach. Participants from three urban schools comprised two teachers of German (one native German, one native New Zealander), one teacher of French (a native German), and their students. The student-centred activity was called cultural portfolio projects (CPPs), long-term research projects based around a theme of a cultural item or value (Byrd & Wall, 2009). CPPs featured in seven published studies, none of which was explicitly set in an ICLT approach. Nevertheless, all showed CPPs to enhance students’ knowledge of the target culture, and in Allen (2004), Byon (2007), and Su (2011), CPPs supported students’ critical cultural awareness of the target culture and their own culture. With those values of the CPPs already established, this study applied the CPPs in a number of unique ways.

Firstly, the structure of the CPPs was explicitly designed to fit within an ICLT approach. Secondly, many elements of the CPPs were developed in collaboration with the participant teachers to uniquely adapt them to the contextual factors of the specific community of the teacher and his/her students. Thirdly, the use of the CPPs was evaluated from the teacher’s perspective in terms of their impact on learning outcomes and their practical application in the classroom; student feedback was also obtained. Fourthly, and perhaps most importantly, the CPPs were used as an intervention to expose teachers to the theory of ICLT in an applied form, with the express purpose of supporting their awareness and practice of ICLT.

This phase comprised qualitative research, which further developed the hypotheses of Phase 1. It sought to determine whether use of the CPPs could address tensions in teachers’ cognitions, practice, and awareness of ICLT. The following research questions were developed as part of the qualitative analysis:

1. To what extent do the teachers’ cognitions about the CPP reveal an ICLT approach?

2. To what extent do the teachers’ and students’ practices of the CPP reveal an ICLT approach?

3. To what extent do CPPs enhance teachers’ awareness of ICLT as a teaching approach?
Section 2.10, chapter 2, provides an expanded list of the ways in which this study made distinct contributions to the research on culture teaching in language education. In the following sections of this chapter, key terms used in the thesis are described and the organisation of the document is detailed.

1.4 Key Terms and Abbreviations

This research involved teachers and students of languages at secondary schools; these key terms are clarified for the specific context. Secondary schools in New Zealand provide education from Year 9 (aged 12 or 13 years) to Year 13 (aged 17 or 18 years, i.e., university entrance). Languages, in this thesis, pertains to all languages in which classes are offered at school. It included all international languages (e.g., French, Mandarin, Samoan), as well as te reo Māori (the country’s indigenous language) and English as an additional language (EAL) for non-native speakers immersed, or “submerged” (Barnard, 2009, p. 233), in English in their general education at school. The teachers of this study were those employed to teach a language at a secondary school; the students were those who elected to study a language subject at secondary school level.

The primary content of this thesis relates to intercultural communicative language teaching, considered here as an approach to teaching and learning languages and cultures; it is abbreviated as ICLT. In Europe and the UK, the approach is more commonly referred to by its goal: intercultural communicative competence (ICC). The term ICC is used in this thesis, but only to refer to the desired outcome of an ICLT approach. The six-principle method developed by Newton et al. (2010) and promoted by the Ministry is also called intercultural communicative language teaching, but is uniquely abbreviated to iCLT. (iCLT is described in detail in section 2.9.1, chapter 2.) This thesis differentiates between ICLT as the approach and iCLT as the six principles and method.

A final matter of clarification relates to a frequently cited research study. In 2004, Sercu headed members of special interest research group, CULTNET (see http://cultnetworld.wordpress.com), in conducting a multinational study of language teacher cognitions about ICLT. The most comprehensive report of the findings and the questionnaire data collection tool were published as Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence: An Intercultural Investigation (Sercu et al., 2005), presented as a collection of chapters individually authored but all with Sercu as author or co-author.
The questionnaire from that research was heavily drawn upon in this study. In this thesis, the study in general is referred to as “Sercu et al. (2005),” but where content of the publication is quoted, the author/s of the relevant chapter is/are stated. Other publications based on the study are referred to by their authors in the conventional way (e.g., Castro, Sercu, & Méndez García, 2004).

1.5 Organisation of Thesis

This thesis comprises 10 chapters and a number of appendices. Following this introduction (chapter 1), chapter 2 presents a review of the literature relevant to the theoretical paradigm of pragmatism and SCT, the methodologies of teacher cognitions and cultural portfolios, and scholarship associated with culture, teaching culture, and teaching culture with an ICLT approach. Chapter 3 describes the research context of New Zealand language education, addressing the relevant curricular materials and providing background to language teaching and learning at secondary school. Chapter 4 presents the methodologies used in the two-phase project. It describes in detail the design and administration of the questionnaire and the quantitative analysis of the associated data, as well as the school sites, the design of the CPPs, and the qualitative analysis of the CPP data. The methodology chapter also justifies the study in terms of the warrants of trustworthiness and ethical matters. In chapter 5, the results of the statistical analyses of the questionnaire data are presented. Directly following, as chapter 6, is a discussion of those results in relation to the hypotheses. Then, in chapter 7, the qualitative analysis of the findings from the CPPs is presented and, in chapter 8, the findings are interpreted in relation to the research questions. Chapter 9 synthesises the results and the findings of the two phases and applies SCT to reveal tensions that influence the value of mediational tools in enabling an ICLT approach. This chapter also provides suggestions to resolve those tensions. Finally, chapter 10 concludes the thesis by summarising the outcomes of the project, raising implications of those outcomes, and recognising the study’s limitations.

1.6 Publication and Presentations

This section describes elements of this research project that have featured in published or presented work. It explains the nature of my involvement in that work and the extent to which material from this study was incorporated.
1.6.1 Published article


One data set from this research project was used in Feryok and Oranje (2015). The transcription of the recorded planning session with Phase 2 teacher participant Ada was, along with other data gathered separately by Feryok, subjected to microgenetic analysis by Feryok to examine how Ada adopted the CPP for use in formal assessment. My involvement comprised conducting and recording the planning session, reviewing Feryok’s analysis of the data, and contributing to the drafting and revision of the journal article. The article is considered “new scholarship” (American Psychological Association, 2010, p. 16) because it applied an entirely different theoretical viewpoint (dynamic systems) and focused on the single specific activity of Ada’s use of the CPPs as a formal assessment task for her class. There is some similarity across documents in terms of the description of the CPPs and the data collection instrument (the recorded planning session). Throughout this thesis, all references to the article’s findings are cited.

1.6.2 Presentations

The following presentations were based on this research. I was the sole author and presenter of the first three; the fourth was co-authored with Feryok and presented by Feryok:

1. *Learning Culture*. The New Zealand Association of Language Teachers’ Langsem, Dunedin, New Zealand, April 2013 (Phase 1 initial findings).


3. *Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching: Using teachers’ cognitions to bridge theory and practice*. Annual conference of the International Association for Languages and Intercultural Communication, Aveiro, Portugal, November 2014 (Phase 1 findings and Phase 2 initial findings).
4. *The complexity of teaching culture in German as a foreign language: Redrawing the boundaries of language teacher cognitions.* Annual conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, March 2015 (co-authored with Feryok) (Data from Ada’s planning session, some general content from literature review; based on Feryok and Oranje (2015)).

Abstracts based on the Phase 2 findings have been accepted for papers written and presented by me at the upcoming (1) biannual combined conference of the Applied Linguistics Association of New Zealand and the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, Adelaide, Australia, November 2015; and (2) the annual conference of the Linguistics Society of New Zealand, Dunedin, New Zealand, December 2015.

This chapter has presented the “research territory,” “establish[ed] the niche” that this study set out to fill, and justified the aims, the research paradigm, and the methodologies that allow this piece of scholarship to “occupy the niche” (Bitchener, 2010, pp. 35-36). The following chapter reviews the relevant literature. The review positions this study in the existing scholarship in terms of the theoretical framework of pragmatism and SCT, and in terms of research on teaching culture generally, and the practice of ICLT, specifically.
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Overview

This chapter reviews literature relevant to the overall research concern, supporting the practice of intercultural communicative language teaching in New Zealand secondary school language classes. The research took the philosophical stance of pragmatism and the psychological perspective (Schuh & Barab, 2007) of sociocultural theory (SCT). These serve as the interpretive framework of the research findings (see chapters 6, 8, and 9).

The review commences with the connection between language and culture, a relationship which underlies the entire thesis. Secondly, the philosophical position of pragmatism is presented focusing on the views of Dewey, given the significance of his work in the field of education. Thirdly, the relevant principles of SCT are outlined and its applicability to this project is justified. The field of research on teacher cognitions and their relationship to practices is then introduced. The review then moves to culture teaching specifically, before describing the instructional theory of intercultural communicative language teaching (hereafter, ICLT). The review then turns to literature pertaining to the two primary research techniques: teacher cognitions about ICLT (Phases 1 and 2) and the use of cultural portfolio projects (CPPs) (Phase 2). The latter section includes a summary of research studies involving CPPs. With the specific context in mind, studies and reports on culture teaching in New Zealand schools are then outlined, and finally, the project is positioned within the existing research in the field.

This thesis is about intercultural pedagogy, the mainstay of which is the relationship between language and culture (Liddicoat, 2011). It is therefore fitting to treat this relationship as the starting point of the review; it is also the thread that ties the whole thesis together.
2.1 Language and culture

"Culture is in language, and language is loaded with culture"

(Agar, 1994, p. 28)

The relationship between language and culture has been well traversed across a variety of disciplines, and Agar’s term “languaculture” (Agar, 1994, p. 28) best demonstrates the association both linguistically and symbolically. Others have emphasised the intertwining (Chan, Bhatt, Nagami, & Walker, 2015), inseparability (Liu & Laohawiriyanon, 2013), inextricability (Schulz, 2007), and interdependence (Elsen & St. John, 2007) of language and culture. Savignon and Sysoyev (2005) considered “access to one is essential for access to the other” (p. 364). The link is multidirectional and continuous (Tudge et al., 1999) and is reflected in the description of the relationship as being co-constructed, transactional, or dialectical.

The extent to which cultural understanding influences linguistic understanding means the relationship assumes great importance in language education and it is of no surprise that it is described as “the starting point for the intercultural” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 837). Liddicoat (2008a) regarded a learner proficient in a language but not in the culture as being “not well equipped to communicate in that language” (p. 278), or as others have put it, “a fluent fool” (Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003, p. 237).

It is not within the ambit of this study to define culture, a “notoriously slippery word” (Roberts, Byram, Barro, Jordan, & Street, 2001, p. 18), particularly when there are myriad definitions already in existence. Any definition must, though, accept the diversity of social roles with which culture is associated (Savignon & Sysoyev, 2002). It must be acknowledged that any member of the culture will also be a member of multiple groups, each with a cultural system dependent upon context-specific factors, and that such membership “does not deprive them of the right to be different and depart from the norm” (Sercu, 2002, p. 68). It is useful to consider culture in its anthropological sense, as “patterns for living” (Lafayette, 2003, p. 55), comprising both active patterns (e.g., shopping, greeting) and passive patterns (e.g., marriage, social divisions) (Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003). The broad scope of the concept of culture must be kept in mind, as “embracing all aspects of human life” (Seelye, 1993, p. 15). These definitional points
are intended to merely set the scene for a project on culture education, but what is more relevant to this study is the nature of language and culture.

As noted by Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) and by Baker (2015), some think of language as a code or a structural system for communication. Others have a more expansive social semiotic view, considering language as expressing, embodying, and symbolising culture by referencing common experience, creating and applying meaning, and developing individual and group identities (Kohler, 2015; Liddicoat, 2008a; Scarino, 2014). Likewise, culture can be viewed simply, as static facts and artefacts, institutions, information, and national attributes, or more expansively, as a dynamic social semiotic system of practices (Kohler, 2015; Liddicoat, 2002, 2005; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013; Risager, 2007; Scarino, 2010, 2014). Culture as a semiotic system brings “order and predictability into people’s use of language” (Kramsch, 1998a, p. 6) by socialising language users through its conventions, norms, and practices (Kramsch, 1998a, 2003) to interpret, create, and exchange meaning (Scarino, 2014).

If culture brings order and predictability to language use, then it must also bring expectations about language choices. Those expectations are generated in association with contextual cues and situational inferences (Kramsch, 1998a). Individuals take account of all relevant factors within the context and infer from those the social and cultural situation, and then apply the associated expectations. These determinations are made instant-by-instant as the interactants interpret each other’s contributions throughout the interaction, and also serve to highlight misalignments in the interactants’ expectations—termed “rich points” by Agar (1994, p. 128). The extent to which culture is used in interpretation of meaning underlines the importance of its equality with language in the language education content.

Some consider culture as something an individual has, or belongs to, or as something “out there” (Bennett et al., 2003, p. 242). But these views exemplify “culture-as-an-independent-variable” (Göncü, 1999, p. 9), pre-existing and unchanging, and altogether “too noun-like, as if it were an entity, something that can be readily named” (Roberts et al., 2001, p. 54). The contrasting perspective is of culture as “a more active verb-like notion” (Roberts et al., 2001, p. 54), a meaning-making process (Liddicoat, 2002; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013; Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, 1996; Street, 1993). The most convincing of the key scholars (e.g., Byram, Kramsch, Risager, and Sercu, and more
locally, Liddicoat, Newton, and Scarino) view culture as a fluid and unpredictable process of active co-construction of meaning. They treat cultures as relative (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013) and not homogeneous (Spencer-Oatey & Franklin, 2009). In other words, a single individual cannot be considered typical or representative of any culture; any one culture cannot be defined by a specific set of characteristics; and all members of a culture will practice its conventions to differing extents. However, a noun-like understanding of culture is reported, by some, to be a common perspective of language teachers (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Lange & Paige, 2003; Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Sercu et al., 2005).

This section has emphasised the equal roles of language and culture in communication, and consequently in language education. Literature associated with teaching culture and the ICLT approach is reviewed shortly, but first the epistemological and theoretical frameworks of this study are presented.

2.2 Dewey’s Pragmatism

*Information is genuine or educative only in so far as it presents definite images and conceptions of materials placed in a context of social life*

(Dewey, 1909/2009, para. 32)

The primary tenet of pragmatism is that knowledge is valuable when it is useful or relevant (Prawat, 2009, p. 326). Pragmatism as a philosophical movement was first developed in the 1880s by Peirce (1839-1914) and expanded by James (1842-1910) (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Sundin & Johannisson, 2005). It was subsequently developed for educational theory by American psychologist, educationalist, and philosopher, Dewey (1859-1952) (Biesta & Burbules, 2003). Because knowledge is made relevant in experience, it is where learning occurs by “the projection of intelligence upon sensations, through which meaning emerges” (Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000, p. 205). Because of Dewey’s association with education—in particular, learner-centred education (Prawat, 2009)—and his references to the role culture plays in learning, his work is highly relevant to this study.

Dewey is commonly associated with a constructivist perspective because of his emphasis on the role of the student as instigator of his/her own learning (Prawat, 2009). Dewey is perhaps best known for his notion of Individualism—“the pedagogy of personal
experience”—where the teacher acts as a “guide on the side” to facilitate learning within the student’s own “experiential workspace” (Prawat, 2009, p. 325). In this approach, it is not the teacher that directly educates the student, but the social participation in the environment (Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006), in other words, the experience.

Experiences are “the transactions of living organisms and their environment” (Biesta & Burbules, 2003, p. 28), and each transaction results in changes to the people and environment and, in turn, impacts future experiences. For pragmatists, “knowledge is created in and through action” (Hjørland, 1997, p. 76). Dewey’s reference to transactions emphasised the interactive element of actions. Through constant and continuous transactions with the environment (we can never not be engaged in transaction) patterns of action, or habits, are created, tested, and adjusted for future transactions, and thus knowledge is gained (Biesta & Burbules, 2003).

Experience is always mediated by culture—the “product of human action and interaction” (Biesta & Burbules, 2003, p. 29). (The notion of mediation will be shown to be particularly important in section 2.3.) In Dewey’s view, language is the most important of the cultural products, “the tool of tools” (Dewey, 1929, p. 168), defining language in very broad terms—“everything that has meaning” (Biesta & Burbules, 2003, p. 29) including spoken and written communication, as well as ceremonies and products of art and technology. Meaning is derived from the use to which the tool is put; that is, “the ways in which humans use things rather than the ways in which they know them” (Sundin & JohanniSSon, 2005, p. 30). For example, clothing can carry meaning through association with an occupation, sports team, or a social status (Biesta & Burbules, 2003). Meaning is communally developed, established by social agreement and shared through cultural transmission (Dewey, 1929). In other words, through interaction, a culture’s repository of meaning is negotiated and acquired as a shared understanding (Garrison, 2009; Vanderstraten & Biesta, 2006). This notion aligns with SCT’s emphasis on the use of mediating tools to transform activity in the social world (described in section 2.3 below) and with the views of culture as being active meaning-making processes.

Crucial to pragmatism is the view that knowledge gained through active engagement and self-induced discovery is superior to the automated acquisition of knowledge through latent listening, memorization, and recitation of pre-determined information (Dewey, 1909/2009, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1938; Guilherme, 2002). It is
more useful and relevant, and therefore more valuable. Such learner-centred development involves students exploring material that is appealing, engaging, motivating, and relevant (Dewey, 1915/2008). A learner exploring and reflecting on subject matter can expect to make discoveries; as a consequence s/he will be able to make unique contributions to the class, and in doing so, create meaning (Dewey, 1916/2008).

In contrast, ready-made information “induced from without” (Dewey, 1916/2008, p. 118) (e.g., teacher-centred) and with little relationship to the individual learner does not enlist interest or involve real and relevant exploration; consequently this amounts to less valuable, technical, knowledge that carries little meaning (Dewey, 1916/2008). Transmission of information to the latent listener means knowledge is achieved and retained only for learning’s sake and through “foreign attractiveness” (e.g., a bribe) or use of counterirritants (e.g., bad marks, punishment) (Dewey, 1915/2008, p. 94). The student’s attention to the material will be partial or divided, and remain dependent on the external enticement or discouragement. Students cannot claim their responses as their own, amounting to a non-educative experience (Dewey, 1915/2008; 1938). The notion of engagement in exploration is a core principle of ICLT (as outlined in section 2.6), and exploration and unique contributions are central to the intervention undertaken in Phase 2 of this study.

Supporting students to make unique responses means their contributions can be evaluated and expanded on by the teacher (and classmates) rather than categorised as simply right or wrong, thus increasing integration and internalisation of the knowledge (Forsman, 2012). Some report, however, that active learner-centred approaches are not common in language classrooms, where reliance is still placed on recalling information, with little opportunity for students’ unique and meaningful contributions (e.g., Byrd & Wall, 2009; Sercu et al., 2005). This study tested the current position in terms of the practice of student-centred activities in New Zealand classes (Phase 1) and implemented a wholly student-centred activity as an intervention (Phase 2).

An element of Dewey’s version of pragmatism especially relevant to this study is the role of reflective thinking; “it alone is truly educative in value” (Dewey, 1910/2005, p. 2). A learner relates the material or task to their experiences through reflective thinking in order to resolve or settle a mental doubt or difficulty, or to find grounds for a belief by judging, reasoning and deliberating (Dewey, 1910/2005, 1915/2008; Guilherme, 2002).
Each thought or idea developed through critical reflection will provide the grounding and support for their next instance of reflection (Dewey, 1910/2005), allowing the student to realise a problem as their own, “a fundamental necessity,” according to Dewey (1910/2005, p. 94). A belief held without it having been explored with critical reflection is essentially held unthinkingly (Dewey, 1910/2005).

But beneficial reflection does not require a pre-existing doubt or problem, since reflection itself might reveal such difficulties. This thesis argues for regular and considered reflection on one’s beliefs and standpoints, with or without “a perplexity, hesitation, [or] doubt,” (Dewey, 1910/2005, p. 9). Reflection assumes importance in ICLT by contributing to awareness of how one’s own cultural perspective could impact on an interaction and the interactants (Jackson, 2014). In this way, reflection generates rich points (Agar, 1994) for considered analysis and management as a pre-emptive measure; otherwise, it is not until conflict, confrontation, or misunderstanding occurs that reflection is employed, if it is employed at all.

Although it is important for a learner to reflect on their own history of experiences, it is also important for the teacher to have an understanding of the personal histories of his/her students, a matter that Dewey discussed in his later writing. Knowing the learner gives the teacher insight into the learner’s mind to appreciate their needs, capabilities, and past experiences, the cultural and intellectual resources they can contribute, and how all of these elements influence their meaning-making processes (Dewey, 1897, 1938; Newton, 2012, forthcoming; Oranje, 2012; Oranje & Feryok, 2013; Stapleton, 2000). With this knowledge, decisions can be made on what experiences will be useful and relevant for the students.

Moral principles and democracy are also central elements of Dewey’s philosophy of education and are relevant here. Dewey emphasised the importance of reducing barriers to communication by fostering students’ active open-mindedness, whole-heartedness in engagement, and responsibility for the consequences of their actions (Dewey, 1910/2005; Guilherme, 2002). These skills are directly represented in ICLT. In pragmatism, and in ICLT, language learners are encouraged to actively engage with the target language’s social environment—arguably synonymous with culture (Byram & Guilherme, 2000)—to negotiate meaning through experience, exploration, engagement, and reflection, to
achieve effective communication. This also represents values listed in the New Zealand

Also relevant to this thesis are Dewey’s observations about the relationship of
subject content to the social world. He observed that school subjects were almost
arbitrarily split from social life into bounded simplified units of history, mathematics,
grammar, and so on, stripping the subject of its logical value (Dewey, 1897, 1915/2008;
1909/2009). Thus, the subject’s role in the greater social world was unclear, and the
material became “a bare or mere symbol... dead and barren” (Dewey, 1915/2008,
p. 118, italics original) and treated as a “case of learning to swim apart from the water”
(Dewey, 1909/2009, p. 50). This approach finds support in ICLT’s integration of culture
and language, where the subject matter of language is not separated from the social life in
which it is used. Teaching either language or culture as stand-alone content means the
relationship between them—and therefore the relationship between the lesson and target
society life—is lost. Similarly, considering the target culture without relating it to one’s
own cultural viewpoint results in cultural content being treated as information about the
other, external, non-transformational, and not relevant to one’s own life (Liddicoat, 2002,
2005; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013). All features of the culture are reduced to the “same

At face value it might appear that Dewey’s many references to the individual means
his theory does not sit well with socially-oriented stances. However, Dewey’s emphasis is
on the individual’s experience, which always involves a transaction, necessarily entailing
engagement with another being in a particular context or environment. In pragmatism, the
self is “thoroughly social” (Garrison, 2009, p. 319). It is therefore considered that
pragmatism is entirely compatible with SCT, in particular. With the pragmatism position
established, the analytical framework of SCT is now outlined.

2.3 Sociocultural Theory

“What the child can do in cooperation today he can do alone tomorrow.”

Vygotsky, 1962/2012, p. 104

This thesis applies sociocultural theory (SCT) with a particular focus on revealing
contextual factors that result in constraints on the practice of ICLT in the language class.
SCT is a psychological perspective (Schuh & Barab, 2007) and a practically applicable framework that shares a close connection and common features with pragmatism’s philosophy of learning (Davydov, 1995; Engeström & Miettinen, 1999; Hjørland, 1997; Sundin & Johannisson, 2005). In fact, some have gone as far as to say that Dewey was a founder of SCT, along with the more commonly associated Russian psychologists Vygotsky and Leont’ev (Hjørland, 1997; Wertsch, del Río, & Alvarez, 1995). Pragmatism and SCT both emphasise participation in interactions as the environment for meaning-making, and the use of tools to socially and culturally mediate that participation (Wertsch et al., 1995); both are “theories of man [sic] as an active agent in the world” (Hjørland, 1997, p. 82). However, there is a significant difference with respect to the unit of analysis: Dewey’s pragmatism takes as the central point the individual who acts on the world around him/her, whereas SCT’s focus is the relationship between the individual and society and their mutual transformation through social interactions (Edwards, 2007; Johnson, 2006; Shuh & Barab, 2007).

SCT is based upon Vygotsky's focus on the social origins of psychological processes (Vygotsky, 1978) and his belief that to understand the human mind one must understand the cultural and historical processes from which it developed (Daniels, Cole, & Wertsch, 2007; Bakhurst, 2007). Differentiating between biological elementary processes and higher psychological functions, SCT takes account of the influence of the cultural, institutional, and historical contexts on individual mental functioning (Scott & Palincsar, 2009). The interplay between the internal (mental) and objective (context) conditions is referred to as a situation (Ashton, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991) and development is said to be “situated and socially distributed” (Cross, 2010); that is, knowledge is shared rather than being an individual experience (Shuh & Barab, 2007).

The basic premise of the theory is that an individual’s participation in the physical and social world (including their thinking) is indirect because it is shaped and defined through social and cultural mediation (Ashton, 1996; Wertsch, 2007). All mediation is fundamentally social, because it has a social origin, and cultural, because it involves procedures developed by, and varying across, cultures (Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000; Van der Veer, 2007).

Mediation is the primary distinction between SCT and other theories of development. Mediation can be effected by oneself or more capable others, and by tools
and signs (also referred to as artefacts and symbols) (Ajayi, 2008; Chan et al., 2015; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf, 2011; Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991, 2007; Wertsch, et al., 1995). Mediational means facilitate the co-construction and internalisation of knowledge (Scott & Palincsar, 2009) and put the world into perspective (Sundin & Johannisson, 2005). Without mediation, individuals could not organise and control their behaviour and would be “buffeted about by the stimuli they happened to encounter as they went about in the world” (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007, p. 115). Both Vygotsky and Dewey considered language to be the most important means of mediation. In this thesis, the key contribution of SCT is in examining various mediational tools, which could be used by teachers to enable their practice of ICLT, and to determine how and why they are impeded in their use of those tools.

As in pragmatism, meaning is derived from the use of the tool; the tools themselves are powerless until used by an individual to play a part in an action (Lantolf, 2011; Wertsch, 1991; Wertsch, et al. 1995). In SCT, mediational tools do not simply facilitate an action, they actively transform it (Wertsch et al., 1995), and in doing so, they redefine the process, the resultant knowledge, the environment, and the individuals involved (Corsaro & Johannesen, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). But, it should be remembered that tools can hinder as well as enable or empower (Wertsch et al., 1995). To enable an activity, tools must be accessible, appropriate, and used effectively.

For Vygotsky, learning and development were neither equivalent nor parallel processes—as was the thinking in some theories of the time—but they were related. He described development as being achieved through “internal reconstruction of an external operation [or] internalization” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 56, italics original). This involves mediated activity and its social, material, and symbolic systems being given psychological status (Swain et al., 2011) through three transformations, called Vygotsky’s general genetic law of cultural development (Bakhurst, 2007; Wertsch, 1991) or law of sociogenesis (Meshcheryakov, 2007), explained as:

(a) An operation that initially represents an external activity is reconstructed and begins to occur internally.…(b) An interpersonal process is transformed into an intrapersonal one.…(c) The transformation of an interpersonal process into an intrapersonal one is the result of a long series of developmental events. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 56-57)
Appearance on the social (intermental or interpersonal) plane occurs through the “co-construction of social interaction ... [with] someone more knowledgeable” in a particular context with mediational tools (Gaskins, 1999, p. 26). The behaviour is subsequently transformed within the individual on the intrapersonal, or intramental, plane and is internalised and realised by the learner (Cole & Engeström, 2007; Gaskins, 1999; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Vygotsky, 1978). Internalisation involves the transfer of mediated external social activity to internal control (Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Zuengler & Miller, 2006), giving it psychological status (Swain et al., 2011) from where it can be organised and “culturally shaped” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 2). Development has occurred when the knowledge can be applied in future independent problem solving (Scott & Palincsar, 2009).

Development is more likely to take place when interactants have diverse perspectives because the opportunities for reasoning and problem solving are increased (Wertsch et al., 1995). This sits well with Dewey’s argument against teacher-transmitted pre-packaged knowledge that precludes opportunities for new discoveries by the student. It also finds a parallel in Agar’s (1994) treatment of mismatches in perspective as rich points ripe for learning and for the remodelling of previously held frames of reference.

To exemplify the process of internalisation, Vygotsky (1978) described a young child reaching towards an object but failing to grasp it. The child attributes no meaning to this action but it is seen by the parent and understood as indicating the child’s desire to hold the object. The activity is, at this stage, other-regulated, controlled by the parent. Through involvement in this interaction and seeing it achieve a desirable outcome, the child comes to understand that reaching or pointing is a gesture, which can be used at will, that is, be self-regulated. The external behaviour was socially mediated and defined by the culture and, when internalized by the child, it can function in future interactions as a tool that has social effect (Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000).

This interactional process is socialisation. In interaction, an individual is not only socialised into a group’s practices, but s/he is also socialising the more expert participants into their roles, identities, and practices (Duff & Talmy, 2011). This is a significant point of contrast between SCT and constructivism, the perspective regularly taken in second language acquisition (SLA) research and by the majority, if not all, of the research on the use of cultural portfolio projects reviewed in section 2.8.1. Constructivists support the
duality of the subject and the independent world, and consider an individual to be “an epistemic person fundamentally unchanged by the construction of knowledge” (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000, p. 228).

SCT, on the other hand, emphasises the crucial prefix of “co-”; learning is dialogical, co-constructed by individuals as they interact with one another, and particularly with more knowledgeable others (Forsman, 2012). Concepts cannot simply be “assimilated in ready made form,” so direct instruction without opportunity for internalisation will lead to nothing but memorisation with limited ability for meaningful future application and limited impact on mental development (Daniels, 2007, p. 312), a point also made by Dewey (e.g., 1910/2005) and Davydov (1995). Development is enhanced, according to SCT, when the activity is relevant and of value to the learner, taught naturally, and within their grasp (Daniels, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). Again, correlations with Dewey’s thinking can be seen with respect to relevance and usefulness. The process of internalisation provides the individual with the opportunity to reflect on, contest, and develop the initially external information before it is accepted as one’s own (Bakhurst, 2007). Applying this specifically to acquisition of additional languages, as well as acquiring knowledge of the language, a learner internalises cultural meanings which then serve to mediate his/her thoughts and behaviours in communication (Chan et al., 2015; Lantolf, 1999; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

As noted, for an individual to develop, the information presented to them must be within their grasp. This is embodied in the uniquely SCT notion of the zone of proximal development (ZPD). It represents the difference between what a learner can achieve independently—their actual development—and what s/he can achieve with assistance from a tool or social interactant such as a teacher or more capable peer, in other words, their potential development (Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Swain et al., 2011; Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky described the ZPD as including functions that “are in the process of maturation … currently in an embryonic state … ‘buds’ or ‘flowers’ of development rather than the ‘fruits’ of development” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). It represents consideration of development as prospective rather than as retrospective.

The ZPD is the setting for “the collaborative construction of opportunities for individuals to develop their mental abilities” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 17), a description
representing much more than an expert transmitting information to a receptive novice. It includes Vygotsky’s notion of the novice’s unique transformation of the information as they internalise it, as well as emphasising collaboration over dictation of the expert’s will (Davydov, 1995). An expert assists a novice to achieve a goal by scaffolding their learning, where scaffolding simplifies not the task but the learner’s role (Daniels, 2007) and thus “brings the learner across this zone with the use of appropriate tools” (Kohler, 2015, p. 134). In Vygotsky’s view, “the only ‘good learning’ is that which is in advance of development” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 89), in which case the learner’s ZPD must be considered when giving instruction (Scott & Palinscar, 2009).

The ZPD has a particular influence on assessment. Traditional static methods of assessment test actual development, in other words, what a learner can do independently at one point in time (Dixon-Krauss, 1996), the already ripe functions (Vygotsky, 1962/2012). This can underestimate a student’s ability to learn (Scott & Palinscar, 2009). Valsiner and Van der Veer (2000) portrayed static assessment using the analogy of a hare in a field: the hare is invisible when it is not moving. In contrast, assessment that takes a learner’s ZPD into account requires evaluation of the learner’s performance while engaged in assisted activities, known as dynamic assessment (Dixon-Strauss, 1996; Scott & Palinscar, 2009). This approach reflects both the matured processes and those that are ripening (Vygotsky, 1962/2012) as the more accurate indicator of mental development.

The notion of the ZPD is not without critics. Some have remarked that it cannot be possible to know how a learner will use the collaborator’s assistance or how that assistance is transforming intrapsychological development (Valsiner and Van der Veer, 2000). There are also different perspectives on whether there is a separate ZPD for each skill or one ZPD that reflects the development of the whole person (Chaiklin, 2003). These criticisms, and others, are probably due to Vygotsky’s ideas still being in flux at his early death (Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000).

Determination of an individual’s ZPD requires taking account of their background experiences and knowledge. Given SCT’s alternative names of socio-historical or cultural-historical theory, it is of no surprise that the history of a situation and the interactants assumes great importance. Vygotsky (1978) described development as focusing on the process as much as the product, and went as far as to say the study of the historical development of behaviour forms the very basis of theoretical study. In order to
determine which experiences will be relevant and useful for the learner, and to provide instruction at a level commensurate with their ZPD, a teacher will benefit from understanding the student’s personal history, prior knowledge and experiences, beliefs, values, and so on, collectively termed their ontogenesis (Cross, 2010; Swain et al., 2011). Dewey, too, recognised the impact that an individual’s past can have on their future, because their personal beliefs and habits, as well as the conditions of the environment, “are precipitates of the past, perpetuating, willy-nilly, its hold and power” (Dewey, 1927/1998, p. 299). An interaction, then, is not simply a transaction between people, it is a transaction between holders of histories and experiences (Kramsch, 2009; Scarino, 2014).

In the language class, the ontogeneses of both the learner and the teacher are especially relevant as both are engaged in movement between own and other cultural and linguistic systems, all of which contribute to meaning making (Scarino, 2014). For language students, SCT emphasises acknowledgment of prior knowledge and experience, recognising teachers and students as funds of knowledge (Ajayi, 2008; Cross, 2010; Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Swain et al., 2011). Knowing the learner provides insight into how they might understand and process new information (Oranje, 2012; Oranje & Feryok, 2013), and how their preconceptions and previous experiences might mediate the internalisation of the knowledge; as Morgan (1993) noted, “no student is a tabula rasa” (p. 69). The influence in the classroom of the teachers’ background knowledge, experiences, and knowledge of their students, is explored in both phases of this study. In Phase 2, students tested the validity of their preconceptions about the target culture.

An individual’s ontogenesis provides one set of affordances and constraints on their participation in social activities and affects their ability to access and use the tools required to carry out a social activity successfully (Swain et al., 2011). Influence on participation in a joint practice is at the heart of the communities of practice theory of learning, first propounded by Lave and Wenger (1991), and briefly outlined next.

2.3.1 Communities of Practice
Lave and Wenger’s (1991) theory of learning is grounded in SCT and involves learning through participation in a community of practice, being a social collective working at a
joint activity. Individuals start out as newcomers to the community, novices or apprentices positioned on the periphery of the situation. Learning takes place when the novice is legitimised by the community as having a contribution to make to the joint activity, is assisted by the community’s more expert members, or old-timers, and is allowed unimpeded access to mediating tools that empower the activity. Thus, the learner gradually progresses along a “trajectory” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 35) from the periphery with greater participation in the community’s core tasks (Engeström, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Learning in a shared endeavour is “dynamic and involves learning on the part of everyone” (Wenger, 2015, p. 4), and does not rely on teachers instructing students; rather it occurs as a “whole person act[s] in the world” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 49) with meaning negotiated as the action is “socially mediated” (p. 51).

The notion of legitimisation is important in a community of practice. An individual’s participation in the joint activity relies on them being legitimised by other community members accepting their role, establishing relationships with them, and valuing their contributions regardless of ability (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Oranje, 2012; Oranje & Feryok, 2013). Progression from the periphery requires access to the activity, to more advanced community members, and to enabling tools; “access is key and crucial” (Swain & Deters, 2007, p. 824).

The communities of practice theory of learning was not developed with the original intention of application in school situations. This is a weakness in the theory, as the transition to application in the classroom can be difficult (Engeström, 1991). Engeström (1991) criticised the theory for not accommodating the ontogeneses of the participants, despite schooling itself being a “historically formed practice” (p. 254), his point being that the communities of practice model does not inherently take account of the full range of contextual factors at play. Communities of practice theory is not used centrally in the current study, but it does make a worthwhile contribution complementary to the wider SCT, particularly in terms of examining teachers’ access to tools to mediate their practice of ICLT.

2.3.2 Relevance of SCT to this research
The application of a sociocultural framework allows a rich and deep understanding of a phenomenon by elucidating meaning and providing a social perspective of the how and
why of people’s actions (Sundin & Johannisson, 2005; Swain et al., 2011). The positioning of this study in SCT consequently contrasts against the great majority of research in language education, which has taken a cognitive viewpoint, most commonly, constructivism (Firth & Wagner, 1997).

In the Discussion (chapter 9) SCT is used to interpret the results and findings of both phases with the particular aim of revealing for examination the affordances and constraints in New Zealand secondary school language education that influence teachers’ understanding and practice of ICLT. To determine teachers’ current understanding of ICLT, the project analysed their cognitions about culture teaching. The field of teacher cognition research is outlined next.

2.4  Teacher Cognitions

*Teacher cognition research is concerned with... teachers’ mental lives.*

Borg, 2009, p. 1

The term teacher cognitions was defined by Borg in 2003 as “the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching—what teachers know, believe and think” (p. 81) and he noted the relationship of those constructs with teachers’ behaviours. In later references, the definition more explicitly incorporated the practice aspect, becoming “what language teachers think, know, believe *and do*” (Borg, 2015, emphasis added).

Teacher cognition research was a shift in focus from investigating teacher behaviour alone, instead seeking also to explain why teachers behave the way they do, what they think about in their decision-making, why their thoughts and practices might not match, and why they might not practise approaches taught in education programmes (Birello, 2012; Borg, 2009). Teacher cognitions are established through socialisation in an educational system (first as student, then in teacher training, then in service) and in other historical, cultural, and social contexts (Pajares, 1992; Sercu & St. John, 2007). Teachers will be best supported in their professional education if their behaviours can be understood in relation to their own interpretation of their practices, the influence of their prior experiences, and the specific situation within which they work (Johnson, 2006). Correspondence with SCT is clear here, as the theory supports the determination, and examination, of those influencing factors on the socialisation of the individual.
Teacher cognitions, although rarely explicit (Grimal, 2007) and usually complex (Feryok, 2010), are generally accepted as having a strong influence on a teacher’s decision-making and practice in classroom interactions and activities (Birello, 2012; Borg, 2009; Daly, 2008/9; Dewey, 1910/2005; Pajares, 1992). Teachers are not “mechanical implementers of external prescriptions” (Borg, 2009, p. 2); their thoughts and beliefs help to filter their decisions on what is (or is not) important in the classroom (Castro et al., 2004; Pajares, 1992; Sercu, 2006). As Feryok (2010) noted, though, classroom reality (subjective or objective) is dynamic, arising from and adapted through interactions with different participants, in different situations, involving different content. It is those “personal and ‘situated’ approaches to teaching” (Richards, 2008, p. 167) that teacher cognitions research examines.

The multiple layers of personal and situated factors can conflict. For example, an individual can experience conflicting systems in their working environment (Zheng, 2013), unequally important personal and professional beliefs (Agee, 2004; Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009), or for language teachers, in particular, some factors may be at odds with their cultural identity or their own language learner identity. The extent to which teachers base their practices on their experiences as students is also relevant (Castro, et al., 2004; Haworth, 2009; Lortie, 2002; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Sercu & St. John, 2007). Even those new to teaching carry many years of experience as observers (Pajares, 1992) and will be influenced by the approaches and techniques they experienced as a student (Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009). Feryok (2010) remarked that practising school teachers are unlikely to be cognisant that they are educating and modelling for future teachers. Socialisation of future teachers by way of this “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 2002, p. 61) is, therefore, essentially unconscious and undirected. It is concerning that such experiences formed as a youth without intention, awareness, goal, or appropriate scaffolding from more capable individuals, become so entrenched as to affect future practices and the degree of acceptance and appropriation of information received through more advanced socialisation (e.g., at teachers’ colleges, by expert teacher educators, through professional development).

Borg noted that an individual’s beliefs may not necessarily be internally consistent, be attributed equal importance, or regulate their practice in a consistent way (Birello, 2012). Some beliefs are positioned on a “central-peripheral dimension” (Rokeach, 1968,
Central or core beliefs are those grounded in personal experience, long-held, deeply personal, tightly connected to other beliefs, taken-for-granted, or considered important. They are stable, less open to change and, as idiosyncratic as they might be, are often given priority in guiding practice (Birello, 2012; Borg, 2006, 2009; Castro et al., 2004; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 1968; Sercu & St. John, 2007). Peripheral beliefs are theoretical, unsupported by experience, and/or newly acquired, and they are generally less stable, more vulnerable to change, less likely to influence teaching practice, and can be more readily rejected (Birello, 2012; Borg, 2006, 2009; Castro et al., 2004; Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 1968).

A similar distinction is made between (i) abstract, theoretical, or academic beliefs, and (ii) concrete, contextualised, practical beliefs (Birello, 2012; Feryok & Oranje, 2015; Mangubhai, Marland, Dashwood, & Son, 2005). A teacher might report a particular belief in relation to an abstract concept (e.g., valuing the integration of language and culture), but s/he might report an alternative belief in relation to the concrete operationalisation of the concept in a particular context (e.g., linguistic focus necessary for examinations). These dynamic realities can account for some practices appearing to be at odds with cognitions (Basturkmen, 2012; Birello, 2012). Given these potentially conflicting “subsets of beliefs” (Birello, 2012, p. 91) it should be of no surprise that teachers’ knowledge and beliefs do not always translate directly into the classroom (Borg, 2009); that is, beliefs and practices may “not necessarily be calibrated” (Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009, p. 912). Teachers prioritise—and sometimes compromise—their beliefs in order to resolve tensions in particular contexts (Zheng, 2013). Studies described in later sections of this chapter provide evidence of this, where teachers expressed cognitions that aligned with ICLT but continued to practise traditional methods in the classroom.

The central-peripheral and abstract-concrete dimensions have as their corollary the notion of dominant and non-dominant behaviours, terms applied by Sannino (2008) as she examined why a well-received innovation to teaching practices was not sustained. Dominant teaching behaviours are the tried and true, historically evolved standard practices, usually personally experienced and invariably well supported (e.g., by policy, programmes, support staff) and well resourced (e.g., time, materials, staff-student ratios). Non-dominant teaching behaviours, on the other hand, are new initiatives which might or might not be adequately supported and resourced, might have been introduced by others,
and might require change or adaptation of existing processes and/or attitudes (Engeström, 2008; Sannino, 2008). These terms are useful in the subject study in two ways: (1) literature and evidence on language education shows teaching language elements to be the dominant activity, and teaching culture elements to be non-dominant—this influenced the Phase 1 and 2 teachers’ cognitions about culture teaching and ICLT; and (2) the CPPs of Phase 2 amounted to a new and non-dominant activity for the participant language classes.

The overall research concern of this study is supporting New Zealand language teachers to understand and practice ICLT. This may require teachers presently unfamiliar with ICLT to review their cognitions (and practices) to take account of the teaching approach, which will not come easily to all. Although some beliefs are changed over time as their grounds are tested, questioned or exposed to alternatives through social reality and objective knowledge, others can self-perpetuate and become protected to “cognitively outmanoeuvre” (Sercu & St. John, 2007, p. 43) experience, evidence, and logic (Castro et al., 2004). It must also be recognised that changes to curricula and political promotion do not alone guarantee changes to teacher beliefs and practices because of the complex web of influences on any individual teacher (Feryok, 2010; Mangubhai et al., 2005; Johnson, 2006; Leeman & Ledoux, 2005; Richards, 2008; Sannino & Nocon, 2008; Zheng, 2013). In a similar vein, Sercu (1998, 2006) made the point that simply passing on to teachers the latest theory or research results will not necessarily lead to changes in their practices or beliefs. This is especially so if innovations are not well represented in curricula and supported by procedures and guidelines (Castro et al., 2004; Scarino, 2014).

But cognitions can and do change. Recognising that one’s practices might benefit from development and being prepared to take risks and trial innovative strategies are important vectors for change (Dewey, 1910/2005; Edwards, 2008; Rainio, 2008; Sercu & St. John, 2007). These are the features of “adaptive experts” (Timperley, 2011, p. 6), teachers with not only deep knowledge of content and methods but also, crucially, the ability to question the assumptions that underpin their practices. To achieve this, circumstances need to support teachers in testing and evaluating new procedures for themselves as concrete activities. Teacher training is “a critical process” and the teacher’s role as practitioner should not be “loaded down with an unnecessary ballast of grey theory” (Sercu, 1998, p. 255). If an approach is seen to work in terms of achieving
desirable learning outcomes, teachers are more likely to change their cognitions and their future behaviours (Guskey, 1986). In pragmatism’s terms, belief changes are experientially derived. Positive contributors include ensuring the provision of ongoing support because change can be gradual (Guskey, 1986), and involving the teacher in the development of associated research (Díaz, 2013; Scarino, 2014) (as practised in Phase 2 of this study).

Teacher cognition research in the particular area of language education is becoming more common (Borg, 2009). Helpfully, Borg manages a bibliography of international publications on language teacher cognitions and in the most recent update (Borg, 2014) there were more than 700 references spanning the period 1976-2014. This thesis makes a strong contribution to that work by augmenting the low number of studies of teacher cognitions about culture teaching generally, and ICLT specifically. Of the 708 references listed, only 11 were about culture. Another 11 addressed intercultural pedagogy, of which 4 were from a single source—Jiménez Raya and Sercu (2007)—and a further three were written by Sercu (2006, Sercu et al., 2005, and with Castro et al., 2004). Although a small number of New Zealand-based language teacher cognition studies were listed (eight explicitly named New Zealand in the title), none of those were about culture or ICLT.

The following section relates teacher cognition research to the pertinent field of teaching language and culture and notes how cognitions can affect classroom practices. Following that, studies on teacher cognitions about intercultural pedagogy specifically, are presented.

2.5 Teachers’ Culture Teaching Cognitions and Practices

Through the development of a second languaculture,
we can not only know more, we can also know differently.
Fantini, 2012, p. 271

Practical skills taught do not allow other skills to be caught, according to Barro, Byram, Grimm, Morgan and Roberts (1993). In other words, teaching linguistic skills will not result in osmotic understanding of other elements of communication, such as cultural meaning. It is of concern that even when teachers express cognitions that recognise the importance of culture in language teaching, integration of language and culture is not the

When culture does feature in the language class it often involves elements such as history, literature, famous people, foods, and achievements, in other words, the “Big C” (Bennett et al., 2003, p. 238), “large” (Holliday, 1999, p. 237), or “overt” (Stapleton, 2000, p. 296) aspects of culture. In this thesis, Stapleton’s term overt is used to describe cultural aspects of this nature. It is overt culture that language coursebooks tend to cover (Sercu, 2000), and it is at risk of being taught as static information. It is as important, arguably more so, for language students to be exposed to a culture’s behaviours and practices (Jedynak, 2011), its social conventions (Neff & Rucynski, 2013), and its beliefs, values, and attitudes. These cultural aspects, in which the potential for change is more readily apparent, are commonly referred to as “little c” (Bennett et al., 2003, p. 244), “small” (Holliday, 1999, p. 237), or the term favoured in this thesis, “covert” (Stapleton, 2000, p. 296, emphasis added) aspects of culture. Furstenberg (2010) questioned whether culture can be “sliced into such discrete elements” (p. 329); this thesis recognises that all aspects are relevant to language learning, provided that they are all explored critically and treated as elements of a system of meaning making.

It is the less bounded, dynamic features of culture that make the practice of teaching culture in language education daunting and challenging for some (Abrams, Byrd, Boovy, & Möhring, 2006; Delett, Barnhardt, & Kevorkian, 2001; Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Stapleton, 2000). However, Byram (1991) warned that inadequate integration of culture in language lessons can lead students to assume that their own viewpoints and understandings remain applicable to the target language, resulting not in the learning of a new language, but “learning a codified version of their own” (p. 18). Without adequate exposure to target cultural viewpoints, gaps in cultural understanding are likely to be filled with one’s own cultural interpretation, or untested uninformed assumptions, as opposed to being left unfilled until the new cultural understanding has been acquired (Liddicoat, 2008a).

A teacher’s perspective on language and culture teaching can be considered in terms of their cognitions on: (1) the nature of culture, (2) appropriate cultural content to teach, and (3) their overall educative orientation to culture teaching (Liddicoat, 2005).
Liddicoat (2002) differentiated between views on the nature of culture as *static* or *dynamic*. Considering culture as static is to treat it as comprising unchanging facts, artefacts, and institutions, or “information and things” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 839). This view lends itself to thinking of cultural content as separate from language, to be transmitted to students in self-contained packages of information for absorption and recall, and treated as representing all members of a culture (Roberts et al., 2001). The target culture consequently remains external to the language learner, as a feature of *the other* (Liddicoat, 2011; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2013). This traditional approach does not integrate or interact with the cultural information and demonstrates a cultural orientation (as opposed to an intercultural orientation).

No single teacher can know all there is to know about a culture (Liddicoat, 2008a)—even their own—and culture cannot be taught as a set of rules to be generalised to all members (Kramsch, 2003). The alternative view treats culture as dynamic, acknowledging it as an ever-changing process. Appropriate cultural content to teach includes the everyday “lived culture” (Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, 1996, p. 432), the “actions and understandings” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 839) practised by people to structure and contextualise their life and their interactions within their social world. Importantly, culture is closely linked to language and is dynamic. In this view, culture is understood through exploration and engagement. Teaching dynamic culture involves fostering skills of discovery, reflection, and comparison, with the expectation of transforming the learner; it is aligned with an intercultural approach.

Liddicoat (2005) represented these perspectives as a series of three axes, reproduced in Figures 2.1 and 2.2. In Figure 2.1, two of the axes intersect medially. The horizontal axis represents cognitions of the nature of culture, with one pole being the traditional extreme of thinking of culture as *facts*, and the other pole reflecting an understanding of culture as dynamic *processes*. The vertical axis represents cognitions related to cultural content for the language class, with one pole associated with teaching content related to *artefacts and institutions*, and the other, with teaching culture as *practices*. Presented in this way, the axes create quadrants that correspond to approaches to learning and content. The quadrant most aligned with ICLT is the lower right, where the approach to learning (processes) and the approach to content (practices) are both dynamic (Liddicoat 2005; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009).
Liddicoat (2005) depicted the teacher’s overall educative approach as a third axis (Figure 2.2). On this axis, one pole represents a *cultural* approach and the other an *intercultural* approach. In the former, a teacher does not intend their practices to transform or confront the learner, and does not strongly tie together language and culture. In the latter, decentring and transformation are promoted, and the relationship between language and culture is central (Liddicoat, 2005, 2011; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009).

Treating any culture as static and essentialising it to a commonly associated nation, religion, or ethnicity, implies that individuals can be determined by their culture (Byram & Risager, 1999; Sercu, 2002). This has the potential to reinforce the existence of cultural stereotypes, and suggests that a culture can be taught by transmitting a parcel of information about it (Elsen & St. John, 2007). Compare this with an intercultural view of cultural knowledge, which is not about knowing just the *what*, but also the *how* and the *why*. In an intercultural approach, it is equally as important to know the how and the why.
in relation to one’s own culture. Exposure to a range of sources of information about the
target culture is important so students are introduced to multiple interpretations, not just
one teacher’s viewpoint, whether native-speaker or not (Jogan, Heredia, & Aguilera,
2001; Schulz, 2007).

Considering culture and language to be separable skills is reinforced by the majority
of textbooks. Books tend to present culture in separate chapters from language or as
“appended as a gesture rather than integrated,” encouraging the treatment of culture as
“supplementary and optional” (Byram et al., 1991, p. 17), a side interest, or fun change
from language lessons (Luk, 2012; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Sercu, 2000; Wilkinson, 2012).
In this way, culture lessons are a pedagogic device, ancillary activities when light-
hearted, less taxing lessons are desired (Byram, Esarte-Sarries, Taylor, & Allat, 1991).
This means language and culture are not integrated and, although the add-on cultural
lessons may be interesting or entertaining, they often do not address elements of culture
that could be difficult for learners or of most assistance to them in intercultural
interactions (Baker, 2015; Liddicoat, 2008a; Sercu, 2002). It is somewhat puzzling to see
that although teachers recognise that culture can be engaging (e.g., Tsou, 2005), few seek
to integrate that motivational aspect into the lesson as a whole, keeping cultural
information as peripheral not core (Lange & Paige, 2003).

In research, the focus is moving away from transmitting static facts about culture
and towards treating culture as dynamic, where the goal is for the student to develop
knowledge, positive attitudes, skills, and awareness of culture (Byram, 1997; Fantini,
2012). It will soon be seen that these are the cornerstones of ICLT, but first, it is
worthwhile to consider a brief history of earlier approaches to culture teaching.

2.5.1 Earlier approaches to culture teaching

The Traditional Approach, prevalent until the 1960s or so, emphasised high culture and
written language (Crozet, Liddicoat, & Lo Bianco, 1999). There was little linkage
between culture and language and, if culture featured at all, it was centred on a canon of
literature (Peiser & Jones, 2013). A learner was considered culturally competent when
they could master the literature. The 1960s and 1970s saw a shift in culture learning to
focus on pragmatic aspects, primarily to assist business and political relationships (Peiser
& Jones, 2013). In this Culture Studies Approach a culturally competent individual had
an understanding of a culture’s history, geography, institutions, and social structures; still, language and culture were not strongly linked (Crozet et al., 1999). In the late 1980s, the Cultural as Practices Approach came to the fore (Crozet et al., 1999). Its alternative name of the Cultural Approach (Peiser & Jones, 2013) and the common reference to the Cultural Turn (Byram, 2000) indicate the elevation of culture in the field of language education. This approach involved studying the culture’s practices and values, and attempted to foster positive attitudes towards the target culture (Peiser & Jones, 2013). Interpretation of the words and actions of the cultural other were invariably from the perspective of the learner’s own cultural background, however. Cultural competence was related to knowing what interactants will do or say. Although this approach heralded the relatedness of language and culture, the two elements were not taught in an integrated way, and the culture was still treated as if it were a static, homogeneous body of information (Peiser & Jones, 2013). In other words, students were still taught about culture rather than in it and through it (Roberts et al., 2001).

In the 1990s, the work of Byram—the “most quoted author” (Jedynak, 2011)—introduced and developed the notion of intercultural communicative competence (ICC). According to Byram (2015), ICC combines communicative competence (see Canale & Swain, 1980) with intercultural competence. In Sercu’s (2002) view, the ICC whole is greater than the sum of its parts of communicative competence and cultural awareness. Contributions from Byram (1997), Byram and Zarate (1997), Kramsch (1998a), Risager (1998), and Sercu (1998) were important early works in the area of intercultural language teaching. These authors continue to publish on the topic. The intercultural communicative language teaching approach is detailed next.

2.6 Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching (ICLT)

*If you want to know about water, don’t ask a goldfish*

Fantini, 2012, p. 271

Byram (1991, 1997), and his work with Zarate (Byram & Zarate, 1996, 1997) in particular, formed the foundations of teaching towards ICC. The associated teaching approach was developed as an advancement on communicative language teaching (CLT) (see Hymes, 1972) to address shortcomings with respect to conceptualising the role of culture in language education, culture’s relationship with language, and the influences of
the backgrounds and needs of the students (Jebahi, 2013; Kelly, 2012; Manjarrés, 2009; Ryan, 2012). ICLT treats language and culture as being integrated and equally relevant from Day 1 of language learning.

Communication in intercultural interactions is more effective with awareness and knowledge of the interactants’ cultures. For this reason, language students will benefit from development of knowledge of the values and beliefs shared by the target culture’s members, as well as skills and attitudes to assist further exploration to contend with the dynamic and non-homogeneous nature of culture. The learner needs to be aware of differences and similarities between their own culture (the C1) and the target culture (the C2) so misunderstandings can be recognised and resolved for effective communication (Barro et al., 1993). Reflection, necessary for an understanding of one’s own culture, is discussed in greater detail in section 2.6.1. Through cultural exploration, borders between the C1 and C2 can be “explored, problematized and redrawn” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 837). In this way, an intercultural identity is developed, representing the learner’s occupation of “a relativising C3” (Young & Sachdev, 2011, p. 83), a new, dynamic, shared, and productive third place from where a decentred learner takes an insider’s and outsider’s view of the C1 and C2 (Kramsch, 1993; Wilkinson, 2012; Witte & Harden, 2011). This third space does not require the relinquishment of one’s own cultural viewpoint (Byram, 1991) but it is likely to mean the individual will experience a transformation as exposure to alternatives viewpoints shapes their identity (Liddicoat, 2002, 2005; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013; Phipps, 2003). This also supports the SCT notion of transformation through activity.

These core features of an intercultural approach can be summarised as learning skills to explore cultures beyond limited sets of information, to critically reflect on one’s own culture, and to then compare and contrast cultures with positive, open-minded attitudes to other perspectives. These are features of an intercultural speaker, one who has developed ICC to the extent that s/he can act as a mediator, both affectively and cognitively, in intercultural interactions (Byram, 1997, 2006; Risager, 2007); one who can “stand on the bridge” or indeed “be the bridge” between people of different languages and cultures” (Byram, 2006, p. 1). The title intentionally contrasts with native speaker, the goal of more traditional approaches (Byram, 2014). ICC does not aim for full mastery of the C2 (Guo, 2010), nor does it suggest the goal of a native-like understanding (Byram
& Risager, 1999; Roberts et al., 2001)—after all, there is no single ideal representative of any culture (Kramsch, 1998b). Liddicoat (2005) packages it succinctly: “Cultural knowledge is not a case of knowing information about the culture; it is about knowing how to engage with it” (p. 31).

The notion of ICC is multifarious in definitions across disciplines and even within the field of language education (Byram & Guilherme, 2010; Guo, 2010). ICC includes the ability to recognise, if not anticipate, and manage rich points (Agar, 1994), and to understand and accept them as equally valid alternative viewpoints. Use of the word competence in ICC (derived from Canale and Swain’s (1980) reference to competencies) emphasises that it does not relate to possessing knowledge of defined set of content, but is a capability, a dynamic skill or behaviour that demonstrates understanding of the processes involved in an intercultural interaction (Byram & Guilherme, 2010; Guo, 2010). ICC includes critical cultural awareness, the ability to reflect on one’s own viewpoint and make comparisons to gain a better understanding of both cultures, and of their similarities and differences (Abrams, et al., 2006; Byram, 1997; Crozet et al., 1999; Newton et al., 2010; Roberts et al., 2001). The aim is to make connections rather than boundaries between cultures (Duff, 2004; Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Rowsell, Sztainbok, & Blaney, 2007), and to see value in differences (Barraja-Rohan, 2000). Importantly, it involves the recognition that every member of any culture will have their unique individual and elastic viewpoint of an encounter (Guilherme, 2002), making culturally-based generalisations or stereotypes inappropriate and unreliable (Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Su, 2011). There is now much evidence of a positive relationship between ICC and proficiency in the target language (Jackson, 2014; Moeller & Osborn, 2014) and that an absence of cultural awareness can mean misalignments between perspectives resulting in misunderstandings. In order to compare the C1 and C2, awareness of one’s own culture is required. The matter of critical reflection warrants separate discussion.

2.6.1 Critical reflection

Reflection on one’s own culture is crucial to ICLT, and to exploit its value it must be objective, critical, and deep. Through reflection, individuals become “more aware of how they and their fellow citizens conceptualize, understand, and experience” identities, situations, and interactions and the consequential impacts on relations with others.
(Jackson, 2011, p. 82); in this way, reflection fosters development of a “meta-level understanding of oneself and one’s own culture” (Moeller & Osborn, 2014, p. 681). It is a necessary step to enable comparison with the C2, but reflection alone is not sufficient (Scarino, 2014).

It is through engagement with, and exploration of, other cultures and reflection on one’s own, that the language learner can *decentre*, consider his/her “own situatedness from the perspective of another” (Scarino, 2010, p. 324) and avoid an ethnocentric stance of treating their own culture as the norm or the right way, against which others are judged as abnormal or odd (Barrett, 2007). This requires objective and critical reflection of one’s own cultural viewpoint to ascertain how it was established and the influence is has on one’s perspective, as well as an ongoing review of its appropriateness; in other words, critical cultural awareness (Byram, 1997; Newton, 2012). One’s own culture can otherwise be invisible (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Kransch, 1993; Lo Bianco & Crozet, 2003) and its influence on interpretation of the target culture not evident (Mantle-Bromley, 1992). It is through knowing others that one comes to know the self (Holmes & O’Neill, 2010; Newton, 2012).

Decentring allows understanding of what is going in the course of making meaning; not just asking “*what* does my culture do?” but “*why* does it do it?” and “*how* does it do it?” It includes analysing that information in terms of its influence on the intercultural interaction and assumptions made about the interactants’ perspectives. Appreciation of “the ‘self’ vis-à-vis everything else in the world” (Fantini, 2012, p. 272) assists development of knowledge, positive attitudes and skills, just as those dimensions enhance the understanding of oneself. Reflection is, therefore, a learning goal of ICLT and a strategy for developing ICC (Blasco, 2012). Teachers are in the position to both teach and model the skill of self-reflection.

Language teachers unfamiliar with the concept of ICLT might see little relevance in spending time enquiring into the student’s own cultures in their language lessons, but ICC relies on a deep level of self-understanding. This includes the need to question one’s own cultural viewpoints and values (Holmes & O’Neill, 2010) and “interrogate [them]... from the perspectives of other cultures” (Bagnall, 2005, p. 107) in order to “make the familiar strange” (Jackson, 2006, p. 83). Kelly (2012) emphasised that learning a target culture without comparing it to one’s own compartmentalises the new information as a distinct
set, amounting to a monocultural education. In contrast, intercultural education allows for new information to be made relevant to the learner through comparison with their own experiences (Sercu, 2002). The relationship with pragmatism’s and SCT’s emphasis on relevance enhancing internalisation is evident here.

Warnings about a “positive bias” (p. 476) towards reflection were raised by Blasco (2012), however. Blasco noted, with concern, that reflection means different things to different people, and involving reflection in the class assumes the learner is capable of transcending themselves and has sufficient insight into their own prejudices to expose what needs to be fixed. It is argued here that any level of awareness is a good start. Being mindful that one’s own perspective is culturally shaped, and acknowledging that is the case for all participants in an interaction, is a necessary step towards decentring. Because reflection is not a natural activity for everyone—maybe even less so for secondary school aged students?—it is all the more important for teachers to explain it, encourage it, and model it. Reflection and relativisation of one’s own culture are not always explicitly promoted in education policy, curricula, and programmes (Scarino, 2014; Castro et al., 2004), so the importance of their roles needs to be actively brought to the attention of teachers. Phase 2 of this thesis seeks to do that.

It is posited here that the absence or presence of critical reflection is the best indicator of whether a teacher’s orientation is intercultural. Although a teacher might have cognitions and practices that align with an ICLT approach, it is often the absence of critical reflection that prevents their approach from being wholly being ICLT (e.g, Han, 2010; Han & Song, 2011; Sercu et al., 2005) and instead retains the goal of communicative competence rather than ICC. Focusing on communicative competence is often construed as relating to fluency of oral performance and ignores the more covert meaning-making elements of interactions (Forsman, 2012; Stapleton, 2000). Both phases of this study address New Zealand teachers’ current perspectives in this regard.

Critical reflection is but one of the competencies of an intercultural speaker. To help guide assessment of the development of all relevant competencies, Byram (1997) introduced his seminal model of assessing ICC based on savoirs. The model is outlined next.
2.6.2 Savoirs

An intercultural speaker has mastery over a range of competencies. Byram (1997) developed a model of assessment of ICC based on five such capabilities, which he termed savoirs, and which remain relevant in today’s research, albeit with modification or addition by some. The savoirs can be grouped into knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Given space limitations, they are presented in Figure 2.3 along a brief description and indicative assessment objectives for each. Given the neutrality of the table format of the figure, it must be stressed here that Byram emphasised savoir s’engager (critical cultural awareness) as being central in the model, embodying the educational dimension where linguistic and cultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes can be critically applied and evaluated (Byram, 2012). (Note, the word “savoirs” is not italicised when referring to the competencies generally, but is italicised when referring to the individual savoirs by name. This requires clarification because one of the savoirs—that relating to cultural knowledge—is also named savoirs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Savoirs</th>
<th>Knowledge about self, other, interaction, the society and its processes. Assessment objectives include knowledge of historical and current relationships between C1 and C2, conventions of communication in C1 and C2, achieving contact with C2, awareness of C1 events from C2 perspective, social distinctions and principal markers in C2, processes of social interaction in C2, and many more.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Savoir être</td>
<td>The ability to relativise oneself and value the other. Assessment objectives include evidence of curiosity, openness, readiness to suspend (dis)belief about C1 and C2, willingness to engage with and experience C2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Savoir comprendre</td>
<td>The ability to interpret and relate. Assessment objectives include identification of ethnocentric perspectives and areas of misunderstanding and dysfunction, and mediate between conflicting interpretations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
**Savoir** The ability to discover and interact. Assessment objectives include ability to identify significant references across cultures and elicit connotations, compare processes of interaction and negotiate appropriate use of them, use knowledge, skills, and attitudes for mediation.

**apprendre** Critical cultural awareness. Includes an awareness of C1 values and how they influence one’s view of C2; relativisation of C1; ability to value meanings, beliefs, and behaviours in C2. Self-reflection beyond own cultural biases (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012). Assessment objectives include ability to identify, interpret, and evaluate explicit or implicit values in C1 and C2; be aware of potential conflict in perspectives.

**Savoir s’engager** Subsequently, Houghton (2010, 2013) further developed Byram’s savoirs by, *inter alia*, adding a sixth: *savoir se transformer*—identity development, relating to changes a student makes in response to the opportunity provided by an interactant. *Savoir se transformer* places emphasis on the importance of a student “knowing how to become, knowing how to develop oneself selectively through interaction with others” thus prioritising the internal domain of self, in contrast to the other savoirs which focus on the external domains of knowledge and the world (Houghton, 2010, p. 224).

Like other references to assessment of the cultural dimension (e.g., Houghton, 2010, 2013; Kohler, 2015; Schulz, 2007), the ICC model utilises dynamic assessment (Dixon-Strauss, 1996; Scott & Palincsar, 2009) to measure the development of cultural understanding in terms of the competencies of attitudes, knowledge, and skills. In culture assessment literature, SCT is invoked rarely (Kohler (2015) is a significant exception), but most models promote ongoing assessment of learners as they engage in a variety of tasks. In this way, the learner’s ZPD is revealed, showing what can be mastered with assistance and thus where development is headed. From the teacher’s perspective, dynamic assessment guides the nature of mediation required by the student to reach more sophisticated levels of development.
2.6.3 ICLT summary

ICLT is the solution to the culture teaching challenge. Based on key principles, it is an adaptable approach to teaching language and culture. It is the antidote to problems arising from teaching culture through the transmission of a set of artificial, soon outdated, limited facts. It involves teaching skills to explore, reflect, and compare cultures and, crucially, integrates language and culture at all levels of language learning (Newton, 2012).

Although the terms intercultural competence and intercultural speaker are widely present in educational research, some consider them to remain vague (Witte & Harden, 2011) or so general as to be almost empty (Holmes, 2006). The concepts themselves are a little nebulous. This is compounded by the application of the term intercultural across a range of disciplines where it has become “all-embracing” (Risager, 2000) and of almost “buzzword status” (Witte & Harden, 2011, p. 1). It is often treated as simply meaning an interaction involving people of different cultures where the prefix inter- is taken to mean only to involve, to be between, people. These interpretations lack the “richer connotations” (Newton, forthcoming) and dynamism that this thesis argues is intended by the prefix, that is, the continuously dialectic, mutual, and jointly transformative process of engagement in an interaction between individuals, each of whom is a collection of histories and experiences (Kramsch, 2009; Scarino, 2014). It is not just engagement with others, but the express purpose of comprehension of others in terms of language, culture, and relationship between the two (Byram, 2015). The imprecision gives some indication of why a single definition has not been accepted by all, and may explain why some language teachers are challenged when it comes to how best to teach and assess intercultural competence (e.g., East & Scott, 2011; Forsman, 2012; Guo, 2010; Lázár, Huber-Kriegler, Lussier, Matei, & Peck, 2007; Manjarrés, 2009; Paige, Jorstad, Siaya, Klein & Colby, 2003; Scarino, 2010). Pinning down an agreed definition of the abstract concepts need not hold up the application of intercultural methods in the classroom, though, if the outcomes can be satisfactorily described and demonstrated.

2.7 Teacher Cognitions on Intercultural Pedagogy

Having outlined the theoretical side of ICLT, this section turns to international studies that examined language teachers’ understanding and practice of ICLT. According to Ghanem (2014), little research has been done on approaches to culture teaching with the
noted exception of the study by Sercu et al. (2005), which is of such influence here that it is discussed separately in section 2.7.5. This thesis makes a contribution in that regard.

Language teachers are the “key ‘brokers’” (Young & Sachdev, 2011, p. 83) between theory and practice of ICLT, and as such their views on the applicability and practicability of ICLT in the classroom are vital if the approach is to be promoted further. Grouped by their most prominent findings (with some overlap in sections), the following review of studies accentuates the primary issues that teacher cognitions research reveals about ICLT. Each theme includes an explanation of how the subject study addresses matters raised in the studies. Research involving New Zealand language teachers is separately presented in section 2.9.

### 2.7.1 Teacher education

In this thesis, *teacher education* encompasses initial tertiary teacher training and all subsequent in-service professional development. Starting where teachers start—at their original teacher training—studies have noted deficiencies in initial training in terms of coverage of culture teaching generally, and ICLT specifically, even in localities where ICLT is required by education policy. Although culture sometimes featured in training it was most often overt cultural aspects and ICLT practices of exploration, reflection and comparison were rare (Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Young & Sachdev, 2011). Notably absent, too, was training in how to assess the cultural dimension (Scarino, 2010; Schulz & Ganz, 2010). ICLT should be included early in undergraduate teacher education programmes to allow sufficient time for study and development of a full understanding of it (Kelly, 2012), and should amount to more than just one short course (Lázár, 2011). These recommendations concur with Scarino’s (2014) observation that development of an understanding of ICLT is gradual, and reports that personal experience with a new approach, along with sufficient time to test it, increases the extent to which teachers incorporate it into their practices (Guskey, 1986; Sercu & St. John, 2007). Byram (2015) noted that there is a difference between training teachers in pedagogy (e.g., ICLT) and training them to develop their own ICC. Studies in this area (e.g., Harvey et al., 2011; Lázár, 2011) have shown the former to be the more successful.

Once teachers are practising they are reliant on professional development opportunities to keep up to date with teaching approaches. Acknowledging in-service
training as being often unsystematic and fragmented, Kelly (2012) still considered professional development as “a key vector for change” (p. 411) and a means of creating connections with other practicing language teachers. But, such opportunities are not always available to, or taken up by, teachers (Cameron & Simpson, 2002; Haworth, 2003; Schulz & Ganz, 2010) and in New Zealand, it appears ICLT is rarely covered in any depth in professional development (Conway et al., 2010). Other research has shown teacher educators to have a more sophisticated understanding of ICLT than pre-service (Woodgate-Jones, 2009) or in-service teachers (Byrd et al., 2011), but nevertheless design courses that centre on the language dimension. This could represent differentials in abstract versus concrete cognitions (Birello, 2012; Mangubhai et al., 2005) held by the teacher educators.

This study took account of these teacher education matters in both phases. The questionnaire asked teachers about extent of their knowledge of ICLT and the nature of their ICLT training, if any. The Phase 2 teachers were asked whether they had received training in ICLT and what future training they desired. Crucially, the intervention of Phase 2 was designed to expose teachers to the ICLT theory in action to test its value for themselves as a professional development opportunity.

2.7.2 **Intercultural beliefs but traditional practices**

Many studies produced evidence of teachers undertaking practices that seem counter to their expressed beliefs, including the study by Sercu et al. (2005) and those derived from it, all of which are discussed later in section 2.7.5. Common across studies, teachers showed an understanding of culture as important in language learning and even demonstrated ICLT-aligned views, but those cognitions were not borne out in their practices. For example, despite having ICLT-aligned cognitions, teachers in Young and Sachdev’s (2011) study ranked ICC second to last out of eight curricular areas. (A similar item was included in the questionnaire of Phase 1 of this study.) Remarkably, this was despite most respondents recognising high levels of ICC as making for good language teachers and successful language learners.

Apparent mismatches have been shown to arise from: a lack of explicit reference to culture and ICLT in curricula; lack of time; insufficient knowledge of the target culture; low proficiency of learners; and a lack of supporting resources (Larzén-Östermark, 2008;
Young & Sachdev, 2011). In some cases, it was the potential for cultural content to lead to classroom disharmony that prevented the practice of exploration, reflection, and comparison of cultures. Larzén-Östermark (2008) remarked that teaching approaches induce particular student reactions, with the traditional transmission of cultural knowledge—which she termed “Pedagogy of Information” (p. 542)—limiting the likelihood of negative or defensive responses, and the student-centred “Pedagogy of Encounter” (p. 542) being more likely to be confrontational and challenging for students.

Like Sercu et al.’s (2005) participants, Larzén-Östermark’s teachers described language and culture as being inseparable but did separate them in practice, and focused on teaching language competence over cultural competence. This could characterise Risager’s (2006) division of the relationship into: (1) the generic level, “as the phenomena shared by all humanity” (p. 3), where language and culture are integrated and it makes no sense to talk of separation since one cannot be conceived of without the other; and (2) the differential level, or micro level, of specific forms of language and culture where they can be separated in certain respects, as might be required for the purposes of language teaching; teaching grammar, for example (see also Byram, 2012; Kohler, 2015).

In this study, the questionnaire gathered teachers’ cognitions and reported practices allowing comparison between the two. In Phase 2, teachers were collaborated with, observed, and interviewed to reveal the relationship between ICLT cognitions and practices. Interpreting the results with SCT assisted in revealing and explaining mismatches.

2.7.3 Cultural experience and nativeness

If, as many have asserted (e.g., Cross, 2010; Dewey, 1927/1998; Feryok, 2010; Lortie, 1975; Kelly, 2012; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Swain et al., 2011; Vygotsky, 1978), an individual’s cognitions and practices are mediated by their own experiences, it is intuitive that a teacher with personal experience of language learning, with affiliations to other cultures, native to the target culture, or any combination of these, would have a professional advantage over teachers with little or no contact with other cultures. Manjarrés (2009) made the observation that some teachers might never have experienced intercultural contact or been “culturally challenged” (para. 14).
Nativeness was foregrounded in Ghanem’s (2014) examination of culture teaching beliefs and practices in teachers of German in the U.S., with native speaker participants considering themselves at an advantage in teaching culture because they were perceived as authorities. Similarly, Kelly’s (2012) native speaker teachers described themselves as having “a sense of embodying” the languaculture (pp. 412-413). Interestingly, though, Ghanem reported that native and non-native teachers alike expressed a preference for teaching the overt aspects of culture. She questioned the authority label: All teacher participants had had some personal experience of the C1 and C2, and a native speaker from Northern Germany had been unaware of the cultural significance of a Southern German food, meaning his nativeness had not been of assistance. This supports Byram’s (2015) remark that a native speaker is likely to be better qualified only with respect to knowledge about the target culture (i.e., just one element of ICC), and probably only with respect to a limited number of social groups in one country. An individual cannot be native to all cultures within a target-language community. This was also an observation by Lazaraton (2003), which led her to recommend that teachers take the role of facilitator, rather than transmitter, to co-construct knowledge with the students, and allow students include their own knowledge and act as experts.

Other studies have discussed the importance of language teachers having substantial personal experience with the target culture specifically, or cultures generally, in fostering abstract understandings of culture, greater self-awareness and positive attitudes (Czura, 2013; Youngs & Youngs, 2001). Looking at it another way, Jedynak (2011) posited the monolingual and monocultural nature of Poland as the reason for Polish teachers favouring traditional approaches because their exposure to other languages and cultures was minimal and training in cultural diversity was limited. Relatedly, teachers in Byram et al.’s study (1991) believed a lack of personal involvement in the target culture adversely impacted on their ability to effectively teach the culture, be seen as a credible cultural informant, and successfully bridge the C1 and C2 (see also Paige, et al., 2003). The corollary of Ghanem’s (2014) finding on native speakers as cultural authorities was that non-native speakers believed they lacked authority to teach culture, and they consequently demonstrated a lack of confidence in culture teaching.

Influences of nativeness and experience with cultures were addressed in this study. The questionnaire asked teachers about the extent of their personal experience with other
languages and cultures, and whether they were native to the language they taught. Phase 2 involved a nativeness variable, with one teacher native to the L2/C2, one teacher native to the students’ L1/C1, and one native to a third language and culture, the influences of which were considered in the application of SCT.

2.7.4 Uncertainty

Many studies raised teachers’ uncertainty about how to implement intercultural teaching (e.g., Byrd et al., 2011; Kohler, 2015; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Paige, et al., 2003; Stapleton, 2000; Woodgate-Jones, 2009). In Australia, “Intercultural understanding” is one of seven General Capabilities in the Australian Curriculum (ACARA, 2013; Díaz, 2013) and features in the National Statement for Languages Education in Australian Schools and associated national plan (Scarino, 2010). Moloney (2010) and Scarino (2010) described ICLT as gaining ground with teachers encouraging students’ critical opinions, cultural investigations and comparisons, and decentring. However, in later studies by Díaz (2013) and Kohler (2015), Australian language teachers reported awareness of the need to integrate culture, but “struggled with how to represent this view in their teaching” (Kohler, 2015, p. 194) and demonstrated only “passive recognition” (Díaz, 2013, p. 13) of integration in practice (see also Díaz, 2011). Uncertainty was also noted by Baker (2015), and was explained by Stapleton (2000) as being due to “the sheer weight of the term ‘culture’” (p. 292) with teachers being wary of making assumptions about the target culture or the students’ culture, or both.

Regardless of whether teachers have been trained in ICLT, all will benefit from ongoing access to support and resources to guide their practice of an intercultural orientation. In Hong Kong, the national curriculum requires integration of language and culture but EFL teachers in Luk’s (2012) study raised concern about insufficient support with the integration and with assessment of cultural understanding. In practice, this led to teachers focusing on language elements, and those who did consciously include culture treated it in a peripheral way, as a “gimmick” (p. 258) distinct from language and not assessed. The need for improved access to materials and practical exemplars was reiterated by Moeller and Osborn (2014), with emphasis on such resources being adaptable to individual classroom contexts. It will be recalled that Guskey (1986) advised that ongoing support was required if teachers were expected to make changes to their beliefs and practices.
This study examined these matters by gathering data on teachers’ perspectives on the nature and availability of support and resources for ICLT practice, their familiarity with the cultures, and their confidence in teaching culture. The in-class activity was designed to test the value of a particular ICLT activity in terms of supporting the practice of ICLT.

Given the significant influence of the study by Sercu et al. (2005) in terms of extent of findings and inspiration for subsequent international research, including the subject project, it warrants separate discussion. The findings of that study are detailed next, followed by an outline of the ensuing research derived from it.

### 2.7.5 Sercu et al.’s (2005) research and related studies

In 2004, Sercu headed a group of researchers from the international special research interest group CULTNET in conducting a multinational study gathering cognitions about intercultural teaching from 424 language teachers across seven countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece, Mexico, Poland, Spain, and Sweden. This work is extremely relevant, given its consideration of teacher cognitions from around the world. As encouraged by Sercu (2007), the project was replicated by others (e.g., Czura, 2013; Han, 2010; Han & Song, 2011; Yeganeh & Raeesi, 2015). To add to the body of work growing from that recommendation, this study used, with permission (see Appendix A), a number of items from the survey in the Phase 1 questionnaire to gather New Zealand language teachers’ cognitions about culture teaching and ICLT.

The primary finding of Sercu et al.’s (2005) study was that the majority of teacher participants were “favourably disposed” (Sercu, 2005, p. 10) to an intercultural approach (see also Sercu, 2007). However, these same teachers did not all see value in teaching students about their own culture, that is, the critical reflection aspect (Sercu, 2007). The “unfavourably disposed” (Sercu, 2005, p. 11) teachers, on the other hand, did not have ICC as a teaching aim; rather, they considered intercultural teaching reinforced stereotypes (Sercu, 2007; Sercu et al., 2005). A second significant finding was that although favourably disposed teachers held cognitions that valued many facets of ICLT, they did not necessarily practise ICLT. Instead, they relied on transmission of cultural information, and the majority reported dedicating 80% of class time to the language dimension and 20% to culture. Teachers reported being most familiar with the overt
cultural aspects of daily life and routines, living conditions, and food and drink (also the case for English and Danish teachers in Byram and Risager (1999)); they were less but still adequately familiar with the covert aspects of international relations and different ethnic and social groups. Culture teaching objectives related mainly to language competence and to passing on cultural information through teacher-centred activities, and rarely aimed at developing ICC. Comparison activities were reasonably common, but reflection and exploration were infrequent.

The study illuminated a number of constraints keeping teachers from practising ICLT. Common across all countries, and reiterating findings presented in the studies above, they included: (i) most prevalently, lack of time to teach culture due to overloaded curricula and too few teaching periods; (ii) curriculum lacked explicit reference to ICLT and/or had a strong linguistic focus (see also Castro et al., 2004); (iii) lack of suitable culture teaching materials, textbooks too clichéd and/or did not integrate culture; (iv) insufficient training in culture teaching or insufficiently familiar with the target culture; and (v) students lacked interest in culture learning.

2.7.6 Research derived from Sercu et al.’s study
Sercu et al.’s (2005) project was promoted as a basis for like studies to extend the knowledge of international practices and beliefs about culture teaching. The subject study does just that, posing many of the same questions to New Zealand language teachers, nearly ten years on from the initial research. A number of other studies have done the same. Han (2010) administered a questionnaire based on Sercu et al.’s survey to EFL teachers in China producing similar results. Han’s teachers also showed a reasonably broad understanding of culture and a willingness to incorporate it in their teaching, but continued to focus on language competence in practice. Lack of flexibility in terms of teaching materials was noted as significant factor—most were required to teach to the textbook—and students were not tested on cultural competence.

Han and Song (2011) employed elements of Sercu et al.’s (2005) questionnaire with language teachers in China and had generally similar outcomes to Han (2010). They additionally found a marked absence of support for students to understand their own culture. Teachers advised their language focus was due to a lack of supporting resources and their own lack of understanding about culture and culture teaching. They tended to
teach (or transmit) the cultural content they were most familiar with, invariably overt culture. Teachers frequently shared their perspectives of English cultures, but rarely talked about negative aspects and stereotypes or involved students’ experiences of English cultures. Little attention was given to enhancing skills of discovery and interaction, development of positive attitudes, and critical reflection, despite teachers’ stated beliefs that aligned with ICLT.

Czura (2013) compared cognitions of Polish pre-service English teachers with those of Sercu et al.’s (2005) Polish practising teachers and found the pre-service teachers had a less traditional view of culture teaching. Notwithstanding this, the pre-service respondents ranked teaching culture as the least important aspect of language teaching (cf. Young & Sachdev, 2011), believed that 80% of class time should be devoted to the language dimension, did not support full integration of language and culture, and undervalued reflection on one’s own culture, considering it the least important aspect of ICC. Pre-service teachers placed less emphasis on the knowledge-based aspects of ICC than did their practising counterparts, though, seeing value in the development of attitudes and skills for intercultural interactions. Czura also reported the infrequency of visits by pre-service teachers to English-speaking locales; those who had had sustained contact with other cultures were more likely to rate culture as being of higher importance, suggesting that mobility experiences, or lack thereof, affect views on the role of culture in the language classroom.

Yeganeh and Raessi (2015) incorporated questions from Sercu et al.’s (2005) questionnaire in their survey of 291 EFL teachers in Iran. Although the published interpretation of the findings lacked depth, the statistics showed that the teachers held positive views on featuring cultural content in class but their practices did not bear this out; lack of time was attributed as the primary reason.

2.7.7 Summary of studies of teacher cognitions on intercultural pedagogy

Despite a range of culture-teaching pedagogical approaches (including ICLT) promoted over the last two decades (Byram et al., 1991), and despite worldwide updating of education policies to emphasise culture-teaching and intercultural methods (Díaz, 2013; Lange & Paige, 2003; Sercu, 2007), and even despite the widespread general acceptance of the importance of understanding culture in language education (Díaz, 2013; Han, 2010;
Han & Song, 2011; Sercu et al., 2005), these studies indicate that culture is still not commonly integrated into language lessons. The literature reveals a set of common beliefs held by teachers which result in culture still being treated like language’s “second cousin, twice removed” (Lange & Paige, 2003, p. xi), including: (i) uncertainty in how to teach culture due to insufficient training, lack of explicitness in curricula, or language focused assessments; (ii) lack of familiarity with the subject culture; (iii) lack of time to teach culture or to learn about teaching culture; (iv) potential for disharmony with controversial cultural topics; (v) and a lack of supporting resources. These beliefs were taken into account when developing the in-class intervention to implement in this study. Cultural portfolio projects (CPPs) were chosen as an activity that could be grounded in the principles of ICLT with the potential to address many, if not all, of the challenges to culture teaching mentioned above. The next section describes CPPs, before presenting the published studies that have applied them in the classroom.

2.8 Cultural Portfolio Projects

*Language teachers have long faced problems in ... how to bridge the gap between learners’ linguistic and cultural competence. The use of portfolios can be the solution.*

Lee, 1997, p. 358

Cultural portfolio projects (CPPs) are a student-centred classroom activity—sitting well with Dewey’s view of pragmatism—and they characterise a student’s participation and progress—supporting a sociocultural approach. Portfolios can be used to “provide a portrait” of students’ abilities, support self-reflection, and link instruction and assessment (Delett et al., 2001, p. 559). They are especially beneficial in language education because they provide opportunities for practicing authentic language use for an authentic purpose and afford in-depth engagement in cultural topics (Abrams et al., 2006; Delett et al., 2001). Portfolios support teachers and students working together with continuous opportunities to communicate, understand, and reflect on learning (Lee, 1997). By invoking multiple sources of information, portfolios can serve to underline the existence of multiple perspectives in any one culture (Jogan et al., 2001; Schulz, 2007). They have been described as contrasting with the traditional prescriptive, teacher-centred transmission of facts, which may be over generalised and from one perspective (Dewey, 1915/2008; Jourdain, 1998; Prawat, 2009; Wright, 2000). In New Zealand, internal assessment of languages in NCEA already makes use of portfolios for writing and
interactions (Ministry of Education, 2012, August 28), but it is not clear that their potential as both formative and summative assessments (Schulz, 2007) is maximised. Portfolios can be used to reveal the learner’s ZPD, offering “windows onto students’ next likely area of accomplishment” by tracking the process of growth from actual development, through potential abilities, to new potential development (Wagner & Brock, 1996, p. 163).

In the CPPs, students gather and create a range of items based on a cultural theme or artefact and include them in a portfolio. A theme could be a cultural item, a film, music, or even a value (Byrd & Wall, 2009) and, when chosen by the student, ensure the project will be of interest and relevance (and therefore useful) to them (Abrams et al., 2006; Dewey, 1916/2008; Prawat, 2009; Sercu, 2004a). Portfolio items, all based on the theme, can include recordings of conversations, evaluations by self and others, evidence of document searches, written reflections, essays, and so on. All items should be annotated by the student with comment on context and relevance, to assist in reflecting on the item’s impact on their learning (Allen, 2004; Byon, 2007; Delett et al., 2001). The portfolio records students’ learning experiences over time as they actively engage in the learning process, ask and answer questions through research, interpret and critically analyse findings, and reflect on the process (Abrams et al., 2006; Delett et al., 2001; Schulz, 2007; Su, 2011). The research aspect supports development of higher order skills such as exploration, critical reflection, and comparison, skills directly aligned with ICLT and applicable beyond the language classroom.

Reflection is an especially important element of the CPPs, mediating the construction of knowledge that is “deeper, more comprehensive, and longer lasting” (Su, 2011, p. 248). This draws on the sociocultural principle of involving the learner’s ontogenesis—including their perspectives, experiences, beliefs, and understandings, accurate or otherwise—to mediate their development. This is also consistent with Dewey’s version of pragmatism, which asserts that it is reflection that is “truly educative” (Dewey, 1910/2005, p. 1), and is clearly aligned with ICLT which requires exploration, reflection and comparison.

The target language should be used as much as possible, particularly with respect to sources used, reflections on new information, and the presentation of findings (Abrams et al., 2006). That said, it is a feature of CPPs that they are entirely adaptable with respect to
the extent to which the native language (L1) and target language (L2) are used, decisions on which should enable maximum opportunity for practice of the L2 without limiting the extent to which the learner can engage with the topic and elucidate their thinking (Liddicoat, 2008b). By presenting findings to the class (e.g., as a speech, poster, or class discussion) new discoveries are shared so all in the classroom community, including the teacher, can learn from them, construct shared meanings, and be mutually transformed as co-explorers (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Cullen, Haworth, Simmons, Schimanski, McGarva, & Kennedy, 2009; Dewey, 1939/1998; Moeller & Osborn, 2014; Scarino, 2014). Students take responsibility for their learning and engage with the cultural information they discover, characteristics of both pragmatism and SCT (Dewey, 1910/2005, 1915/2008, 1938; Guilherme, 2002; Lee, 1997; Delet et al., 2001; Jourdain, 1998; Mantle-Bromley, 1995; Morgan, 1993; Schulz, 2007; Su, 2011). Exploration that includes elements of ethnographic study of both the C1 and C2 allows students to “learn from a subject how that subject sees the world” (Sobolewski, 2009, p. 30), providing opportunities for development in the target culture as well as revealing a different perspective on their own culture (Roberts et al., 2001). Students become more confident in interpreting cultural meanings in interactions and are given a chance to reconsider the appropriateness of their currently held views, which could comprise positive and negative cultural generalisations (Barro et al., 1993).

These objectives are all represented in the CPP-based research of Phase 2 of this study. With an understanding of the nature of CPPs, the following section presents a summary of published research studies involving CPPs in the language classroom.

2.8.1 CPP studies

Seven published studies were found that used portfolios to teach culture in language classes. The methodologies, findings and, if mentioned, recommended improvements, all contributed to the development of the particular form of CPPs used in this study. In the interests of space, these studies are presented in summary form in Figure 2.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Context</th>
<th>Features and primary findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lee (1997) US learners of Spanish | - Students chose own theme from given list (included Spanish food, art, holidays, gender roles, immigration)  
- Developed cultural knowledge, writing, speaking, and higher order cognitive skills, e.g., organising, analysing, summarising.  
- Student response: portfolios interesting and motivating being student-centred, not teacher-centred. |
| Wright (2000) US tertiary learners of German | - Compared CPPs with traditional textbook-based, instruction-centred approach  
- CPPs allowed students to: separate facts from beliefs, shift perspective, become comfortable with diversity, and differentiate between “personal discomfort and intellectual disagreement” (p. 335).  
- Positive attitudes towards C2 inhibited in instruction-centred group. |
| Abrams (2002) US tertiary learners of German | - Compared CPPs with traditional textbook-based, instruction-centred approach  
- Pre-project, all students aware of within-culture diversity in C1 but referred to stereotypical generalisations for C2.  
- Post-project, all deemphasised overt culture. CPP-group expanded definition of culture to include covert culture, recognised multiple perspectives, made comparisons, and avoided generalisations.  
- Student response: CPPs stimulating and challenging, but stereotype focus limiting. |
- Gained knowledge about C2 and C1; recognised influence of C1 on perceptions of C2; developed critical thinking skills. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>CPP Type</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrams et al. (2006)</td>
<td>US tertiary learners of German</td>
<td>Compared “typical” CPP (online and printed texts as information sources) with structured film-based CPP with set questions from pre-assigned perspective (e.g., anthropologist, film critic). Findings presented in English (L1).</td>
<td>Typical CPP: students enjoyed choosing own topic, learned cultural knowledge, improved language; did not enjoy group work, wanted more time, and saw no clear connection between CPP and language structures learned in class. Film-based CPP: students enjoyed structure and guidance, and thought film more authentic than textbooks or teacher; students considered some aspects irrelevant, instructors thought language-teaching time sacrificed, movie plot limiting, no personal choice element.</td>
<td>Recommended provision for choice of topic, present findings in L2, connect project with language, and make findings relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byon (2007)</td>
<td>US tertiary learners of Korean culture and heritage</td>
<td>Stereotype-based CPPs, research included interviews. Reframed to relate to C1. Wrote reports on changing understanding; findings presented to class. Fostered positive attitude towards Korean culture. Students enjoyed CPPs, especially choice of topics, gained understanding of own learning processes, appreciated alternative perspectives, recognised tendency to overgeneralise.</td>
<td>Recommended: More detailed instructions, including search strategies and examples; allow pair or group work; more class time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su (2011)</td>
<td>Taiwanese tertiary learners</td>
<td>Stereotype-based CPPs, groups of 2 or 3 using provided resources.</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflective journals documented findings and influence on cultural understanding. Short presentation of findings.

- Culture understanding broadened from limited knowledge of overt culture, to greater knowledge of overt and new knowledge of covert culture.
- Gained awareness of C1 and C2 and could compare.
- Students reviewed stereotypes, recognised past extent of inaccurate or generalised C2 content.
- Student response: rated CPPs positively; changed views; gained motivation to understand cultures.
- Recommended: Conduct in Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

**Figure 2.4.** Summary of published articles on research involving CPPs in language classes

In all cases, the CPPs were evaluated positively by students and teachers, and were shown to enhance culture learning in a variety of ways. That said, some of the studies suggested improvements for future CPP activities.

The CPP used in this study was based chiefly on those of Allen (2004), Byon (2007), and Su (2011), where hypotheses were generated and selected by the students, researched, refined, and then reformulated to relate to their own culture. The specific features of the CPPs are detailed in the Methodology (chapter 4). The study accommodated recommended improvements made in the earlier studies and addressed Su’s (2011) call to conduct a project of this nature in New Zealand. The small extent of research on culture teaching in New Zealand is now outlined.

### 2.9 New Zealand Research

In recent times, the Ministry of Education has commissioned a number of reports on language education in New Zealand. Scarino’s (2005) report played a significant part in the national curriculum review that saw learning languages developed as a learning area in its own right and put a new emphasis on culture. The report recommended an intercultural approach throughout the curriculum, encouraging development of the ability “to ‘move across’ languages and cultures through communication” (p. 10), so that:
students are continuously learning to become better and better intercultural communicators; that in each social encounter, students come to realise that what each person brings to the interaction is their knowledge (concepts, ideas), understanding and values, developed through their experiences over time, captured through their language; that they cannot fully anticipate what others will bring, and that coming to know and understand means hearing what others bring, responding, elaborating, and, through these processes, developing, over time, an ever-evolving communicative repertoire and linguistic and cultural understanding.

(pp. 10-11)

Among the number of recommendations Scarino made for the curriculum revision process was the need for sustained professional learning to connect teachers with the research in the field. This appears not to have happened, or at least, professional learning could not be described as having been “sustained,” equally and widely accessed, or proven effective. Scarino promoted teacher and researcher collaboration, including investigation of and reflection on teaching practices, as a suitable means of ongoing professional development. Phase 2 of this project is such an investigation.

Other reports were commissioned by the Ministry after the curriculum review, seeking to gauge teachers’ understanding of culture teaching in language education. The most influential of these was the report prepared by Newton et al. (2010) (hereafter, the Newton report).

2.9.1 The Newton report
The Ministry of Education-commissioned report, prepared by Newton and his colleagues and titled Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching: Implications for Effective Teaching and Learning (Newton, et al., 2010), was intended to be made available in 2009, before full effect was given to the revised curriculum in 2010 (East, 2012a). The full 90-page report was published in 2010 and is still accessible on the Ministry’s research publications website (www.educationcounts.govt.nz) along with a 41-page “summary for teachers” version prepared by Rivers (2010). The Newton report was described as complementing the earlier and widely disseminated report prepared by Ellis (2005), which reviewed second language acquisition theory and practice and recommended task-based teaching (East, 2012a; Newton et al., 2010), now “implicitly being encouraged” for
language education in New Zealand (East & Scott, 2011, p. 184). The Ellis report did not mention intercultural pedagogy and made “only passing reference” to culture teaching (East, 2012a, p. 61).

The Newton report produced a framework to guide teachers in intercultural practices by advancing a set of principles developed from the international literature and other models available at the time. It coined the term *intercultural communicative language teaching* (uniquely abbreviated to *iCLT*) to refer to the particular method supported by the principles that represent intercultural pedagogy and the curriculum’s emphasis on communication. The method is defined by six principles, as presented below.

**Intercultural communicative language teaching (iCLT):**

1. integrates language and culture from the beginning
2. engages learners in genuine social interaction
3. encourages and develops an exploratory and reflective approach to culture and culture-in-language
4. fosters explicit comparisons and connections between languages and cultures
5. acknowledges and responds appropriately to diverse learners and learning contexts
6. emphasises intercultural communicative competence rather than native-speaker competence. (Newton et al., 2010, p. 63)

As mentioned earlier, these principles feature in the curriculum guide for the learning languages in secondary schools to support teachers in creating language learning programmes, where each principle is accompanied by at least three lesson examples for class application, and links to references and resources (Ministry of Education, 2013). The CPP learning tool used in Phase 2 of this study encompasses all six principles within a single activity.
Five years on, Newton commenced a “re-visioning” of the principles of iCLT reflecting on them in response to teaching experiences, consultations with intercultural and educational stakeholders, and subsequent literature in the field (Newton, forthcoming). The review undertaken so far has confirmed the framework generally, but is reworking the principles to make them less abstract and more translatable into practice. It is not clear that a final form of principles has yet been settled on, but the versions seen so far suggest a three-pronged focus for teachers: (1) To mine the social and cultural context of learning; (2) To foster and affirm intercultural learning objectives; and (3) To adopt intercultural classroom practices such as explore, reflect, compare and connect, and to apply learning beyond the classroom. It will be evident that these new principles reflect a great deal of the scholarship reviewed in this chapter. The CPP tool used in Phase 2 epitomises the revised principles.

2.9.2 Reports based on teacher studies
Other commissioned reports have been based on teacher studies. Of primary relevance to this thesis is the evaluation of a Ministry-sponsored one-year professional development programme intended to educate or refresh language teachers in language acquisition theories and methods (Harvey et al., 2010). (The main report spawned a number of subsequent publications from the researchers, which are also referenced in this section.) The Ministry was aware that practising language teachers had a “lack of a principled knowledge base of intercultural language teaching” (Conway et al., 2010, p. 449). The programme was evaluated as successful in educating teachers in approaches and practices for teaching language knowledge; teachers studied and deeply processed the language knowledge strand. However, it was not effective in increasing teachers’ understanding of how to develop a student’s cultural knowledge. The programme itself did not model the importance of cultural learning, and teacher participants were tested only on aspects of the communication and language knowledge strands, not on the cultural knowledge strand. Conway et al. put this down to ICLT still being an “emerging area in New Zealand” (p. 459) and lacking a clear set of principles and supporting resources. Newton et al.’s principles of iCLT were in only draft form at that time.

Referring to the same evaluation project, Richards, Conway, Roskvist, and Harvey (2010) described discovering at the outset that none of the teachers involved in the professional development programme were aware of a need to develop students’ ICC; all
were focused on building language competence. Later in the project, a number indicated they would attempt to implement ICLT practices in the future, but in talking about the detail of this intention, it was clear it would be restricted to overt culture: “food, festivals, facts and folk tales” (p. 9). Observations of those teachers in practice saw a lack of opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture and to interact with the L2/C2 community. Once again, those culture teaching shortcomings were explained as a manifestation of the lack of principles associated with the curriculum’s cultural knowledge strand. The Newton report was newly released at the time. This thesis tests whether change has occurred in the intervening period.

The New Zealand government-funded language immersion programme was evaluated by Roskvist, Corder, Harvey, and Stacey (2011) in terms of the value of the immersion experience for development of teachers’ cultural knowledge and ICC. The significant majority of teachers reported the greatest gains in proficiency and confidence in speaking, but almost all considered their cultural knowledge had also been improved. However, evidence suggested a continued understanding of culture as static and there was no evidence of deeper understanding of the cultural foundations, recognition of cultural values, or awareness of the influence of their own perspectives. The subsequent classroom focus remained primarily on the language dimension and substantiation of critical cultural awareness and reflection was notably missing. Roskvist et al. concluded that the “paucity” (p. 216) of teacher knowledge and limited practice of ICC methods was because intercultural pedagogy had been only recently introduced, with minimal professional development support, implying they would expect an improvement in due course. This thesis tests that notion a few years on.

East (2012a) raised the matter of the compatibility of ICLT with the communicative approach of task-based language teaching (TBLT). Studying teachers and teacher advisors, he noted, with concern, the impression of some that TBLT and ICLT were distinct fields or that TBLT did not fit with an ICLT approach. East found that several teachers treated culture as a discrete component in their classroom practices and based tasks around culture as artefacts, despite awareness that this did not exactly fit the new learning area. Even teachers who involved experiential culture learning still centred lessons on facts about overt culture (commonly food and festivals), did not provide for integration of language and culture, and did not involve reflection. It appears that the
teachers in East’s study were following a TBLT approach without maximising, or perhaps not even realising, opportunities to make those tasks intercultural. Teacher advisors, on the other hand, had a strongly developed understanding of both TBLT and ICLT, but their experience appeared not to be influencing teachers.

These studies suggest that professional development needs greater, if not sole, focus on the cultural knowledge strand to raise teachers’ awareness of its value and how it can be practised and assessed in a task-based classroom. Returning to the notion of the abstract-concrete dichotomy, teachers require concrete opportunities to test the abstract theory for themselves (Guskey, 1986; Sercu, 1998). This is exactly what occurs in the subject study, where the CPPs used in Phase 2 bridged the gap between TBLT and ICLT and allowed teachers to see the theory of ICLT in concrete form. The scene is now set for this research project. This chapter is concluded by positioning the study within the scholarship reviewed above.

2.10 Relationship to Existing Research

As an overall summary, this section presents the ways in which this thesis addresses lacunae in existing research:

(i) No published study was found that definitively sought New Zealand secondary school language teachers’ cognitions on culture teaching and awareness of intercultural pedagogy. This study took what appears to be an internationally unique approach of considering the views of teachers of all languages, including te reo Māori (never tested in this way) and the language of immersion, EAL. The current study canvassed teachers from an entire Ministry of Education region, an under-researched one at that, and those teachers were in their usual environment, that is, not engaged in a professional development programme. Gathering information on challenges and affordances faced by New Zealand teachers in their practice is crucial if change is required and assistance is to be provided.

(ii) No other study has evaluated the practice of an ICLT approach in New Zealand. No other study has involved the use of cultural portfolio projects in New Zealand (or Australia or the UK for that matter).
No other study was found to include evaluation from the teacher’s perspective of the practicability of a CPP of the proposed design. In the main, existing CPPs studies focused on the students’ perceptions or benefits. This study considered the CPP from the design stage, involved teachers in individual adaptations of the CPP and their implementation, and sought feedback post-CPP from teachers and students. Taking this extended perspective allowed examination of the practical application of an activity based in theory. Uniquely, it considered the CPP activity in terms of its value in both achieving desirable outcomes for students as well as its influence on the teachers’ practice of a Ministry-recommended approach.

All existing CPP research related to teaching a single foreign language, in one class, at tertiary level, and all but one were based in the United States. This CPP study was based outside the US, conducted with secondary school participants, in three schools, and involved two foreign languages. It introduced the unique elements of accommodating adaptations to suit unique contextual factors of each situation, and involving teachers with L1s/C1s native to the target, native to the learning environment, and native to neither.

Many (if not all) published studies of CPPs took a constructivist approach when assessing their contribution to language education. This study was grounded in SCT, a framework not mentioned in any of the existing CPP research reviewed and uncommon in intercultural research. SCT emphasises the contribution of all interactants, the whole context, the role of mediation, and the relevance of the teacher’s and the learner’s ontogeneses. No other study was found that similarly applied pragmatism and SCT to culture teaching in language education.

This study involved collaboration between researcher and teacher, to ecologically develop CPPs to fit the unique needs of the teacher and the learners. The Phase 2 intervention emphasised the importance of knowing the learner and using their ontogenesis to assist their learning, and to legitimise their roles as both expert and novice.

Few studies, if any, have taken a similarly systematic approach to determining the tensions that result in gaps between researchers’ theory and teachers’ practice, and between teachers’ cognitions and their practices. This study examines teacher
cognitions with SCT to both identify teaching challenges and, crucially, attempt to resolve them.

(viii) The project goes some way to address explicit calls made by other researchers and to produce results to consider against past studies, by:

- Taking up Scarino’s (2005) recommendation for teacher and researcher collaboration in activities that involve reflection and self-assessment.
- Responding to questions raised by Paige et al. (2003) to direct future research in the area of culture teaching: “how do teachers translate their objectives for cultural learning into practice?” and “in what ways do teachers’ knowledge and beliefs actually inform their practice?” (p. 223).
- Responding to Su’s (2011) recommendation for CPP research in New Zealand.
- Providing the latest insight into New Zealand teachers’ understanding of ICLT generally, and iCLT specifically, some years after their inclusion in education policy and publications, and after past related studies.
- Using the CPP as an intercultural task to link task-based teaching with intercultural teaching to evidence the compatibility of the approaches (East, 2012a).
- Taking question lines directly or inspired from Sercu et al. (2005), Byram and Risager (1999), Young and Sachdev (2011), Luk, (2012), Jedynak, (2011), and Lazaraton (2003) to allow comparison to be made across continents, and over time.

2.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the philosophical theory of pragmatism, the psychological theory of SCT, and the instructional theory of ICLT, which together serve as the research paradigm for this study. It promoted a process-oriented approach to culture-learning, and argued it was more fittingly aligned with the sociocultural paradigm than constructivism. SCT considers all learning to be a process: a process of enculturation, of development, of transformation through mediation and participation. Furthermore, SCT allows the broader social context to be considered when interpreting a situation (Scott & Palinscar, 2009). Taking the narrower constructivist perspective in this project, requiring focus on the
individual rather than the social world that is language education, could limit the study’s implications for the support of New Zealand language teachers in practicing ICLT. Moreover, research applying SCT to the situation of New Zealand language education is scarce.

The description of the research techniques of teacher cognitions and CPPs, and studies applying them, showed their value in terms of collecting and examining data characterising challenges and affordances in the practice of ICLT. The chapter also presented the small base of research in culture teaching in New Zealand, before outlining the ways in which this study will test, respond to, and fill lacunae in the extant research. In the next chapter, the context of New Zealand secondary school language education is described, before the detailed methodological procedures of each phase are presented in chapter 4.
3.0 Overview

This section provides a basic outline of the educational context of this research project. It introduces the New Zealand national school curriculum highlighting features that pertain to learning languages. Supporting documents and online assistance related to the curriculum are also presented. Then, language education at secondary level is described regarding the nature of language learning and the nature of teacher training.

3.1 The New Zealand National School Curriculum

*Learning a new language provides a means of communicating with people from another culture and exploring one’s own personal world.*

The New Zealand Curriculum, 2007a, p. 24

The New Zealand national school curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007a) is not subject based or prescriptive, but is organised around a structure of eight learning areas: English, the Arts, Health and Physical Education, Learning Languages, Mathematics and Statistics, Science, Social Sciences, and Technology. Learning Languages was established as a learning area in its own right in the 2007 revision of the curriculum, taking full effect in 2010 (East, 2012a, 2012b). Previously, language learning had been subsumed in the general learning area of Language and Languages (Daly, 2013; Richards et al., 2010), along with English—as the medium of education and as an additional language—and te reo Māori, the indigenous language. The new Learning Languages learning area has, at all levels of achievement, the sole objective of communication.

The “core Communication strand” (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 24) focuses on students learning to use the new language to make meaning and, through development of their language and cultural knowledge, become effective communicators in the language. “Language knowledge” and “cultural knowledge” are the two equally weighted “supporting ... strands” (p. 24). The former relates to the language’s structure and the development of explicit language knowledge and accuracy; the latter is associated with the relationship between language and culture, and concerns the expression of belief systems through language and cultural practices. Learners develop cultural knowledge by comparing and contrasting those beliefs and practices with those of their own culture(s).
Newton (forthcoming) described the revised curriculum as presenting an “unambiguously ... explicit intercultural agenda” for all areas of education. However, it is not so explicit as to actually use the word intercultural. Sercu (2007) might have reported that in school curricula around the world the object of communicative competence has been replaced with intercultural communicative competence, but this is not the case for New Zealand, where communication is the core.

The Learning Languages section of the curriculum makes particular mention of the relevance to New Zealand of te reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language as the country’s official languages, and mentions Pasifika languages as having “a special place” because of “New Zealand’s close relationships with the peoples of the Pacific” (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 24). English was retained as a separate learning area as the medium of instruction and fundamental to all areas of the curriculum. Somewhat incongruously, EAL was incorporated within the English learning area and not treated as a language learned, whereas te reo was relocated to the new Learning Languages learning area. Despite singling te reo out as having particular importance, it is now in the only non-compulsory learning area, an anomaly accentuated by use of te reo throughout the curriculum.

Learning a language is not compulsory—Scott (2011) put this down to “nervousness by the Government about both teacher supply and potential shallow implementation” (p. 13)—but it is an entitlement for Years 7-10. That means students must have the opportunity to learn a language, although the nature of that opportunity varies and in many cases amounts to no more than a “taster” with no prospect of progression (East, Shackleford, & Spence, 2007, p. 21). The meaning of entitlement seems not clearly understood, and ambiguity and inconsistency in the expressions used across Ministry publications does not help (Jones, 2014). In Jones’s view, this lack of clarity makes language learning appear inferior to other subjects. The non-compulsory position of language subjects could also influence the extent to which language teachers are willing to change or adapt their classroom practices, a matter worthy of further investigation.

In a review of international developments in the integration of language and culture, Byram (2014), acting on the advice of New Zealand researchers Conway and Richards,
held up New Zealand as having made one of “the strongest statements” (p. 214) in its inclusion in the curriculum of culture and language as equally weighted strands supporting communication. However, as recognised elsewhere in Byram’s review, and in reports from Conway et al. (2010) and East and Scott (2011), it can be hard for teachers to see what this development means in practice. An audit (the SCALES project) revealed gaps between teachers’ practices and the revised curriculum’s intentions, with teachers being “cautious about anything that might cause extra work or a change in practice” and unsure of how to practise the newly recommended dynamic assessment (East & Scott, 2011, p. 186). Teachers did see value in assessing authentic interactions as opposed to contrived situations.

The curriculum presents the values, key competencies, learning areas, and principles for New Zealand schools. A number of those features explicitly relate to culture. For those with an understanding of ICLT, those aspects will be recognised as alluding to ICLT principles, but for teachers not aware of ICLT, the fundamental points may be so inexplicit as to pass their notice. A selection of culture-related values, competencies and principles from the curriculum are presented below, with those aspects most closely aligned with ICLT accentuated, in bold:

- **Values of diversity and respect.** Students are encouraged to **value “diversity”, as found in our different cultures, languages and heritages” and “respect themselves, others, and human rights”**. Students should **learn about “their own values and those of others** [including] different kinds of values, such as **moral, social, cultural”,** and develop their ability to “express their own values; **explore, with empathy, the values of others; critically analyse values … [and] discuss disagreements that arise from differences” (p. 10).

- **Key competencies:** Using language, managing self, relating to others, and contributing. Students should learn to “**recognise different points of view … [and be] aware of how their words and actions affect others”** (p. 12).

- **Learning Areas of English, Learning Languages, and the Arts:** Those who learn another language “**explore different world views in relation to their own”** (p. 17) allowing communication with people of other cultures and **exploration “of one’s own personal world”** (p. 24). Students are encouraged to learn te reo and become “familiar” with tikanga Māori (Māori customs and values) to strengthen Māori
students’ identity and assist the “journey towards shared cultural understandings” (p. 14). “Learners in the arts are able to view their world from new perspectives” (p. 20).

- **Principles:** Cultural diversity, inclusion, and community engagement refer to the need for “students’ identities, languages, abilities and talents [to be] recognised and affirmed and that their learning needs are addressed” (p. 9).
- The curriculum’s vision for young people includes “all cultures [being] valued for the contributions they bring”, where young people are “positive in their own identity” and “connected…international citizens” (p. 8)

Ministry published or endorsed documentation is available for language teachers, most of which is available online. This includes: curriculum guides (Ministry of Education, 2012, June 20), as well as examples of class activities organised by language and learning level, language-specific multi-media materials, assessment guides, newsletters, and language-specific listserv email groups. The New Zealand Qualifications Authority website (NZQA, n.d.) also offers a range of resources for language teachers, including language-specific standards, assessment resources, and exemplars. Perhaps most likely to be accessed is the curriculum guide for learning languages at secondary school (Ministry of Education, 2012, June 20). The **Key Concepts** section of the curriculum guide (Ministry of Education, 2011) is introduced with a quotation by Byram on the definition of an intercultural speaker, followed by a quotation by Kramsch on identity and cultural competence. The curriculum guide also clarifies the changes arising from the curriculum revision with respect to learning languages (Ministry of Education, 2012, August 28), emphasising communication as the objective and basis for all assessment, and advising that language knowledge and cultural knowledge are to be assessed indirectly through their contribution to communication.

The curriculum guide also refers to achievement objectives as being focused on development of explicit linguistic and cultural knowledge of the L2 and C2 and general understanding of how languages work and cultures are organised. Central to this thesis are the following recommendations of the guide:

(i) Teaching should “not be limited to neatly packaged fragments of information about the target language and culture,” but should involve opportunities for genuine
communication and support “explicit comparisons between cultures and languages, leading to reflection and exploration of different perspectives.”

(ii) Teachers and students should develop “an actively reflective disposition towards language and culture and, for the student, it means actively exploring their own identity at the same time as they are learning about the world views of others.” (Ministry of Education, 2012, August 28, Implications for teaching and learning programmes, paragraph 3, emphasis added)

With respect to recommendation (ii), it is noted with interest that although the guide expressly refers to “teachers and students” at the beginning of the sentence, the second clause singles out “the student” as being required to explore their own identity as they learn others’ world views. An ICLT perspective would require the teachers, too, to explore their identity in order to practice and model open-mindedness and acceptance of other views; they, too, are members of the classroom community of practice (Bryd & Wall; Cullen et al., 2009; Dewey, 1939/1998; Laave & Wenger, 1991; Moeller & Osborn, 2014; Scarino, 2014). This seems to miss an opportunity to impart to teachers the principles of an ICLT approach and is of concern given the evidence of teachers feeling unsure of what an ICLT approach means in practice (e.g., Byram, 2014; Conway et al., 2010; East & Scott, 2011; Richards, Conway, Roskvist, & Harvey, 2011).

To assist teachers in implementing the new direction, the curriculum guide links to a page called Learning programme design (Ministry of Education, 2013) where the six principles of iCLT (Newton et al., 2010) are listed. There are other useful links to online support, too, such as to the National Library of New Zealand Curriculum Services (see also Ministry of Education, 2014, July 3), Te Kete Ipurangi (the online knowledge portal established by the Ministry), and the online Learning Languages Community (Ministry of Education, n.d.), which describes itself as a “portal to Professional Learning Opportunities, Professional Support for the New Zealand Curriculum, Pedagogy, Assessment, Resources and Key Links” and publisher of regular newsletters.

Agencies affiliated with the Ministry of Education also have resources available. The New Zealand Qualifications Association provides assessment guidelines for NCEA learning languages (NZQA, 2006). International Languages Exchanges and Pathways (ILEP) supports five National Language Advisors (Chinese, French, German, Japanese
and Spanish). Funded by donor governments, the advisors are all based in the North Island and are available to provide teachers with language-specific advice, networks and resources (ILEP, 2015). ILEP runs workshops on language teaching and makes available, with the support of the Ministry but at a cost to the school, language assistants—young native speakers of French, German, or Spanish, up to date with language and culture—to participate in the class with the aim of “improving teacher capability and lifting student achievement” (ILEP, 2015).

3.2 The research context

The study was conducted in New Zealand, a country with a population of 4.24 million (all figures in this section are based on the 2013 census). English is the de facto official language (spoken by 96% of people), and the legislated official languages are the indigenous te reo Māori (spoken by 148,395 or 3.7%) and New Zealand Sign Language (used by 20,235 people, or 0.05%) (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). Despite the predominance of English speakers, New Zealand is described as one of the few culturally and linguistically “superdiverse” countries (Spoonley & Bedford, 2012, p. 11) being home to more ethnicities than the world has countries (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). The number of people who report the ability to have an everyday conversation in more than one language has increased steadily over time, reaching 18.6% in 2013 (Statistics New Zealand, 2014).

The population for this study was the teachers of languages at New Zealand secondary schools, with South Island secondary school language teachers as a sample for Phase 1, and three secondary school teachers as a sample for Phase 2. The following sections provide an outline of the context within which those teachers operated.

3.2.1 Secondary schooling

The population distribution in New Zealand is such that 76% of its citizens live in the North Island (Statistics New Zealand, n.d.-a). The Ministry divides the country into four administrative regions, three of which encompass the North Island. At the time of data collection, there were 396 schools teaching secondary education across the three North Island regions and 134 secondary schools in the South Island’s single Southern region. Around three-quarters of secondary school EAL students are enrolled in North Island
schools (Education Counts, 2015). It is not surprising, therefore, that the majority of New Zealand school-based language education research involves North Island participants. It is a point of difference that both phases of this study involve South Island schools.

In New Zealand, schooling is compulsory for children aged 6-16 years (Ministry of Education, 2015, June 10), typically divided into three tiers: Primary, Years 1-6; Intermediate, Years 7-8; and Secondary, Years 9-13 (approximately 12-18 years old). The main secondary school qualification is the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), although additional national qualifications are possible (NZQA, 2015). NCEA can be gained in three levels, usually, but not strictly, aligned with the three senior school years (Year 11 – Level 1, Year 12 – Level 2, and Year 13 – Level 3). All subjects are divided into a series of standards reflecting discrete skills or knowledge areas of the subject, and each standard carries a particular number of credits earned through internal and/or external assessments. As a student meets the standards of her/his chosen subjects s/he amasses credits towards the minimum number needed to achieve the relevant NCEA level.

3.2.2 Learning languages

The Ministry’s statistics from 2013 were most relevant at the time of data collection. At that time, 14 international languages were taught in New Zealand secondary schools, with student numbers nationwide ranging from 2 students of Russian to 21,570 learning French. Te reo Māori was studied by 23,361 secondary school students, a figure that remained reasonably constant over the preceding decade. English was learned as an additional language by 9,876 secondary students, the lowest number in the decade 2003-2013, having fluctuated but trended down from a peak of 17,420 in 2003. Other trends of interest include a doubling, or near so, of students of Chinese (from 1,618 in 2003 to 3,277 in 2013), Samoan (1,473 to 2,391), and Spanish (5,820 to 11,680), and a significant increase in Tongan (74 to 540). Decreases in studentship over the decade were experienced in German (7,603 in 2003 to 4,477 in 2013), Latin (2,239 to 1,501), and Japanese (21,449 to 12,044). These figures will encompass some overlap in individuals because senior students are likely to have been studying more than one language (Peddie, 2005). It is also important to note that not all languages were offered at all schools.
With the exception of EAL, languages taught at secondary school are generally offered as distinct subjects, scheduled for regular periods, and assessed internally and externally. Teachers are usually qualified in secondary education and possibly in languages and/or language acquisition, although it has been shown that some New Zealand language teachers “may have minimal language competence” (East, 2008, p. 127). Learners of te reo have the advantages that come with learning a language in a country in which it is spoken, such as visits to places of cultural importance, and access to literature and native speakers, all of which are rare for learners of international languages in New Zealand given the country’s geographical isolation.

There are no specific requirements in the national curriculum related to EAL as it is subsumed in the learning area of English. However, the Ministry publishes other documents to support EAL teaching, the primary one being the English Language Learning Progressions (ELLP) (Ministry of Education, 2008), against which EAL students are tracked and monitored. Withdrawal teaching is the most common form of EAL support in New Zealand schools. Students are mainstreamed for the majority of their class time and withdrawn for a session of concentrated English instruction, which is often not based around any planned programme or related to content of the mainstream classes (Franken & McComish, 2003). EAL teachers are often not qualified teachers and/or have little or no training in second language teaching (Haworth, 2003, 2008; Oranje, 2012). Like their mainstream classmates, EAL students work towards NCEA certification in their chosen subjects.

3.2.3 Teacher training

Ideally, teachers of languages should be qualified in secondary school teaching and have additional tertiary level qualifications related to the language that they teach (Teachnz, 2015). The University of Otago’s College of Education’s Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Secondary), for instance, required students of language teaching to achieve at least at third-year level in the subject language. Other courses (e.g., the University of Auckland’s Faculty of Education’s Graduate Diploma) include generic language teaching papers. The University of Auckland hosts a Ministry-funded full-year programme for practising New Zealand teachers called Teacher Professional Development Languages (TDPL). All generalist teacher education routinely includes one or more course components relating to the importance of te reo for all students, and particularly for Māori students.
Notwithstanding these ideal levels of qualification, it is not compulsory for secondary school language teachers to hold any qualifications at all.

With respect to EAL, papers in second language teaching are not routine in New Zealand’s most common teaching qualifications (i.e., Bachelor’s degree or Graduate Diploma) (Haworth, 2008) and a review of New Zealand universities’ websites suggests that any that do exist are not compulsory in teacher education courses. Comprehensive second language teaching programmes are offered at some New Zealand universities. Haworth (2003) reported that New Zealand’s EAL teachers are commonly part-time or with limited tenure, and professional development is not prioritised. Furthermore, a study by Cameron and Simpson (2002) referred to unequal opportunities for EAL professional development across New Zealand, with Auckland teachers being best served because of the greater number of EAL students there.

This chapter has outlined the specific context of language teaching and learning at secondary school level in New Zealand. The following chapter describes in detail the methodological processes employed in this two phase project, as well as justifying the study’s trustworthiness and compliance with ethical matters.
CHAPTER 4 – METHODOLOGY

4.0 Overview

This research project had two distinct but related phases. Phase 1 was a survey of New Zealand secondary school language teachers’ cognitions of teaching culture in their language classes. Phase 2 was the implementation and evaluation of a class activity (cultural portfolio projects) designed in accordance with ICLT. This chapter outlines the project design. Firstly, the research parameters and paradigm are presented and discussed. Then, the methodological procedures are described, with separate sections dedicated to each phase given the difference in methodologies, participants, data collection methods, and data analyses. Lastly, once again considering the phases together, the warrants of validity, reliability, and objectivity are discussed from qualitative and quantitative perspectives, and ethics considerations are addressed.

4.1 Research Design

This section describes the research design of both phases of the project. It presents the parameters of the study in terms of its investigative approach and purpose, data collection nature and methods, the perspective taken, and the research paradigms.

4.1.1 Parameters of study

Guided by Seliger and Shohamy (1989), this study is first described using four parameters: (1) investigation approach, (2) objective, (3) degree of control, and (4) data. These parameters are addressed in turn below.

Investigative approach: Both phases of the study were analytic investigative approaches, examining particular constituent parts of the overall second language acquisition “phenomenon” of culture-teaching (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989, p. 40).

Objective: The questionnaire of Phase 1 had a deductive purpose, designed to elicit data that could be statistically analysed to objectively test hypotheses. In contrast, the practice and evaluation of CPPs in Phase 2 had a heuristic purpose, with descriptive data analysed using qualitative methods to discover the underlying patterns and relationships (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989).
**Control:** The control levelled over the questionnaire was reasonably high. It had a clear structure and the majority of items had a high degree of explicitness with restricted options from which the participants had to choose (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). Short answer items were largely tightly focused, requiring a single word response that still fell within a limited range. The questionnaire was designed with a particular focus on the knowledge and implementation of ICLT as a teaching approach and the question indicators were similarly focused.

The CPPs were less controlled. Although certain steps of the CPPs were compulsory for consistency across classes, the operationalisation of those steps was developed in collaboration with the teacher participants to accommodate their particular contextual factors. In addition, the data generated was subjective, chiefly comprising the particularised perspectives of each participant. Beyond use of a template for the students’ reflection sheets, and semi-structuring of the teacher interviews and final class discussions for consistency across participants, the responses were unique to each participant or group. The reflection and interview frameworks inevitably controlled the data, but only inasmuch as they set a minimum level for quantity and nature; participants were free to address matters beyond those fundamental areas.

**Data:** This parameter relates to the consideration of which data were important, and how the data were collected. This information is provided, in detail, in the following sections that describe each phase of the study, including the hypotheses (Phase 1) and research questions (Phase 2), the data of importance, how the data were collected, and the methods of analysis used to test the hypotheses and explore the research questions.

### 4.1.2 Paradigms

Although a combination of methods was used in the two phases of this study, it would not be accurate to describe the project as wholly mixed methods or combined methods research (Gorard & Taylor, 2004). Yin (2006) highlighted the difference between mixed methods studies and parallel studies, and reported that using a range of methods can only be classed as *mixed methods* when they relate to a single study and there is integration in procedures such as research questions, units of analysis, data collection, and analytic
strategies (see also Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010). The alternative is that the various methods relate to separate studies, conducted unconnectedly but possibly later synthesized, and can be subject to “cross-study question[s]” (p. 41) to determine whether the findings are confirmed, replicated, or contradicted. Blurring this distinction somewhat, Natesan, Webb-Hasan, Carter, and Walter (2011) discussed the use of “a parallel mixed methods” (p. 238) framework, comprising “two parallel and relatively independent strands, the QUAN and the QUAL ... [where] each provides a different perspective of understanding the phenomenon under investigation” (p. 243).

The two phases of this project were related in that they both addressed the phenomenon of the practice of ICLT, but they could not be said to be integrated. Phase 1 had its own hypotheses and Phase 2, research questions, but they were related in that both addressed cognitions, practices, and awareness of ICLT. Different data collection methods and procedures of analysis were employed in each phase. However, the overall discussion (chapter 9) is a cross-phase interpretation of the results and findings, and at that point the two phases are genuinely considered together. Based on the assertions from Yin (2006) and Natesan et al. (2011), the project cannot be described as mixed methods. Although nothing is gained from settling on a single descriptor (Gorard & Taylor, 2004), for the sake of completeness, Natesan et al.’s notion of parallel mixed methods is the most valid here.

The questionnaire of Phase 1 was a combination of exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory research, all still categories of statistical research (Brown, 2001, 2011a), but where data were gathered to explore, describe, and explain elements of a phenomenon, chiefly through analysis by quantitative methods. The questionnaire data were examined using primarily parametric tests, where the analyses sought to determine whether there were correlations among variables (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010). Factor analyses were used to determine how the individual items grouped together (Kline, 1994).

With respect to Phase 2, the implementation, observation, and evaluation of the CPPs amounted to three descriptive case studies (Brown, 2001; Duff, 2008; Yin, 2003), with each class being a “bounded system” (Hood, 2009, p. 68). Kohler (2015) used the term “collective case study” (p. 5) and this seems the most accurate descriptor here, because the three cases were considered sometimes on their own and sometimes collectively, and because variety across cases was important (Stake, 2003). This
classroom-based phase was “a situated activity that locate[d] the observer in the world” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 4), through which data were gathered from multiple participants through multiple data collection methods and analysed using qualitative interpretive practices to “make the world visible” (p. 4). This approach allowed rich (Croker, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003) or thick description (Geertz, 1973) of the context of the phenomenon.

In considering whether the respective phases were quantitative or qualitative, it is worthwhile considering Brown’s (2011a) point that few studies are exclusively one or the other, but positioned on a continuum between the extremes. That position is influenced by the various features of the study, each of which can also be measured on continua, such as data type, collection and analysis procedures, degree of intrusiveness, nature of theory generation, reasoning, and context. These features are considered in the following assessment of each phase’s position on the quantitative-qualitative continuum.

The questionnaire was designed to elicit primarily quantitative data. Most items either generated a numerical response or were easily allocated a numerical value for statistical analysis. Some items required open responses; those with limited response options, numerical values could be readily allocated post-hoc. Five items allowed free responses and were more appropriately analysed using qualitative methods. The questionnaire was non-experimental in design and gathered data on a cross-sectional time orientation from a large sample size. Existing theory drove the development of the hypotheses and analysis was chiefly deductive. Brown (2001) referred to questionnaire research as being distinct from but “somehow sandwiched between both qualitative and statistical research” (p. 4) because it draws on techniques from both paradigms. To summarise, Phase 1 was not one or other of a dichotomous distinction, but was on the quantitative side of the continuum.

The data generated in the high-intervention Phase 2 classroom-based application of CPPs were qualitative and could only be analysed using non-experimental, interpretive methods. Codes allocated to concepts were “summative” (Saldaña et al., 2011, p.99) and “essence-capturing” (Saldaña, 2009, p.3), semantically related to the features they labelled (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) and not directly analysable as quantitative statistics. The sample size was considerably smaller than that of Phase 1, but still larger than a single case study, and it was longitudinal over the course of one school term (9 weeks).
Emergent patterns in the data were analysed using inductive reasoning to form theory, grounded in data gathered from a range of sources in which the participants explained their world, characteristic of a qualitative approach.

The question of whether the phases took an etic or emic perspective is particularly representative of Brown’s (2011a) assertion that the paradigmatic aspects are best measured on continua. There are tensions between the two extremes (Harvard University, 2010) and some dispute over whether the distinction is clear cut. Croker (2009) described an emic perspective as one where researchers “endeavour to see the world as their participants do” (p. 8) by directly interacting with them and using their words and concepts. An emic approach has also been described as one that “put[s] aside prior theories and assumptions in order to let the participants and data ‘speak’ … and to allow themes, patterns, and concepts to emerge,” used in studies where the influence of context is of importance (Harvard University, 2010, para. 2). An etic perspective, on the other hand, is “the researcher or ‘outsider’ point of view” (Croker, 2009, p. 8) or “the researcher’s interpretive framework” (Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p. 197).

Tensions are revealed when seeking to determine the perspective of this study’s questionnaire phase. Most of the questionnaire data were analysed using primarily statistical methods to test hypotheses stated at the start of the project; in that respect, Phase 1 applied an interpretive framework and took an etic perspective. It was an outsider’s approach inasmuch as it was asking direct questions of participants—tell me about what you do, what you think—but the complication arises in that the project was seeking to see the world as the teacher participants did, and it did let the data speak by including a mix of open- and closed-response questionnaire items.

Labelling the perspective taken in the CPPs is somewhat clearer. There were no pre-stated theories or hypotheses tested against data. Rather, theory was generated from analysis of patterns in the data. Observations, with field notes, supported my experience and understanding of the situation, and permitted data triangulation to bring different perspectives (Gorard & Taylor, 2004) to find corroborations and irregularities. However, my presence in the classrooms and discussions was part of testing CPPs as a class assignment and I was therefore, fundamentally, using the data to test a theory that CPPs are an effective way to teach culture and encourage ICLT practices—seemingly an etic approach. The primary endeavour, though, was to experience the real-life application of
CPPs in the classroom, where observing students engaged in the activities, seeking feedback from teachers and students, and using participants’ own words to depict their perspectives moved me beyond the peripheral outsider position, an approach most in line with an emic perspective.

Byram (2011) proposed a framework for a research agenda in ICLT which comprised three main elements: (1) etic research where a phenomenon is observed by an outsider seeking explanations of cause and effect; (2) emic research seeking to understand the insider’s perspective and their explanation of the cause and effect; and (3) intervention research where the researcher is advocating and attempting to persuade. Although Byram was not suggesting that all three elements should be conducted in one study, that, in effect, is what has occurred in this project.

Having established the paradigms under which the two phases operated, the specific methodological procedures for each phase are now separately described.

4.2 Phase 1: Questionnaire

This section of the Methodology is dedicated to Phase 1, the questionnaire administered to practising secondary school language teachers. It commences with a discussion on the relative merit of questionnaires as a data collection tool, before outlining the stages of design, testing, and administration of the questionnaire itself. The method of data analysis is then described and the section concludes with an explanation of the generation of the hypotheses. The methodology of the CPPs of Phase 2 is presented separately in section 4.3.

4.2.1 Questionnaires as a data collection tool

Questionnaires are an efficient way of gathering data from a large number of participants distributed over a wide area and they can elicit data in a format that lends itself to uncomplicated processing (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). Of particular relevance given this study’s focus on teachers’ cognitions, questionnaires can gather data about unobservable conceptual phenomena, “such as attitudes, motivation and self-concepts” (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989, p. 172). They are commonly used in a cross-sectional design (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010) to collect large amounts of data from a number of cases at one point in time to create a “snap-shot of a status quo” (Rasinger, 2008, p. 36).
4.2.2  Purpose of questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to elicit information for three purposes (Brown, 2001): *description*, with respect to the demographic details of the participants; *exploration*, through investigation of participants’ cognitions; and to a lesser extent, *explanation*, with a small number of open-response items for additional detail to provide context, justification, clarification, or reasoning. The first step of the development of the questionnaire items required the determination of the content areas or the expected “critical concepts” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012, p. 76), which must be entirely theory-driven (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). The content areas for this study were established by determining the relevant issues raised in the literature. Two studies were of particular importance given their alignment with the current project in terms of topic and questionnaire methodology, namely, Sercu et al.’s (2005) seven-nation comparative study of the intercultural cognitions of language teachers, and Byram and Risager’s (1999) comparative study of British and Danish language teachers’ perspectives of secondary school language teaching. Given the relevance of these studies, the accessibility of their established data collection instruments, and their repeated use by others, it was sensible to borrow items from their published questionnaires (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). Permissions were gained from the authors to use items (see Appendix A).

4.2.3  Item selection

The first step in the design of this study’s questionnaire was the creation of an item pool (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010) amounting to over 10 pages of potential questionnaire items. In an iterative manner, repeated edits of the pool were made. Firstly, repetitions or overly similar versions were deleted and others were combined or rephrased to better reflect the content area. Then, those relating to issues of only “ peripheral interest” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012, p. 76) and not directly applicable to the hypotheses were removed. Lastly, each remaining item was questioned, “Is it absolutely necessary?” (Rasinger, 2008, p. 71). A document was created justifying every item as being: (i) relevant in the literature; (ii) associated with a defined content area; and (iii) related to the hypotheses that its responses would assist in testing.

The participants were questioned with respect to three psychological constructs (Brown, 2001) relating to teachers’ cognitions about teaching culture in language
education: beliefs, knowledge, and reported practice. Because these are unobservable constructs, they required operationalisation by defining ways to transform them into variables for quantitative analysis (Brown, 2001; Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010).

4.2.4 Operationalisation

Given the variety of response styles, operationalisation involved a range of techniques. Some responses could be measured using a nominal, or categorical, scale (Brown, 2000, 2001, 2011b; Brown & Rodgers, 2002), such as biographical items like gender and language taught, where responses could be assigned to a category, whether naturally occurring or designated (Brown, 2011b; Brown & Rodgers, 2002). Nominal data are the “weakest level of measurement” (Allen & Seaman, 2007, p. 1) but they have an important part to play by dividing respondents into sub-groups against which the data can be explored.

The majority of the items had a Likert-type response format, which is common in questionnaires in any field (Brown, 2011b). A Likert-type item presents a statement and asks respondents to select, from a range of fixed responses, the one which best reflects their view, typically strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree. Using only one indicator to address a content area comes with the risk of quirks associated with respondents misunderstanding or differently interpreting items, unduly skewing results or hindering the accurate understanding of their views (Bryman, 2012; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). In this study, this was managed by measuring some concepts with a multiple-indicator scale of interrelated items associated with the same concept (Bryman, 2012), each addressing the target from a slightly different direction (Rasinger, 2008). At least six items were used in each section of the questionnaire to maximise potential internal consistency and allow for the possible exclusion of any items found to be unreliable without resulting in too short a scale for any section (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). In this study, scale scores for sections of the questionnaire were created by summing a participant’s individual response scores (of 1 to 4) for the items in a given section.

This thesis endorses Brown’s (2011b) assertion that Likert-type items lend themselves to measurement on an interval scale, a view not universally accepted (e.g., Wagner, 2010). There are significant benefits associated with interval scales, including
allowing the use of parametric testing; ordinal scales, on the other hand, allow use of only distribution-free non-parametric statistical tests (Allen & Seaman, 2007; Brown, 2011b). Brown (2011b) argued that ordinal data’s representation of responses as rankings (e.g., first, second, third), where it is the order of responses along a continuum that carries relevance, is not applicable to individual Likert-type item responses; a response of agree is not ‘ahead’ of neutral, which is not ahead of disagree, and so on (see also Brown, 2001; Bryman, 2012; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Wagner, 2010). Brown (2011b) recommended grouping Likert-type items, for analysis as an interval scale.

If it is nonsensical to say a single response of disagree strongly is below (or ahead of) one of disagree, then to consider the summed scale data as having an order is “doubly wrong” (Brown, 2011b, p.12), so analysing the scale data as ordinal was considered not appropriate. Wagner (2010) argued that although “many, if not most, applied linguists” (p. 28) treat Likert scale items as interval data, the items should be considered as ordinal data because the intervals between responses are not likely to be equal. In contrast, Allen and Seaman (2007) reasoned that “the ‘intervalness’ is an attribute of the data, not of the labels” (p.2), and, as Carifio and Perla (2007) stated, “‘ordinal’ is a scalar property of the item response format (and not of the 20 item instrument, which is the real scale)” (p. 108). In other words, misunderstandings arise from not differentiating between the response format and the measurement scale. Brown’s argument was persuasive, and given the significant extent of publication of his work (e.g., Brown, 2001, 2002, 2009a, 2011a, 2001b), the frequency of citations of that work (see Harzing, 2013), and his particular focus on second language research, his interpretation was accepted here. Moreover, support is found for that view in Carifio and Perla’s (2007) article written with the express intention of correcting misunderstandings about Likert-type response formats and scales.

A final comment on Likert-type items relates to the number of points in an item’s response range. No set number of points is required but many scholars have made recommendations, some of which conflict. A large number of options make it difficult for respondents to distinguish between points and to be consistent across items (Bernhardt & Geise, 2009; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). A metastudy by Rammstedt and Krebs (2007) noted that shorter scales produced more responses at the extremes, and longer scales generated more responses in the middle of the scale. Allen and Seaman (2007) considered
a minimum of five points to be necessary. Dawes (2008) promoted short ranges, noting only one argument to support the commonly used 10-point scale, that being “the fact that many people are familiar with the notion of rating ‘out of 10’” (Dawes, 2008, p. 63). Bernhardt and Geise (2009) reported that respondents do not favour an even number of points because of the lack of half-way or no opinion response options.

This study used a four-point scale and did not include a neutral or don’t know response. The intention was to keep response time to a minimum, reduce missing responses, and force a choice over whether a participant’s inclination was to support or oppose the item content (Brown, 2000). This reduced the potential for participants to: (i) sit on the fence and give a neutral answer “for neutrality’s sake” (Rasinger, 2008, p.62); (ii) avoid having to think deeply about the nuances of an issue; and (iii) make a middle choice as symptomatic of the “cultural characteristics of the respondents” (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 28). However, there remained the possibility for participants to make an acquiescence response—the tendency to agree regardless of the content of the item (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Rasinger, 2008, 2010)—and it prevented those participants who felt genuinely uncommitted from answering accurately which might, in itself, have been an interesting response (Brown, 2000; Wagner, 2010). Participants intent on making a neutral response still found a way to do so, such as circling two scores, or adding ½ alongside the score; the treatment of the data from the five participants who responded in that way is explained in section 4.2.11.

The questionnaire included some open-response items that generated unique replies not able to be predicted and operationalised at the time of questionnaire construction. Nevertheless, they were mostly “fill-in ... specific open question[s]” (Brown, 2009a), requiring short answers within a limited range of responses (e.g., teaching qualifications) and could be categorised once the full extent of responses was known. Three questions were “broad open” (Brown, 2009a) items unable to be operationalised for statistical analysis and they required qualitative analysis: Two were optional “clarification questions” (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 38) for comment about a preceding closed-response item (e.g., explanation for a response that particular cultural topics were avoided); the third question invited final comments at the conclusion of the questionnaire. Although these three items required a separate style of analysis, their complementary role
reduced the rigidity of the structure and supported deeper understanding of responses (Brown, 2009a).

There were four main reasons for this variety in question styles. Firstly, some items were taken verbatim from, or inspired by, existing questionnaires tested by other researchers in the field. This generally involved retaining the question style but modifying content to relate to this study’s context. Secondly, a mix of styles provided variety for the participant to add interest—or reduce monotony—but also to require them to think afresh about each question, reducing the likelihood of fatigue or automated responses (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). Thirdly, a combination of styles allowed flexibility in the layout and compactness of the questionnaire (Brown, 2001). Lastly, a variety of question types meant different depths of information could be obtained.

Other measures were included to further protect against exhibition of biases such as acquiescence, social desirability, self-deception, or fatigue (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). For instance, pairs of statements related to the same general content area but presented with opposing frames were included as non-consecutive items, as demonstrated in the following example. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with:

____ A language teacher should present only a positive image of the culture and society
____ Language teachers must present a realistic, so sometimes negative, image of the target culture

In theory, if answering in an unbiased manner, those who rated high levels of agreement with the first item should have rated high levels of disagreement with the second.

No items required reverse coding because there were no instances of questions worded in an inverse or negative format. Some items had a negative content focus but they did not use negative grammatical constructions within the sentence, which have been recognised as being potentially confusing (Brown, 2009a; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Rasinger, 2008).

4.2.5 Organisation of the questionnaire

The questionnaire’s introduction was brief because the rationale of the project was included in a cover letter. It acknowledged the potential participants’ time pressures, seeking to secure cooperation by addressing the human characteristic of wanting to know
one’s opinion matters (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012), and because it relied on “the goodwill of others and ... everyone perceives themselves as very busy” (Ng & Brown, 2012, p.43). Each section commenced with specific instructions and included a title and, in some cases, a statement about the purpose of the section’s content, intended to “help the respondent to shift gears between different topic sections” (Brown, 2001, p. 60).

Regarding the organisation of the items, the first question attempted to attract the participant’s interest by asking about various affiliations s/he had with other cultures. A similar question in Oranje (2012) showed respondents enjoyed recognising the extent of their cultural contacts, so this question featured early to aid in securing participation. Next, participants were asked to record the language(s) they taught and which, if any, was their mother tongue. These were scene-setting items, immediately establishing the context within which the participant should complete the document. Requiring neither a lot of thought nor revelation of personal details, the initial items were thought to be unlikely to deter potential participants.

The remaining items were presented in four sections to “guide respondents through the questionnaire – without guiding them into a particular answer direction” (Rasinger, 2008, p. 70). Items in Section A sought to establish details about the participant’s knowledge about the subject culture. The aim of Section B was to ascertain views on teaching culture as part of language education, and involved items representing both traditional culture teaching approaches and ICLT. Section C introduced ICLT and asked about familiarity with the approach, the extent to which ICLT-aligned activities were used, and whether ICLT-related resources were accessed to assist practices. Lastly, Section D requested a range of demographical and biographical information from the participants. Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010) suggested using demographical questions as simple starter items because of the minimal effort required to answer them. However, it was considered that they could also be perceived as seeking a lot of personal detail upfront, doing little to entice participation. By the end of the questionnaire, participants had established a commitment to participate and become familiar with the context, meaning they could understand the relevance of the items and be more willing to provide demographic data.

The order of the items within any section was randomised to: (a) avoid items from a multi-item scale being grouped together; and (b) avoid the potential for the appearance of
a progression through the items, such as from traditional approaches to ICLT, or from undesirable classroom practices to desirable practices. Where respondents recognise, or think they recognise, such patterns, the potential is increased for social desirability responses, where participants select what they believe is the desired, expected, or correct answer (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010).

4.2.6 Presentation

The last step of the development of the questionnaire focused on its presentation and format. It was printed for administration as a booklet of quality A3 paper folded in half to create eight sides of A4 to make it compact and easy to read and handle (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). The layout of the content was clearly sequenced, and balanced the density of information on a page with the length of the overall document. At the end of the document, participants were given the opportunity to record an email address (to be stored separately to maintain anonymity of the questionnaire) if they wished to receive a copy of the results. The full questionnaire is included as Appendix B.

4.2.7 Piloting

The questionnaire was piloted at four stages of development to check whether the item content and associated answer styles and scales accurately represented the variables of interest (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010) and to test the relevancy, clarity, format, completion time, and administration process (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). In the first pilot, two of my colleagues, one experienced in gathering data on language teacher cognitions and the other a specialist in design and statistical analysis of questionnaire data in education, reviewed the questionnaire. Feedback from their evaluations was invaluable in terms of the anticipated levels of variability in response and the phrasing of items and instructions. As a result, the number of items was reduced and the questionnaire was more clear and compact.

Subsequent piloting was undertaken by individuals as similar as possible to the intended target subject sample and under conditions similar to the final administration (Brown, 2001). The second pilot was completed by a personal contact, a former secondary school teacher of French. He completed the questionnaire from the perspective of a language teacher, but was also asked to provide feedback on it as a “declared... questionnaire under construction” (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 56). This pilot indicated
changes were appropriate to reduce the length of questionnaire by removing repeated and redundant information. The respondent questioned the absence of neutral or don’t know response options. There was a rationale behind the choice (discussed earlier), so no change was made in this respect other than to use bold font to emphasise that each item must be scored. The respondent advised he enjoyed completing the questionnaire which neutralised his initial concern that it appeared long.

In the third test situation at a rural school in the North Island, the contact person (a teacher of Spanish) was asked to complete the questionnaire as a practising teacher and provide feedback on its construction. He recruited a colleague to complete the questionnaire as a teacher respondent. The Spanish teacher made comments about the design of the questionnaire itself, suggesting tick boxes be shifted from the left hand side to the right, and noting two items as being similar. No change was made to the tick boxes; although ticking to the right of an item might seem most natural, the uneven length of the statements made it difficult to discern which tick box aligned with which statement. The noted similarity between two items was intended, being both associated with the same multi-item scale. The second respondent (a teacher of French) completed the questionnaire with no comments made.

The final pilot was conducted through a contact at an urban school in the North Island and involved two language teachers. One respondent (a teacher of Spanish) occasionally assigned two scores on the four point scale responses (e.g., writing 3/4). The propensity for this was anticipated to some extent when the decision was made to have no neutral response option, so it was managed at the time of data entry rather than requiring a change to the questionnaire design. That respondent also did not answer the first four questions of the section related to ICLT, but did respond to the later questions of the section. It was not clear that it was the questionnaire design that led to this behaviour, so no change was made. The second respondent (a teacher of Japanese) completed the questionnaire with no apparent issues and no comments on the design.

4.2.8 Participants
For the purposes of this study, the participant sample comprised language teachers at all South Island secondary schools; a total of 121 schools. This was non-probability sampling because a strategy was used to select participants rather than using random
selection or “scientific... procedures that provide a truly representative sample” (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 60). The “rational grouping” (p. 60) of South Island schools is best described as “quota sampling” (p. 60) because a distinct subgroup was chosen to represent the entire population. Of course, there remains the possibility that South Island schools had unique characteristics, potentially reducing the generalisability of the results to secondary school language teachers across the country. Generalisability is discussed in more detail in the Warrants section (section 4.4).

The Ministry’s Excel database (Education Counts, 2013) was filtered for all secondary schools in the Southern educational region. Of the 134 secondary schools in the Southern region, 13 were excluded from the sample because of their unique teaching practices and learning goals (e.g., a school for deaf children, a hospital-based school for sick children, and a youth justice school). Whether the school was state- or privately-funded did not affect inclusion, as all worked within the New Zealand curriculum for English-medium schools. Māori immersion schools were also included in the sample (although no questionnaires were returned from those schools).

4.2.9 Administration
An Excel database of South Island schools was created with each entry including, inter alia and where listed, an identification number (allocated by the Ministry), school name, email and website addresses, principal’s name, school type, decile ranking, roll ethnicity composition, and number of fee-paying international students. Ninety of the schools had websites, all of which were viewed to find an indication of the number of language teachers at the school; if available, that information was entered into a separate Excel database. It was common for schools to teach EAL, te reo Māori, and at least one international language. At the extremes, eight languages were offered at one school, and only one language was taught at nine schools, that language most commonly being te reo. Websites of some of the smaller rural-based schools indicated that languages were available by distance learning. It was rarely clear how many language teachers were employed at any given school but, guided by the website information on the number of languages taught, a corresponding number of questionnaires were posted to each school, addressed to the principal. For schools with no website, or where websites made no mention of languages, three questionnaires were sent, that being the mode for number of languages taught. In total, 393 questionnaires were sent to 121 schools.
Because prospective participants could self-select, the determination of participants was out of the control of the researcher (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). Each teacher who received a questionnaire but chose not to participate in the study was a non-response, inevitably leading to a sampling error because of the consequential reduction in the extent to which the sample represented the population of South Island language teachers (Rasinger, 2008). The number of such cases could not be known; neither was the total population of South Island language teachers known.

Before it was administered, each questionnaire was labelled with a four-digit identification (ID) number, representing the school’s Ministry ID number and the quantity of questionnaires sent to the school. For example, Queen Charlotte College’s Ministry ID number was 287; they were sent four questionnaires numbered 287-1, 287-2, 287-3, and 287-4. This identification allowed returned questionnaires to be tracked.

The questionnaires were addressed to the school principals, a requirement of the project’s ethics approval, as a matter of courtesy, and to ensure that authority had been gained for staff involvement. The cover letter described the nature of the questionnaire and included instructions for the return of the completed documents in the stamped, addressed envelopes provided. It was suggested that the school’s office administrator be responsible for managing the distribution and return process because it was expected that s/he would already have systems in place for circulating information to and from teaching staff. However, advice was subsequently received from one school’s Head of Languages that only senior management was supported by administrative staff. A large number of completed questionnaires were posted by the teacher him/herself (and therefore did not use the stamped, self-addressed return envelope which had been held at the school office).

A separate cover letter addressed to the language teacher was attached to each questionnaire. (All cover letters are included in Appendix C.) Following Brown’s (2001) recommendation, the cover letters and the questionnaire emphasised the academic affiliation of the researcher, addressed the matter of anonymity, and explained the value of the participants’ contribution.

4.2.10 Rate of return
Based on Brown (2001), a number of measures were taken to improve the rate of return. Cover letters explained the purpose and value of the project, the questionnaire length was
controlled as much as possible, stamped and self-addressed envelopes were included for return (from the school office), and the timing avoided examinations and holiday periods. As an incentive, a teabag was attached to the questionnaire to encourage the participant to take time out to complete it over a cup of tea. The teabag could be used even if the individual chose not to participate, but it played on the “human instinct of reciprocation” (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 67).

The cover letter asked for questionnaires be completed and returned within one week, the intention being to allow sufficient time (including a weekend) for the participant to complete it but not long enough to encourage them to put it aside and forget. Approximately 30 questionnaires were returned within two weeks of administration. Three weeks after the initial post-out, a follow-up email was sent to the principals (copy in Appendix C), except those who had advised they could not take part or had returned the majority of their questionnaires. The email included an electronic version of the survey for those who preferred to complete it on their computer; only one response in that format was received.

In total, 76 completed questionnaires were returned. The first response was received 19 August 2013; the last was received 2 December 2013. It is not possible to calculate an accurate return rate. The total number sent (393) was a very loose estimate based on an assumption of there being at least three language teachers at each school so the calculation of 76/393 = 19% is not appropriate. Perhaps a more fitting, but still not precise, calculation is to consider the number of schools represented in the return out of the total number: 39/121 = 32%. Any difference between this figure and the reality is likely to fall in favour of a higher actual return rate, because some of the schools included in this figure did not have language teachers on staff and/or had a single teacher teaching multiple languages. With the design and administration processes outlined, the next section turns to analysis of the questionnaire data.

4.2.11 Analysis

Questionnaires structured with a high level of explicitness, as this one was, are the most efficient for analysis (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). Quantitative data analysis requires the researcher working through six stages of data management: (1) data check; (2) data coding; (3) data entry; (4) data screening and cleaning; (5) reliability check; and (6) data
reduction (Phakiti, 2010). The following section explains the data management and includes a description of how each of the six steps was carried out.

**Data management**

As each completed questionnaire was received, a photocopy was made of all but the last page. The last page was detached as it contained an email address if a participant was requesting a copy of the results; all email addresses were entered into a separate Excel database. Two digits were added to the original ID number as each questionnaire was returned, to represent its position in order of receipt (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010) and the updated number was recorded in the administration database against the participant’s school. For example, Questionnaire 287-1-70 indicates that of the batch sent to Queen Charlotte College, the document numbered 1 was the 70th returned. (The legend for this and other data management coding is included in Appendix E.) Notes were made within the database about matters such as incomplete questionnaires or advice received from principals about the ability to take part. The data from each questionnaire were entered as it was received (Step 1 data check), as detailed in the next section. Responses to open-ended questions and comments written on the questionnaire were entered into a Word document for separate analysis using qualitative methods.

**SPSS statistical analysis software**

This study utilised the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (IBM Corp, 2012 & 2013). Data entry and initial analyses used Version 21, but during the data analysis process, the software was upgraded to Version 22.

Before data entry commenced, each item was labelled with a variable name or code, a total of 201 codes in all (Step 2 data coding). A codebook was created listing every full variable name, its SPSS variable code, and the distribution of response codes (Pallant, 2013) (sample page included as Appendix D). Three entries from the codebook are replicated in Table 4.1 for demonstration purposes.
Table 4.1

*Examples of Codebook Entries.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full variable name</th>
<th>SPSS Variable code</th>
<th>Response codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I touch on an aspect about which I feel negatively disposed</td>
<td>C6negative</td>
<td>1 = Never use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Rarely use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Sometimes use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>D1gender</td>
<td>4 = Frequently use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 = Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association affiliation</td>
<td>D7profass1</td>
<td>1 = NZALT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = GANZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = NZAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = NZAJLT (or NZJALT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Local cluster group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 = TESOLANZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 = NZCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 = NZSLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 = Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first entry relates to a question asking participants to rate the frequency of their use of a classroom practice from 1 *Never use* to 4 *Frequently use*. Responses were therefore limited to whole numbers of 1, 2, 3, or 4, which could be entered directly as the data items (Step 3 data entry). In the second entry, the question asking for the participants’ gender included two options; each was allocated a representative number for data entry: Male = 0, Female = 1. In the third example, the question was open, leaving participants to list the associations with which they were affiliated. Because responses were limited and usually recurring they could be subsequently allocated codes for data entry. Non-recurring responses were grouped as *other.*
The variables were then defined in the data editor of SPSS by recording the variable name, the values reflecting the possible responses, and the measure of scale. This included the creation of values of 99 and 999 as discrete missing variables (Pallant, 2013; Rasinger, 2008) for use where a response was not required (e.g., routed items) so as to distinguish it from missing data where an answer was expected but not provided, in which case the cell was left blank (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). Five participants used the occasional uncertain response writing two answers rather than a discrete number (e.g., “1-2” to represent mid-way between scores 1 and 2). In these cases, the value entered was the one most aligned with the participant’s responses on other similar questions. Interestingly, that response method rarely indicated neutrality.

Data screening and cleaning

After data from all questionnaires had been entered, a full report was run of the frequencies for every variable. This information allowed an initial error check (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Pallant, 2013) to ascertain the number and acceptability of missing values, and ensure the maximum and minimum responses fell within the expected range (Step 4 data screening and cleaning). With the exception of question block B4 (discussed in section 5.6.4 of Results chapter 5), the number of missing values was most commonly one or two. At this stage, the instruments and measures were analysed to ensure “consistency in capturing the focus of the investigation” (Phakiti, 2010, p. 42) (Step 5 reliability check). (Reliability is also addressed in section 4.4.) Overall, the number of missing values was considered acceptable as it was low, not “unexpected,” and there appeared to be no “systematic pattern” for their occurrence (Pallant, 2013, p. 60). The SPSS option of pairwise deletion allowed the retention of cases that had occasional missing values but were complete in all other respects, excluding them only from the analyses that related to the variable for which a value was missing (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Pallant, 2013). Three errors in the data entry indicated by a number falling outside the range of permissible responses were found and corrected. With any error, the full set of data for that participant was checked.

Regarding the responses coded as not applicable, it should be noted that Not applicable did not appear as a response option on the questionnaire. The majority of these were uniform, as in the case of Question C1 response option No, I have not heard of it [ICLT]. Please skip to Question C5, in which case responses to items C2-C4 were not
applicable. However, some were not so clear cut. Question A4 asked participants to rate their familiarity with each of a list of cultural aspects pertaining to their subject culture. One item was *The country’s relationship with and/or significance for New Zealand* which, although not caught in the pilot testing, was not applicable to teachers of te reo and could be confusing for teachers of EAL. In retrospect, the item should have been worded as *The culture’s relationship with and/or significance for New Zealand*. Some te reo and EAL teachers selected the item and some did not, so it was considered logical to enter all responses from teachers of te reo and EAL as 99 - *not applicable*. Question A3 listed ways to keep in touch with the subject culture and one item was *I visit places where the language is spoken every:* with bands of frequency offered. Again, it could be argued that this could have been confusing to teachers of EAL or te reo because they were teaching the language in the country where it was spoken. However, with respect to EAL, there are many other countries where English is spoken each with unique cultural aspects; similarly, there are places in New Zealand where te reo is routinely spoken (e.g., marae, immersion schools, Māori homes) so the item remained applicable. The item was selected by 1 of the 8 teachers of EAL, and by 7 of the 12 teachers of te reo.

**Data reduction**

At the time of data entry there were 201 variables. Reduction was required to make the variables manageable and to avoid the detail clouding the broader constructs (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010) (Step 6 data reduction). The questionnaire was designed to facilitate this process by allowing the construction of multi-item scales. Internal consistency of the scales was checked through Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients and principle components analysis.

Initial analysis established descriptive statistics—frequencies, central tendency, dispersion (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010)—revealing preliminary patterns of interest (Brown, 2001). More complex statistical analyses were then undertaken to determine whether patterns were reflections of genuine relationships in the variables or just occurred by chance (Brown, 2001; Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Levon, 2010; Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). Using inferential statistical analysis, inferences were made about “population parameters” (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010, p. 353), such as relationships between variables (at individual item and scale level) using Pearson’s
product-moment correlation coefficients, and the reliability of the scales, determined using Cronbach’s alpha.

Inferential statistics allowed the measurement of the probability (\(p\)) that a null hypothesis was true. By convention in the field of language acquisition (Gass, 2010), if a null hypothesis is found to be more than 5% likely to be true (i.e., \(p > .05\)), it cannot be rejected and it cannot be claimed that there is a meaningful relationship between the independent and dependent variables (see also Levon, 2010). When the null hypothesis is rejected (i.e., \(p \leq .05\)), it can be said that there is a 95% likelihood that a change in the dependent variable can be attributed to the independent variable rather than by chance.

Factor analysis, or more specifically, a principal components analysis, was applied to find interrelationships within independent variables (Field, 2013; Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). Factor loadings indicated the extent of correlation between the variables, where a higher loading on a variable suggested that it could be used to “define the factor” (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989, p. 229) or “underlying theme” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012, p. 84). These analyses are all presented in the Results (chapter 4).

4.2.12 Hypotheses

Hypotheses were proposed at the head of Phase 1, stating relationships among the various independent and dependent variables. The data collection process was developed with the intention of testing the hypotheses. Hypotheses “never exist alone” (Levon, 2010, p.71) because any hypothesis must be falsifiable and have a corresponding hypothesis “counter-claim” (Levon, 2010, p.71). The hypotheses were based on theory and previous research findings and each was “a statement about a particular aspect of reality” (Rasinger, 2008, p. 11), predictive, and able to be tested empirically (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010). The quantitative results were compared to each hypothesis in turn to deduce whether the statement was supported or rejected by the study (see chapter 6). This contrasts with the qualitative research phase, where research questions were developed throughout the project and findings were inductively analysed for patterns (see chapters 7 and 8) in the hope of developing theory to answer the research questions. The quantitative results and qualitative findings are discussed together in the overall Discussion (chapter 9). Phase 2 of the project involved qualitative research centred on a classroom intervention—cultural portfolio projects—the design and methodology of which are presented next.
4.3 Cultural Portfolio Projects

This section presents the methodological aspects of the cultural portfolio projects implemented in Phase 2. Firstly, the design of the CPPs themselves is outlined. Secondly, the investigation procedures and perspective are detailed. The teacher and student participants are then introduced and lastly, the qualitative methods used to analyse the data are described.

4.3.1 CPPs as a data collection tool

This phase involved the staging of an in-class intervention, engaging secondary school language teachers and students in a class activity that embodied the principles of ICLT, namely cultural portfolio projects (CPPs). Classroom interaction research is a way in which theory and practice can be bridged, since practising teachers are directly involved in the research project (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Scarino, 2014). Past studies have shown that teachers are uncertain of how to put intercultural theory into practice in the classroom (e.g., Díaz, 2011, 2013; East & Scott, 2011; Stapleton, 2000). This project used CPPs to provide a concrete demonstration for teachers to experience and evaluate.

The CPP used in this study was developed from those of similar projects (outlined in Figure 2.4 of the literature review chapter 2) but it incorporated two specific features used by Allen (2004), Byon (2007), and Su (2011): (1) testing hypotheses about the target culture, and (2) reformulating the hypothesis for consideration with respect to one’s own culture. It is unique to this study that the CPPs were used as expressly representing ICLT. CPPs align well with Barrett, Byram, Lázár, Mompoint-Gaillard, & Philippou’s (2013) features of activities conducive to developing ICC, especially in terms of their emphasis on multiple perspectives from multiple sources (see also Schulz, 2007) and the ethnographic aspects which assist in exploration of the lived C2, and reflection on and comparison with the C1 (see also Sobolewski, 2009).

Most of the lesson-by-lesson implementation of the CPPs was flexible and planned in collaboration with each teacher at a planning session and week-to-week as the project progressed. However, to ensure consistency across the three cases of this study, five steps of the CPP were fixed, with accommodation for case-specific adaptability in each step. Those steps and areas of flexibility were:
**Step One:** Class generates a collection of statements that represent their existing knowledge, understanding, beliefs about the target culture. Flexibility in: the method used to generate statements (e.g., class brainstorm, anonymous contribution, written exercise); limitations, if any, on topics.

**Step Two:** Each student chooses a statement they find interesting, treats it as a hypothesis about the target culture, and tests its validity by searching a range of primary (e.g., native speakers) and secondary (e.g., books, internet) sources. Students write a reflection on each search made. Flexibility in: how many hypotheses to test; work individually, in pairs, or groups; number of students testing each hypothesis; sources used; content of reflection; and general operational details.

**Step Three:** Students reformulate their hypotheses to relate to their own culture and retest validity. Flexibility in: means of testing against their own culture, including the nature of sources, how many sources, and how sources are varied (e.g., by age, gender, membership of other subcultures, etc.).

**Step Four:** Students present their findings to the class to expose all to the range of perspectives explored. Flexibility in: method of presentation (e.g., poster, speech, class discussion); audience, and whether audience response is required (e.g., a summary or response to classmates’ speeches).

**Step Five:** Students complete a post-project questionnaire about their impressions of the project. This step was purely for the purposes of this evaluative study. Flexibility was not relevant.

A planning session was held with each teacher. These were audio-recorded and transcribed for content. Ada’s planning session, the first, lasted 39.14 minutes, Craig’s lasted 27.41 minutes, and Helene’s, 38.31 minutes. The structure and content of these meetings form part of the findings of Phase 2, presented in chapter 7.

Teachers were given full control over how many lessons were involved in the CPP project and the extent of my involvement in the class activity. It was made clear to the teacher participants that they were free to include associated pre-task activities and use any aspect of the research project for the students’ formal assessment. Given the exploratory nature of this phase, much of the methodology developed as the project was
operationalised. For that reason, additional procedural detail is presented as part of the Phase 2 findings in chapter 7.

4.3.2 Participants

This section provides details about the participants engaged in the CPPs. Firstly, the nature of the school is described and information about the student participants is presented. The teacher participants are then introduced, along with some biographical detail and information about their ontogeneses as language teachers. All names of schools and individuals are pseudonyms.

This phase involved three participant schools located in urban areas of a city in the South Island of New Zealand. The schools were selected because a language teacher from each had volunteered to participate in the research after hearing a presentation on my research at a “Langsem” meeting of the New Zealand Association of Language Teachers. This amounted to a “convenience” sample (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 18) of 3 teachers and 23 students.

4.3.3 Greenview School

Greenview School was a decile 10\(^1\) school for boys catering for Years 7 to 13. At the time of the study Greenview’s roll was 517 students and languages taught at secondary level (i.e., Years 9-13) were German, French, Spanish, and EAL. The class involved in the study was the Year 12 German language class comprising six boys and their teacher Ada. The research period at this school extended for the length at Term 2 (of 4 in a school year) (5 May - 4 July 2014). The class worked on the CPPs every Monday, last period (2.20-3.10pm). The Greenview students, all aged 16 or 17 years, are listed in Table 4.2 with relevant notes included.

---

\(^1\) Decile 10 represents the 10% of schools with the lowest proportion of students from low socio-economic communities; decile 1 represents the 10% of schools with the highest proportion of such students (Ministry of Education, 2015, June 7).
Table 4.2  
*Names and Relevant Notes for Greenview School Student Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevant notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>German mother; had visited Germany on school exchange; was applying for scholarship to Germany (was unsuccessful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Stated he had no intention of travelling to German-speaking country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Boarder at the school; had visited Germany on school exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richie</td>
<td>Had visited Germany on school exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagashi</td>
<td>Japanese parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greenview’s part-time German teacher, Suse, also a native German, was involved indirectly in the study. Suse was present during one observed class and she was Ada’s substitute teacher in an additional unobserved lesson where Ada had set work related to the CPPs. In addition, Greenview had employed Astrid, an ILEP German language assistant, for the length of the term. Astrid’s contract was shared with City School, so she attended Greenview and City schools on alternate weeks but was not always present in observed classes.

### 4.3.4 City School

City School was a decile 9 secondary school for girls in Years 9 to 13. Its roll in 2014 was 820 students and language courses were available in German, French, Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin, Latin, te reo Māori, and EAL. Student participants comprised City’s combined Years 12 and 13 German class of six, taught by Craig. This class also participated for the length of Term 2, dedicating first period on Tuesday mornings (8.50-9.50am) to the CPPs. The Year 12 girls were aged 16 or 17 and the Year 13 girls were aged 17 or 18, and their relevant details are presented in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3

*Names and Relevant Notes for City School Student Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Relevant notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frith</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Had visited Germany on school exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Had visited Germany on school exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>German mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnie</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Absent for a number of CPP sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinead</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Had learning difficulties; Dutch mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted, Astrid the German language assistant was at City School on alternate weeks.

### 4.3.5 Muirside School

Muirside School was a decile 5 secondary school for girls in Years 9 to 13. The roll of 432 students was offered language education in French, Spanish, te reo Māori, and EAL. The Year 11 French language class, comprising 11 students and their teacher, Helene, took part in the project throughout Term 3 (28 July – 26 September 2014), in the first period on Thursdays (9.00-10.00am). The student participants, all aged either 15 or 16 years, and their details are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

*Names and Relevant Notes for Muirside School Student Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevant notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anya</td>
<td>Some social difficulties, including self-reported Tourette’s Syndrome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Malene  | German student on exchange                         | *(continued)*
Margo  German student on exchange; attended school in France for a short period
Adrian  Male student attends only French class at Muirside School
Caitlyn  Soon to go on exchange to France
Tineke  Soon to go on exchange to France; absent for a number of CPP sessions
Nadine  Soon to go on exchange to France
Talia  Initially intended to go on exchange to France, but withdrew
Kim  Soon to go on exchange to France
Holly  ---
Kelly  Some unspecified learning difficulties

The three teacher participants are now more fully introduced.

4.3.6  Teacher participants
The three teachers volunteered to participate in the project. One teacher, Helene, said that she found it hard to keep up with research, so she thought being a part of the research would help her. Her comment supports the recommendation by Scarino (2005, 2014) for more teacher and researcher collaborative studies for professional development purposes. Each teacher is introduced below, including some detail of their ontogenesis as language teachers, gathered at the conclusion of the project in their post-CPP evaluation interviews.

Ada, teacher of German at Greenview School
Ada was a native German speaker. She taught the Year 12 German class at Greenview School. Aged in her mid-30s she had lived in New Zealand for ten years and was married to a New Zealander. Some of Ada’s teacher training was undertaken in Germany, but since being in New Zealand she had obtained a graduate diploma in teaching and was also part-way through a Masters degree in applied linguistics (language teaching). German was the only language she had taught, at two schools. When asked if she had participated in any training in ICLT, Ada’s response was clear cut: “nope” (ATI127).
Craig, teacher of German at City School

Craig, a native New Zealander aged in his late 40s, was the teacher of the combined Years 12 and 13 German class at City School. He was Head of Languages at the school and taught all levels of German and junior French, he had taught Spanish in the past, and was expecting to soon teach Mandarin. He had gained German language and cultural knowledge as a young man from having followed his then girlfriend (a native German) to live in Germany, and where he completed some university undergraduate papers. He returned to New Zealand to complete his Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees (German literature, language, and linguistics) and a diploma of secondary teaching. He had been teaching for 18 years, at girls’ schools, which he put down to German being mostly “done at girls’ schools” (CTI49). Craig had recently visited France on a language immersion award. He had received “a wee bit” (CTI174) of training in ICLT, referring to a single training day workshop. Instead, he had read about ICLT, aware of it being “where everything is moving” (CTI203).

Helene, teacher of French at Muirside School

Helene, a native German aged in her 40s, taught the Year 11 French class at Muirside School. She taught French at the time of the study, but had taught German until it was removed from Muirside’s syllabus. Helene had learned French at school in Germany and had “loved it right from the start” (HTI21). Her childhood home was 20km from the border between Germany and France so she had enjoyed many family camping holidays in France, exposing her to French culture due, in particular, to her father’s “real joy in discovering France” (HTI44). She had been employed in the hospitality industry in France, which she credited as having the greatest impact on her proficiency. Two language immersion awards supported Helene’s visits to France in 2010 and 2014, which she described as aiding her grammar and sentence structure. She regularly met with a native French friend, speaking in French so he could correct her, which she considered to be “much more efficient than going to university” (HTI66). Helene had lived in New Zealand for 20 years and been teaching French and German at New Zealand secondary schools for 14 years, interrupted in 2004 by one year of teaching English as a foreign language in Germany. She had a Master’s degree in geography from Germany, and a New Zealand teaching diploma. Helene had attended workshops in ICLT, some of which
included tasks demonstrating ICLT in practice, but in her experience the majority of workshops retained a focus on teaching language, not culture.

With the participants introduced, the sections that follow detail the Phase 2 data collection methods and data analysis procedures.

4.3.7 Investigative procedures
This phase of the study comprised qualitative research analysing teachers’ thoughts and practices of an activity in their natural setting to “understand... contexts as they actually are” (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010, p. 355). Data were gathered using a mix of techniques allowing for triangulation, detailed rich or thick description (Charmaz, 2006; Croker, 2009; Geertz, 1973), and my interpretation of the phenomena I experienced as observer and occasional facilitator (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010). Each data collection method is described below.

4.3.8 Observations
Direct observation facilitates an understanding of the phenomena under study and the contexts in which it occurs (Hatch, 2002). For observation purposes, I attended one class per week at each school for the full term. At Ada’s invitation, I visited one of the occasional extra sessions she allocated to CPP work.

During my attendance in the classrooms I undertook “global and holistic” observation (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010, p. 354). I audio-recorded the first (introduction) and last (class discussion) session at all schools, placing the recorder in a central position in the room, with all aware of its presence. In all other sessions, seating arrangements made recordings difficult to hear and because students spent most of the time doing internet searches, reading, or writing, minimal conversation arose that was relevant to the research concern. Field notes were taken to record anything said or done that was pertinent to the CPPs. It was also clear that the boys at Greenview were conscious of the recorder as they would occasionally ask if they were being recorded especially when conversations, unrelated to the project, become comical. Some of the girls from City School contributed very little during the initial recorded session, but spoke more freely at later classes; it was not clear whether this was related to the presence of the recorder. I therefore decided to use the audio-recorder only when a planned conversation about culture was to take place.
In the first and last lessons, I was an active participant as the primary facilitator, in
the presence of the class teacher, but acting as a “participant as observer” (Paltridge &
Phakiti, 2010, p. 355). In the majority of the intervening lessons, my participation was
significantly reduced to either sharing facilitation with the teacher or to sitting at the side
with minimal involvement. I was still involved in the activity, though, and could not be
described in Paltridge and Phakiti’s (2010) terms as an “observer as participant” (p. 355)
because I was interacting beyond merely establishing a rapport with the participants.
Kohler’s (2015) description of her role also applies to my level of involvement:
“contributor to the process while also being the arbiter of what was included in the
analysis” (p. 14).

All audio-recordings made were broadly transcribed for content only (Duff, 2008;
Révész, 2012). (Transcription conventions are included in Appendix E; see also
additional information on the transcription process later in this chapter.) For all
observations, I handwrote brief notes in the classroom, expanding them as I typed them
up as individual Word documents after each lesson. The notes included environmental
aspects such as the seating layout in the room or student behaviour. (An example field
note is included in Appendix G.)

4.3.9 Reflection Sheets
Students completed a reflection sheet for each search carried out. A student’s reflection is
included in Appendix H, as an example. The purpose of the reflection sheet was
manifold: (i) it provided a record of the sources used, an important habit for research
assignments; (ii) it allowed the writer to consolidate and condense the information gained
from a source; (iii) it required critical thinking with respect to the impact of the
information on the hypothesis and in doing so, provided evidence of metacognitive
thinking (Allen, 2004); and (iv) it required associated terms and phrases in the target
language to be noticed and learned. Although the sheets served as a data collection
method in their own right, they were also a core step of the CPPs. For that reason, they
are described in more detail in the Findings (chapter 7).

4.3.10 Post-project class discussion
In the final lesson of the project work at each school I facilitated a class discussion,
essentially a focus group interview that benefited from interaction between participants
(Hatch, 2002). It was based around a semi-structured schedule of question prompts (included as Appendix I), intended to ensure consistency of data across the three classes. In all cases, the class teachers were present during the discussion and could contribute as they wished. This discussion served as part of the project activity, it being a time at which all participants could hear each others’ findings (essentially the only time, as discussed in chapters 7 and 8), and as a data collection method for student participant evaluations of the CPPs. I audio-recorded the discussions and transcribed them for content.

At the outset of the discussion each student stated their hypothesis and a brief summary of their findings. This was the only question that insisted upon a response from all student participants. For the remainder of the discussion, the questions were posed to the group, and responses were voluntary. Question prompts covered aspects such as: the value they placed on learning culture in their language class; whether the CPPs had allowed them to learn about the target culture; how the content compared with what they expected to learn in their usual language lessons; and the value of the reflective CPP steps. General prompts inquired about their opinion on the projects overall, what they liked and did not like, and finally, whether the project should be used in future lessons.

4.3.11 Teacher interviews

Each teacher was interviewed once his/her CPP classwork had been completed and the class discussion conducted. Using a semi-structured approach, question lines ensured consistency in data collection across teachers (schedule included in Appendix J). The questions were designed to meet Hatch’s (2002) recommendations of being clear, open-ended, neutral, and relevant by using simple language and treating the interviewees as having valuable knowledge. Response length varied significantly between teachers, and as a consequence, so did overall interview length: Ada’s (Greenview School) interview was 29.12 minutes long, Craig’s (City School) was 34.01 minutes, and Helene’s (Muirside School) was 53.40 minutes. The interviews with Ada and Craig were conducted at in quiet spaces at their respective schools, and Helene’s interview was conducted at a local café (at her suggestion).

The interview gathered demographical data about the teacher participant’s ontogenesis with respect to teaching and exposure to their subject language and culture, and asked about their teaching goals, and the affordances and constraints they
experienced in teaching culture. A block of questions gathered information on their views on the CPPs with respect to their practical application in the classroom, impact on the students, and value for the teacher. A number of questions focused on the teacher’s previous exposure to ICLT and whether the CPPs had affected their understanding of the approach. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, as described in the next section.

4.3.12 Audio recordings and transcriptions

All audio recordings were made on an Olympus digital voice recorder, model WS-321M, with the prior permission and knowledge of all participants. With one exception (specified below), all recordings were transcribed by me, for content only (Duff, 2008), with the assistance of Express Scribe, software downloaded from www.nch.com.au/scribe. The recording from the recording of Ada’s planning session was professionally transcribed as the data set was to form part of the research by Feryok and Oranje (2015) (outlined in section 1.6.1, chapter 1). Advantages were gained by doing the majority of the transcribing myself including the ability to: recognise and understand the content; make bracketed notations to add context (Hatch, 2002); and, most importantly, have lengthy and regular concentrated exposure to the data. Each transcription was allocated a macro code for document management, saved as a separate Word document on my personal computer, and printed in hard copy (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998).

Transcription conventions are listed in Appendix E, along with a sample transcription (of Ada’s interview), and a legend of macro codes used for document management.

4.3.13 Analysis

This section describes the methodological procedures used to analyse the data. The data in this phase were analysed with qualitative methods, central to which is coding. Coding is necessary to manage the data, reveal patterns, and interpret those patterns with respect to the research questions. The coding processes used for the CPP data are described first.

Coding

All transcriptions of qualitative data were imported into qualitative data analysis software, MaxQDA (version 11) (http://www.maxqda.com) for the primary purpose of coding. The coding process was, in itself, analysis because it allowed me to become familiar with the data and see patterns forming. However, it was with deep analysis of—and “submission
to” (Holliday, 2011, p. 42)—the coded data that patterns, or regularities, were revealed, interpreted for meaning, and explained for similarities, differences, frequency, sequence, and correspondence (Hatch, 2002; Saldaña, 2009).

As the “first cycle” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 3), or “initial” coding (Charmaz, 2006, p. 42), I coded participants’ biographical details and the classroom observation environment information using attribute codes (Saldaña, 2009) for data management. For the remainder of the data, this stage of coding was mostly elemental—such as structural (content), topic, and in vivo (participant’s own voice)—and affective, like values (attitudes, beliefs), and evaluation (Saldaña, 2009). Creating descriptive code names as I encountered new ideas, or “open coding” (Baralt, 2012, p. 230), I attributed every utterance with a code that reflected its essence (Saldaña, 2009). Some utterances pertained to more than one notion; those cases were simultaneously coded, that is, attributed with more than one code (Saldaña, 2009).

As recommended by Saldaña (2009), in the first cycle, every word of all transcripts was allocated at least one code, despite some of it potentially being “noise” (Richards & Morse, 2007, p. 108). My field notes and utterances made by me during interviews and class discussions were coded in the same way as they often formed part of a participant’s idea unit. Even seemingly unimportant utterances, such as a student asking permission to leave the room or comments on behaviour, were allocated codes reflective of their domain-based or process nature rather than cognitive content (Saldaña, 2009). This approach enhanced the reliability with all data being included in the early phases of the analysis, and no decisions made about which data to include or exclude. This is contrary to the recommendation of Richards and Morse (2007), however, who advocated storing and coding no more material at this stage than is needed to ask and answer the research questions, to avoid confusion. Because important patterns and themes might not be revealed in the first cycle, making decisions on relevance at such an early stage was considered risky. Coded data in that first cycle included individual words, clauses, full sentences, or collections of lines, and highlighted “rich or significant” participant quotes by coding them QUOTE for easy retrieval, as suggested by Saldaña (2009, p. 16). There were 74 rather unwieldy codes at the end of the first cycle (included in Appendix F, marked up with moves for second cycle code reduction).
For the initial part of the “second cycle” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 3) or “focused coding” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 42) process I printed out hard copies of all coded transcripts and did parts of this cycle by hand. While computer-aided analysis is very helpful for large data sets, I considered it worthwhile to include the additional element of manual processing, viewing the data with an alternative “literal perspective” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 22) and using the simple materials of paper and coloured pens to assist in revealing fresh or more comprehensive patterns. The resulting codings were transferred to the MaxQDA electronic datasets, from where I continued with computer-aided coding in subsequent iterations.

This second cycle took a more focused and theoretical approach and included data reduction based on the research questions (Baralt, 2012). “Second” is something of a misnomer as the process was undertaken multiple times and was both recursive and iterative (Sipe & Ghiso, 2004). Over the course of these cycles, I reconfigured and refined (Charmaz, 2006) the existing codes in a range of ways: (i) closely related items were synthesised where there was no value in retaining division (Sipe & Ghiso, 2004); (ii) codes were subdivided to create subcodes where an internal pattern emerged (Sipe & Ghiso, 2004); (iii) categories were created from clusters of codes and their subcodes through axial coding (Charmaz, 2006; Richards & Morse, 2007; Saldaña, 2009; Strauss, 1987); and (iv) data more clearly discernible as not salient, process-, or domain-based data were grouped as one category, coded Not Applicable. I also created new codes attributed to patterns or “interconnections of coding decisions” (Baralt, 2012, p. 233) that had emerged through the cycles, in pattern coding (Saldaña, 2009) or analytic coding (Richards & Morse, 2007). I continually sought “negative ... [or] disconfirming evidence”, that is, data that could be contradictory to the emergent patterns (Hatch, 2002, p. 171). The multiple coding rounds were not carried out in one or two solid sessions but took place intermittently over several months. This gave me regular contact with the data and provided distance and time for ideas to develop, and reduced the chance of coder fatigue (Révész, 2012).

The coding process was supported with memo-writing (described below), and regular review of the research questions, theoretical framework, and main areas of interest for the qualitative phase, as well as reacquaintance with the results of the quantitative questionnaire phase (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). This holistic approach brought focus
to the review and refinement process, and met Saldaña’s (2009) bottom line: I was “making new discoveries, insights, and connections” (p. 51) about the participants, their cognitions and practices, and theory. This cyclical process continued until I felt the data had reached saturation, where no further adjustments appeared worthwhile (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Révész, 2012), leaving a “coterie of codes” (Richards & Morse, 2007, p. 143) for more considered abstraction. Through the iterative nature of theoretical coding I moved from recording repeating ideas, to organising the ideas as themes, to grouping the themes into theoretical constructs (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Thus, I was able to make “analytic sense” of the participants’ meanings and actions (Charmaz, 2006, p. 11).

**Memos**

Throughout all stages of coding, I wrote analytic memos. Charmaz (2006) describes memos as the pivotal discovery phase between data collection and written findings. In a variety of formats I noted down thought processes, explanations for codes and groupings, potential and emerging patterns and themes, reflections on the research questions, and “epiphanies” (Sipe & Ghiso, 2004, p. 478). The memos took a number of forms, from “short and stilted” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 80), to free-flowing, lengthy, stand-alone documents, and included the following:

1. Thoughts jotted in a notebook whenever, and wherever, they came to mind.
2. Explanations and elaborations of code labels using the memo feature of MaxQDA.
3. Longer, more considered musings typed as individual Word documents, including substantial think pieces on the emergent theoretical constructs, possible models through which to present and discuss the data, and narratives describing the findings by school, by teacher, and by CPP step.
4. Problems and limitations, recorded as they became apparent in a Word document created for the purpose. These took on a role as memos in the data analysis period.
5. Personal reflections or reactions to events in the classroom, recorded as features of the field notes of observed classes.
(6) Questions and justifications for various elements of the data analysis process that formed part of my preparatory notes for meetings with my research supervisors.

(7) My daily research journal entries (Hatch, 2002), which detailed steps in the analysis process and my thinking behind them.

All forms of memo helped bridge the gap between the mass of raw data and the research concerns by allowing the exploration of increasingly analytical ideas (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003).

Grounded theory

In differentiating between quantitative and qualitative studies, Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) noted that, for some research, too little is known at the outset to be able to develop hypotheses to be tested, and it is not until data has been gathered and analysed that the issues become apparent. That was exactly the case with the value of the CPPs in supporting ICLT. Qualitative methods take a “reflexive and reflective” approach (Basit, 2003, p. 149) through which an “intimate relationship” is developed between the researcher as an instrument and the data (Strauss, 1987, p. 6), allowing common threads, or themes, to emerge (Richards & Morse, 2007). Methods supporting an “ongoing interrelationship” between the cycles of coding and the memo writing (Saldaña, 2009, p. 42), and the “constant comparison” (Strauss, 1987, p. 25) of data, codes, patterns, inconsistencies, themes, and constructs, formed the basis of the grounded theory approach used in this phase (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Charmaz, 2006; Richards & Morse, 2007). These methods were applied in a systematic but flexible way to explore and analyse the data, and develop theory grounded in the data (Charmaz, 2006, p. 2).

Hypotheses were developed from theory and literature before the quantitative data from Phase 1 was collected and analysed, but there were no preconceived hypotheses or questions for the qualitative research of Phase 2. Rather, it was in the analysis process that ideas emerged as to why particular patterns, or lack of patterns, were present. In this way, theory was grounded in the data and allowed the development of an abstract understanding (Charmaz, 2006) of the experience of practising CPPs in the classroom and of teachers’ understanding of ICLT. It is in the environment of the grounded theory method that research questions are generated (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003), and it is in answering those questions, that the theory is applied.
The three research questions revealed themselves throughout the analysis of the Phase 2 CPP data. It will be noticed that they reflect the hypotheses from Phase 1 in that they, too, relate sequentially to cognitions, practices, and awareness. That should not be taken as suggesting they were preconceived. Rather, the process of their development took into account the fit between the initial research concern, the results of Phase 1, and the emerging ideas grounded in the Phase 2 data, in order to present a synthesised coherent study. As will be evident in the presentation of the findings (chapter 7) and the discussion of them (chapters 8 and 9), the CPPs influenced the teachers’ cognitions and practices about culture teaching and their awareness or understanding of an ICLT approach.

The final section of this Methodology chapter again considers Phases 1 and 2 together and addresses the warrants of trustworthiness of the quantitative and qualitative methodologies used, and the ethics considerations of the data collection methods.

4.4 Trustworthiness Warrants

It is important for both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to have standards by which the research can be evaluated. However, the recognised quantitative concepts of reliability, validity, generalisability, and objectivity cannot be directly applied to qualitative research. Objectivity, in particular, cannot be expected from qualitative work where the goal is the subjective interpretation of human behaviour by human researchers in a particular context (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003), in other words, the social construction of the social reality (Richards & Morse, 2007). Alternative forms of “warrants” (Heigham & Croker, 2009, p. 307) of trustworthiness for qualitative research have been proposed, and although a range of terminology exists, the notions are generally consistent. In this section, the justifications for trustworthiness of the quantitative and qualitative phases of this study will be explained, with consideration given to how the different methods require different understandings of the concepts.

Validity is the degree to which results from a quantitative study can be accurately interpreted (the internal validity) and effectively generalised (external validity) (Brown & Rodgers, 2002). Internal validity is also described as the extent to which the “instrument measures what it has been designed to measure” (Dörnyei and Taguchi, 2010, p. 92) and external validity relates to how the results can be generalised to a different time, different
participants, different language, and so on (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010). To achieve validity, the data collection procedures must be “representative, inclusive and comprehensive of the aspect of research under investigation” (Phakiti, 2010, p. 42).

The corresponding terms in qualitative research are credibility (internal) and transferability (external) (Brown & Rodgers, 2002). Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) offered “justifiability of interpretations” (p. 78) in place of both validity and reliability, although they also put forward arguments against the notions of validity, reliability and generalisability because the inferences needed to make the findings of one study universally applicable are too great. Credibility has been defined as the “believability of the results” (Brown & Rogers, 2002, p. 242), a reflection of the extent to which readers can have confidence in the truth of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Transferability corresponds with the quantitative term generalisability, and relates to a study’s meaningfulness in relation to other contexts (Brown, 2009b; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In order to have evidence of validity a study must be reliable, otherwise, it would have no practical use (Brogan, 2009). Reliability, in quantitative research, is confidence in the consistency of results across, or in spite of, variations in conditions such as time, setting, participants, analysers, or other irrelevant conditions existing at the time of original data collection (Alden, 2007; Brogan, 2009; Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010; Phakiti, 2010). Internal reliability refers specifically to consistency of results if data were reanalysed by another researcher, and external reliability is consistency across the study and any replications of it (Brown & Rodgers, 2002). The corresponding warrant in qualitative research is dependability, being the degree of consistency of results and the extent to which they can be trusted (Brown & Rodgers, 2002), in other words, the study’s “fidelity” (Brown, 2009b, p. 282). High reliability and high dependability indicates that observed variance in data from a group of individuals is due only to the true variance in the individuals’ responses, beliefs, and behaviours (Brogan, 2009).

Objectivity in quantitative methods, according to Brown and Rodgers (2002), relates to the extent to which a representation of an object reflects how it exists in reality, as opposed to how it exists in the mind of the observer. In quantitative methods it relies on the researcher having no impact on the phenomenon in the course of the study. Qualitative research cannot be bias-free in this way, thus challenging “the myth of
The allied qualitative term is confirmability, or the degree to which results can be corroborated (Brown & Rodgers, 2002) and can be achieved if a researcher “owns up” to their ideological perspective (Janesick, 2003, p. 56).

The next two subsections address how the two methodologies in this study satisfy these warrants.

4.4.1 Quantitative methods
This thesis has described in detail the design of the questionnaire, its rationale, its administration (including piloting), the analysis of the data collected, and the associated ethical matters. Limitations of the study are noted throughout this thesis. The full questionnaire has been made available (Appendix B).

The extent to which results can be generalised has been affected by the representativeness of the participant sample. A return rate cannot be confirmed for this sample. In addition, because participation was voluntary, it is possible that those who completed the questionnaire shared characteristics not possessed by those who declined to respond, for example, time to do so, an interest in culture, or a penchant for completing surveys; results might, therefore, only be relevant to those in the population that have those characteristics. Similarly, participants were limited to teachers in the South Island meaning it is also possible that those teachers shared traits that differentiated them from their North Island counterparts. This being the case, and because the sample is not the entire population and participants could self-select (i.e., not random), I acknowledge the associated risk of bias of an indeterminate manner (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010).

Following recommendations (e.g., Brogan, 2009; Brown, 2011b; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010), multi-item scales were used, clear instructions were provided on the questionnaire, and pilot studies were carried out, all with a view to avoid variance and skewed results due to ambiguity or confusion in interpreting items. Internal reliability of all scales was measured using Cronbach’s alpha (Brogan, 2009; Field, 2013; Pallant, 2013). All results were presented, including negative instances. The reliability of all scales was calculated and noted. The number of missed responses was reported. It is considered that the results of the quantitative methodology used here can be assessed as
being trustworthy and any diversions from high measurements of reliability are acknowledged candidly.

4.4.2 Qualitative methods

Turning to justification of the qualitative methods used in this study, my interpretation of the results was described in thick, rich detail, supported throughout with examples of data, and involved coding of all data at the initial cycle (Charmaz, 2006; Geertz, 1973). Although other interpretations are possible, sufficient information has been included to make my analysis transparent, not arbitrary (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Bachman, 2004; Brown & Rodgers, 2002), and allow others to “decide for themselves if the interpretations apply” to their context (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2010, p. 357). The use of triangulation in terms of both data collection methods and participants (Bachman, 2004; Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Brown, 2009b; Gorard & Taylor, 2004; Nunan & Bailey, 2009) allowed an understanding of the context from multiple perspectives: (1) mine, as CPP designer, observer, and occasional facilitator; (2) the teachers’, as observed and as interviewed; and (3) the students’, as observed and as informally interviewed. Because observations and interpretations cannot be exactly repeated, triangulation presented the phenomenon from different viewpoints to make it vivid for the reader (Stake, 2003).

I was present in each classroom for an extended period—9 weeks at each school—during which time I came to know the teachers and the students and established a rapport with them. With respect to generalisability, however, given the specific contexts presented here, and the low sample size of three classes (with small rolls), generalisation is likely to extend to the abstract patterns of the theoretical constructs at best, rather than the content detail (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003).

Qualitative findings can be challenged from many perspectives as they rely on the individual researcher’s interpretation of events. Geertz made the distinction, however, between person-specific and personal (Geertz, 1988, p. 6). The findings of this research are indeed specific to me (i.e., person-specific), because they are based on my construal of a particular context, at a particular time, involving a particular group of people, which are not reproducible. This thesis makes it explicit that the research was undertaken within the theoretical frameworks of pragmatism and sociocultural theory. In the interests of confirmability, it is therefore acknowledged that the paradigm influenced the analysis
process (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). All steps throughout the analysis were documented (Révész, 2012) through codebooks and memos, some of which were extensive, and all written to elucidate the thinking behind the creation and allocation of the codes and the grouping of the patterns and themes. The use of triangulation of participants and of data collection methods further bolstered the dependability of the findings, as did regular peer-review of procedures, analyses, and findings by two colleagues each with different but directly relevant experience in the fields of language acquisition and education. Rich description and regular use of participants’ own words allow readers to consider whether my interpretations “make sense” (Merriam, 1998) and could be repeated (Charmaz, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I made every attempt to use “low-inference categories” readily understood rather than “high-inference ones which involve evaluation based on less concrete or ambiguous evidence” (Révész, 2012, p. 213), using simple yes/no decisions—for example, does this comment recommend an improvement to the CPP?—rather than guessing the participants intention behind the recommended improvement. For all these reasons, I submit that my approach to the research was person-specific and not personal.

It is acknowledged that dependability can be enhanced by using inter-coder checks, where two or more people code the data and the results are compared for consistency in coding (Brogan, 2009). According to Révész (2012), it is “always good” to carry out inter-coder checking of categories that are researcher-imposed, but it is crucial for high-inference coding (p. 216). In this study, it was considered unnecessary to require another person to independently code all data because the interpretation of the findings does not rely on making high inference decisions. Nevertheless, a second coder (a fellow postgraduate researcher) reviewed a number of transcripts marked up with the coding I had applied, and made comments on the rationality of those allocations. It is argued that the detail provided above supports an assessment of the qualitative aspects of the study as being trustworthy.

4.4.3 Ethics

Lastly in this chapter, comment is made on matters of ethics. The study involved human participants and the collection of personal information so particular consideration was given to ethical research design. In accordance with the research university’s procedures, approval was sought, and obtained, from the university’s Human Ethics Committee.
Of most importance was the need for all participants to understand what was expected from them and to provide their informed consent before data collection commenced. Principals were the “gatekeepers” (Hatch, 2002, p. 46) in both phases. In Phase 1, cover letters were addressed to the potential teacher participant outlining what was involved and stating that completion of the questionnaire amounted to written consent. For the CPP classroom work, written consent was obtained from the three school principals and all teacher participants before data collection commenced. Because most student participants were under 18 years of age at the outset of the classwork, approval was required from the students themselves and a parent or guardian. All consent forms were accompanied by a participant information sheet, tailored to the specific role in the study and using comprehensible language (Hatch, 2002, p. 63) (copies in Appendix K). All participants were advised that their involvement was entirely voluntary and that they could withdraw at any point without recourse.

Anonymity of all participants was protected as much as possible. The questionnaire did not carry details that could readily identify the participant, and all related documents and administrative databases were accessible only by me. Phase 1 participants were given the option of recording their email address on the final page so results could be sent to them. Those pages were free of other information, and were detached and stored separately from the questionnaire to avoid identification of the participant. For Phase 2, pseudonyms were used for all participants and schools, including in transcriptions.

A teabag was attached to each questionnaire as a small incentive for Phase 1 participants to complete the survey over a refreshment break. I took home-baking (including gluten-free options) to the class discussions of Phase 2 and, as a token of thanks, I gave each of the Phase 2 participants a gift voucher at the conclusion of the data collection ($20 per student and $50 per teacher).

In accordance with the research university’s memorandum of understanding with local Māori and its commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi\(^2\), research consultation with Māori was completed favourably prior to commencement of research (see decision letter in Appendix L).

\(^2\) The Treaty of Waitangi is New Zealand’s founding agreement signed in 1840 by British settlers and Māori.
4.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the methodological procedures used in the two phases of this study. It has described the perspective taken in the research approach and detailed specific data collection methods and the quantitative and qualitative processes used in analysing the data. Finally, in addressing warrants and ethics, the chapter concluded that the study can be deemed trustworthy and ethical.

The next four chapters present and discuss the data gathered from both phases. Chapter 5 presents the results of the quantitative data analysis using statistical methods. Chapter 6 then relates those results to the hypotheses. Chapters 7 and 8, respectively, present the findings of the qualitative data and apply them to the research questions. In the Discussion (chapter 9), sociocultural theory is applied to results and findings to reveal tensions and possible solutions to in relation to the overall research concern of supporting teachers in the practice of ICLT.
CHAPTER 5 – QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

5.0 Overview

This chapter presents the results from the analyses of the data gathered through the language teachers’ questionnaire in Phase 1. These results were analysed (see chapter 6) with a view to testing the following hypotheses:

1. Teachers’ cognitions about language and culture teaching do not reflect an ICLT approach.

2. Teachers’ reported language and culture classroom practices do not reflect an ICLT approach.

3. Teachers do not demonstrate awareness of ICLT as an approach to teaching language and culture.

The first results presented are those associated with the participants’ personal and professional ontogeneses (Cross, 2010; Dewey, 1927/1998; Swain et al., 2011), that is, their demographic data, history, and experiences with culture as language teachers. Then, in relation to Hypothesis 1, the teachers’ cognitions about culture in language education are examined. This includes descriptive statistics for the questionnaire items associated with cognitions, as well as correlations between items, and between items and scales. Next, responses associated with teachers’ culture teaching practices, associated with Hypothesis 2, are analysed, with emphasis on correlations between practice-related items and with associated scales, as well as between cognitions and practices. Lastly, data relating to Hypothesis 3, regarding teachers’ awareness of ICLT as a teaching approach, are examined treating levels of understanding as a dependent variable with a range of independent variables. Where relevant, the principal components analyses of the factor structures of groups of items are shown, and the resulting scales are used in the analyses. For these scales, reliability coefficients were calculated using coefficient alpha (Field, 2013). In addition, t-tests were used for independent group comparisons and Chi-square analyses were used to compare dichotomous categorical variables.

It is stated at the outset that these results are not intended to demonstrate causality; there was no random selection of the sample or random assignment to groups. Where correlations, t-tests, or Chi-square statistical tests are used, a 99% or 95% probability of
occurring for reasons other than chance alone was set (that is, \( p < .01 \) or \( p < .05 \)) as deemed appropriate for any given analysis (Gass, 2010). The questionnaire is included in Appendix B for reference when item numbers are mentioned within this chapter.

5.1 Participants’ Biodata

Questionnaire participants were 76 language teachers from 39 schools from the South Island of New Zealand. As noted, the return rate cannot be determined as a proportion of the total population, but it does represent responses from 39 of 121 schools, or 32%.

5.1.1 Demographic data

Demographic data are presented in Table 5.1. These data include the distribution of responses for gender, age, ethnicity, and the primary language taught. The results for each variable are described in the following sections.

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand European</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language taught</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin/Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching their L1?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total number of responses for Ethnicity exceeds 76 because 8 individuals selected two ethnicities.

5.1.2 Gender and age

The majority of participants were female (n = 69, 90.1%). Age data were gathered in bands of 10 years (i.e., 20-29 years, 30-39, etc.) and, although there was a spread across age bands, the greatest number of participants reported that they were aged 40-49 years. No participant was aged 70 years or older. Figure 5.1 shows the distribution of gender across the age bands. All seven male participants reported being between 30 and 59 years of age.

Figure 5.1. Distribution of participants by age and gender.
5.1.3 Ethnicity
Participants were asked to identify the ethnic groups to which they belonged, selecting all that applied from a list of eight ethnicities and *Other, please specify*. This replicated the ethnicity item in the 2013 New Zealand census (Statistics New Zealand, n.d.-b), a recommendation arising from research consultation with Māori. New Zealand Europeans (Pākehā) were represented to the largest degree, with $n = 54$ (64.3%) participants identifying as Pākehā; the next most represented ethnicity was Māori, selected by 9 participants (11.8%). The 6 people (7.9%) who selected *Other* specified the following ethnicities: Tokelauan, Zimbabwean, Mongolian, Mexican, Namibian, and Latino American. Eight participants (10.5%) recorded more than one ethnicity.

5.1.4 Languages taught
The majority of participants ($n = 44$, 57.9%) were employed to teach one language. Twenty individuals (26.3%) stated that they taught two languages, most commonly French and German. Eleven participants (14.5%) reported teaching three languages, with unique combinations in almost every case, and one person taught four languages: EAL, French, Chinese, and Tongan. Teachers of multiple languages were asked to state the language they spent most time teaching and complete the remainder of the questionnaire with that language in mind.

Fifty-six participants (73.7%) taught languages other than English or te reo Māori, of which French ($n = 26$, 34.2%) and Japanese ($n = 13$, 17.1%) were the most common. Of the 20 participants (26.3%) who reported teaching New Zealand languages, 12 (15.8%) were teachers of te reo, and 8 (10.5%) taught EAL. More than two-thirds of participants ($n = 52$, 68.4%) stated that they were teaching a language that was *not* their mother tongue. The distribution of languages taught and the proportion taught by native speakers is shown in Figure 5.2.
Figure 5.2. Distribution of participants by language taught and whether they are native speakers.

5.2 Professional Qualifications, Teaching Experience, and Professional Affiliations

Information about the participants’ qualifications and length of teaching experience is presented in Tables 5.2 and 5.3 respectively. The variables are described in the following sections.
Table 5.2
*Reported Qualifications and Teaching Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of teaching/Bachelor’s degree in education or teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree + diploma or other teaching postgraduate qualification</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma + certificate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree or PhD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree (not education or teaching)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas qualifications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1 Qualifications

The open-ended item, *What, if any, teaching qualification(s) do you hold?*, resulted in a variety of labels for qualifications, many of which were similar or equivalent, although this was not always clear. The responses were grouped into nine categories for analysis (see Table 5.2). Five participants (6.6%) had no teaching qualification: four were teachers of te reo (of whom three were native speakers) and one was a native-speaker teacher of
Chinese. The majority had a diploma of teaching or a Bachelor’s degree (often in education or teaching), or both. Five participants (6.6%) recorded that their teaching qualifications were obtained outside of New Zealand, namely in the UK, Japan, Mexico, and Germany.

5.2.2 Experience
An open-ended item asked participants how long they had been teaching. The individual responses were grouped into bands for data analysis: less than one year’s experience, more than 30 years’, and six blocks of 5 years for the intervening time periods. Ungrouped results are presented in Figure 5.3. There was one missing response.

![Figure 5.3. Distribution of length of teaching experience.](image)

Reported length of teaching experience ranged from two individuals (3%) having less than one year’s experience to seven people (9%) having taught for more than 30 years. The mean length of experience, based on the individual data rather than the grouped data, was 15.07 years ($SD = 10.01$). The median was 13.5 years and the mode was 20 years.

5.2.3 Professional associations
Information was gathered on participants’ membership of professional language associations. The results are shown in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3
*Membership of Professional Language Associations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of professional associations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Association of Language Teachers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Association of French Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Association of Japanese Language Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL Aotearoa NZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German in Aotearoa NZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Teachers Association of NZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Cluster</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentage values relate to the proportion of the 53 participants who are association members. Some participants reported being members of more than one organisation.

Just over two-thirds of participants reported being members of language associations ($n = 53, 69.7\%$), the majority of whom were members of the New Zealand Association of Language Teachers (NZALT). Membership of the New Zealand Association of French Teachers (NZAFT) ($n = 14, 26.4\%$) was the highest of the language-specific associations for international languages. Four participants reported membership of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Aotearoa New Zealand (TESOLANZ) and five referred to a local cluster group, of whom three were teachers of te reo.

### 5.2.4 Knowledge of professional literature

Based on an item in Byram and Risager’s (1999) questionnaire, participants were asked how often they read professional literature about teaching language and culture, selecting from five options: *less than once a year, between once and six times a year, monthly, weekly,* and *daily.* Results are shown in Table 5.4.
Table 5.4

**Regularity of Reading Professional Literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularity of reading</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between once and six times a year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest proportion of participants reported reading professional literature *between once and six times a year* \((n = 32, 42.1\%)\). Just over one-fifth of participants advised that they read professional material on a weekly or daily basis; under one-fifth reported reading professional literature less than once a year. The potential for a relationship between membership of professional organisations and reading professional literature was explored and, as Figure 5.4 shows, professional membership appears to have had little bearing on the regularity with which participants read professional material.

![Figure 5.4](image)

*Figure 5.4.* Membership of professional language teacher association and regularity of reading professional literature.
5.3 School and Language Class Details

Three open-ended items gathered information about the size of each participant’s school, the number of students studying the subject language, and the regularity of the language classes. A final item in this section asked participants about the degree of control they had over the content and teaching methods used in their lessons. The results for these items are presented in Table 5.5 and are described in the sections that follow.

Table 5.5
School Size, Language Student Numbers, Regularity of Lessons, and Teachers’ Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size (roll)</td>
<td>930.70</td>
<td>573.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 250</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-750</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751-1000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-1500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-2600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students studying</td>
<td>136.37</td>
<td>119.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or fewer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours per week</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>they teach the language to Juniors (Years 9-10)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.75-3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.25-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.25-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.25-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours per week</th>
<th>4.30</th>
<th>2.73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>they teach the language to Seniors (Years 11-13)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25-5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.25-10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.25-15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility of content and approach</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>65.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* With respect to school sizes, class sizes, and teaching hours, responses were grouped for ease of presentation. Means and standard deviations represent the total category and were calculated from the raw individual data.

### 5.3.1 Student numbers and lesson regularity

School sizes ranged widely, from seven schools (9.6%) with fewer than 250 students (smallest roll was 125) to eleven schools (15%) with rolls of 1500 or more (the largest was 2600 students) ($M = 930.70$, $SD = 573.02$). The largest proportion of schools had rolls of between 500 and 750 students ($n = 20$, 26.1%). The number of students studying
the subject language ranged from four schools (5%) with fewer than 10 students of the subject language (three EAL classes, one French class) to two schools (3%) with more than 400 students of the language (one EAL, one French) \((M = 136.37, SD = 119.88)\). The largest proportion of participants \((n = 20, 26.1\%)\) had between 51 and 100 students studying their subject language.

More than half of the participants \((n = 43, 56.5\%)\) reported junior classes spending between 1¾ hours and 3 hours per week in the language class \((M = 3.38, SD = 2.33)\). The mode was 3 hours. Nearly three-quarters \((n = 54, 71\%)\) of participants reported that their senior students spent 3¼ - 5 hours per week in the language class, with a mode of 4 hours \((M = 4.30, SD = 2.73)\).

5.3.2 Flexibility in course design

All participants reported that they had at least some flexibility over lesson content and teaching methods in the language class. Participants selected from a choice from three levels of flexibility:

*High: I have total, or near total, control so I can design and conduct the lessons in any way I see fit;*

*Some: I am bound to some curricular and/or school programmes, but within those parameters I have control over what and how I teach; and*

*Low: I am entirely bound to curricular and/or school programmes (e.g., coursebook, repeated lesson plans, etc) and have little or no control over content and teaching methods.*

As can be seen in Table 5.5 above, two-thirds of participants \((n = 50, 65.8\%)\) had full control over their lesson content and teaching methods. The remainder had some flexibility, within parameters set by the curriculum or school programme.

The next sections present results related to the participants’ affiliations with cultures other than their own, a component of their ontogenesis.
5.4 Association with Cultures

Participants were asked about their affiliations with cultures other than their own, and how they keep in touch with the cultures associated with the language they taught.

5.4.1 Affiliations with cultures other than their own

Item A1 (see questionnaire in Appendix B) asked participants to report the various associations they had with other cultures by selecting all applicable options from a list of nine. It was developed from similar items in Byram and Risager (1999) and in Sercu et al. (2005). The distribution of responses is shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6

Affiliations with Cultures Other Than their Own

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have family members from another culture (including ... marriage, adoption ...)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have holidayed outside of New Zealand</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived outside of New Zealand</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have close friends from another culture</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have acquaintances who are from another culture</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned a second (or additional) language and my learning included cultural knowledge</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in other cultures</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively seek to learn about other cultures</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have taught classes in which there were children from other cultures</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n is the number of participants who replied in the affirmative.

Each listed method of affiliation with other cultures was selected by at least half of the participants. The most common affiliation was, \textit{I am interested in other cultures}, selected by all but two participants \((n = 74, 97.3\%); although, interestingly, \textit{I actively seek to learn about other cultures} was one of the two least commonly selected affiliations.
The option *I have family members from another culture* was selected by the fewest number of participants ($n = 42, 55.2\%$).

To reduce the number of variables, the responses to these nine items were summed to form the Total Affiliations Scale. A score of 1 (selected) or 0 (not selected) was allocated to each of the 9 listed affiliations resulting in a possible maximum score of 9 and a minimum of 0. The distribution of the results (shown in Table 5.7) yielded a mean of 7.53 ($SD = 1.49$) and a mode of 9, suggesting reasonably high average levels of affiliations with other cultures.

Table 5.7

*Distribution of Scores on Total Affiliations Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The internal reliability of the scale was assessed as moderate, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .57. It was, therefore, considered worthwhile to conduct a principal components analysis on the nine items (Kline, 1994) to determine whether the items could be said to “hang together” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012, p. 84). Using a Kaiser’s criterion of an eigenvalue of 1 or more (Pallant, 2013), the analysis suggested a three-component solution. This was supported by an inspection of the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) (Figure 5.5), as there were three components appearing above “the elbow” (Pallant, 2013, p. 191),
or point of inflection (Field, 2013), of the curve. The item loadings are presented in Table 5.8.

Figure 5.5. Scree plot for principal components analysis of individual items of Total Affiliations scale.

The items with the strongest loadings on Component 1 were: *I have holidayed outside of New Zealand; I have acquaintances who are from another culture; I have learned an additional language which included cultural knowledge; and I actively seek to learn about other cultures*. It could be said that these items relate to the participant having had affiliations with other cultures gained through self-direction. The item *I have taught classes in which there were children from other cultures* also loaded on Component 1 but split with Component 2. The other items that loaded on Component 2 were: *I have lived outside of New Zealand and I am interested in other cultures*. The relationships between these items are less apparent, and the distinction from Component 1 is also unclear, particularly with respect to the separation of having an interest in other cultures and actively seeking to learn about them. A possible association among these items is interest through less self-directed exposure. The items that loaded on Component 3 were, *I have family members from another culture ... and I have close friends from another culture*, which suggests a social relationship of Family and Friends. However, it is then unexpected to see *I have acquaintances who are from another country* not loading on that component, unless the choice between close friends and acquaintances was taken as exclusive, or as representative of their typical relationships. The scale was retained as a
group of nine items reflecting ways in which a participant could be affiliated with cultures other than their own, but the results of the principal components analysis and the moderate reliability of the scale are acknowledged as affecting the extent to which these results can be generalised.

Table 5.8
*Component Structure of the Affiliations Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have family members from another culture ...</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have holidayed outside of New Zealand</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived outside of New Zealand</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have close friends from another culture</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have acquaintances who are from another culture</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned an additional language which included cultural knowledge</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in other cultures</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively seek to learn about other cultures</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have taught classes in which there were children from other cultures</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>Interest/Exposure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.4.2 Keeping in touch with the culture

Item A3 of the questionnaire, again developed from Byram and Risager’s (1999) and Sercu et al.’s (2005) surveys, related to how participants kept in touch with the cultures associated with the language they taught. Participants were asked to select all that applied from a list of eight specified options, and a ninth, Other ways, please specify. Results are shown in Table 5.9.

Table 5.9
Ways to Keep in Touch with the Cultures of the Subject Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a native of the culture</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am immersed in the culture as an ESOL teacher from a non-English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in the language (e.g., film, television, printed</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material, Internet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in English about the culture (e.g., film, television,</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printed material, Internet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with native speakers who live in New Zealand</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with native speakers who live outside of New Zealand</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit the place where the language is spoken every:</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ways (please specify)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n is the number who answered in the affirmative.

Many reported that they followed media sources generated in the target language (n = 59, 77.6%). Also regularly selected was visits to places that speak the language (n = 55, 72.4%), although half made those visits infrequently (more than 6 years apart),
with 11 individuals (14%) reporting visits of more than 11 years apart. Also of interest is the comparatively low count for contact with native speakers outside New Zealand ($n = 39, 51.3\%$).

In retrospect, it is noted that this item could have posed some confusion for teachers of New Zealand languages. One EAL teacher reported visiting a place that speaks English every two years—perhaps the participant was referring to visiting other English-speaking places. Seven of the 12 te reo teachers advised that they visited a place that speaks Māori, and did so every year. As noted, it is not clear whether they were referring to New Zealand generally, given their ongoing presence in the country, or whether they applied an alternative interpretation of “place,” such as a marae, or a region of New Zealand where te reo is commonly spoken.

A number of participants selected the Other ways option. Although many of their responses could have been encapsulated by other options in this item, some reported keeping in touch through membership of native speaker groups and cultural activity groups (e.g., kapa haka), inviting native-speaking international students into the language class, visiting homes of native speakers, and as one participant advised, “My daughter is taking French at university and shares lots with me” (369-1/72).

To reduce the number of variables, the six items were grouped together to form the Keep In Touch scale. Responses were summed across the six related items to produce a score reflecting the extent to which the participants kept in touch with the culture of their subject language. A score of 1 was allocated to each of 5 listed ways to keep in touch plus a score reflecting the regularity of visits to the culture (5 for annual visits to 1 for visits separated by 11 years or more) resulting in a possible maximum score of 10 and a minimum of 0, that is, not keeping in touch with the culture. The distribution of the scale results (shown in Table 5.10) had a mean scale score of 5.83 ($SD = 3.05$).
### Table 5.10

*Distribution of Scores on Keep In Touch Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.83 3.05

The internal reliability of the scale was moderate—Cronbach’s alpha of .47—suggesting that not all of the items were sufficiently related to form one scale. To explore this further, a principal components analysis was conducted, using a Kaiser’s criterion of an eigenvalue of 1 or more (Pallant, 2013). Figure 5.6 shows the resulting scree plot (Cattell, 1966).
The component structure (Table 5.11) suggested a three-component solution. On closer inspection, it was clear that three items did not fit well with the others on the scale. Two related to being a native speaker of the subject language or living within the native culture: *I am a native of the culture* and *I am immersed in the culture as an ESOL teacher*; the third was the *Other ways* open response option. Responses from those three items were consequently removed from the scale, and the reliability test run again.

**Table 5.11**  
*Component Structure of the Keep In Touch Scale on First Run*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a native of the culture</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am immersed as an ESOL teacher</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in the language</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in English about the</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Contact with native speakers in New Zealand  .530 .267 .044 .317
Contact with native speakers outside New Zealand .629 .152 -.388 .460
I visit places where the language is spoken .833 -.389 .176 .904
Regularity of visit in years .724 -.362 .286 .915
Other ways to keep in touch with culture -.159 .125 .886 -

The Cronbach’s alpha of the reduced number of items in the scale increased to a moderate .63, suggesting the items were sufficiently related to form a scale, but for additional robustness, another principal components analysis was conducted (Table 5.12).

Table 5.12
Component Structure of the Keep In Touch Scale with Three Unreliable Items Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in the language</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in English about the culture</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with native speakers who live in New Zealand</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with native speakers who live outside of New Zealand</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit the place where the language is spoken</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity of visit</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>KeepInTouch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen in the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) (Figure 5.7) that one component lay above the curve’s point of inflection (as shown in Table 5.12), supporting a one-component solution. The eigenvalue was 3.25, explaining 36.10% of the variance and all six items loaded on that component. These items were deemed to relate to keeping in touch with the subject culture.

![Scree plot for principal components analysis of six individual items of reduced Keep In Touch scale.](image)

*Figure 5.7. Scree plot for principal components analysis of six individual items of reduced Keep In Touch scale.*

### 5.5 Teacher Cognitions

Part B of the questionnaire (see Appendix B) focused on teaching culture as part of language education and was divided into participant teachers’ cognitions and their reported practices. This section addresses cognitions about the role of culture in the language class as they relate to the first hypothesis: Teachers’ cognitions about language and culture teaching do not reflect an ICLT approach. It includes presentation of the descriptive statistics associated with the pertinent items, as well as the details of the development and testing of the ICLT Cognitions scale. Relationships between variables are explored using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients.

#### 5.5.1 Relative importance of curricular areas

Item B1, drawn from Young and Sachdev (2011), asked participants to rate the importance of seven curricular areas, presented in the following order: vocabulary, speaking, culture, writing, listening, reading, and grammar. Ratings were allocated by
scoring each item on a scale from 1 *Not at all important* to 4 *Very important*. The results are presented in Table 5.13. No participant rated vocabulary, speaking, culture, or reading as being not at all important, and only a small number considered writing, listening, and grammar to be not at all important (less than 3% in each case, \(n = 2\), \(n = 1\) and \(n = 2\), respectively).

**Table 5.13**

*Relative Importance of Curricular Areas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Area</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the participants (\(n = 38\)) rated culture as very important. However, this should be contrasted against the higher frequency of ratings of *Very important* given to speaking (\(n = 69\)), vocabulary (\(n = 68\)), and listening (\(n = 65\)), by at least 85% of participants. Correspondingly, most of the ratings of *Little importance* or *Not at all important* were given to culture (little importance: \(n = 5\), 6.6%; not at all important: \(n = 0\)), writing (little: \(n = 3\), 3.9%; not at all: \(n = 2\), 2.6%), and grammar (little: \(n = 4\), 5.3%; not at all: \(n = 2\), 2.6%). Low ratings were rare for the other curricular areas. It is worthwhile to note that this item did not require ranking of the options, as Young and Sachdev’s (2011) item did. That is, participants were free to select any rating for each curricular area and could, for example, choose 4 *Very important* for all seven areas; 19 (25%) did respond that way.

Relationships between ratings of the curricular areas were analysed using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient. The results are shown in Table 5.14, including \(r^2\) for calculation of the percentage of shared variance between the variables.
Table 5.14
Correlations Between Responses on Importance of Curricular Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable correlated</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Speaking</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Culture</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Writing</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Listening</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Reading</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Grammar</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and Culture</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and Writing</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and Listening</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and Reading</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and Grammar</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Writing</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Listening</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Reading</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Grammar</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Listening</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Reading</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Grammar</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening and Reading</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening and Grammar</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Grammar</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * denotes correlation significant at $p < .05$; ** denotes correlation significant at $p < .01$. In all correlations, $n = 76$ and all relationships noted as significant are two-tailed.

There were high correlations between reading, writing, listening, and grammar. Writing and reading had the greatest correlation, with the importance placed on reading predicting 71% of the variance in importance placed on writing. Importance placed on vocabulary appears to have accounted for very little of the variance in importance placed on all other curricular areas. Culture, of most relevance to this study, had positive
relationships (at $p < .05$ level) with vocabulary, reading, and grammar, and no significant relationships with speaking, writing, and listening. Speaking was rated as having the greatest importance, with positive relationships with writing, listening and reading, all at $p < .05$.

### 5.5.2 Teachers' familiarity with the culture they teach

Participants were asked to rate their familiarity with a range of aspects associated with the cultures of their subject languages. Those aspects were, for the most part, taken from the earlier questionnaires of Byram and Risager (1999) and Sercu et al. (2005). Level of familiarity with each aspect was scored from 1 *Not at all familiar* to 4 *Very familiar*. Results are presented in Table 5.15. Elements marked + are examples of covert culture; those unmarked are instances of overt culture.

**Table 5.15**

*Reported Familiarity with Aspects of the Subject Culture*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of culture</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Ethnic and social groups, ethnic relations</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Racism towards this culture</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life and routines</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Youth culture</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+School and education</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political system</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Social and living conditions</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivities, holidays, customs, traditions</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Tourism and travel</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Gender roles and relationships</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Working life and unemployment</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Religious traditions</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
Stereotypes associated with the culture 3.26  .81
The country’s relationship with New Zealand 2.11  1.52
Environmental issues 2.75  .85

Note. $n = 76$ for all aspects.

It must be remembered that these are the participants’ self-reports of their familiarity with the various cultural elements. Their knowledge of those aspects was not verified in any way.

With the exception of *The country’s relationship with New Zealand* (which might have proved problematic for teachers of EAL or te reo), on average, participants reported good levels of familiarity with cultural aspects of their subject language. The listed aspects were divided into examples of overt culture and examples of covert culture and a scale was developed for each. The aspect of *school and education* was included in both groups because it could logically apply to both categories. Some aspects of daily school practices and routines might be covered in course books; the educational system, however, is less likely to be presented in such materials. The reason to highlight the distinction is that whereas the overt cultural aspects have had a presence in traditional “facts-oriented” language classes (Byram & Feng, 2004, p. 160), the covert cultural aspects are less commonly featured in language lessons but are considered central to an ICLT approach given the relevance of their role when culture is considered as a “social construct” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 205; see also Liddicoat, 2008a).

Scales allowed a total score to be generated for each participant’s familiarity with aspects of overt culture and another score for familiarity with aspects of covert culture, viz:

- Seven items were categorised as Overt Culture. A participant rating every aspect with a 4 *Very familiar* would have a total score of 28 – the highest level of familiarity; the lowest possible score for that category was 7 (7 x 1) – *Not at all familiar*.
- Twelve aspects were categorised as Covert Culture. The maximum possible score was 48 (12 x 4) and the minimum was 12 (12 x 1).

The scales were assessed as having internal consistency, initially through an independent evaluation by a co-rater with 96% agreement with the original ratings, and
then tested analytically with the resulting Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .86 for the Overt Culture scale and .85 for the Covert Culture scale. These were deemed sufficiently reliable for subsequent analyses.

Considering Overt Culture familiarity first, the average score was $M = 22.04$ ($SD = 3.94$) from a possible maximum score of 28. The median score was 23 and the mode was 19. Four participants (5%) had the maximum possible of 28, reporting that they were very familiar with all aspects. The lowest score was 11, achieved by one person (a teacher of French), just four points above a score of no familiarity with any aspect. That individual rated 1 *Not at all familiar* on all aspects other than history, geography, daily life and routines, and school and education. The distribution across the scores is shown in Table 5.16.

Table 5.16

*Distribution of Scores on Familiarity with Overt Culture Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Responses were grouped into bands of four for presentation, except the lower and upper bands which reflect the limit of the range of scores; means and standard deviations were calculated from raw individual data.

With respect to the Covert Culture scale, the highest score of 47, from a possible maximum of 48, was reported by one participant. The lowest score was 15, just three points above no familiarity with any aspect, reported by one person, the same French teacher who had the lowest level of familiarity in Overt Culture, this time rating all aspects at 1 *Not at all familiar* except tourism and travel, stereotypes, and school and education. The mean response in this scale was $35.07$ ($SD = 6.96$), the median 35, and the mode 34 (see Table 5.17).
Table 5.17

*Distribution of Scores on Familiarity with Covert Culture Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>6.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scores were grouped into bands of four for presentation, except the lower and upper bands which reflect the limit of the range of scores; mean and standard deviations were calculated on the individual ungrouped data.

A Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine whether there was a relationship between the Overt Culture scale and the Covert Culture scale. A significant positive relationship was found between the scales ($r = .85, p < .01, r^2 = 0.72$).

This concludes the sections of the chapter that present results of the participants’ personal and professional ontogeneses.

### 5.5.3 Cognition statements about teaching culture in language education

Item B2 (see questionnaire in Appendix B) gathered cognitions about the place of culture in language teaching by asking participants to rate their level of agreement with 29 statements, using a scale from 1 *Do not agree at all* to 4 *Strongly agree*. For purposes of analysis, a rating of 2 was interpreted as *Agree to a minor extent* and a rating of 3 as *Agree moderately*. The majority of the statements repeated items from the questionnaires conducted by Sercu et al. (2005) and Byram and Risager (1999). The remainder were original but represented content from previous work by Newton (2009), Dellit (2005), and Larzén-Östermark (2008), among others. Some of the statements aligned with the
principles of ICLT and some reflected earlier traditional approaches to culture teaching, although they were not grouped together by approach for the questionnaire.

Results for each item are shown in Table 5.18, in the order that they appeared in the questionnaire. The statements are numbered in the table to aid discussion, C1, C2, etc., where C denotes a cognition statement (as distinct from practice statements, discussed later). Statements marked + are those aligned with ICLT. In general, \( n = 76 \), although in some statements there were missing responses, but never more than three.

Table 5.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C1) +Language and culture are intertwined</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C2) Intercultural misunderstandings are mostly due to language differences and not cultural differences</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C3) In teaching, my focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C4) My school’s focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C5) The New Zealand language curriculum’s focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C6) Culture is a fifth skill, to be introduced once reading, writing, speaking and listening are acquired</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C7) +The students’ own cultures should be incorporated in their language lessons</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C8) A language teacher should present only a positive image of the culture and society</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C9) +Knowledge about other cultures builds tolerance towards members of those cultures</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C10) +Discussing controversial cultural topics is beneficial in the language classroom</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
It is not possible to teach language and culture in an integrated way; the two have to be separated.

+Language education includes development of reflective understanding of one’s own culture.

+It is important to prepare students for future intercultural encounters.

+Introducing the cultural knowledge strand into the National Curriculum was important.

Culture knowledge is primarily gained through transmission from the teacher.

+Students ought to be assessed on the cultural dimension in their language course.

+Language teachers must present a realistic, so sometimes negative, image of the target culture.

+Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations.

+Personal contact with people from the relevant culture creates tolerance.

If the time pressure is great, the cultural dimension ought to give way to the linguistic.

Culture knowledge is primarily gained through addressing it as it arises incidentally.

Teaching culture means lost opportunities for teaching language.

+Language teaching ought to contribute to students’ understanding of their own identities.

+It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their own cultures while learning about a new culture.

+Language education includes skills to accommodate cultural differences.

+The most important outcome of language education is intercultural competence.

(continued)
To learn a new culture you need to consider how it is similar to, or different from, your own

Culture should be taught from the beginning of language education

Comparing languages and cultures draws students’ attention to the influence of invisible culture in their lives

To begin, it is worthwhile to describe some interesting responses to individual statements. Statement (C1) *Language and culture are intertwined*, supporting ICLT principles, had the highest level of agreement ($M = 3.84, SD = .40$); 98.7% agreed moderately ($n = 10, 13.2\%$) or strongly ($n = 65, 85.5\%$). Other statements related to views about practical applications of this concept. For example, (C11) *It is not possible to teach language and culture in an integrated way; the two have to be separated* scored the strongest level of disagreement among all statements ($M = 1.17, SD = .44$), with the majority reporting not agreeing at all ($n = 65, 85.5\%$) and no one strongly agreed. However, for (C20) *If the time pressure is great, the cultural dimension ought to give way to the linguistic* ($M = 2.20, SD = .85$), scores were spread across all four response options, with many agreeing to a minor extent ($n = 34, 44.7\%$) and almost a third of the participants agreeing to a moderate extent ($n = 23, 30.3\%$), suggesting that language and culture might be treated separately in the classroom.

Other statements with low levels of agreement were:

(C6) *Culture is a fifth skill, to be introduced once reading, writing, speaking, and listening are acquired* ($M = 1.46, SD = .84$). This statement reflected Kramsch’s (2003) argument that this view is contrary to ICLT’s fully integrated approach and was disagreed with by 71.1% ($n = 54$) of participants. Four participants (5.3%) strongly agreed with the statement.

There was also little agreement with the statement associated with traditional approaches, (C22) *Teaching culture means lost opportunities for teaching language* ($M = 1.66, SD = .92$); 57.9% ($n = 44$) did not agree at all but five participants (6.6%) strongly agreed.
The non-ICLT statement (C8) *A language teacher should present only a positive image of the culture and society* ($M = 1.79$, $SD = .79$), received mostly no ($n = 30$, 39.5%) or low ($n = 35$, 46.1%) agreement. Eleven individuals (14.5%) agreed moderately or strongly with the statement. With respect to the related statement framed to represent ICLT (C17) *Language teachers must present a realistic, so sometimes negative, image of the target culture* ($M = 2.93$, $SD = .81$), the balance was in favour of moderate ($n = 36$, 47.4%) or strong ($n = 19$, 25%) agreement, as might be expected based on responses to statement (C8), but there were 21 individuals (27.7%) who agreed minimally or not at all. In other words, more people disagreed with the idea that only a positive image of the cultures should be presented, than agreed with the idea that a realistic image should be presented.

The other statements with which participants agreed most strongly were:

(C9) *Knowledge about other cultures builds tolerance towards members of those cultures* ($M = 3.63$, $SD = .71$); three-quarters of participants strongly agreed with this ICLT-allied statement and one person did not agree at all.

(C13) *It is important to prepare students for future intercultural encounters* ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .52$); just under three-quarters (72.4%, $n = 55$) agreed strongly with this ICLT objective and no one did not agree at all.

(C14) *Introducing the cultural knowledge strand into the National Curriculum was important* ($M = 3.59$, $SD = .715$); based on a similar item in Byram and Risager’s (1999) study, this statement drew strong agreement from 69.7% ($n = 53$) participants and two (2.6%) did not agree at all.

Some of the statements related to how learning a new culture can have a personal impact on the student. Statement (C7) *The students’ own cultures should be incorporated in their language lessons* ($M = 3.24$, $SD = .75$), consistent with ICLT and with Newton’s (forthcoming) proposed new Principle 1 of iCLT, drew mostly positive responses, with 84.2% moderately ($n = 33$) or strongly ($n = 31$) agreeing. When asked for their level of agreement with statement (C12) *Language education includes development of reflective understanding of one’s own culture* ($M = 3.42$, $SD = .72$), a core principle of ICLT, more than half of the participants responded with strong agreement ($n = 42$, 55.3%) and no one disagreed. Furthermore, approximately half of the participants ($n = 39$, 51.3%) strongly
agreed with statement (C23) Language teaching ought to contribute to students’ understanding of their own identities (M = 3.38, SD = .71); no one disagreed. With regard to statement (C24) It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their own cultures while learning about a new culture (M = 3.11, SD = .93), the majority agreed either moderately (n = 27, 35.5%) or strongly (n = 31, 40.8%). Three people (3.9%) did not agree at all.

All cognition items were explored using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient to examine their inter-relationships. These results are included as Table M1 in Appendix M. Strong positive relationships (p < .01) were found between many pairs of items, with the five strongest relationships presented below.

The strongest correlation was between (C28) Culture should be taught from the beginning of education and (C25) Language teaching includes skills to accommodate cultural differences (r = .62, p < .01, r^2 = .38), followed by the correlation between (C28) with (C29) Comparing languages and cultures draws students’ attention to the influence of invisible culture in their lives (r = .60, p < .01, r^2 = .36).

There were significant correlations between (C25) Language teaching should include skills to accommodate differences and both (C29) Comparing languages and cultures draws students’ attention to the influence of invisible culture in their lives (r = .55, p < .01, r^2 = .30) and (C24) It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their own culture while learning about a new culture (r = .53, p < .01, r^2 = .28).

There was also a significant correlation between (C12) Language education includes development of reflective understanding of one’s own culture correlated and (C13) It is important to prepare students for future intercultural encounters (r = .53, p < .01, r^2 = .28).

The ICLT cognition statements were grouped to form the ICLT Cognitions scale, the process of which is described in the next section, along with analyses of that scale.
5.5.4 The ICLT Cognitions Scale

A scale was created from the cognition statements that reflected ICLT values. The ICLT Cognitions scale summed the results across the 18 items associated with cognitions representative of ICLT (as denoted by + in Table 5.18 above). A principal components analysis was carried out on these items to determine which dimensions might explain the relationships between the variables (Kline, 1994) and to explore the feasibility of grouping these items as a scale related to participants’ cognitions about ICLT. Kaiser’s criterion of an eigenvalue of 1 or more (Pallant, 2013) and an inspection of the scree plot (Cattell, 1966), shown in Figure 5.8, suggested a one-component solution, as one component appeared above the curve’s point of inflection (Field, 2013; Pallant, 2013). The eigenvalue was 5.69, explaining 31.62% of the variance. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .85 also suggested that the one-component solution was appropriate and that the scale had internal consistency. The component loadings are presented in Table 5.19.

![Figure 5.8. Scree plot for principal components analysis of individual items of ICLT Cognitions scale.](image)

Two statements did not load onto the component: (C16) Students ought to be assessed on the cultural dimension in their language course, and (C17) Language teachers must present a realistic, so sometimes negative, image of the target culture.
Table 5.19

*Component Structure of the ICLT Cognitions Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C1) Language and culture are intertwined</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C7) The student’s own cultures should be incorporated in their</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C9) Knowledge about other cultures builds tolerance towards</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members of those cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C10) Discussing controversial cultural topics is beneficial in</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the language classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C12) Language education includes development of one’s own culture</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C13) It is important to prepare students for future intercultural</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encounters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C14) Introducing the cultural knowledge strand into the National</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum was important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C16) Students ought to be assessed on the cultural dimension in</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their language course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C17) Language teachers must present a realistic, so sometimes</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative, image of the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C18) Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C19) Personal contact with people from the relevant culture</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creates tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C23) Language teaching ought to contribute to students’</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding of their own identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C24) It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own cultures while learning about a new culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
(C25) Language education includes skills to accommodate cultural differences.

(C26) The most important outcome of language education is intercultural competence.

(C27) To learn a new culture you need to consider how it is similar to, or different from, your own.

(C28) Culture should be taught from the beginning of language education.

(C29) Comparing languages and cultures draws students’ attention to the influence of invisible culture in their lives.

Using the participants’ ratings of 1 *Do not agree at all* to 4 *Strongly agree*, the lowest possible score for this scale was 18 (18 x 1) and the maximum possible was 72 (18 x 4); the higher the score, the more the participant’s reported cognitions aligned with ICLT. Results for this scale (Table 5.20) show the range of scores extending from one person scoring 40 to one person scoring the maximum possible, 72. The largest number of participants (*n* = 15, 19.7%) scored between 65 and 68 on the ICLT Cognitions scale.

Table 5.20

*Scores from ICLT Cognitions Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Scores were grouped into bands of four for presentation, except the lower and upper bands, which reflect the limit of the range of scores.

5.5.5 The relationship between ICLT Cognitions scale and variables of interest

Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine whether there were relationships between the ICLT Cognitions scale and a range of variables: awareness of ICLT, language taught, reading professional material, distribution of teaching time, age, gender, years teaching, ethnicity, membership of professional association, affiliation with cultures, keeping in touch with the subject culture, and familiarity with overt and covert aspects of the subject culture. A number of variables were found to have significant relationships with the ICLT Cognitions scale, which were all in the positive direction. These are presented in Table 5.21, including the $r^2$ statistic for calculation of the percentage of variance accounted for by what would be considered the independent variable.

Table 5.21

**Significant Correlations Between Scores on ICLT Cognitions Scale and Variables of Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable correlated with ICLT Cognition Scale</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of ICLT</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language taught</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of professional association</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with covert culture</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * denotes correlation significant at $p < .05$, ** denotes correlation significant at $p < .01$. 
Of note, is the strong correlation between scores on the ICLT Cognitions scale and membership of professional language teacher associations. Professional membership accounted for 21% of the variance in the scores on the ICLT Cognitions scale, more than twice the size of the next strongest correlation. Also of interest is the significant relationship between ICLT cognitions and familiarity with covert culture, but not with familiarity with overt culture.

Consideration was given to whether a scale needed to be created for the non-ICLT cognitions. The overall research concern of this project relates to the extent to which participants’ cognitions were associated with ICLT, and the remaining cognitions are relevant only because they did not reflect ICLT. That is, there is no particular value to be gained in examining whether the non-ICLT cognitions are related to each other, and so those correlations are not included here.

5.6 Reported Culture Teaching Practices

This section turns to considering the data associated with teachers’ reported practices with regard to teaching culture in the language class, that is, what they actually do as opposed to what they think or believe about culture in the classroom. As such, this section relates to the second hypothesis: Teachers’ reported language and culture teaching practices do not reflect an ICLT approach. The fact that these are their reported practices is emphasised, as these teachers were not observed. Firstly, descriptive statistics for the pertinent items are presented. Then the development and testing of the ICLT Practices scale is discussed before the associated responses are compared to a range of variables using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients, t-tests, and Chi-square analyses, as appropriate.

5.6.1 Distribution of teaching time across culture and language

Taken directly from Sercu et al. (2005), Item B5 (see questionnaire in Appendix B) asked participants how their teaching time was distributed over teaching language and teaching culture. A range of divisions as a ratio of language:culture was offered, as listed in Table 5.22 along with the frequency of responses for each option. It should be remembered that an ICLT approach promotes full integration, effectively a 50:50 response.
Table 5.22

*Distribution of Teaching Time as a Proportion of Language to Culture*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of teaching time as a ratio</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 language-0 culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 language-20 culture</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 language-40 culture</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% integration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 language-60 culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 language-80 culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 language-100 culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over a quarter of the participants (n = 20, 26.3%) reported fully integrating language and culture, reflecting an ICLT approach. Three participants said they taught more culture than they did language (two teachers of te reo, one of French). The remaining participants reported teaching language for the greatest proportion of the time.

Participants who reported teaching language for more than 50% of the time (n = 53) were asked to indicate their reasons for prioritising language over culture (Item B6, reflecting Byram and Risager (1999) and Sercu et al. (2005)). A selection of statements was offered and participants asked to score the extent to which each was a reason for their emphasis on language, using a scale of 1 *Not at all* to 4 *A great deal*. There was also an option of *Other, please specify*. Table 5.23 shows the responses given.
Table 5.23

Reasons for Teaching More Language than Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am constrained by a curriculum that is more linguistically oriented</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of information to support me in teaching culture</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of time to teach more culture</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have access to enough activities suitable for teaching culture</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer more knowledge of the target culture in order to teach it</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer more knowledge of how to teach culture</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because culture is not assessed, it need not be taught</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $n = 53$ participants.*

The most cited reason for teaching more language than culture was lack of time, with 79.6% agreeing moderately ($n = 16$) or strongly ($n = 23$), and a further 10.2% ($n = 5$) saying time had a minor influence on their practise. Of particular interest, given the second phase of this project, were the participants’ perceptions of the existence of support and resources for culture teaching.

Of those participants who taught more language than culture (that is, an approach seemingly not consistent with ICLT), nearly half (48.8%) reported that this division was due, to some extent, to their perceived shortfall in knowledge of how to teach culture. Just over a third (36.7%) considered there to be, to some extent, a lack of information to support them in culture teaching. Over half (59.6%) considered, to some extent, that there are insufficient resources to support the teaching of culture.

The reasons listed in this item did not specifically accommodate the notion that it was the participant’s intention to favour language. It did, however, include the option for participants to provide their own reasons. Seven individuals (9.2%) did so, many of whom gave reasons that reflected the offered response options but by selecting the option
of “other” they could provide comments. Three (3.9%) referred to time and curricular constraints: “The reality in high school is teaching ESOL to improve English skills → NCEA success” (372-3/32); “Constrained by time and ability of students to pick up the language” (296-2/61); and “NO TIME! Just not enough - my students have very little French in Yrs 9 & 10 so I have to play catch-up. NCEA assessment takes up far too much time” (358-2/22). One participant expressed a desire for more knowledge of how to teach some cultural areas (312-5/15) and another commented, “You can not teach language without teaching their culture” (333-4/25). Two responses (2.6%) suggested satisfaction with the level of culture taught: “I believe this is a good balance” (310-2/14) and “Culture is more easily assimilated & therefore does not require the same degree of repetition and practice” (296-1/62).

5.6.2 Practice statements about teaching culture in language education

Item B3 (see questionnaire, Appendix B) provided a range of statements about practices (20 in all) and participants rated their level of agreement as to how much the statement reflected their practices. It is again emphasised that these are reported practices. Some of these items repeat elements of Sercu et al.’s (2005) questionnaire and the remainder were original but developed from the content of Larzén-Östermark (2008), Conway et al. (2010), Ryan (1998), Dellit (2005), Luk (2012), and Moloney (2010), and Newton (2007), among others. Again, the response scale was from 1 Do not agree at all to 4 Strongly agree, and again the statements aligned with either ICLT practices or traditional culture teaching approaches.

Results for each item are shown in Table 5.24, in the order that they appeared in the questionnaire, labelled here for ease of reference P1, P2, etc. to distinguish them as practice statements. Statements marked + are aligned with ICLT principles. For all statements, n = 76, with, at most, one missing response for any given statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P1) When I have limited teaching time, culture teaching has to give way to language teaching</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P2) I feel restricted from implementing my own cultural ideas/ideals</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P3) +I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P4) +I consider the cultural knowledge strand of the New Zealand curriculum when I plan my lessons</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P5) +I am aware of my own culture when I am teaching</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P6) +I provide opportunities for students to make links between culture and language</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P7) +My school requires that I implement intercultural communicative language teaching methods</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P8) +I purposefully plan to talk about my own experiences of the culture that I teach</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P9) +If using texts for linguistic skills (reading, speaking etc) I also critically discuss the text’s meaning with students</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P10) +I provide opportunities for students to make connections with their own cultural backgrounds and experiences</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P11) +I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture(s) through the eyes of others</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P12) I teach culture as it crops up</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P13) +I critically analyse my own culture in class activities</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P14) +I assign projects based on culture</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P15) +I aim to teach the ability to mediate between cultures</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P16) I teach culture as a distinct subject area</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P17) +I provide opportunities for students to interact with native speakers of the language</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Responses for individual statements are noted next and comparisons are made with associated cognition results. The scale for ICLT practices is then presented.

Regarding the separation of language and culture, responses to the statement (P1) *When I have limited teaching time, culture teaching has to give way to language teaching* indicated a mix of practices. Nearly 45% of participants moderately \( (n = 23, \ 30.3\%) \) or strongly \( (n = 11, \ 14.5\%) \) agreed that they sacrificed culture for language at times of pressure. A further 31 individuals \( (40.8\%) \) expressed agreement to a minor degree. This practice statement was directly aligned with cognition statement (C20) *If the time pressure is great, the cultural dimension ought to give way to the linguistic.* The same number of participants moderately agreed that with the cognition statement that culture ought to be sacrificed with time pressure \( (n = 23, \ 30.3\%) \) but fewer people strongly agreed with the cognition statement \( (n = 4, \ 5.3\%) \). From another perspective, 18.4% \( (n = 14) \) did not at all think that culture ought to be sacrificed, a figure higher than the number who reported that they did not at all do so in practice \( (n = 11, \ 14.5\%) \). In other words, although many of the participants reported that they did not think or believe culture should give way to language teaching, the results suggest that some of them did so in practice. Having said that, this relationship between (P1) and (C20) was further examined using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient and found to be positive and significant \( (r = .50, \ p < .01, \ r^2 = .25) \).

Four practice statements were associated with the relevance of reflecting on one’s own culture. Two were associated with reflection by the teacher: (P13) *I critically analyse my own culture in class activities* and (P5) *I am aware of my own culture when I am teaching.* With respect to the first of the pair, less than one-quarter \( (n = 17, \ 22.4\%) \) strongly agreed that they critically analysed their own culture when teaching and, at the other extreme, seven \( (9.2\%) \) reported not doing so. For the second, (P5), the majority \( (n = 46, \ 60.5\%) \) strongly agreed that they were aware of their own culture when teaching, and 9% either did not agree at all \( (n = 2, \ 2.6\%) \) or only to a minor extent \( (n = 5, \ 6.6\%) \).
The relationship between responses to these two teacher-reflection practice statements was significant and positive \( (r = .50, p < .01, r^2 = .25) \).

The other two reflection-oriented practice statements related to teaching students the skill of reflection. Just over one-third of participants \( (n = 28, 36.8\%) \) strongly agreed with statement (P11) *I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture(s) through the eyes of others*; another third moderately agreed \( (n = 26, 34.2\%) \). It will be recalled that more than half of the participants \( (n = 42, 55.3\%) \) strongly agreed with the allied cognition statement (C12) *Language education includes development of reflective understanding of one’s own culture*. Although 55.3\% \( (n = 42) \) of participants reported that they strongly believed in the value of reflection for students, a smaller proportion \( (n = 28, 36.8\%) \) strongly agreed that they provided opportunities to do this in practice. However, the relationship between this associated pair of cognition statement and practice statement was positive and significant \( (r = .37, p < .01, r^2 = .14) \).

Responses to (P11) were also considered with respect to two other related cognition statements. There was a significant positive correlation \( (r = .42, p < .01, r^2 = .18) \) with (C24) *It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their own cultures while learning about a new culture*, with which 58 individuals (76.3\%) strongly or moderately agreed. There was also significant correlation between (P11) and (C23) *Language teaching ought to contribute to students’ understanding of their own identities* (strong or moderate agreement, \( n = 66, 86.8\%) \ (r = .29, p < .05, r^2 = .08)\).

The second of the student-centred reflection statements, (P10) *I provide opportunities to make connections with their own cultural backgrounds and experiences*, was agreed with strongly or moderately by 63 participants (83\%). The relationship between this statement and the associated cognition statement (C7) *Students’ own cultures should be incorporated* (supported strongly or moderately by 64 participants, 84.2\%) was significant and positive \( (r = .49, p < .01, r^2 = .24) \).

Two practices that demonstrate core principles of the ICLT approach were included and are worthy of note: (P15) *I aim to teach the ability to mediate between cultures*, and (P18) *I teach the ability to explore culture to find out more*. The first pertains to Byram’s (1997) notion of an intercultural speaker, an individual who can successfully mediate between cultures. Responses varied widely \( (M = 2.32, SD = .93) \) with just over one-third
(n = 30, 39.5%) reporting moderate or strong agreement that their practices facilitated mediation, but nearly 20% (n = 15) not agreeing at all. The second statement, (P18) *I teach the ability to explore culture to find out more* promoted exploration of cultures and was associated with the goal of Atkinson (1999, 2013), Holliday (2011), and others, of avoiding essentialising individuals to their cultures. Again, responses were varied, with 43.4% not agreeing at all (n = 7, 9.2%) or agreeing to a minor extent (n = 26, 34.2%), and over half agreeing moderately (n = 22, 28.9%) or strongly (n = 21, 27.6%).

The two statements with the highest levels of agreement were (P3) *I am motivated to teach culture* (only one person did not agree at all) and (P19) *I teach culture to support curriculum topics, e.g., a unit on food allows discussion on food and eating habits* (two people did not agree at all). Participants reported the lowest levels of agreement with the two statements (P2) *I feel restricted from implementing my cultural ideas/ideals* (although four agreed strongly) and (P16) *I teach culture as a distinct subject* (one agreed strongly). With regard to the latter, (P16), it is worthwhile considering correlations with related cognition statements. A significant positive relationship was found between (P16) and (C6) *Culture is a fifth skill, to be introduced once reading, writing, speaking and listening are acquired* (r = .27, p < .05, r^2 = .07). However, the relationship between (P16) and the cognition statement (C11) *It is not possible to teach language and culture in an integrated way; the two have to be separated* was not significant (r = .18, p = .13, r^2 = .03).

All practice items were analysed using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, to examine their inter-relationships (Table M2 in Appendix M). Many significant positive relationships at p < .01 were found between pairs of practice items. The five strongest relationships were:

(P11) *I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture(s) through the eyes of others* correlated significantly with (P10) *I provide opportunities for students to make connections with their own cultural backgrounds and experiences* (r = .66, p < .01, r^2 = .44) and also with (P13) *I critically analyse my own culture in class activities* (r = .59, p < .01, r^2 = .35). (P10) and (P13) were also significantly correlated (r = .57, p < .01, r^2 = .32).
(P14) I assign projects based on culture and (P18) I teach the ability to explore culture to find out more were significantly correlated ($r = .55, p < .01, r^2 = .30$), as were (P13) I critically analyse my own culture in class activities and (P5) I am aware of my own culture when teaching ($r = .50, p < .01, r^2 = .25$).

### 5.6.3 The ICLT Practices Scale

The practices that reflected ICLT values were further examined through the development of the ICLT Practices scale. The scale was developed by summing the results across the 14 items of ICLT practices (as denoted by + in Table 5.24). Participants responded using a scale of 1 *Do not agree at all* to 4 *Strongly agree*, meaning the lowest possible score was 14 (14 x 1) and the maximum possible was 56 (14 x 4). Therefore, the higher the score, the more that participant’s reported practices aligned with ICLT. Results for this scale (Table 5.25) show the range extending from one person scoring 22 to two people (2.6%) scoring the possible maximum of 56.

**Table 5.25**

*Scores from ICLT Practices Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scores were grouped into bands of four for presentation; mean and standard deviations were calculated on the individual ungrouped data.

The two largest groups (each $n = 15, 19.7\%$) scored between 37 and 40 or between 41 and 44 on the ICLT Practices scale. Referring to the individual data, there were three
modes: 38, 44, and 49 (each \( n = 6 \)), two of which were higher than the mean of 42.07 \((SD = 7.31)\). The median was 43.

A principle components analysis was used to examine the factor structure of the scale. The item loadings, the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) (Figure 5.9), and internal consistency of the scale (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .86) suggested a one component solution, where an eigenvalue of 5.03 explained 35.89\% of the variance. The scale was deemed to be related to teachers’ practices.

![Scree plot](image)

*Figure 5.9. Scree plot for principal components analysis of individual items of ICLT Practices scale.*

The item loadings are presented in Table 5.26, which shows that all statements loaded on the component labelled as Practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P3) I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P4) I consider the cultural knowledge strand of the New Zealand curriculum when I plan my lessons</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
(P5) I am aware of my own culture when I am teaching.

(P6) I provide opportunities for students to make links between culture and language.

(P7) My school requires that I implement intercultural communicative language teaching methods.

(P8) I purposefully plan to talk about my own experiences of the culture I teach.

(P9) If using texts for linguistic skills (reading, speaking, etc.) I also critically discuss the text’s meaning with students.

(P10) I provide opportunities for students to make connections with their own cultural background and experiences.

(P11) I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture(s) through the eyes of others.

(P13) I critically analyse my own culture in class activities.

(P14) I assign projects based on culture.

(P15) I aim to teach the ability to mediate between cultures.

(P17) I provide opportunities for students to interact with native speakers of the language.

(P18) I teach the ability to explore culture to find out more.

Eigenvalue: 35.89
Percentage of variance: 5.03
Component: Practices
5.6.4 The relationship between ICLT Practices scale and variables of interest

Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine whether there were relationships between the ICLT Practices scale and the following variables of interest: awareness of ICLT, language taught, reading professional material, distribution of teaching time, age, gender, years teaching, ethnicity, membership of professional association, affiliation with cultures, keeping in touch with the subject culture, familiarity with overt and covert aspects of the subject culture, and the ICLT Cognitions scale. A number of variables were found to have significant positive relationships with the ICLT Practices scale. These are presented in Table 5.27, including the $r^2$ statistic for calculation of the percentage of variance accounted for by the relationship between the ICLT Practices scale and the respective variables.

Table 5.27
**Significant Correlations Between Scores on ICLT Practices Scale and Variables of Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable correlated with ICLT Practices Scale</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of ICLT</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity of reading professional literature</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with subject’s textbook culture</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with the subject’s everyday culture</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLT cognitions scale</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of teaching time language:culture</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language taught</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of professional associations</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of interest are the two strongly significant relationships between scores on the ICLT Practices scale and scores on the ICLT Cognitions scale (accounting for 31% of the variance) and between ICLT Practices scores and familiarity with the covert culture of the subject language (accounting for 25% of the variance). In this case, familiarity with both overt culture and covert had an impact on ICLT Practices scores, and both membership of professional associations and regularity of reading professional material had an influence.
on practices. Note that the relationship between the ICLT Practices score and distribution of teaching time across language and culture was negative.

Once again, a Non-ICLT Practices scale was not created because the area of interest in this thesis relates to whether practices were associated with ICLT; the remaining practices are simply relevant because they did not reflect ICLT. Any relationship between them is not relevant to the general research concern.

5.6.5 Rating and practice of cultural aspects
The cultural aspects used earlier in Item A4 to determine participants’ familiarity with overt and covert culture were presented again as Item B4, this time with regard to their importance and presence in practice. Combining the approaches of Byram and Risager (1999) and Sercu et al. (2005), participants were asked to (1) rate each aspect in terms of its importance in the language lesson on a scale of 1 Not at all important to 4 Very important, and (2) tick the aspect if they currently included it in their practice. Some participants did not complete both parts of this item (as discussed below), so the results for each part are presented separately. Results from the rating of importance of the cultural aspects are discussed first (and presented in Table 5.28).

Table 5.28

Rating of Importance of Aspects of the Subject Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of culture</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and social groups, ethnic relations</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism towards this culture</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life and routines</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth culture</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and education</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political system</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
For every item there was at least one missing response, but never more than four missing, which was the case for *The country’s relationship with New Zealand*, perhaps because it posed difficulties for teachers of EAL or te reo Māori. These results show that the three cultural aspects considered most important in the language class, in order from the highest rated, are: daily life and routines, festivities (holidays, customs, traditions), and school and education. The aspects rated as least important in the language class, in order with least important listed last, were equally gender roles and relationships and working life and unemployment, racism towards this culture, and least, political system.

As alluded to in the Methodology (section 4.2.11 chapter 4, data screening and cleaning), the second part of the item, the reported practice of the cultural aspect, resulted in some significant limitations to the data because there were between 19 and 20 missing responses (25% of participants) for every aspect. It is likely that this occurred because of the two-part format required for the response (see Appendix B). This style of response did not appear anywhere else in the document, although instructions were specified and performed well in pilot testing. The first part of the response, the rating score, was of a style similar to the preceding items and was answered by most participants. Perhaps in their haste to complete the questionnaire the instructions for the item were not read properly, or a habit had been formed by the response format of the previous items. Results for the second part—classroom practice of the cultural aspects—are discussed here (and presented in Table 5.29), but with the caveat that the sample size is reduced to 57 participants.
Table 5.29  
*Classroom Practice of Aspects of the Subject Cultures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of culture practised in the classroom</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and social groups, ethnic relations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism towards this culture</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life and routines</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth culture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political system</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and living conditions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivities, holidays, customs, traditions</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and travel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles and relationships</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working life and unemployment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious traditions</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes associated with the culture</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country’s relationship with New Zealand</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n is the number of participants who answered in the affirmative with respect to the incorporation of the aspect in their lessons. Percentages relate to the reduced sample size of n = 57.

The three aspects rated as most important in Table 5.29 are the three that were most commonly practised in the classroom, with the two highest ranked transposed: *festivities* (most practised), *daily life and routines*, and *school and education*. The three least practised aspects mirror the aspects rated of least importance: *ethnic and social groups*, *ethnic relations* and *gender roles and relationship* equally placed, then *racism towards this culture*, and lastly, *political systems*. 
Consideration was given to whether there were any significant relationships between the variables of familiarity with the aspects of culture (Item A4), the rating of importance of the aspects, and practice of them in the classroom. The correlations are presented in Table 5.30.

Table 5.30

*Correlations Between Familiarity, Importance, and Practice of Cultural Aspects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural aspect</th>
<th>Familiarity with Importance</th>
<th>Familiarity with Practice</th>
<th>Importance with Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 76$</td>
<td>$n = 76$</td>
<td>$n = 57$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$ $r^2$</td>
<td>$r$ $r^2$</td>
<td>$r$ $r^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>.18 .03</td>
<td>-.02 &lt;.001</td>
<td>.32* .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>.17 .03</td>
<td>-.02 &lt;.001</td>
<td>.24 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and social groups,</td>
<td>.15 .02</td>
<td>.03 &lt;.001</td>
<td>.42** .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism towards the culture</td>
<td>.45** .20</td>
<td>.11 .01</td>
<td>.31* .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life and routines</td>
<td>.10 .01</td>
<td>.17 .03</td>
<td>.42** .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth culture</td>
<td>.18 .03</td>
<td>.32* .10</td>
<td>.55** .30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and education</td>
<td>.04 .002</td>
<td>.03 &lt;.001</td>
<td>.65** .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political system</td>
<td>.37** .14</td>
<td>.30* .09</td>
<td>.46** .21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>.24 .06</td>
<td>.03 &lt;.001</td>
<td>.48** .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and living conditions</td>
<td>.19 .04</td>
<td>.14 .02</td>
<td>.47** .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivities</td>
<td>.29* .08</td>
<td>.28* .08</td>
<td>.15 .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and travel</td>
<td>.37** .14</td>
<td>.30* .09</td>
<td>.44** .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles and</td>
<td>.31** .10</td>
<td>.33** .11</td>
<td>.40** .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working life and</td>
<td>.17 .03</td>
<td>.25 .06</td>
<td>.51** .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious traditions</td>
<td>.27* .07</td>
<td>.24 .06</td>
<td>.58** .34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Stereotypes associated with this culture  .11  .01  .12  .01  .47**  .22
The country’s relationship with New Zealand  .17  .03  .28*  .08  .33*  .11
Environmental issues  .17  .03  .10  .01  .50**  .25

Note. * denotes correlation significant at \( p < .05 \), ** denotes correlation significant at \( p < .01 \).

For the majority of cultural aspects, there was no significant relationship between the participants’ familiarity with it and either the importance they placed on it, or their practise of it in the classroom. Some of the exceptions are worth noting. Level of familiarity yielded a significant positive relationship with both the rating of educational importance and the practice in the classroom of the subject culture’s tourism and travel, gender roles and relationships, political system, and festivities. It is interesting to see that for racism towards the culture and the culture’s religious traditions, there was a positive relationship between familiarity with the aspect and its importance, but no such relationship between familiarity and practice.

The situation differed with respect to the relationship between the rating of importance of the cultural aspect and the extent to which it was practised. There were significant relationships between importance and practice for 16 of the 18 cultural aspects, of which 13 were significant at \( p < .01 \).

5.7 Knowledge and Practice of ICLT

This section primarily addresses the third hypothesis: Teachers do not demonstrate awareness of ICLT as an approach to teaching language and culture. It takes as its starting point the data gathered from the item directly concerning the participants’ familiarity with ICLT. Then, awareness of ICLT is used as a dependent variable for a series of analyses with respect to a range of variables, using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients, independent samples \( t \)-tests, and Chi-square analyses.

5.7.1 Awareness of ICLT

Item C1 (see questionnaire in Appendix B) lies at the heart of this phase of the study. Reflecting a similar item in Jedynak’s (2011) survey, it asked: Have you heard of
intercultural language teaching as a teaching approach? and provided the following response options:

No, I have not heard of it (in which case participants skipped to Item C5)  
Yes, I have heard of it, but I’m not familiar with what the main principles are  
Yes, I have heard of it, I understand its main principles, but I do not practice it  
Yes, I have heard of it, I understand its main principles, and I practice it.

Results for this item are presented in Table 5.31. Two participants did not answer the item; the responses reflect an $n = 74$.

Table 5.31  
Awareness of ICLT as a Teaching Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of awareness</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I’ve not heard of it</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I’ve heard of it, but I’m not familiar with what the main principles are</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I’ve heard of it, I understand its main principles, but I do not practice it</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I’ve heard of it, I understand its main principles, and I practice it</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under two-thirds of participants reported being unfamiliar with ICLT, either being aware of ICLT but not familiar with its principles ($n = 15, 20.3\%)$, or not having heard of ICLT at all ($n = 31, 41.9\%)$. Less than one-third of participants ($n = 23, 31.1\%)$ advised that they understood and practised ICLT. Again, it should be remembered that these are participants’ reports; they were not verified in any way.

A range of bivariate correlations were run to examine whether awareness of ICLT was associated with participants’ age, gender, ethnicity, teaching experience, qualifications, the language they taught, the extent to which they read professional literature or were members of professional associations, and the scales for familiarity with cultural aspects, keeping in touch with the culture, ICLT cognitions, ICLT practices and ICLT activities. Significant positive relationships were found between awareness of ICLT
and extent of reading professional literature \( (r = .33, p < .01, r^2 = .11) \), membership of professional associations \( (r = .37, p < .01, r^2 = .14) \), age \( (r = .33, p < .01, r^2 = .11) \), length of teaching experience \( (r = .34, p < .01, r^2 = .12) \), and the three ICLT-based scales of Cognitions \( (r = .31, p < .01, r^2 = .10) \), Practices \( (r = .42, p < .01, r^2 = .18) \), and Activities \( (r = .44, p < .01, r^2 = .19) \). No other relationships of significance were found. It is interesting to note that of the two participants who reported reading professional material daily, one had not heard of ICLT (an EAL teacher); the other reported practising it (a teacher of French).

5.7.2 ICLT training

The 43 participants who had heard of ICLT were asked whether they had participated in any training in it, and if so, whether that training was part of their original teacher training, personal study, or in-service professional development (selection of multiple answers was permitted) (Item C2, based on Byram and Risager (1999) and also Jedynak (2011)). The majority had participated in ICLT training of some kind \( (n = 27, 62.8\%) \), most commonly during in-service professional development courses or workshops \( (n = 22, 51.1\% \text{ of those familiar with ICLT}) \). Nine individuals \( (21\%) \) had chosen to study ICLT in their own time.

Six participants reported that they had received ICLT training as part of their original teacher training (being 14% of the participants aware of ICLT, and 8% of all participants). Four of those participants had been teaching for longer than 15 years (of whom three had taught for longer than 20 years), that is, starting out before the approach had appeared in the NZ curriculum. Three of those teachers were New Zealanders and one was Mexican. It is possible that they gained a teaching qualification part way through their teaching career. In fact, this is likely for the participant from Mexico, who had a diploma in language teaching from Mexico and a diploma in teaching from New Zealand. However, the potential for bias exists here.

5.7.3 Cognitions about New Zealand’s promotion of ICLT

Item C3, developed as part of this study, asked those participants who had heard of ICLT whether they thought ICLT was encouraged in New Zealand. Applicable to 43 participants, but answered by 37, the majority \( (n = 29, 78.4\%) \) replied that ICLT was encouraged in New Zealand education. So, although 29 individuals (i.e., around 40% of
all participants) believed it was encouraged, a similar proportion reported that they had not heard of it, and of the 43 participants who had heard of it, 18.6% \((n = 8)\) did not think it was encouraged.

The item included an open option where participants could expand on their answer; 16 individuals did so. Comments from five participants’ reflected an awareness of the term but uncertainty over how to implement the approach: “Even though it is part of the curriculum, courses have not been easily accessible[sic]/restrictive, anything offered is a ‘token gesture’” (359-1/6); “As a new teacher I felt experienced teachers critiqued this topic when discussed but I wasn’t convinced anyone completely understood it – myself included” (360-2/11); “It is everywhere, but is not used” (307-2/39); “Encouraged and I am aware of it but not sure what it is in reality, I couldn’t explain or specifically demonstrate it, I may be doing it without specifically referencing the title” (327-3/47); and, “I believe it’s being talked about, but I don’t know anything more concrete about it” (358-2/22). Another five participants stated they were uncertain about whether ICLT was promoted in New Zealand, or did not know enough to comment.

Six comments showed greater depth of understanding of the place of ICLT in language education in New Zealand: “The government funds PD for this” (333-1/21); “the New Zealand curriculum and all related papers subsequently produced point out the importance of intercultural teaching and this is evident at all Language seminars, workshops and PD training” (319-4/7); and “Part of ELL principles and curriculum” (326-6/13); “I participated in Teacher Professional Development Languages (TPDL) 2 years ago” (346-4/52); “Language Knowledge’ and ‘Curriculum [sic] Knowledge’ are stated in the NZ Curriculum’s ‘Learning Languages’ section as equally important in developing the key competencies” (320-2/34); and, “Through my AFS Scholarship and previous conferences Ellis principles & Newton et al” (384-0/76).

### 5.7.4 Access to ICLT resources

Item C4, original in this study, asked the participants who had indicated awareness of ICLT \((n = 43)\) about their access to and use of resources for improving their knowledge of the approach and for ICLT activities for classroom use. Table 5.32 lists the two options offered for each of teacher training and classroom activities, along with the responses obtained.
### Table 5.32

**Frequency of Use of Resources for ICLT Training and Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education published or endorsed information for teacher</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training about principles of ICLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry published or endorsed activity ideas and materials</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resources developed for teacher training about ICLT (e.g.,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>created by colleagues, from non-MoE websites, professional literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resources for activity ideas and materials (e.g., created by</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues, from non-MoE websites, professional literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentage relates to the 43 eligible participants. Multiple answers were permitted. There were two missing responses.

Materials published or endorsed by the Ministry were marginally favoured for sourcing information to develop knowledge of ICLT as an approach, being used by more than half of eligible participants. With respect to sourcing ICLT activity ideas and materials, the vast majority ($n = 38, 88.4\%$) used resources developed by themselves or colleagues, or from general websites, twice as many as used Ministry-related sources for classroom activities.

### 5.7.5 Culture-teaching resources

Item C5, applicable to all participants regardless of awareness of ICLT, sought information about the nature of resources used to teach culture. It was based on similar items in Luk (2012) and Larzén-Östermark (2008). Participants could choose all that applied from six listed options and *Other, please specify.* Responses are presented in Table 5.33.
Table 5.33

Resources Used for Teaching Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coursebooks and textbooks</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-owned cultural materials such as books, artefacts, music, film</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits from native speakers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items you bring from home (associated with your own culture, the target culture, and/or New Zealand cultures)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items the students bring from home (associated with their own culture or the target culture)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class trips</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There were two missing responses.

Whereas the most commonly used resource was items brought from the teacher’s home ($n = 58, 78.4\%$), the least common was items brought to the class by students, although half ($n = 38, 51.4\%$) reported that this was done in their classrooms. School-owned cultural materials (e.g., films, books, artefacts) and coursebooks/textbooks were also popular, being used by around three-quarters of participants. Nearly two-thirds of participants reported taking class trips ranging from local museums, Japanese restaurants, and Pétanque clubs, to visits to Japan, New Caledonia, France, and Chile. Twenty individuals used the Other option to supply unique responses, including the internet (YouTube, interactive games, emails to native speakers), newspapers and magazines, games, language assistants, and one participant specified, “show interviews/videos that I filmed when I was in France” (384/76).

5.7.6 Awareness of ICLT and resources used to teach culture

As part of addressing the third hypothesis—teachers do not demonstrate awareness of ICLT as an approach to teaching language and culture—the awareness of ICLT and use of culture teaching resources was examined. This analysis required the creation of new variables. Firstly, a variable was created using participants’ awareness of ICLT to form
two groups: Not Aware ICLT comprised participants who had not heard of ICLT and those who had heard of it but not familiar with its principles ($n = 46$); and Aware ICLT comprised those who reported they were familiar with it but did not practise it and those who reported practising it ($n = 28$). Secondly, a scale was created from responses to the seven listed teaching resources of Item C5 (six named resources plus Other), where use of a resource generated a score of 1, meaning participants could have a maximum possible score of 7 and a minimum possible of 0 (no resources used). The distribution of responses for the resources scale (Table 5.34) shows the largest group scored 6 on the scale ($n = 23$, 31.1%).

Table 5.34

Distribution of Scores on the Teaching Resources Used Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages relate to the 74 responses to item C5.

An independent samples $t$-test was used to explore differences between awareness of ICLT (independent variable) and the use of teaching resources (dependent variable). The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 5.35. A significant difference was found with those aware of ICLT making greater use of culture teaching resources ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.50$) compared to those not aware of ICLT ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.09$), where $t = 2.93$, $p < .01$. 
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Table 5.35

Mean Scores of Culture Teaching Resources Used and Awareness of ICLT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICLT Awareness</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching resources use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware (n = 46)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware (n = 28)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.7 Activities grounded in ICLT

This subsection is relevant to two hypotheses. It concerns the extent to which teachers practiced activities that were grounded in ICLT. For that reason, the results are applicable to the participants’ reported culture teaching practices (Hypothesis 2), and also to their awareness of ICLT as a teaching approach (Hypothesis 3).

A list of 17 culture teaching activities that embody ICLT (although not described as such) formed part of Item C6. The majority of these activities were obtained from Sercu et al.’s (2005) questionnaire. Participants were asked to rate the frequency with which they used each activity in class, ranging from 1 I never use this activity to 4 I frequently use this activity. Results are shown in Table 5.36 below, numbered for ease of reference, A1, A2, etc. For all activities n = 74.

Table 5.36

Rate of Practice of ICLT Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A1) I ask my students to think about the image that media promotes of the culture</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A2) I tell my students what I have heard or read about the culture</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A3) I tell my students why I find something fascinating or strange about the culture</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A4) I ask my students to independently explore an aspect of the culture</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>I use videos, DVDs, audio-recordings, and/or the Internet to illustrate</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspects of the culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>I ask my students to think about what it would be like to live in the</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>I talk to my students about my own experiences in the culture</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>I ask my students about their experiences in the culture</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>I invite a person of that cultural origin to my classroom</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>I ask my students to describe an aspect of their own culture using the</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>target language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>I bring objects originating from the culture to my classroom</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>I ask my students to role-play situations in which people from different</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cultures meet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>I decorate my classroom with illustrations of particular aspects of the</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>culture (e.g., posters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>I comment on the way in which the culture is represented in the language</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>materials that we use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>I ask my students to compare an aspect of their own culture with that</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspect in the new culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>I touch upon an aspect of the culture about which I feel negatively</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>I talk with my students about stereotypes of particular cultures,</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>countries, or individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, there is interest in providing detail for a selection of the activities listed. The activity with the lowest mean score was (A1) *I ask my students to think about the image that media promote of the culture*, suggesting the activity is used least often. A low mean score was also obtained for activities (A12) *I ask my students to role-play situations in which people from different cultures meet* (also the activity with the highest frequency of 1 Never use responses), and (A16) *I touch upon an aspect of the culture about which I feel negatively disposed*.

The activity with the highest mean score was (A5) *I use videos, DVDs, audio-recordings, and/or the Internet to illustrate aspects of the culture*, suggesting it was the
most commonly practised activity. High mean scores were also obtained for activities (A7) *I talk to my students about my own experiences in the culture* (the activity with the highest number of 4 *Frequently use* responses), and (A13) *I decorate my classroom with illustrations of particular aspects of the culture (e.g., posters)*.

5.7.8 The ICLT Activities scale

A total score was generated for each participant to reflect the extent to which ICLT activities were practised. With a list of 17 statements, each with the potential to be rated at most, 4 *Frequently use*, the maximum possible total scale score was 68 (17 x 4) and the lowest possible, 17 (17 x 1). The resulting ICLT Activities scale was assessed as having high internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha = .94. Given the level of internal consistency, it was deemed not necessary to conduct a principal components analysis for this scale. The distribution of scores (Table 5.37) shows the lowest score was 28 and the highest score was 67, each selected by one participant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28-31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scores were grouped into bands of four for presentation, except the lower and upper bands which reflect the limit of the range of scores. There were two missing responses.

The individuals with the two lowest scores, suggesting the lowest frequency of use of ICLT activities, were a non-native teacher of te reo Māori and a native teacher of EAL;
the two participants who rated the most frequent use of the ICLT activities listed were both non-native teachers of French. The mode was 51, slightly higher than the mean of 49.36 ($SD = 12.01$). A total of 50 individuals (65%) had scores below the mean.

5.7.9 The relationship between ICLT Activities scale and variables of interest

Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine whether there were relationships between the ICLT Activities scale and the following variables: awareness of ICLT, language taught, reading professional material, distribution of teaching time, age, gender, years teaching, ethnicity, membership of professional associations, affiliation with cultures, keeping in touch with the culture, familiarity with overt and covert culture, and the ICLT Cognitions and Practices scales. Significant positive relationships were found, as presented in Table 5.38, along with the respective $r^2$ statistics for calculation of the percentage of variance accounted for by the ICLT Activities scale and the variables of interest.

Table 5.38
Significant Correlations Between Scores on ICLT Activities Scale and Variables of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable correlated with ICLT Activities Scale</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of ICLT</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of professional association</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLT practices scale</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of teaching time language:culture</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLT cognition scale</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching experience</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * denotes correlation significant at $p < .05$; ** denotes correlation significant at $p < .01$.

Reported awareness with ICLT had the strongest relationship among the variables tested, accounting for 19% of the variance in scores on the ICLT Activities scale. Once again, it is membership of professional organisation and not reading professional material that had an influence on this scale. It is noted that the relationship with distribution of teaching time over language culture was a negative one.
5.7.10 Relationship between awareness of ICLT and practice of ICLT activities

The relationship noted above between awareness of ICLT and practice of ICLT activities was examined further, using an independent samples \( t \)-test to examine whether having a reported awareness of ICLT had any bearing on the extent to which participants practised the range of ICLT activities mentioned. The ICLT Activities scale was used as the dependent variable, and awareness of ICLT as the independent variable, in an independent samples \( t \)-test. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 5.39.

Table 5.39
Mean Scores of ICLT Activities Used Scale and Awareness of ICLT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICLT Awareness</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICLT Activities Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware (( n = 46 ))</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware (( n = 28 ))</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( t \)-test results showed a significant difference in the scores on the ICLT Activities scale between those who reported being aware of ICLT (\( M = 55.21, SD = 7.47 \)) and those who reported not being aware of ICLT (\( M = 47.93, SD = 8.68 \)), where \( t (72) = 3.68, p < .01 \). The effect size using Cohen’s \( d \) (Hedges & Olkin, 1985) was 0.90, which is considered a large effect.

5.7.11 Relationships between the three ICLT scales

Consideration was given to whether there was any correlation between the ICLT Cognitions scale, the ICLT Practices scale, and the ICLT Activities used scale. The results of the Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient analysis indicated significant positive relationships between the scales, as shown in Table 5.40.
Table 5.40

*Significant Correlations Between Scores on Three ICLT Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlated variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICLT cognitions and ICLT practices</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLT cognitions and ICLT activities</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLT practices and ICLT activities</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * denotes correlation significant at $p < .05$; ** denotes correlation significant at $p < .01$.

All three scales were found to be significantly correlated in a positive direction, indicating that an individual who had high scores on one of the scales was likely to have scored highly on all of the scales.

**5.7.12 Avoiding cultural topics**

Based on a similar item posed by Luk (2012) and also reflecting Jedynak (2011) and Oranje (2012), participants were asked whether there were any cultural topics that they avoided in class (Item C7). Most said there were not ($n = 61$, 83.6%); three did not answer the item. This item included the opportunity to specify topics consciously avoided. Many mentioned not teaching a topic because they felt they had insufficient knowledge of it; these included politics, history, fashion—“too outmoded myself!” (382-2/35)—and youth culture. The latter is interesting, given that youth culture was listed by the majority as an important cultural aspect. Other topics were avoided for different reasons, for example, “Attitudes to nudity and sexuality - much more liberal than here and a bit ‘scary’ for, especially, the female students” (351-2/1, a teacher of German); “Burakumin – Japan’s ‘underclass’ caste. Difficult to explain how it came about and is still around today” (351-3/3); and, “Feminism in France – not interested, Immigration – quite difficult; would do it if I had time, Fairy Tales – so not interested” (358-2/22). One native-speaking Japanese teacher reported steering clear of discussing Japan’s relationships with Korea and China because, “I don’t know enough background to discuss with students. I also don’t want kids to have biased information from Japanese point of view. It’s especially sensitive topic if there are kids from China and Korea (or have a background) in class” (321-3/30).
5.7.13 Awareness of ICLT and avoidance of cultural topics

To further explore the third hypothesis—teachers do not demonstrate awareness of ICLT as an approach to teaching language and culture—awareness of ICLT and avoidance of cultural topics were examined. The newly created dichotomous variable Awareness of ICLT was compared with the dichotomous Yes/No responses to Item C7 Are there any cultural topics you avoid, using a Chi-square analysis. The Chi-square statistic was not significant: $X^2 (1, N = 73) = .07, p = .80$. An examination of the crosstabulation showed that regardless of awareness of ICLT, a similar proportion reported not avoiding any cultural topic (84.4% of not aware of ICLT, 82.1% of aware of ICLT). Considered from another angle, the majority of those who did report avoiding cultural topics were not aware of ICLT (58.3%).

5.7.14 Testing the cultural dimension

Item C8, influenced by Sercu (2004b) and Luk (2012), asked participants whether they tested their students’ culture acquisition. Two-thirds (64.5%) reported that they did not. In a component unique to this questionnaire, those 49 individuals were asked to record their reasons for not testing culture acquisition by selecting all that applied from five options. They were also given the opportunity to write in their own reason. Results (for $n = 49$) are shown in Table 5.41; six eligible participants did not answer the item.

Table 5.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Not Assessing for Culture Acquisition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum does not require the testing of culture acquisition</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have enough expertise to assess culture acquisition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t teach enough culture to warrant testing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing is important for language acquisition but not important for culture acquisition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have time to assess culture acquisition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most commonly selected reason for not testing for culture acquisition was that it was not required by the curriculum; half selected this option. Interestingly, the reason with the lowest level of agreement was *I don’t have time to assess culture acquisition*; 20% of this group of participants said time was a reason for not testing cultural knowledge. It will be recalled that a majority of *all* participants (79.6%) agreed strongly or moderately that a lack of time was a reason for not teaching culture. A smaller proportion cited time restraints for not testing the cultural dimension. Reasons provided in the open-ended option revealed cognitions about the impact of assessment: “I don’t want to turn something quite positive and motivating into an assessment task” (351-2/1) or the nature of assessment: “I do not see it as something that can be tested in a meaningful way” (296-1/62), and “Cultura [sic] is very important but it’s understood in different ways and perspectives so I don’t think you need to test it” (340-3/64). Comments were also given about the impact of the national qualification system on learning: “Not enough time in NCEA courses” (351-3/3) and “NCEA does not reward it” (360-2/11). Some suggested that the intertwined nature of language and culture meant that culture knowledge was assessed through assessment of language knowledge: “Cultural acquisition informs and supports language acquisition. It does not need to be assessed” (312-1/12), “It is an integral part of language learning – and as such is part of any assessment” (357-3/49), and “The acquisition occurs in the language acquisition” (357-2/50).

5.8 Reflection

The analysis of the qualitative data of Phase 2 (chapters 7 and 8) generated findings about the reflective dimension of ICLT. This warranted a return to the Phase 1 quantitative data to determine whether further support could be found for the qualitative findings related to reflection. Those analyses are presented here.

5.8.1 The Reflection scale

It was considered worthwhile to generate a scale using those items that related to the reflective dimension of ICLT, in terms of both reflection by the teachers on their own culture, and teaching the students the skill of reflection on one’s own culture. To this end, the questionnaire was reviewed for all items that pertained to reflection. The result was a
Reflection scale of 13 items, comprising 5 cognition statements, 5 practice statements, and 3 ICLT activities.

The scale was assessed as having high internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha of .80, \( n = 76 \). Even though the high Cronbach’s alpha indicated good reliability of the scale overall, a principal components analysis was carried out on the Reflection scale to examine the structure of the scale. The scree plot (Figure 5.10) and the factor loadings (Table 5.42) suggested a two-component solution.

![Scree plot for principal components analysis of individual items of the Reflection scale.](image)

**Figure 5.10.** Scree plot for principal components analysis of individual items of the Reflection scale.

**Table 5.42**

*Component Structure of the Reflection Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C12) Language education includes development of reflective understanding of one’s own culture</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C23) Language teaching ought to contribute to students’ understanding of their own identities</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their own cultures while learning about a new culture.

To learn a new culture you need to consider how it is similar to, or different from, your own.

Comparing languages and cultures draws students’ attention to the influence of invisible culture in their lives.

I am aware of my own culture when I am teaching.

I purposefully plan to talk about my own experiences of the culture that I teach.

I provide opportunities for students to make connections with their own cultural backgrounds and experiences.

I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture(s) through the eyes of others.

I critically analyse my own culture in class activities.

I talk to my students about my own experiences in the culture.

I ask my students about their experiences in the culture.

(continued)
The majority of the items loaded on Component 1. The three items that loaded on the second component were the three ICLT activities items. Cognition item (C24) *It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their own cultures while learning about a new culture*, loaded on to both components. The loading on Component 2 was negative and lower than the loading on Component 1, with which the item was deemed more conceptually relevant. It was considered that Component 1 related to the cognitions and practices of the participants, and Component 2 related to Activities. Because all items ultimately related to practising or encouraging reflection, and given the high Cronbach’s alpha (0.8), all 13 items were retained in the Reflection scale. Those items are listed in Table 5.43, with associated means and standard deviations. All but two of the mean scores were above 3 (that is, moderately agree or sometimes use, as relevant), with the two exceptions being (P13) *I critically analyse my own culture in class activities* (*M* = 2.71, *SD* = .92), and (A10) *I ask my students about their experiences in the culture* (*M* = 2.54, *SD* = 1.09).

Table 5.43

*Responses to Items on Reflection Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection Related Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C12) Language education includes development of reflective understanding of one’s own culture</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
(C23) Language teaching ought to contribute to students’ understanding of their own identities 3.38 .71
(C24) It is important to deepen students’ knowledge about their own cultures while learning about a new culture 3.11 .93
(C27) To learn a new culture you need to consider how it is similar to, or different from, your own 3.07 .85
(C29) Comparing languages and cultures draws students’ attention to the influence of invisible culture in their lives 3.34 .74
(P5) I am aware of my own culture when I am teaching 3.49 .74
(P8) I purposefully plan to talk about my own experiences of the culture that I teach 3.11 .84
(P10) I provide opportunities for students to make connections with their own cultural backgrounds and experiences 3.28 .84
(P11) I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture(s) through the eyes of others 3.04 .89
(P13) I critically analyse my own culture in class activities 2.71 .92
(A7) I talk to my students about my own experiences in the culture 3.49 .95
(A8) I ask my students about their experiences in the culture 3.21 1.00
(A10) I ask my students to describe an aspect of their own culture in the target language 2.54 1.09

Note. Means reflect scales from 1 to 4 where, for (Cx) and (Px), 1 = Do not agree at all and 4 = Strongly Agree and, for (Ax), 1 = Never use and 4 = Frequently use.

5.8.2 The relationship between the Reflection scale and variables of interest
Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine whether there were relationships between the Reflection scale and the following variables of interest: awareness of ICLT, language taught, reading professional material, distribution of teaching time, age, gender, years teaching, ethnicity, membership of professional association, affiliation with cultures, keeping in touch with the subject culture, familiarity with overt and covert aspects of the subject culture, and the ICLT Cognitions, Practices,
and Activities scales. A number of significant positive relationships were found; these are listed in Table 5.44 along with the respective $r^2$ statistics.

Table 5.44

*Significant Correlations Between Scores on the Reflection Scale and Variables of Interest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable correlated with ICLT Reflection Scale</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICLT cognitions scale</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLT practices scale</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLT activities scale</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of ICLT</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with everyday culture</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading professional literature</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of professional association</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total affiliations with other cultures</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language taught</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * denotes correlation significant at $p < .05$; ** denotes correlation significant at $p < .01$.

Scores on the Reflection scale had strong positive relationships with the ICLT Cognitions scale (accounting for 53% of the variance), the ICLT Practices scale (62% of the variance), and the ICLT Activities scale (28% of the variance). An individual who scored highly on the Reflection scale would be predicted to score highly on the three ICLT scales, have high familiarity with covert culture (crucial for ICLT), and take advantage of extensive professional support. It is also interesting to note the link between the score on the Reflection scale and associations with other cultures.

The significant relationship between the Reflection scale and awareness of ICLT was examined further. To do this, the Reflection scale was re-coded as a dichotomous variable, by grouping responses as High Reflection or Low Reflection, with the division made at the median scale score of 41. The two scales were then compared using Chi-square, where $X^2 (1, N = 74) = 6.65$, $p < .01$. The results of the crosstabulation showed that 63% of those not aware of ICLT scored in the low half of the reflection scale. Put another way, of those scoring low on the Reflection scale, 76% were not aware of ICLT.
However, the high reflection scores were reasonably equally distributed regardless of reported awareness of ICLT. In other words, awareness of ICLT was not a prerequisite for high reflection scores, but if a low level of reflection was reported, it was more likely that the participant was not aware of ICLT.

This concludes the presentation of the results of Phase 1 of the study, the language teachers’ questionnaire. These results are discussed in the following chapter (chapter 6) with reference to the hypotheses and in relation to the philosophical theory of pragmatism and the relevant literature. They are considered again, unified with the Phase 2 findings, in the general Discussion (chapter 9).
CHAPTER 6 – DISCUSSION OF QUANTITATIVE HYPOTHESES

6.0 Overview

This chapter discusses the results from Phase 1 in relation to the three hypotheses. The results will be considered again when the two phases are synthesised in the Discussion (chapter 9) to address the overall research concern of New Zealand secondary school teachers’ awareness and practice of ICLT. Here, the results from the quantitative data are related to the philosophical theory of pragmatism and the relevant literature. These data were gathered from practising language teachers by questionnaire, and set out to examine the three hypotheses, each of which serves as a section heading, under which the results are considered in terms of their support of the hypothesis.

6.1 Hypothesis 1: Teachers’ cognitions about language and culture teaching do not reflect an ICLT approach.

This hypothesis was generated in response to research that revealed language teachers as having low levels of understanding of ICLT, apparent both in international studies (e.g., Ghanem, 2014 (U.S.); Jedynak, 2011 (Poland); Kohler, 2015 (Australia); Larzén-Östermark 2008 (Scandinavia); Luk, 2012 (Hong Kong); Sercu et al., 2005 (multinational); Young & Sachdev, 2011 (U.K.)) and in those involving New Zealand teachers (e.g., Harvey et al., 2010; East, 2012a; Newton et al., 2010; Roskvist et al., 2011). It was expected that results of the questionnaire completed by New Zealand teachers of languages would disclose cognitions that represented traditional (i.e., not ICLT) approaches to culture teaching. The following sections consider the influences on teachers’ cognitions about culture teaching generally and their thoughts, beliefs, and knowledge about teaching the cultures associated with their subject language.

6.1.1 Cultural familiarity

For pragmatists, experience is the environment for learning (Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000). In the context of language learning, experience with the target culture will support the development of cultural knowledge in and through transactions in the cultural environment and with its members (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Hjørland, 1997). Just under one-third of the participants taught their mother tongue. Those individuals may be at an advantage with respect to culture teaching, embodying the C2 (assuming they maintained contact with it (Kelly, 2012)) and therefore providing students with more experience of
of EAL or te reo Māori accounted for half of the mother-tongue teachers and being native to the dominant cultures could mean a risk of having little personal experience of intercultural contact, or even of language learning (Byram et al., 1991; Jedynak, 2011; Manjarrés, 2009). However, New Zealand is a “super-diverse” nation (Spoonley & Bedford, 2012, p. 11), meaning many New Zealand teachers will be exposed to a variety of cultures and languages, and may consequently expect a range of points of view. It is of interest, therefore, to consider how all teachers in the study, native to the L2 or not, experienced other cultures.

Teachers reported high levels of contact with the target culture specifically and different cultures generally. Research suggests that because of this, they should have a broad understanding of their subject culture and of the nature of culture (Czura, 2013), and be aware of and value cultural differences in intercultural interactions (Allen, 2004; Byram, 1997; Youngs & Youngs, 2001). This bodes well for cognitions aligned with an intercultural approach, but the means of contact will affect how valuable those experiences were in terms of pragmatism’s *sine qua non* of relevance and usefulness (Prawat, 2009).

All teachers reported making some attempt to keep in touch with the subject culture, most commonly via media generated in either the target language or in English, and contact with native speakers living in New Zealand. Most reported having native speakers visit the class but only half kept in touch with native speakers outside of New Zealand. For languages other than te reo and EAL, this represents a potentially reduced extent of genuine interaction with authentic culture and its members, sources more relevant and up to date than some forms of media (especially texts or unauthenticated websites) (Byram, et al., 1991; Sercu, 2000; Sercu et al., 2005). Visits to places that practice the L2 and C2 are of particular value because exposure to culture is “from the bottom up” (Atkinson & Sohn, 2013, p. 669), representing pragmatism’s emphasis on the value of experience (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000; Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006). Visitors will encounter a variety of lived practices and a range of perspectives as they interact in the C2 environment. The significant majority of
participants reported having visited the target culture, although for some the visits were rare or not recent. Infrequent travel to L2/C2 locations was a finding of the studies by Sercu et al. (2005) and Czura (2013). That being the case for teachers with shorter distances to travel and often comparatively inexpensive means of doing so, it is not surprising that international visits were few and far between for teachers from geographically isolated New Zealand.

The nature of contact with the target culture will also influence a teacher’s familiarity with cultural aspects, and consequently the extent to which those aspects are considered important in the language class (Czura, 2013). Mirroring teachers of all countries in Sercu et al.’s (2005) study and supporting a similar finding in Byram and Risager (1999), the New Zealand participants rated highest familiarity with the target culture’s daily life and routines, geography, school and education, and festivities. Those same aspects were rated as the most important in the classroom, again replicating the findings of the other studies. These are all overt cultural aspects and are susceptible to representing culture as facts (rather than processes), taught through content related to information and things (Liddicoat, 2005). Teachers’ reported use of coursebooks will have exposed them to overt culture and, given the history of language teaching approaches (see section 2.5.1, chapter 2), their own language learning experiences were not likely to have been conducted with an ICLT approach (if, indeed, culture was taught at all). Also commonly used were other school-owned materials (e.g., books, film, and artefacts). Ownership by the school is relevant as they were likely to have been used year after year, and were therefore at risk of not being current.

In contrast, evidence of teachers’ awareness of covert cultural aspects was largely absent from the data. This is important because covert culture takes on significance in an ICLT approach, aligning with pragmatism in seeking the information most relevant in intercultural interactions (Baker, 2015; Liddicoat, 2008a; Sercu, 2002). It was the lived practices of the target cultures with which participants reported being least familiar and which were rated as being of least importance, specifically, the target country’s relationship with New Zealand (recognised, in retrospect, as a confusing item for EAL and te reo teachers), racism towards the culture, the political system, working life and unemployment, and environmental issues. These results aligned with Sercu et al. (2005) and Byram and Risager (1999). Covert aspects are not typically presented in coursebooks
Sercu, 2000) and Dewey’s description of pragmatism would suggest that they are likely to be best understood through personal experience of and engagement with the culture (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000; Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006). The alignment in teachers’ familiarity and importance ratings could have arisen from their endeavouring to become familiar with the topics they considered important; alternatively, a topic could have been considered important simply because the teacher was sufficiently familiar with it, or because it was covered in their own language learning experiences (Feryok, 2010; Lortie, 2002; Pajares, 1992; Sercu & St. John, 2007). The reported regular efforts to keep in touch with culture suggest that either the means of contact were not good sources for covert culture or teachers were not choosing to seek out that information.

Ryan and Sercu (2005) asserted that teachers must have “a thorough understanding of the target cultures” (p. 39) in order to adequately prepare students for intercultural interactions. Sercu (2006) later softened that language, stating that intercultural teachers need to be “sufficiently familiar” (p. 61) with the cultures. This is ideal, but it is acknowledged that New Zealand language teachers are not always proficient in the target language (East, 2008), let alone the culture. Hope need not be lost, however. Other research has emphasised that it is not possible for a teacher to know all there is to know about a culture (Liddicoat, 2008a), making it more important for teachers to follow pragmatism’s approach of working alongside students to guide them as they explore, reflect, and compare cultures to make their own self-induced discoveries (Byram et al., 1991; Byrd & Wall, 2009; Dewey, 1938, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1909/2009; Prawat, 2009; Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006). In this way, cultural knowledge is collaboratively co-constructed, with the teacher scaffolding the students as they relate the material to their own experiences (Daniels, 2007; Davydov, 1995; Dewey, 1915/2008; Lantolf, 2000; Lazaraton, 2003), representing Dewey’s concept of “pedagogy of personal experience” (Prawat, 2009, p. 325). It could be argued that a teacher would only need to be deeply knowledgeable about the target culture if they saw value in a “Pedagogy of Information” (Larzén-Östermark, 2008, p. 542)—transmitting information to the students. Such an approach carries the risk of the information remaining external to the learner (Liddicoat, 2011; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2013), belonging to the other (Roberts et al., 2001), and being...
provided from only one perspective. It cannot be said that a low level of familiarity with the target culture is alone representative of cognitions that are not aligned with ICLT.

Cultural familiarity could be associated with cognitions aligned (or not) with ICLT if teachers felt insufficiently knowledgeable about the target culture to teach it. This was a view expressed by teachers in other studies (e.g., Byram et al., 1991; Byrd & Wall, 2009; Han & Song, 2011; Kohler, 2015; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Sercu et al., 2005). In this study, of those who reported teaching culture less than 50% of the time, half recorded insufficient knowledge of the target culture as a reason for doing so. Those individuals believed that only cultural aspects familiar to the teacher should, or could, be taught, corroborating Ryan and Sercu’s (2005) comment on the need for teachers to thoroughly understand the culture. Like teachers in Byram et al.’s (1991) study, those participants appeared concerned that a lack of familiarity prejudiced their role as cultural informants. Cognitions of that nature are not indicative of an ICLT approach, nor are they aligned with pragmatism’s emphasis on student-centred self-discovery (Dewey, 1938, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1909/2009; Guilherme, 2002).

6.1.2 Professional support
Professional support is available for teachers through language teacher association membership, language teaching literature, and resources provided by the Ministry and others. In pragmatism terms, this allows for co-construction of a shared understanding of language and culture teaching through cultural transmission (Dewey, 1929; Garrison, 2009; Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006). Two-thirds of all participants were members of professional language associations (the majority of non-members were teachers of EAL or te reo) and even more reported reading professional literature, although rates of regularity varied widely. Teachers accessing such support would be kept informed of culture and culture teaching, assuming associated publications and meetings included material of that nature. However, professional development conducted by the Ministry was focused on language, not culture or ICLT (Conway et al., 2010; Richards et al., 2010; Roskvist et al., 2011) (corroborated by Phase 2 teacher participants). In addition, studies involving EAL teachers, which may apply more widely, showed the more populated areas of New Zealand to be better catered for in terms of local professional development (Cameron & Simpson, 2002) and that EAL teachers often did not (or could not) take up such opportunities (Haworth, 2003).
6.1.3 Influences on cognitions corresponding with ICLT

The ICLT cognitions scale summed responses to cognition statements aligned with ICLT. The higher an individual’s score on the scale, the more his/her cognitions could be said to align with ICLT. All but two participants achieved scores that fell on the ICLT side of the scale’s midpoint of 45 (the lowest score was 40) evidencing that all teachers had some cognitions about culture teaching that were consistent with ICLT; two-thirds were within the quartile closest to the wholly ICLT end of the scale (hereafter, “the ICLT quartile”).

Considering the scale scores in relation to other variables revealed a number of influences on a teacher’s cognitions. Firstly, there was a positive correlation between scores on the ICLT cognitions scale and extent of familiarity with covert culture but interestingly, not overt culture. This result is not causal but suggests that an individual consciously following an ICLT approach would be more likely to be aware of the relevance of covert culture for ICC than an individual not following an ICLT approach. The same cannot be said for the relationship between overt culture and an ICLT approach.

Secondly, scores on the ICLT cognitions scale correlated with membership to a professional organisation (but not to reading professional material). The data indicated that those with scores in the ICLT quartile were six times more likely to be a member of a professional association; the four lowest scores were all achieved by individuals who were not members of any professional associations. Again, although a causal link cannot be made, this finding suggests that either support offered by professional organisations (e.g., training programmes, workshops, and meetings) assists with development of ICLT cognitions, or those with an ICLT mindset tend to attend such events. Either way, belonging to an organisation is likely to expose members to ICLT directly through content, or indirectly through interactions with interculturally-minded teachers (Kelly, 2012). It would be worth exploring further the significance of this finding and the speculation regarding its implications, as put forth here. The concern remains that some teachers do not actively pursue professional development opportunities in language teaching, whether it be by choice or contextual constraints. Those who do not take up available opportunities are likely to be less open to “cognitive renewal” (Sercu & St. John, 2007, p. 54) and may continue to hold on to cognitions representative of more traditional approaches (Edwards, 2008; Rainio, 2008).
Thirdly, ICLT Cognition scale scores correlated positively with language taught. The 12 lowest scores were achieved by teachers of te reo Māori, EAL, or French, representing 25% of te reo teachers, 38% of EAL teachers, and 19% of French teachers. The data suggest that teachers of te reo are the group least likely to demonstrate cognitions that correspond with ICLT; they were three times more likely to have scores outside the ICLT quartile than within it. Teachers of all other languages represented were either equally likely to score within or outside the ICLT quartile (EAL, French, German), or more likely to score within the ICLT quartile (Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin, Other). The EAL and te reo teachers’ low scores on the ICLT cognitions scale could be indicative of issues related to teaching languages native to the environment, and/or a lack of professional grounding and support in language education theory and methods. The implications of this are noted in chapter 10. Reasons for a small proportion of French teachers scoring low on the ICLT cognitions scale are less clear in the data. The significant majority of those teachers were members of professional organisations, more than one third reported attending training in ICLT, and half scored within the ICLT quartile.

6.1.4 Cognitions mismatches
In many respects, participants produced seemingly conflicting cognitions. Some of the conflicts could have been due to the wording of the question items. This is not a criticism of the drafting, though, because it served to clarify contextual factors that influenced responses. For example, related cognition statements differed in the modal verb used: compare Teachers should present only positive views of the target culture (non-ICLT) with Language teachers must present a realistic, so sometimes negative, image of the target culture (ICLT). More participants disagreed with the former statement than agreed with the latter inverse form. Based on extant literature, there are at least two possible explanations for this difference. Firstly, it could represent the notion of a differentiation between abstract and concrete concepts (Birello, 2012; Mangubhai et al., 2005). The former statement relates to what ought to happen in theory, where use of should suggests an ideal or abstract situation that allows for alternatives. The latter suggests a more concrete application, with use of must, a firm obligation with no room for non-compliance. Secondly, studies have suggested that teachers avoid cultural topics that could cause conflict or disharmony in the classroom (e.g., Kohler, 2015; Larzén-
Östermark 2008; Leeman & Ledoux, 2005; Oranje, 2012; Paige, et al., 2003; Sercu et al., 2005; Young & Sachdev, 2011), perhaps making agreement with the ICLT statement—that the image presented must sometimes be negative—less desirable to some. The ability to manage conflicting interpretations is a feature of ICC (savoir comprendre and savoir s’engager (Byram, 1997), in particular), so it would be difficult to foster those skills in students without exposing them to situations that show a cultural view in a negative light, whether it be their own culture or another. Dewey argued that avoiding engaging with negative viewpoints amounts to the information being of limited relevance and use (1916/2008); the content being separated from its real-world application, where positive and negative perspectives exist (1897, 1915/2008; 1909/2009); and, a missed opportunity to reduce barriers and support moral and democratic education (1910/2005; see also Guilherme, 2002).

The most explicitly ICLT cognition statements were (C13) *It is important to prepare students for future intercultural encounters* and (C26) *The most important outcome of language education is intercultural competence.* There was a marked difference in the degree of agreement with these two statements; more than three times as many participants agreeing strongly with the former than agreed strongly with the latter. This difference in responses to two very similar statements indicates two important situations. Firstly, the results have shown that teachers do not understand ICLT; consequently, they will not understand the meaning of intercultural competence, and could even have interpreted it as excluding communicative competence. Secondly, teachers appear to be interpreting the curriculum’s objective of communication as aiming for communicative competence (Forsman, 2012; Stapleton, 2000), in which case, intercultural competence would not be the expected outcome, much less the “most important” one.

This is not unreasonable given the language used in the curriculum document, especially if the participant is not familiar with the curriculum guide and its promotion of iCLT (Ministry of Education, 2013). According to Forsman (2012) and Stapleton (2000), communicative competence is often construed as relating to fluency of oral performance and ignores other meaning-making elements of interactions. That could be the case here, with participants reporting that curriculum had a focus on linguistic competence; were they interpreting that as meaning *language* focus, or as achievement in linguistic skills of
fluency, accuracy, and complexity? The New Zealand curriculum’s focus is not linguistic competence—it is not explicitly intercultural either—but supporting documents expressly dissuade an aim of native-like accuracy. Teachers could have been responding to a perceived language focus of the assessments (Sercu et al., 2005), or expressing honest cognitions that described their practices, as did teachers in other studies (e.g., Han, 2010; Richards et al., 2010; Roskvist et al., 2011; Sercu et al., 2005; Woodgate-Jones, 2009). Recalling Liddicoat’s (2005) axis of overall teaching orientation, it appears that, generally speaking, New Zealand language teachers are positioned nearer the cultural pole than the intercultural one, and as such, have not moved from the position at the time of the New Zealand research of Conway et al. (2010), Richards et al. (2010), and Roskvist et al. (2011). This is not helped by the absence of reference to ICLT (or iCLT) in the curriculum document itself, resulting in a rather ambiguous situation. This matter is considered in more depth in the Discussion (chapter 9).

Other cognitions evidenced traditional approaches. The first relates to evidence of the belief that culture knowledge is principally gained through teacher transmission and by addressing cultural matters that arise incidentally. This view does not support the intercultural approach of exploration, reflection, and comparison of cultures. Furthermore, the view is categorically counter to pragmatism, which argues that meaning is created through student-centred activity aimed at self-induced discovery of unique and meaningful contributions (Dewey, 1916/2008). Secondly, all teachers believed language and culture to be intertwined, potentially indicative of an ICLT approach, but the strength of that conviction was diluted by the prevalence of the view that culture teaching must yield to language teaching when under time pressure. For this sample, therefore, language and culture were not so tightly intertwined as to be inseparable, and language was given precedence. This supported the findings of Sercu et al. (2005) and others (e.g., Byrd & Wall, 2009; Han, 2010; Kohler, 2015; Sercu & St. John, 2007). However, care must be taken not to interpret this mismatch as an outright contradiction. For some, it may represent a view of culture as being on two levels, generic and differential (Risager, 2006), where language and culture are inseparable when considered generically in relation to the human phenomena but can be separated at the micro or differential level to ensure both aspects are understood in the classroom (see also Byram, 2012; Kohler, 2015).
Bolstering the popularity of the traditional views, though, was the rating of culture as one of the least important of the curricular areas, corroborating the findings of Young and Sachdev (2011) and Czura (2013). An intercultural teacher would believe culture to be of equal importance to the linguistic skills, and in this study participants had the ability to score all skills equally, if that was their opinion. That occurred rarely, however, and culture was rated higher than grammar only, with speaking and vocabulary being the most favoured skills. The difference in ratings of speaking and culture might have arisen from the curriculum’s emphasis on communication and suggests appreciation of a move from earlier linguistic approaches that aimed for native-speaker-like accuracy (where grammar knowledge was valued). Much has been made of the curriculum’s balanced approach in terms of the two equally weighted strands of language knowledge and culture knowledge. That balance, praised by Byram (2014), addresses Castro et al.’s (2004) point that a lack of explicit reference to culture in curricular documents leads to the interpretation of a language focus. Although culture *is* explicitly mentioned in the curriculum, teachers of this study (and others, e.g., Castro et al., 2004; Conway et al., 2010; Luk, 2012; Sercu, 2006; Woodgate-Jones, 2009) described a reality of a language focus in examination content and professional development, and a lack of support in culture teaching and assessment. Perhaps the more realistic alternative is that the difference in the ratings between speaking and culture reflects the dominant activity (Sannino, 2008) of teaching the language dimension, a carryover from traditional approaches and washback from assessments that test linguistic skills. This interpretation finds support in Sercu (2006), in that ICC is viewed as peripheral to the more commonly accepted communicative competence.

Replicating a significant finding in Sercu et al.’s (2005) study, comparison of cultures was routinely carried out by the teachers in this study, as would be required in an ICLT approach, but the emphasis was placed on finding differences—“enhancing familiarity with what is foreign” (Castro & Sercu, 2005, p. 20)—rather than similarities, and they did not encourage reflection of students’ own cultures as the ICLT counterbalance. The matter of reflection warrants deeper consideration here, particularly given the role it takes in pragmatism, with Dewey describing reflective thinking alone as being “truly educative” (Dewey, 1910/2005, p. 2).
6.1.5 Reflection

The reflective element of ICLT is arguably the most patent difference between ICLT and CLT. It is reflection that makes sense of the prefix *inter*- by providing the additional cultural perspective with which to make multi-directional comparisons and through which an individual is transformed (Kramsch, 2009; Liddicoat, 2005, 2011; Newton, forthcoming; Scarino, 2014; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009). Studies from New Zealand and abroad have shown that reflection does not feature strongly in teachers’ views on culture in language education. The New Zealand findings are despite reflection being explicitly specified in the Ministry’s curriculum guide (Ministry of Education, 2012, June 20) and in Principle 3 of iCLT (Ministry of Education, 2013; Newton et al., 2010), and less explicitly in the curriculum document itself. From a pragmatist’s viewpoint, reflection provides learners grounds for a belief and allows them to claim it as their own, not something held unthinkingly (Dewey, 1910/2005, 1915/2008).

A number of cognitions related to reflection on, and understanding of, one’s own culture. The majority of the participants agreed that language education should develop reflective understanding, contribute to students’ understanding of their own identities and own cultures, incorporate students’ own cultures, and compare cultures to draw attention to the influence of one’s invisible culture. There were also positive correlations between many of those reflection-focused cognitions and other ICLT-aligned cognitions, such as the importance of teaching culture from the beginning, and of preparing students for intercultural encounters and to accommodate differences. These positive findings suggest that teachers could be in the process of developing “a reflective mindset” (Jackson, 2014, p. 226). The real issue is whether that mindset is influencing their practice; that matter is considered in the discussion of Hypothesis 2.

6.1.6 Overall Evaluation of Hypothesis 1

Teachers in this study did have thoughts and beliefs that fit within an ICLT orientation. Although not wholeheartedly ICLT in nature, the evidence suggested that the cognitions of this group of teachers are in many respects aligned more with ICLT than traditional teaching approaches, and certainly more than Sercu et al.’s (2005) survey and subsequent studies based on that survey. This is indicative of a hybrid approach (Mangubhai et al., 2005), acting as a transitioning stage from earlier approaches in recognition of a new political emphasis on culture in the classroom. This is particularly so for cognitions
associated with teaching methods. Some cognitions, such as low levels of familiarity with covert culture and not considering ICC as the primary objective, initially appeared not to align with ICLT, but that was less clear-cut on closer inspection. Those cognitions could equally be interpreted as suggesting that the participants may be willing to, or have commenced upon, change towards ICLT.

The aspects that do indicate a traditional approach among the majority are the belief that most cultural knowledge is acquired through teacher transmission or incidentally, and the lack of value placed on reflection on one’s own cultural viewpoint. These both conflict with exploration and reflection which are core principles of ICLT and central to pragmatism’s philosophy of education. Exploration and reflection are necessary for comparison and discovery, the means necessary for educative knowledge, internalised and able to be applied in future transactions, as opposed to technical knowledge with little meaning and retained only through “foreign attractiveness” (Dewey, 1915/2008, p. 94; see also Dewey, 1916/2008). For these reasons, those areas of misalignment carry some weight.

In summary, it cannot be said that the cognitions of New Zealand secondary school language teachers emphatically support ICLT, but for the purposes of this study, it must be concluded that the hypothesis—Teachers’ cognitions about language and culture teaching do not reflect an ICLT approach—is rejected. For this sample, the teachers’ cognitions reflected an ICLT approach, at least in some respects. What is less clear is whether the participants’ orientation to teaching was straightforwardly cultural, or was further along the axis towards intercultural (Liddicoat, 2005). Regardless, it is promising to see evidence of teachers’ perceptions of culture teaching including elements of ICLT. This suggests that with exposure to theory and methods in initial training and professional development, the movement from their current views and practices to a full ICLT position might not be great and, therefore, need not be daunting.

The second hypothesis, regarding the relationship between teachers’ classroom practices and ICLT, is now discussed.
6.2 Hypothesis 2: Teachers’ reported language and culture classroom practices do not reflect an ICLT approach.

This hypothesis was generated from research that reported that teachers did not practice ICLT in the classroom (e.g., Conway et al., 2010; Jedynak, 2011; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Luk, 2012; Sercu et al., 2005; Young & Sachdev, 2011). It was expected that the teachers’ reported practices would characterise traditional approaches, irrespective of the extent to which their cognitions were consistent with ICLT. In this study, all participants reported having full control or limited restrictions on the lesson content and teaching approaches used in their language classes, suggesting that there were few restraints on teachers’ practising ICLT, if they so desired. The following subsections describe reported classroom practices that indicated traditional approaches, ICLT, or a “hybrid” of the two (Mangubhai et al., 2005, p. 55), the first of which is the distribution of teaching time with respect to language and culture.

6.2.1 Distribution of teaching time

Teachers reported on the distribution of their time as a ratio of time teaching language and time teaching culture. The associated question was taken directly from Sercu et al.’s (2005) study and also was used by Han (2010) in China, and Czura (2013) in Poland, thus permitting results obtained in this study to be compared across studies (and countries). In total, nearly 70% of the New Zealand teachers reported spending more time on the target language than the target culture. This is a large proportion but it is smaller than was the case for the teachers in the studies by Sercu et al., Han, and Czura, in which language teaching was favoured over culture teaching by 88.57%, 80.93%, and 90% of teachers, respectively. At first glance, this imbalance appears contrary to an ICLT approach. It is explored at greater depth shortly.

Unsurprisingly, those who reported an imbalance in time spent on language and culture were found to make less use of ICLT activities. ICLT activities involve integration of language and culture, so those consciously practising in accordance with ICLT should not report unequal attention to language and culture. Furthermore, a concern from pragmatism is that separating language and culture, and favouring one over the other, risks splitting the content from the social context in which it is used (Dewey, 1897, 1915/2008; 1909/2009). Around a quarter of the participants reported teaching language
and culture as fully integrated, as would be selected by practitioners of an ICLT approach. This figure was significantly larger than the proportions of teachers reporting full integration in Sercu et al. (2005), Han (2010), and Czura (2013) of, respectively, 6.89%, 13.66%, and 10%. It would be wise, though, to consider the possibility that some participants selected this response option because of a social desirability bias (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010), given the questionnaire’s emphasis on culture. It must also be remembered that these were unverified reported practices.

Taken on its own, the response to this question would suggest that the majority of New Zealand language teachers were not practising an intercultural approach. However, there is risk in relying on one indicator as providing evidence for generalisability of findings (see Firestone, 1993; Polit & Beck, 2010). Sercu et al. (2005) themselves recognised that it could not be known how teachers interpreted this question, particularly with respect to the full integration option. Teachers reporting full integration of language and culture could have meant they do not discuss one without discussing its relevance to the other, or they might have meant they discuss the culture-in-language (where the primary focus is on language) or language-in-culture (where emphasis is on culture), either of which does not teach language or culture discretely (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Kohler, 2015; Risager, 2012).

6.2.2 Overt and covert cultural aspects
The three cultural aspects that were reported as most commonly practiced in the classroom were festivities, daily life and routines, and school and education. These mirrored the aspects with which teachers were most familiar and considered most important (section 6.1.1 above), so it is unsurprising that teachers regularly introduced those overt cultural aspects into their lessons. Similarly, the least practised aspects replicated the aspects with which teachers felt least familiar and considered least important (section 6.1.1); all were covert cultural aspects. This result is indicative of teachers taking a more traditional culture teaching approach in terms of lesson content and provides further evidence for teachers having a cultural orientation (Liddicoat, 2005). Culture was incorporated into lessons, but the tendency to keep to overt textbook-style topics and avoid (actively or not) covert everyday cultural aspects suggests that the participants did not demonstrate either an intercultural orientation or a pragmatism-allied position.
Twelve participants reported avoiding teaching some cultural topics and of those topics named (e.g., caste system, feminism, youth culture, immigration, sexuality, nudity), all related to covert culture. Features of covert culture might come with conflict and controversy, which some teachers sought to avoid, but they are arguably the aspects that will be most useful and relevant (Dewey, 1915/2008; Prawat, 2009) to the advancement of a learner’s ability to mediate intercultural interactions (Byram, 1997; Houghton, 2010, 2013; Liddicoat, 2008a). If controversial or confrontational topics are explored objectively, individuals learn to decentre from their taken-for-granted views and be personally transformed as they come to occupy a relativised C3 (Jourdain, 1998; Kramsch, 1993; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Luk, 2012; Mantle-Bromley, 1995; Morgan, 1993; Young & Sachdev, 2011). In this regard, reported practices were generally consistent with an ICLT approach with the significant majority reporting not choosing to avoid particular topics.

6.2.3 Culture teaching resources

The use of coursebooks and school-owned materials has been noted, along with the potential for them to be out-dated and presenting culture as facts and information, and therefore unlikely to support an intercultural approach, at least without adaptation. Less frequently, participants reported using their privately-owned items as culture teaching resources. Items with personal significance better support exploration of cultures through a “Pedagogy of Encounter” (Larzén-Östermark, 2008, p. 542), as the content is less likely to be interpreted as external, static information about the other (Dewey, 1909/2009; Liddicoat, 2011; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2013), or “dead and barren” (Dewey, 1915/2008, p. 118) to the learners. Teachers sharing their own cultural experiences is valued by students as an authentic cultural resource (Byram et al., 1991) and in sharing, teachers demonstrate they are taking the role of “fellow inquirer” (Scarino, 2014, p. 398) (see also Byrd & Wall, 2009). Unfortunately, only half of the participants reported treating items brought to class by the students as a resource. This means missed “mediatory moment[s]” (Kohler, 2015, p. 164) to make learning relevant to students’ own lives, experiences, and ontogeneses (Daniels, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978), crucial in the pragmatism philosophy of learning (Dewey, 1909/2009) and through which the learners come to know themselves (Holmes & O’Neill, 2010; Kelly, 2012). It also fails to treat the learners as funds of knowledge (Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Scott & Palincsar, 2009).
6.2.4 Assessment of students’ cultural understanding

Teachers’ responses and rationales about assessment of cultural understanding served as indicators of their overall teaching approach. The clear majority (two-thirds) reported not testing acquisition of cultural understanding, half of whom justified this on the basis that culture assessment is not required by the curriculum. In fact, it is required by the curriculum, to the same extent that language is assessed, actually, although the language used is obfuscating:

The achievement objectives in the Communication strand provide the basis for assessment. The two supporting strands [language knowledge and culture knowledge] are only assessed indirectly through their contribution to the Communication strand. (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 25, italics added)

Teacher–designed internal assessment is best placed to assess culture knowledge, especially given the perception that external examinations focus on the linguistic dimension. The New Zealand curriculum is not prescriptive, and teachers are used to designing programmes to reflect curriculum objectives (East, 2012a). The Ministry provides online support for language learning programme design (Ministry of Education, 2013). In fact, it is there that iCLT is promoted to its greatest extent. It is not the case that “NCEA does not reward it” (360-2/11), as one participant stated. Around 60% of the NCEA grade is allocated by assignments designed by the teacher, so an assessment could be developed for cultural understanding addressing, for instance, the curriculum’s expectation that language students at Levels 7 and 8 can “analyse how the use of the target language expresses cultural meanings” (Ministry of Education, 2007b, p. 18).

Some participants reported a lack of expertise in culture testing, possibly put off by the degree of subjectivity involved (Lázár et al., 2007) and the lack of comprehensive assistance in this regard in the support resources (East & Scott, 2011; Forsman, 2012; Guo, 2010; Manjarrés, 2009; Paige et al., 2003; Scarino, 2010). Concern was also expressed that assessment adversely affects the enjoyment and motivation that students gain from cultural content. This corresponds with the teachers in Luk’s (2012) study, who did not assess cultural knowledge because culture was “a lesson sweetener” (p. 256). Others thought culture could not be meaningfully assessed separately from language, so either did not need individual assessment, or included culture in all assessment. This
response perhaps best represents the New Zealand curriculum’s sole objective of communication with language and cultural knowledge being assessed indirectly through assessment of communicative abilities. It would also align with ICLT, provided that it involved dynamic assessment with an objective of intercultural communicative competence.

6.2.5 Practising ICLT

The ICLT Practices scale grouped responses to items that related integrating language and culture, and represented cultural exploration, reflection, or comparison. The large majority of participants’ scores were on the ICLT side of the scale, meaning that they practised many ICLT activities or practised some ICLT activities with high frequency. In fact, scores from just over one-third of participants were within the ICLT quartile. This is an encouraging finding. The proportion of New Zealand language teachers that reported practising ICLT-aligned activities was larger than that of the studies by Sercu et al. (2005) and Han (2010).

Scores on the ICLT Practices scale were positively related to levels of familiarity with both overt culture and covert culture. Research has established that those familiar with a wide range of cultural aspects will possess (and appreciate the value of) more advanced knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Czura, 2013; Youngs & Youngs) so it would be expected that teachers scoring high familiarity with overt and covert culture were more likely to practice ICLT-aligned activities (Sercu et al., 2005). Membership of professional organisations once again featured, as did reading of professional material, both correlating with scores on the ICLT Practices and ICLT Activities scales. Those engaged with professional support were more likely than others to practice activities, consistent with the emphasis of the importance of such affiliations in ICLT.

Moderate agreement was reported for one statement that would appear antithetical to ICLT practitioners: (P20) *I aim to assimilate students in the target culture*. The concern about this response is that it hints at teachers expecting native-speaker-like competence, a leftover from CLT. In Byram’s early work on the development of ICLT (Byram, 1997; Byram & Zarate, 1996, 1997), it was a primary intention to change the goal from being native-like to being an intercultural speaker. In ICLT a learner is not assimilated into the target, and does not replace their own language and cultural values
with the L2/C2; rather, s/he develops competence in mediating between the languages and cultures from the position of a third place (Kramsch, 1993), the relativised C3 (Young & Sachdev, 2011). In addition, the Learning Languages area of the curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007a) made communication the focus rather than the former aim for native-like accuracy. This is clarified in the curriculum guide (Ministry of Education, 2012) and embodied in iCLT Principle 6 (Ministry of Education, 2013; Newton et al., 2010). Having an aim of assimilation, therefore, is not consistent with ICLT.

Closer consideration is given to two practices representing core principles of ICLT: teaching the ability to mediate between cultures, and teaching the ability to explore cultures. With respect to the former, ICC involves the ability to mediate intercultural interactions, to predict, ascertain, and manage cultural rich points to facilitate effective communication (Agar, 1994; Byram, 1997; Byram & Zarate, 1997; Roberts et al., 2001). The New Zealand teachers were divided in their views but the majority reported rarely, if ever, teaching the ability to mediate between cultures, thus providing firm evidence of non-ICLT approaches in practice. With respect to the latter statement, exploration is characteristic of pragmatism’s approach to learning and one of the distinctions between ICLT and traditional teacher-centred methods, allowing genuine engagement with the material (Dewey, 1915/2008; Scarino, 2010). Once again, reports from the teachers of this study varied in terms of whether they practised this indisputably ICLT approach, but many reported rarely exploring culture in the classroom. The absence of exploration in the classroom means the tendency may remain to essentialise people to their cultures and treat culture as a set of static facts for transmission (Atkinson, 1999, 2013; Holliday, 2011; Liddicoat, 2005). In contrast, exploration generates the expectation for students to make new discoveries rather than passively absorb what Dewey referred to as pre-ordained information (Dewey, 1938, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1909/2009; see also Jourdain, 1998; Mantle-Bromley, 1995; Morgan, 1993).

6.2.6 Mismatches between cognitions and practices
In some respects, cognitions and practices appeared not to be “calibrated” (Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009, p. 912). There were two specific areas where teachers’ cognitions were more aligned with ICLT than their reported practices were: separation of language and culture and reflection. Each is addressed below, followed by discussion of the possible reasons for the mismatches.
Separation of language and culture

There was a range of differences in cognitions and practices based on the separation (or not) of language and culture. Although few teachers believed the linguistic dimension should be favoured under time pressure, greater numbers reported doing just that in practice. This suggests differentiation between beliefs about abstract concepts (the cognition was framed as what “ought to” happen) and reports on concrete applications influenced by a range of contextual factors (the practice was framed as, “when I have limited teaching time...”) (Birello, 2012; Mangubhai et al., 2005; Richards, 2008).

Participants scored low levels of agreement with the related non-ICLT practice statement (P16) I teach culture as a distinct subject area. This low agreement does not align with the higher levels of agreement with cognition and practice statements relating to separation of language and culture if under pressure. One possible interpretation is that it is language that is taught as a distinct subject area, and that when culture is involved, it is in an integrated fashion, that is, by taking a culture-in-language approach (Kohler, 2015; Risager, 2012).

Reflection

Reflection can feature in at least two ways in an ICLT language class: the teacher models reflection by objectively analysing his/her own cultural viewpoint, and the students are explicitly encouraged to reflect on their own culture to aid cultural comparisons and enhance intercultural interactions. From the teacher’s perspective, the data indicated that the majority of the participants were aware of their own culture when teaching, but a much smaller group reported that they critically analysed their own culture when teaching. A significant positive relationship was found between these two practices. It makes sense that those who critically analyse their culture are more aware of their culture at the outset. It is not necessarily so, though, that awareness of one’s own culture necessarily leads to critical analysis of it, and a lack of awareness will mean the absence of analysis. So, for teachers to be good at modelling reflection they need to extend their awareness of their culture by interrogating it from other viewpoints (Bagnall, 2005). A good place for the teacher to start would be to consider how other cultures represented in the class might view his/her cultural position.

With respect to fostering students in the skill of reflection, more teachers reported that they provided opportunities for students’ critical reflection than reported critically
reflecting on their own culture. This may represent a case of not practising what they preach, but it also evidences a lack of appreciation that the community includes the teacher among the learners, as being open to transformation (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Lave & Wenger, 1991, Scarino, 2014). However, the number of teachers who reported providing opportunities for students to reflect was markedly less than the number with cognitions that valued the rule of a student’s reflection. This is another example of teachers demonstrating ICLT-aligned cognitions but reporting practices that appeared not to correspond. Higher numbers reported providing opportunities for students to make connections between the C2 and their own cultures and experiences. This step aids in cultural comparison and, important in ICLT, puts some of the focus on similarities between cultures, as opposed to the more common emphasis on differences (Duff, 2004; Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Rowsell et al., 2007). It also supports pragmatism’s belief in the need to make learning relevant to the learner (Dewey, 1938, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1909/2009).

**Potential explanations for the mismatches**

Although two-thirds of scores on the ICLT Cognitions scale were within the ICLT quartile, only one-third of scores on the ICLT Practices scale were within the ICLT quartile. The New Zealand teachers behaved as their international peers did, with practices being less likely to follow ICLT approaches than their more sophisticated cognitions would suggest. Reasons for the mismatch postulated in other studies included a lack of resources to support teachers in the practice of ICLT (e.g., Han & Song, 2011), teachers’ lack of control over classroom content (Han, 2010), constraint by linguistically oriented curriculum and/or assessments (e.g., Young & Sachdev, 2011), uncertainty about the practical application of an ICLT approach (Díaz, 2011, 2013; East & Scott, 2011; Harbon & Browett, 2006), and lack of time (e.g., Sercu et al., 2005). These are all external factors. That is, these are constraints imposed (or perceived as being imposed) by others on the teachers’ practice. They represent some of the contextual factors that apply in the reality of the classroom, forming the concrete experience-based context which might hinder teachers in their application of the more abstract cognitions (Birello, 2012; Feryok, 2010; Feryok & Oranje, 2015; Mangubhai et al., 2005). Many of these contextual factors were evident in the responses from the teachers in this study.
Participants reported moderate to high flexibility over both the content and the teaching approach, in contrast to teachers in Han’s (2010) study, but they still felt their practices were constrained by a linguistically oriented curriculum and assessments, as was the case in Young and Sachdev’s (2011) research. The data showed that New Zealand teachers were uncertain of how to teach (and assess) the culture dimension, a reason also given by teachers in other Australasian research (Díaz, 2011, 2013; East & Scott, 2011; Harbon & Browett, 2006) on why ICLT-aligned cognitions were not implemented in practice.

Sercu et al. (2005) found lack of time to be the primary reason why ICLT was not practised despite teachers’ willingness to do so. Time constraints also were the principal reason why the teachers of this study did not spend more time teaching culture, even if their cognitions valued its role. Of course, time is not only needed to enact culture teaching ideals, but also to attend training to develop skills in culture teaching, subsequently adapt lesson plans to accommodate new approaches, and to evaluate changes. East and Scott (2011) reported that many New Zealand language teachers were “cautious about anything that might cause extra work” (p. 186).

Taken together, practices related to core elements of ICLT—reflection, exploration, and mediation of intercultural interactions—were not frequently reported by the majority of the New Zealand language teachers and, in that respect, responses suggest that practices did not represent ICLT.

6.2.7 Culture teaching activities

Teachers’ reports on the extent to which they practised ICLT activities revealed some interesting patterns. All practised ICLT activities to some degree but the four least commonly used were: (1) asking students to think about media images of the culture, (2) asking students to role-play intercultural situations, (3) discussing cultural aspects about which the teacher feels negatively disposed, and (4) asking students to describe their own culture using the target language. These all provide opportunities for students (and teachers) to connect more personally with the culture and in some cases, as pragmatism recommends, engage with it (Dewey, 1915/2008). All involve interrogation of the culture from different viewpoints (Bagnall, 2005) to explore it, rather than absorb transmitted information about it (Dewey, 1938, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1909/2009). The
low frequency with which these activities were employed restricted students’ access to
the culture as something they could be a part of, which could transform them (Liddicoat,
2005, 2011; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009), and which they could transform (Kramsch,
2009; Scarino, 2014).

In contrast, the most popularly used ICLT activities were: (1) using a range of
media to illustrate aspects of the culture, (2) sharing the teacher’s own experiences of the
culture with students, (3) decorating the class with cultural illustrations, and
(4) discussing cultural aspects that the teacher finds strange or fascinating. These
activities all engage the learners but can often emphasise differences, the strangeness of the other without the corresponding step to “make the familiar strange” (Jackson, 2006, p.
83). It is promising to hear teachers share their own experiences as a common practice, an
effective means of providing engaging and relevant information (Byram et al., 1991;

It is noted with interest that the most commonly used activities are the inverse of, or
in some way contrary to, those least commonly used. Although the teachers reported that
they relied heavily on media sources to illustrate the culture, they rarely chose to question images portrayed by the media. Teachers regularly discussed strange or fascinating aspects about the culture, but were less likely to discuss negative aspects. Rather than ask students to role play intercultural situations, an experiential learning activity, teachers decorated the classroom with cultural images, keeping that cultural information external to the learner. Teachers commonly shared their own experiences of the target culture but rarely asked students to describe their own culture in the target language. The data indicated that the teachers did not regularly promote reflection and learning more about one’s own culture, as was also the case in many of the international studies (e.g., Han & Song, 2011; Jedynak, 2011; Sercu et al., 2005).

Many of the ICLT activities, particularly the four most commonly used, could also
be implemented as part of a more traditional teaching approach. It is the nature of
engagement with the material that is important for an ICLT approach. Using media and
decorating the classroom will only be truly intercultural if the information is interrogated from different perspectives, considered objectively, explored deeply, and contrasted against one’s own cultural viewpoint. Compare this with watching and absorbing it as information external to the students, with little critical analysis and no transformation of
the learner. A teacher discussing aspects of the culture with respect to personal experiences and feelings could characterise ICLT if those views are broken down for objective examination, but if the experiences and feelings are offered from an ethnocentric perspective (i.e., they are strange because they are different to my view), they could equally represent a teacher-centred non-ICLT approach.

6.2.8 Overall Evaluation of Hypothesis 2

Relating this information to the second hypothesis—Teachers’ reported language and culture classroom practices do not reflect an ICLT approach—New Zealand language teachers did engage in practices that reflected an ICLT approach but, as was the case for their cognitions, they did not do so wholeheartedly. Some shared their own experiences of the culture, took opportunities to integrate culture, and created opportunities for students to consider their own cultures, all practices aligned with ICLT. There were a number of practices employed that could be treated as either intercultural or traditional, depending on the particular ways in which they were implemented in class. Without further detail, it is not possible to confirm the stance the teacher took in such cases. This is an area that merits additional study.

There were, however, clear-cut instances where teachers’ reported practices suggested traditional approaches. Of concern is that this meant fundamental elements of ICLT went unpractised. It was primarily overt culture that featured in the classroom, rather than covert cultural aspects which would be of most use in an intercultural interaction (Baker, 2015; Liddicoat, 2008a; Sercu, 2002). Teachers aimed to assimilate learners into the target cultures, and reported not fostering skills to mediate between cultures, not assisting with cultural exploration, and neither supporting nor modelling critical reflection on one’s own culture. It appeared that many teachers were working with something of a “hybrid” (Mangubhai et al., 2005, p. 55) approach of ICLT, although whether this was intentional could not be ascertained.

Consideration was given to whether there was any distinction between content and method; were teachers more likely to take an ICLT approach in one or the other? It can be seen that methods were a mix of traditional and ICLT: teachers seemed comfortable with student-centred activity and comparison (ICLT) but less so with exploratory and reflective practices (non-ICLT). Content, though, often retained a language focus, and
culture that was integrated amounted to mostly overt aspects (Byram & Feng, 2004; Sercu et al., 2005) with few opportunities for genuine engagement with, and exploration of, a target culture perspective (non-ICLT). In other words, often students were taught about culture rather than in it and through it (Roberts et al., 2001).

These results support those studies that have demonstrated that teachers have an appreciation of the value of culture in the language class, but in practice, culture remains secondary to language, and integration is rare (e.g., Byrd & Wall, 2009; Díaz, 2013; Lange & Paige, 2003; Manjarrés, 2009; Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Oranje, 2012; Oranje & Feryok, 2013; Sercu et al. 2005). This represents the abstract—concrete divide, in which contextual circumstances hinder the carrying out of theoretical ideals. The participants’ uncertainty about how to practice integration, exploration, and reflection in the classroom was a significant impediment to enacting ICLT beliefs and implementing pragmatism’s theory of learning.

Although the reported practices of New Zealand secondary school language teachers do not emphatically align with ICLT, it must be concluded that the hypothesis Teacher’s reported language and culture classroom practices do not reflect an ICLT approach is rejected. The data from this study indicated that the majority of teachers’ reported classroom practices did, to some extent, reflect an ICLT approach. Overall, though, they appear to be working from a hybrid, or perhaps transitional position. For some, this might have amounted to a “cut-down or ‘stream-lined’ version of their theoretical understandings... refined through their exigencies of practice” (Mangubhai et al., 2005, p. 58). However, as the upcoming discussion of Hypothesis 3 reveals, it seems more likely to be the coincidental development of thoughts and practices consistent with ICLT without necessarily understanding the theory, principles, and methods of the approach. Regardless, this suggests that the progression of teachers’ orientations from cultural to intercultural will not require overwhelming and off-putting change. The third and final hypothesis relating to Phase 1 is discussed next.

6.3 Hypothesis 3: Teachers do not demonstrate awareness of ICLT as an approach to teaching language and culture.

Responses to Hypotheses 1 and 2 provided evidence that the teachers in this study demonstrated some cognitions and some classroom practices that were consistent with an
ICLT approach. That does not necessarily mean they were aware of, and consciously put into practice, ICLT theory and principles. Hypothesis 3 relates to the teachers’ awareness of ICLT as a teaching approach.

A single item was used to explore this hypothesis, asking participants if they had heard of ICLT, and if so, whether they were familiar with its principles and whether they practised the approach. Given that many teachers reported thinking and working in ways that accorded with ICLT, it was surprising to obtain the result that two-thirds of the participants reported being unfamiliar with ICLT. The one-third who reported awareness, understanding, and practice of ICLT is larger than the proportion who agreed with cognition and practice statements fundamental to ICLT. (There could have been a social desirability bias at play, or it is possible that those participants do not practice ICLT wholeheartedly.) For example, less than one-third agreed strongly that they taught the ability to explore cultures and only 11.8% agreed strongly that they taught the ability to mediate between cultures, both important ICLT practices. Most telling was the result that only 20% considered intercultural communicative competence, the fundamental objective of ICLT, to be the most important outcome of language education. There was a positive correlation between awareness of ICLT and scores on the ICLT Activities scale. In that respect, there was a clear association between cognitions (awareness) and practices (ICLT activities).

Just over one-third of all participants reported having participated in training that had exposed them to ICLT, most commonly as part of in-service professional development courses or workshops. This supports Kelly’s (2012) assertion that professional development opportunities are an appropriate means of developing ICLT understanding in practising teachers. Indeed, professional affiliation and reading professional literature positively correlated with ICLT awareness. Those aspects are within the reach, and control, of any teacher. There was also a positive correlation with teaching experience, indicating that with time, awareness of ICLT might develop within an individual.

Research has highlighted the importance of ICLT being included in initial teacher education programmes (e.g., Bastos & Araújo e Sá, 2014; Byrd et al., 2011; Kelly, 2012; Peiser & Jones, 2013; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Woodgate-Jones, 2009) and pragmatism would require that such exposure allows student teachers to engage with, test, and reflect
on the content. Thus, the content will be internalised for future application and amount to more than simply technical knowledge (Dewey, 1916/2008). Only six participants reported that ICLT instruction had been part of their original teacher training, despite some 16 individuals having had teaching careers of four years or less, that is, since ICLT (and iCLT in particular) became a feature of the New Zealand education system. The fact that four of those six actually trained more than 15 years ago has already been mentioned as suggesting a response bias might be at play for some. It is possible, therefore, that only two participants were actually exposed to ICLT in their teacher training course. This is of concern and will be discussed later in the Discussion (chapter 9).

Of those teachers who claimed to be aware of ICLT, the majority believed the practice was encouraged in New Zealand by the Ministry, professional bodies, and through the literature. Some of the responses came across as being unsympathetic towards those who reported not having heard of ICLT, making emphatic references to the curriculum, other Ministry documentation, and availability of funding for associated professional development. If this were so, how could there be such a large proportion of participants with no awareness of ICLT? It could simply be a case of once the idea has been noticed it is recognised more often, so appears more prevalent to those already aware of ICLT. It could also represent a divide between teachers who participate in professional development and therefore have the chance to engage with ICLT theory and practices and internalise them as their own (as Dewey would encourage), and those who do not, or cannot, take up those opportunities. Some of those aware of ICLT sought to further their knowledge of the approach, with Ministry published or endorsed materials being the marginally preferred means of doing so. Participants also accessed resources for ICLT-based activity ideas and materials but were more likely to gather this information from general websites and through collaboration with colleagues than from Ministry sources. It is not known how many participants were aware that the online curriculum guide for Learning Languages features the principles of iCLT and provides activity examples to incorporate them within the learning programme (Ministry of Education, 2013), but such low levels of awareness of ICLT suggests the resource is not being regularly, or fruitfully, accessed by practising teachers.
6.3.1 Overall Evaluation of Hypothesis 3

It is clear that awareness of ICLT is low in practising New Zealand language teachers. A large group has no awareness at all, and for another sizable number the full extent of their awareness is having heard the name. For those participants, any exposure that they may have had to ICLT appears to have served no educative value (Dewey, 1910/2005). It is evident that steps must be taken to increase New Zealand teachers’ engagement with ICLT if the Ministry and scholars continue to promote the approach. Unfortunately, despite the lapse of time since ICLT, and iCLT specifically, were introduced into the educational system, there seems to have been little advance on the reports from the other New Zealand studies. The passing of time means that ICLT can no longer in good faith be described as an “emerging area in New Zealand” (Conway et al, 2010, p. 459); it has emerged, but without the notice of many. The results, then, do not support the rejection of this third hypothesis. The majority of teachers do not demonstrate awareness of ICLT as an approach to teaching language and culture.

6.4 Overall Summary

It was found that the participants considered culture to be important in the language class, and intertwined with language, but rated it as being less important than most linguistic skills, and reported favouring the language dimension in practice. This is characteristic of cognitions from a professional perspective being at odds with, and dominant over, personal beliefs (Agee, 2004; Birello, 2012; Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009). Professional beliefs can be associated with tested and trusted core beliefs and dominant activities (Sannino, 2008) and in this context, they emphasise the language dimension. These conflict with and also overpower personal beliefs, which may be peripheral and more theoretical, as represented by the non-dominant activity of culture taking a central role in the classroom.

The participants demonstrated cognitions that either agreed slightly with many of the ICLT cognition statements or agreed strongly with a few, and ICLT practises were either occasional for a large number, or regular for a few. In many ways, New Zealand language teachers are heading in the right direction towards ICLT; they were “favourably disposed” (Sercu, 2005, p. 10). Pragmatism would encourage exposure to focused professional development with opportunities for engagement with ICLT theory and
practices, and time to reflect, judge, and reason on it with support from concrete examples and evidence of benefits. In this way, the meaning of ICLT, in terms of its relevance and usefulness in teaching languages and cultures will be created, tested, and adjusted for future transactions (Biesta & Burbules, 2003). ICLT could shift to being a core belief, not held unthinkingly, internalised to guide future practices (Dewey, 1910/2005). The responses from this study suggest that the teachers’ could move towards more of an ICLT approach without significant changes in ways of thinking or behaving, subject to access to professional development and supporting resources, and exposure to the theory in practice.

This concludes the evaluation of the hypotheses of Phase 1 of the study. The next chapter presents the findings from Phase 2, the classroom work on cultural portfolio projects.
CHAPTER 7 – QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

7.0 Overview

This chapter presents the findings from the in-class intervention of the cultural portfolio project (CPP) task, implemented in three classes as Phase 2. The steps of the CPPs were outlined in the Methodology (chapter 4). This phase comprised qualitative research using data collected during the classroom work and from interviews. The data were analysed with the three research questions in mind:

1. To what extent do the teachers’ cognitions about the CPP reveal an ICLT approach?
2. To what extent do the teachers’ and students’ practices of the CPP reveal an ICLT approach?
3. To what extent do CPPs enhance the teachers’ awareness of ICLT as a teaching approach?

Data from the following sources are incorporated within each section of this chapter allowing triangulation of perspectives for each step of the project:

(i) Pre-CPP planning session with each teacher;
(ii) Field notes based on observations of the CPPs in practice;
(iii) Reflection sheets completed by the students as part of the CPPs;
(iv) Post-CPP semi-structured class discussions;
(v) Post-CPP interview with each teacher.

The findings are presented as a chronological report of the implementation and evaluation of the CPPs. Firstly, data relating to the initial planning sessions with each of the three teachers are described. From there, the findings progress through the practical application of the projects over the 9-week term concluding with teachers’ evaluations of the CPPs. After initially deliberating on presentation by theme and by case study, this chronological framework was settled on because of its clarity in reflecting the operationalisation of the activity over time and in revealing the participants’ development.
over the course of the study. Accordingly, the findings commence with the initial contact with the teacher participants and the formal planning sessions, where much of the practical implementation of the CPPs was negotiated.

7.1 Recruitment and planning sessions

All three teacher participants volunteered to be involved in the project at a presentation I gave to the local branch of the NZALT. To follow up on that initial expression of interest, I met briefly with each teacher to give them a general idea of the project so they could confirm their desire to participate. I specified the steps that were to be consistent across all classes (see section 4.3.1, chapter 4), emphasising that the details of the implementation of each step would be determined in collaboration with the teacher, in a planning session.

The planning sessions were held at the respective schools at times selected by the teachers. The schedule, presented in Table 7.1, shows the short time between the planning session and the first classes, for Ada and Helene especially.

Table 7.1
Schedule of Planning Sessions and First CPP Classes with Teacher Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher participant</th>
<th>Planning session</th>
<th>First class lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig – City School</td>
<td>Monday 14 April</td>
<td>Tuesday 6 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada – Greenview School</td>
<td>Thursday 1 May</td>
<td>Monday 5 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene – Muirside School</td>
<td>Tuesday 29 July</td>
<td>Thursday 31 July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I took to the planning sessions four documents I had prepared to assist the meeting, namely:

(1) A tentative and simple timetable for the steps of the project. A timetable was finalised by the end of each planning session, but in all cases it remained flexible to accommodate ever-changing school-life.
An example reflection sheet. This was offered as one method for students to generate critical and explanatory notes on each research session. It is discussed later in this chapter.

A list of the matters on which decisions needed to be made before the first lesson. These included aspects such as the extent of my involvement in the lessons, the method used to generate hypotheses, the nature of the annotation of each session’s findings, access to native speakers, presentation of findings, and other similar details.

An explanation of how the project could be dynamically assessed (Schulz, 2007; Su, 2011). It transpired that this information was unnecessary because none of the teachers wanted the CPPs per se to be assessed. This was summed up by Craig, “They’re assessed to death here, in every subject. They don’t need another set of marks I don’t think” (CPS511-512), and he did not believe his students needed grades to motivate them. Elements of the CPPs were adapted for assessment, though, as discussed elsewhere in this chapter.

Completed examples of first three documents are included in Appendix N. These documents acted as meditational tools to frame the planning sessions. Working through the decision list, in particular, facilitated the detailed application of the CPP in each case to suit the particular needs of the students and the objectives of the teachers.

Although five steps of the project were consistent across the classes, the ways in which those steps were implemented in each class were uniquely developed in collaboration with the teacher. Collaboration was important for two main reasons: (1) it enhanced the teacher’s engagement and level of investment in the study, improving its value as a professional development tool and a means of influencing their beliefs and practices (Díaz, 2013; Guskey, 1986; Pajares, 1992; Scarino, 2005, 2014; Sercu, 1998); and (2) it allowed the CPPs to be designed to fit the unique environment of each classroom as teachers shared the individual needs of the students (Davydov, 1995; Dewey, 1897, 1938; Ministry of Education, 2007a; Newton, forthcoming; Oranje, 2012; Timperley, 2011). It also improved the quality of the activity, as teachers could reveal my blind spots in the design and practicability of the project (Sercu & St. John, 2007).
In these sessions, the teachers settled on class of students they wanted to involve. Their decisions were based on a range of matters, but for Ada and Craig it primarily related to the nature of assessment expected for each level of NCEA, the national secondary school qualification. Ada and Craig both saw that the presentation of findings stage of the CPP could be in the form of a speech, a required assessment for Year 12 (Level 2) NCEA. This decision was bolstered by the fact that the timing of the project (Term 2) fitted well with the due date for the speech assessment (end of Term 2). Craig taught a combined class of Years 12 and 13, so it was necessary that the project could be adapted to suit both NCEA Levels 2 and 3. Because Helene’s planning session was held later, her classes were at a different stage in the assessment year, so other factors led to her decision to involve her Year 11 French class. The length of period over which the project could be carried out was flexible, provided all steps of the CPP were accommodated; all three teachers suggested a term-length run (9 weeks), with project work one class period per week.

All teachers singled out particular students in the class who had unique characteristics that could shape the project, evidence of their understanding of the influence of their students’ ontogeneses (Cross, 2010; Swain et al., 2011). In some cases, it was to acknowledge students as being funds of knowledge (Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Scott & Palincsar, 2009), such as Craig’s reference to Frith and Sarah as making valuable contributions having just returned from an exchange to Germany, and Ada’s description of Tom as being more advanced and more dominant in the classroom. In other cases, it was to emphasise the diversity in the class. Craig mentioned Jacqui as having “special needs” (CPS31) that could mean that some of her responses “might be interesting” (CPS33). Helene’s French class was the most diverse. It included two girls on exchange from Germany—Malene and Margo—and although Muirside was a girls’ school, Adrian attended Helene’s French class because of a timetable clash in his subject choices at his school. In addition, two girls (Anya and Kelly) had learning difficulties. With this knowledge of the diversity of their classes, the teachers were in a position to mine the social and cultural knowledge of the classroom, characterising the revised principles of iCLT (Newton, forthcoming).

This knowledge of their students had an impact on how the first step of the CPPs—hypothesis generation—would be carried out in each class. Craig and Helene believed
their students would be comfortable generating hypotheses by brainstorming as a class and sharing their preconceptions as they came to mind. Ada anticipated that Tom would dominate such a session, so stipulated that time be provided for all students to write down three preconceptions, after which each would share at least one with the class.

The extent to which the target language would be used in the CPPs was discussed with each teacher. Ada considered the CPPs would have a low focus on German language, making them less cognitively taxing and therefore suitable for the last class of the day on Mondays. Craig, though, took a more expansive approach in the planning session, thinking about how language could be incorporated within the basic CPP framework: “I think we can do lots of language things in there too. I mean I can build other things into it as well” (CPS140-141). It appears that Craig saw potential for the CPPs to be a foundation activity upon which he could build his own class objectives. As will be seen later in this chapter, however, there is no evidence of this happening in practice.

Presenting their findings as their speech assessment would require output in German from Ada’s and Craig’s students. In her planning session, Ada anticipated teaching language-focused lessons near the end of term to prepare the boys for their speeches. Part of Ada’s reasoning for this was that it was her first year teaching at Greenview and she considered the Year 12 students to have lower language proficiency than she would expect if she had taught them from the outset. Other avenues for use of German were discussed, such as searching German websites and texts, interviewing native German speakers in German, and/or translating interview answers into German. These are all authentic applications of target language generated by the context of the CPP (Abrams et al., 2006; Delett et al., 2001), an objective of the New Zealand curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007a), a principle of iCLT (Newton et al., 2010), and genuinely educative (Dewey, 1916/2008). Craig, in particular, made regular mention of the importance of activities being authentic, for example, “If there’s a purpose for doing it, then yeah, I’m into it” (CPS127), which reflects teachers’ responses in East and Scott’s (2011) report.

It was Helene’s usual practice to expose her students to as much French as possible, although she remarked that many would be happy to use English in the CPPs. Initially
desiring all research and findings to be carried out in French, Helene altered her stance with recognition that Year 11 students are likely to “copy and paste and they don’t digest it” (HPS242-245). She advised she would prefer her students to try to put things in their own words and would be satisfied with “Franglaise, you know a mixture of the two?” (HPS248-250). She intended to cover the language with students as they worked on the CPPs, managed so as not to affect their focus or feeling of ownership of the project.

All teachers confirmed at the planning session that the students would have access to native speakers who could serve as interviewees, a primary source of information for the hypothesis testing step. Ada was herself a native speaker. She worked closely with Greenview’s other teacher of German, Suse, also a native speaker, and Astrid, the ILEP German language assistant, would be present on alternate weeks. On the opposite weeks, Astrid would attend City School. Helene was particularly keen to make use of native speakers, something she already did when possible because they did not suffer from being outdated or irrelevant; whereas, books could be “just too specialized... and old-school” (HPS350) (as noted by Abrams et al., 2006; Byram, 1991; Luk, 2012; Sercu, 2004a; Sercu et al., 2005; Schulz & Ganz, 2010). Helene had contacts from her exchanges to France, she knew a number of native speakers in the city who could visit, and there was a French student at Muirside School who could come to class. In this way, Helene was mining the social and cultural knowledge of her community (revised iCLT Principle 1 (Newton, forthcoming)).

Craig and Ada quickly settled on internally assessed output in German as the method for presentation of findings. In Ada’s class this was a speech; in Craig’s class it could be a speech or a conversation. Again, Craig emphasised the value he saw in using the CPP findings as affording a real purpose to the speeches and conversations, giving the students a “good reason” (CPS491) for doing them as a genuine social interaction, putting into practice, consciously or not, Principle 2 of iCLT (Ministry of Education, 2013; Newton et al., 2010). Helene, though, was not yet certain of how the presentation of findings would occur. Although Year 11 (Level 1 NCEA) assessment had a speech requirement, it was only simple, one minute long, and usually about the students themselves or another topic they knew well. I raised the possibility of a poster (Allen, 2004), which Helene liked. She also considered a PowerPoint presentation and a speech in English, but in which students shared some French language, and “they could almost
make like a little dictionary” (HP472) of language relevant to the topic. She was also mindful of the range of proficiencies in her class conscious that some students might use language that was too complicated, and therefore not useful, for others. She chose not to settle on the method of presentation at the planning session.

Based on the recommendations of earlier CPP studies (Allen, 2004; Byon, 2007; Delett et al., 2001; Su, 2011) the project included reflection sheets for students to consolidate the information found in a research session, consider the impact of the information on their hypothesis, and reflect on whether the findings were similar or different to their own cultural perspective. I presented a draft reflection sheet as an option for recording and annotating each search session, and mentioned other possibilities such as written summaries in the target language presented as different genres (e.g., postcard to a friend, annotated bibliography). All teachers were satisfied with the reflection sheets and saw particular value in them as being easily accessible records of findings and providing structure (especially Ada, who believed her class of boys worked best with structures and plans). Ada suggested the sheets could include a requirement to write two or three sentences in German about findings from each session. (This is raised again later.) Craig said he could “work something up for it” (CPS235-236) to include a language component. (He did not do so in practice.)

Craig and Ada agreed it would be worthwhile for students to submit the reflections for feedback on a regular basis. However, as discussed later, that did not transpire in operation, a matter I mentioned in Helene’s planning session. Helene saw value in dynamic assessment and suggested that, rather than base it on submitted reflection sheets, she could do it orally, sitting alongside the students as they completed their reflection. She also saw value in creating regular opportunities for the students to share findings, such as taking a few minutes at the end of the lesson to ask if anyone had something interesting or useful to share. (This did not occur in practice.)

Craig and Ada both recommended electronic means supported by Google Docs for reflection sheet completion; their classes were used to this facility. Helene had recently experienced Google Docs and she wanted to offer that option to her class. All teachers confirmed that their students would have access to computers, a necessary resource for searching websites if not for reflection completion. At Greenview School, all students had
their own laptops; at City and Muirside Schools a pool of laptops could be booked for class use.

There were some early responses to the CPP steps involving students’ reflection on their own cultures. Helene demonstrated awareness of the value of this, raising it herself as I described how the *Conversity Across Cultures* (Magee, n.d.) discussion cards could be used for the first lesson (detailed later). She recognised the value of the cards in getting students to think “does that happen in my culture?” (HPS57) and “how it might be different? how it might be similar?” (HPS67). This is indicative of Helene taking an intercultural orientation in this respect (Liddicoat, 2005) and having an understanding of culture as a verb (Roberts et al., 2001), as dynamic practices and ways of living (Liddicoat, 2002, 2005). She saw the need to be aware of similarities and differences between the C1 and the C2 (Barro et al., 1993). In contrast, Ada did not express value in the students’ considering their own culture. In fact, it seemed that she believed that step of the CPPs to be a hindrance to learning sufficient language for the speech, taking up lessons that should be devoted to the language dimension. Her view on students’ reflection on their own culture was that “they’re gonna do that automatically anyway, aren’t they?” (APS835), saying again later, “I think they’re gonna automatically put it back on, well this is different to what I do” (APS844-845). This appears to suggest that Ada took a chiefly cultural (rather than intercultural) orientation, and that although she expected comparisons to be made, they would be done without critical self-awareness, without the learner being transformed (Dewey, 1909/2009; Liddicoat, 2005, 2011; Phipps, 2003; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009), and without relativising their C1 and entering a C3 (Byram, 1997; Crozet et al., 1999; Dewey, 1910/2005; Jordan, 2002; Kramsch, 1993; Newton et al., 2010; Wilkinson, 2012). This approach runs counter to the New Zealand curriculum guide’s recommendations for explicit comparison between cultures and languages and development of an “actively reflective disposition” (Ministry of Education, 2012, section 5, para 6). Without critical self-awareness the ICLT competency of savoir s’engager (Byram, 1997) will go undeveloped.

All three teachers considered it appropriate that I was the primary facilitator in the first lesson to establish the purpose of the project and stimulate the integration of culture in their lessons, but that they would also contribute, particularly with respect to the hypothesis generation step. All were motivated and positive about the start of the CPPs.
Craig ended his planning session by saying the CPP was a “nice little project that can run in conjunction with everything else that we’re doing. I really like it” (CPS219-220).

7.2 First CPP classes

I facilitated the first lesson at all three schools, following the same format in each. After introducing myself and describing my research area (and defining linguistics), I asked the class about their understanding of culture. Immediate responses from the Year 12 and 13 students of City and Greenview Schools suggested a rather broad perspective that reflected everyday values and behaviours, or culture as practices (Liddicoat, 2005). Frith, a Year 13 student of German at City School said culture was “everything we do” (CFC14). In the Year 12 German class at Greenview, Marc offered, “Values to groups of people” (GFC12) and Tom contributed, “The way that everyday life varies from different places” (GFC15) and, “It’s everything” (GFC17). In the younger Year 11 French class of Muirside School, though, only Holly responded, saying culture was food and celebrations. With some direction from me, the conversations all eventually suggested some recognition of individuals being members of multiple cultures, associated with their ethnicity, their citizenship, the school, the classroom, the language classroom, and so on.

The Conversity Across Cultures cards (hereafter “Conversity cards”) formed a significant part of this first session. Created by Magee (n.d.), a New Zealand educator, the cards are conversation starters about diversity (see Appendix O for examples, included with permission). Taking advice offered by Newton (J. Newton, personal communication, 29 November 2013) that it could be beneficial to start the project off by first directing students to their own culture, and to the potential for generalisations to be made about it, we considered three Conversity cards from the perspective of the dominant New Zealand cultures. The scenarios were: (1) holding hands in public, (2) looking at someone in the eye, and (3) women taking their husband’s last name on marriage. These conversations highlighted that there was no single answer for each situation. A number of aspects about each topic arose, including the following:

*Holding hands in public:* Conventionally acceptable for parents and their young children, couples (although rare and “tacky” (GFC166) for older couples to hold hands, and most were uncomfortable with their parents holding hands), and as a
comfort gesture (but two heterosexual males holding hands for comfort was not conventional).

**Looking someone in the eye:** Acceptability reliant on duration of the look and the context. Some disagreement in conventions. For example, if reprimanded by the Principal some said they would look him/her in the eye, and some said they would look at the ground. (This could be influenced by a level of awareness of Māori and some Pasifika cultural conventions, which consider direct eye contact to signify challenge, an awareness arising from New Zealand’s multicultural environment.)

**Women taking husband’s name on marriage.** Common, normal, traditional; not a matter of *should* but *can*; connotations of Mrs, Ms, and Miss; what name children take; advent of husband taking wife’s name. Tom (Greenview) said of New Zealand culture, “It just goes to show that there *is* a culture of set things, but still people do it differently” (GFC219-220).

With the next two cards, the classes were asked to share some of the different cultural perspectives they had heard of, in order to appreciate the existence of a range of alternative viewpoints. The two scenarios were (1) waiting in line, and (2) meal time rituals. Awareness of alternatives for waiting in line was limited to queuing, pushing in to a queue, and swarming in together. The card based on mealtime rituals, though, generated a rich range of cultural alternatives related to: who can eat first (based on age, gender, social role, etc.), who serves whom (gender, role, seating position, help yourself, reaching across food/people), where the meal is eaten (at a table, on the floor, in front of the television, gender division), utensils used (fingers, chopsticks, spoons), acceptability of noises (talking, slurping, burping), shared dishes/individual servings, finish whole serving/leave some on plate, second helpings, and more.

The third use of the *Conversity* cards was to prime the students for their preconceptions about the target culture specifically. The following matters were raised about the target culture’s viewpoint on: (1) being on time (trains on schedule, lateness is disrespectful or rude, structure important, depends on relationships), (2) honesty versus kindness (upfront but not unkind, dishonesty interpreted as unkind), and (3) conducting greetings (handshakes, hug, cheek kisses, gender differences, use of titles).
Use of the Conversity cards supported the development of savoir être (Byram, 1997), encouraging curiosity, openness, and relativising the C1 with other cultural viewpoints. These general cultural discussions lasted for approximately half of the lesson and set the scene for a project based on culture. Teachers and students were keen contributors.

The second half of class was devoted to the generation of preconceptions about the target cultures which would be treated as hypotheses in the CPPs. Students were asked to state things they knew, thought they knew, or had heard about the target culture in a class brainstorming session (Craig’s and Helene’s classes) or initially individually and then shared (Ada’s class). The teacher typed a list of all preconceptions into a Word document projected onto the whiteboard.

Because I was facilitating the first classes, the extent of target language use was limited. There was no use of German in Ada’s class. She sat to the side in this session and at times carried out her own work meaning her attention was divided for much of the first half, and was focused on recording the hypotheses in the second half. Ada’s contributions of her own experiences of New Zealand or German cultures were limited, despite her position as native to the target language and therefore an authority on it to some extent (Byram, 2015; Ghanem, 2014; Kelly, 2012). Craig and Helene were fully engaged participants in all stages of this lesson—Helene even made her own addition to the list of preconceptions, about French workers striking, in the hope it would be chosen for investigation so she could learn about it. (It was not.) In this respect, Craig and Helene appeared happy to take on the role provided by the CPPs of co-explorer (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Scarino, 2014) and the classes seemed engaged by their teacher’s viewpoints and experiences, supporting Byram et al.’s (1991) point that students value teachers’ personal contributions as being relevant and current. Astrid, the language assistant—a position promoted as being up to date with language and culture (ILEP, 2015)—was present in Craig’s class and she engaged in the activity but contributed infrequently and remained neutral when students raised their preconceptions about German culture. Occasionally, Craig would use German language but he appeared to restrain it, conscious of the fact that I could not understand German. Helene used French for classroom instruction, which appeared to be her routine. She was aware that I had studied French many years ago, so
might not have felt the need to inhibit her use of French. Use of the target language is discussed again at other points in this chapter.

Students were given the week to decide on an item from the list to treat as a hypothesis to research and test its validity. All three classes seemed motivated at the conclusion of the first lesson. Craig asked his class if they thought the project sounded interesting; all responded affirmatively and he added “me too” (CFC600). The findings arising from the week-to-week operationalisation of the CPPs are discussed next.

7.3 CPPs in progress

The findings that relate to the practice of the CPPs are subdivided to address the specific steps and features of the projects, namely, researching, the reflection sheets, native speaker interviews, reformulating the hypotheses to relate to the C1, and the use of the target language. But first, the hypotheses selected by each student are presented.

7.3.1 Students’ hypotheses

The preconceptions chosen as hypotheses and researched by the students are listed in Table 7.2, along with the students’ own verdicts on whether their research had confirmed or challenged their hypotheses. It will be seen that for many of the confirmed hypotheses, students recognised that the notion also applied to their own culture. The findings of the students’ research are not the focus of this study, so they are not presented other than appearing in data excerpts elsewhere in this thesis.

Table 7.2

Hypotheses Chosen and Researched by the Students with Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Verdict (students’ report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenview School</td>
<td>Sagashi</td>
<td>That German school systems are different to Japan’s</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>That Germans are comfortable with nudity</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>That Germany has a good engineering industry</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Confirmation and applicability to C1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richie</td>
<td>That Germans tend not to wear bright coloured clothes</td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>That Germans eat a lot of meat and potatoes</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>That Germans drink a lot of beer</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City School Sarah</td>
<td>That Germans are punctual</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frith</td>
<td>That Germany as a nation is respectful of religion</td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnie</td>
<td>That Germans care a lot about holidays like Christmas</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsty</td>
<td>That Germans are practical, punctual, and follow the rules</td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinead</td>
<td>That music has historical importance in Germany</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui</td>
<td>That German teenagers’ clothing is different</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muirside School Kim</td>
<td>That French breakfasts are sweet</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talia</td>
<td>That French people smoke a lot</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>That French people consider Christmas important because of its religious value</td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlyn</td>
<td>That French people are formal</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine</td>
<td>That mime is important to French people</td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malene</td>
<td>That the French school system is different</td>
<td>Confirmed but some applicability to C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Margo  That French people smoke a lot  Confirmed but some applicability to C1
Kelly  That French students are not allowed to learn a musical instrument at school  Confirmed
Anya  That food is important to French people  Challenged
Tineke  That French students are not allowed to learn a musical instrument at school  Confirmed
Adrian  That the Arts are important to French people  Confirmed

Note. Kelly and Tineke worked as a pair on a single hypothesis due to Tineke’s regular absences from the CPP sessions and Kelly’s learning difficulties.

Helene chose not to impose any restriction on the hypotheses generated by her class. Both Ada and Craig had suggested that a Year 11 class, being larger and of lower language proficiency, would benefit from some restraint on the hypotheses so the teacher’s language assistance could be tailored to either pre-set topics, or to a limited number of topics. However, Helene was happy for the class to have free reign on hypothesis generation and not be “too channelled” (HPS317). In fact, she considered the open choice and unrestrained exploration element of the project to be “the beauty of it” (HPS231), allowing students’ natural interests to guide and motivate their exploration of the topic (Dewey, 1915/2008).

This study was not concerned with the merit of the hypotheses or the students’ findings per se. The focus was on whether the CPP task provided the students with an opportunity to explore a topic from the perspective of the target culture and their own culture, in order to make comparisons, in line with an intercultural approach. The findings associated with the operation of that primary exploratory step, researching the hypotheses, are presented next.

7.3.2 Researching
Between Weeks 1 and 2 all students had picked their hypotheses from the list, with the exceptions of Sinead (City) and Tineke (Muirside), who had each thought of a novel one
grounded in their love of music. The timetables created at the planning sessions set aside two or three lessons for researching the target culture’s perspective using sources other than native speakers. It was anticipated that those research sessions would involve multiple information sources (Schulz, 2007; Wright, 2000), such as websites, books, films, newspapers, advertisements, YouTube videos, and more. In reality, the principal source of information was the internet. (Contact with native speakers, the other key resource, is discussed separately in section 7.3.3.)

Despite being regular users of the internet, the students were not adept at searching efficiently and took longer to find relevant information than predicted. This was clear after the first research session so I subsequently developed a tip sheet of internet search techniques based on one available on my University’s library website (www.otago.ac.nz/library/) and in the second session I provided some basic instruction on improving search results. Despite being online for most of the research sessions, participants seemed to avoid music videos and YouTube clips as a source of information, in favour of text-based webpages of varying quality and reliability. (I had also provided points on how to assess reliability.) I took to the class books on loan from the public library but they were limited in value because they were out of date, directed at young children, and/or covered only overt culture. At Greenview School, Tom and Matt went to the school library, but fared no better in terms of books of quality and relevance. Ada contributed to the CPP classwork by using German search engine www.google.de to find sites pertaining to the boys’ topics and emailed the URLs to the respective students. Helene had stipulated in her planning session that she wanted only two sessions dedicated to in-class researching because she wanted greater focus on interacting with native speakers.

Students were given the option to change their hypotheses if their initial searching was not fruitful. No one did so, in spite of some of topics proving difficult to find information on. Nadine (Muirside) was a case in point. Asked twice by Helene if she wanted to change her hypothesis from That mime is important to French people, Nadine elected to pursue it because it was something that interested her. She had become engaged in exploring that particular cultural aspect (Abrams et al., 2006; Delett et al., 2001; Dewey, 1916/2008) and there was value in the associated struggles as it gave rise to
opportunities for teacher and student to work together to communicate, understand, and reflect on learning (Lee, 1997).

All students were engaged in exploring aspects of the target culture that were of particular interest to them meaning, in pragmatism terms, the knowledge was more useful and relevant (Prawat, 2009). For instance, Sinead (City) and Tineke (Muirside), both keen musicians, selected hypotheses related to music, and jocular Tom (Greenview) clearly enjoyed the risqué nature of his topic on nudity. As Tineke (Muirside) put it, the projects were not “just something that the teacher’s spouting off, [but] something we’re actually interested in” (MCD264). All remained committed to their topics to the end. This is likely to be because they were able to make their own unique and meaningful contributions to the class (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Dewey, 1916/2008; Sercu et al., 2005). Because the knowledge was not simply transmitted by the teacher with the expectation that it be memorised, students’ attention to it was wholehearted and the resulting products of their exploration could be claimed as their own (Lazaraton, 2003), underscored by Helene’s remark, “They own it much more” (HTI487). They could take the role as expert on their topic (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and could actively make meaning from new and unique information (Lee, 1997; Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006).

To demonstrate the exploratory nature of the CPPs, Excerpt 1 from Muirside’s post-CPP class discussion introduces Nadine’s discoveries as she explored the C1 and C2 in relation to her hypothesis, That mime is important to French people.

Excerpt 1.

61. Nadine: I did miming? And like ’cause a lot of us kiwis stereotype France with miming? And I found out
62. that it’s actually not like that at all and they don’t do so much ...miming anymore? Um, and it originated
63. not from France either? So I think it was like Rome or something like that? way back
64. Jo: that’s interesting
65. Nadine: and I think it was- it became popular because of Marce- that thing like
66. Jo: Marcel Marceau?
67. Nadine: yeah (MCD)

Excerpt 1 demonstrates how exploration had mediated Nadine’s development in a number of the competencies of Byram’s (1997) model of ICC. Productive exploration
requires an attitude of curiosity and openness to new perspectives, a feature of the competency of *savoir être*. By exploring cultures, Nadine had discovered the origins of mime and found they were not based in French culture, thus enhancing her development of *savoirs* or knowledge of culture. She had come to appreciate the stereotypical nature of her preconception (Barro et al., 1993) and how she had over-generalised (Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Su, 2011). Nadine reported that the French people she had corresponded with had not realised that others associated mime with French culture. This revelation became a step towards her development of *savoir comprendre*, as she identified her hypothesis as taking an ethnocentric perspective.

Engagement of this level supported development of the students’ curiosity, and their willingness to engage with the C2 and suspend beliefs, all features of the ICC competency of *savoir être* (Byram, 1997). In the CPPs, engagement with the C2 was at its most meaningful when students interacted with native speakers. This step and the associated findings are presented next.

### 7.3.3 Native speaker contact

Interviewing a native speaker was a compulsory component of the research step of the CPPs. This ethnographic element exposed students to different viewpoints explained by those who lived within the culture (Roberts et al., 2001; Sobolewski, 2009). It also provided opportunities for students to engage in genuine social interaction (iCLT’s Principle 2) and make appropriate responses in different contexts (iCLT Principle 3) (Ministry of Education, 2013; Newton et al., 2010). On a day-to-day basis, the boys at Greenview had the greatest access to native speakers. This was the only class with a teacher native to the target language culture. Greenview’s other native-speaking German teacher, Suse, was regularly present in their class including periods when she acted as a substitute teacher (not observed); it was at one such period that all boys interviewed Suse. Astrid was at Greenview on alternate weeks. During an unobserved non-CPP period, the boys contacted a former language assistant in Germany, via Skype, at Tom’s request. In arranging the Skype meeting, Ada sent ahead the list of hypotheses so the conversation could be used to provide an alternative perspective on the topics.

At Muirside, at Helene’s request, focus was given to interacting with native speakers. Her class posed their interview questions to a native French visitor to the class—an
acquaintance of Helene’s and former secondary school teacher of French—during an unobserved non-CPP period. In addition, Helene emailed the students’ interview questions to a selection of her personal contacts, based mostly in France, asking for responses to be given in simple French. This provided each student with a further two or three perspectives, which were especially valuable given their variety across location, gender, age (one was 96 years old) and profession (Jogan et al., 2001; Roberts et al., 2001; Sobolewski, 2009). The students did find it difficult to translate the emailed responses, however, and relied on either Google Translate or Helene’s direction translation. In an unplanned follow-on task, Helene required the students to formulate a supplementary question, in French, based on one of the email responses. This required more extensive use of the language and, being a genuine social interaction, supported iCLT Principle 2 (Ministry of Education, 2013; Newton et al., 2010) and developed competence in savoir apprendre (Byram, 1997).

Other than Astrid’s visits on alternate weeks, City School had no native speaker visit during the CPPs. Astrid was interviewed by Jacqui and Sinead, but the other students had personal contacts with German speakers, and put their interview questions to them. Frith and Sarah used friendships established during their exchange to Germany; Kirsty’s mother was German; and, Marnie knew a German student at the school. Unlike the other two classes, the City students each obtained only one native perspective.

The interviews were a particularly crucial part of the CPPs because they allowed students to consider the target culture “from the bottom up” (Atkinson & Sohn, 2013, p. 669) through the individual perspectives of those socialised into it. This provides an insider’s view of the C2 (Jordan, 2002; Kramsch, 1993; Wilkinson, 2012), a step towards the students creating their own relativised C3. Making opportunities for contact with native speakers can ease the pressure on those language teachers who are concerned that they do not know enough about the target culture to teach it (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Kohler, 2015; Larzén-Östermark, 2008; Paige et al., 2003; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Sercu et al., 2005; Sercu & St. John, 2007; Woodgate-Jones, 2009). The greater the variety of perspectives, the more likely the student will recognise that the culture is not homogeneous, so in this respect it would seem that Helene’s students are likely to have benefitted most, followed closely by Ada’s.
All three teachers were observed contributing perspectives from their experience of the target languaculture as either a native (Ada) or as a past resident (Craig and Helene), which facilitated comparative discussions as part of the CPPs. Helene’s recent return from France meant she was enthusiastic about sharing her cultural experiences. She had, for example, been particularly struck by the cultural expectation that her French friend address his mother-in-law with the formal form vous. This discussion inspired the hypothesis on formality studied by Caitlyn. Craig volunteered his understanding of a German perspective in response to a remark from Kirsty about her German-born mother having a particular dislike of being stereotyped with ideas “relating back to the time of, like Hitler” (Kirsty, CCD231). Craig asked whether Kirsty’s mother deliberately went “out of her way to not be punctual to break the stereotype” (CCD234-236) given that “it’s a particularly German thing ... to want to not be German” (CCD242-244).

Two examples from Ada’s class are relevant in their demonstration of the value of comparing cultures. In one instance, the boys expressed surprise at Matt’s finding that New Zealand was low in world rankings of beer consumption (#27, to Germany’s #3). Ada suggested alcohol consumption was made an issue of in New Zealand because of the social wrongs it contributed to (left undefined or unexplored) which were less prevalent in Germany. Without this point of comparison, Matt’s findings might have been limited to facts about alcohol consumption. In the second instance, the class discussed Tom’s hypothesis, That Germans are comfortable with nudity. Ada explained that nudity was not “a big thing” (AO3-33) in Germany so a naked person was not necessarily noticed. This appeared to act as a light-bulb moment for Matt, as he became aware that his own culture’s propensity to notice, focus on, and judge a naked person was not necessarily a feature of German cultures. Thus, he could reconcile the different perspectives as being grounded in different cultural conventions (savoir comprendre) (Byram, 1997). Ada’s contributions, directing attention to the why, provided a deeper level of understanding to these instances of shared exploration. It must be said, though, that although the New Zealand perspectives were noted, they were not questioned to the same extent. Nevertheless, the students’ engagement in these examples provided further support for assertions by Byram et al. (1991) and Sercu (2004a) that teachers’ experiences are valued as representations of real target culture over inauthentic or clichéd culture in course materials.
To support the research and interview sessions, students completed reflection sheets. Practices associated with those sheets are now discussed.

### 7.3.4 Reflection sheets

The reflection sheets were completed after each session of research, including the interview and other native speaker contact. The sheets were a mediating tool serving as a record of information to support the final presentation of findings. But, of greater importance in terms of developing ICC, they were the catalyst to comparing and contrasting C1 and C2 throughout the CPPs. As new information was gathered it was not only considered in light of its support of or challenge to the hypothesis, but also how it was similar to or different from the student’s own culture.

In retrospect, however, it was recognised that these reflection sheets did not make the most of the opportunity for experiencing critical self-awareness. Although the format did require comparison, it was not necessary that it be conducted critically or objectively, and did not encourage consideration of one’s “own situatedness from the perspective of another” (Scarino, 2010, p. 324) with an intention to decentre. For example, in Sagashi’s (Greenview) research into secondary schooling in Germany he noted under *Similarities and differences* on one reflection sheet: “Teachers in NZ and Germany are both strict overall. But NZ teachers are friendly” (GRSS4). The extent to which their own culture shaped their viewpoint was not always illuminated for the students. That is not to say that the CPPs as a whole did not lead to individual transformations or critical review of their own culture. This did occur for some, as is discussed later, but looking back on the project, and in light of student and teacher feedback, more should have been made of the reflection sheet’s role in critical cultural awareness in order to enhance development of *savoir s’engager* (Byram, 1997) and to better practice ICLT techniques.

It was initially envisioned that the reflection sheets would be submitted at set intervals for feedback as dynamic assessment of the students engaged in the task (Dixon-Strauss, 1996; Scott & Palincsar, 2009) and so their level of development could be ascertained and supported. However, it became clear that one class period was rarely enough to gather sufficient information *and* write a reflection in response to it. At times, students were tasked with the reflection as homework, but they did not always complete it. Moreover, the extent of self-management of the CPPs meant that students were rarely
all at the same point at the same time. For instance, at week two, some were still conducting their first search and others were writing their third reflections. Holly (Muirside), Tom, and Sagashi (both Greenview) generated notably more reflections than their classmates, but these three students varied greatly in terms of depth of information included on the sheet. Muirside students were not familiar with using Google Docs and so spent a large portion of the first search session setting up the facility on the laptops.

It will be seen in the later sections on CPP evaluation that teachers’ views on the value of the reflection sheets were mixed and some improvements were recommended. The next section presents the step that required students to reformulate their hypothesis to refer to their own culture.

7.3.5 Reformulation

The emphasis on reflection in the reformulation of the hypotheses to relate to the students’ own cultures was most central to this study, but most peripheral for many participants. The concept of critical reflection on one’s cultural conventions and culturally-grounded standpoint is essential in ICLT, and some have argued it is the feature that differentiates ICLT from CLT (e.g., Byram, 1997; East, 2012a). Being aware of research that demonstrated the lack of reflection in language classes (e.g., East, 2012a; Roskvist et al., 2011; Sercu et al., 2005), and to counter Bagnall’s (2005) assertion that “existing school and organisation structures inhibit reflection” (p. 107), the reformulation step from Allen’s (2004) project design was included as a mediational tool to support reflection. The reflective steps were favourably received by the students. Tom (Greenview) explained, “You only really think about your culture if something really weird happens? And you think, oh we don’t normally do that?” (GCD209-211).

In practice, this step suffered in some classes. In the timetables, only one period was dedicated to research on the reformulated hypothesis and, because of delays at other earlier stages, not all students were able to spend even that short time on the own-culture research. Progression on this step was piecemeal, meaning students were not working on it at the same time which, in turn, reduced the level of support available to them because no one session was dedicated to it.

Students were free to choose their research methods for testing the reformulated hypotheses, provided that they considered viewpoints beyond their own peer group in
order to be exposed to alternative perspectives within their own culture. Some of the Greenview students sought views from the school librarian; others talked to their parents or searched the internet. At City, students searched the internet or spoke to their parents; interestingly, no one used Craig as a native New Zealander resource despite the potential value given differences in age and gender. Favouring the human touch once again, Helene brought her New Zealand-born university-aged daughter, Amelia, to class to give the students an alternative New Zealand perspective. Amelia sat with each student in turn and offered her viewpoint on the student’s hypothesis. Two students also asked me for my perspective as a compatriot.

Once again, it was not clear whether the reformulation step involved reflection that was objective and critical. Although the “borders between self and other” were often explored, they were rarely “problematised and redrawn” (Liddicoat, 2005, p. 33), or “interrogated” from the perspectives of other cultures (Bagnall, 2005, p. 107). For example, Caitlyn’s (Muirside) testing of her reformulated hypothesis, That New Zealand people are formal, revealed New Zealand English’s absence of formal address terms (cf. French vous and tu) and New Zealanders’ propensity to be more informal. However, there was no evidence of objective consideration of alternative viewpoints on the New Zealand approach—Is formality expressed in other ways? Is formality influenced by context? Why are New Zealanders informal? and so on. The teacher participants’ evaluations on these reflective stages post-CPPs were revealing though, as will be seen in section 7.4.1. With the primary steps of the CPPs now individually addressed, the next section considers the extent of target language use evident in the practice of the CPPs.

7.3.6 Target language use
It must be noted at the outset of this section that I do not understand German and have low proficiency in French. All participants were aware of this and there was a clear effect on the extent to which German was used in Craig’s class at City School. I regularly observed Craig and Astrid speaking in German to Frith and Sarah, both advanced Year 13 students; it was rare to see German used to this extent with the Year 12 girls in the class. Frith and Sarah would switch to English when aware of my presence. Twice, Craig apologised to me for using German and changed to English. On all such occasions, I requested that they use language as if I were not present, but they continued in English, perhaps because they experienced conflict between conventions of the classroom and
conventions of politeness. It was not so clear that my presence reduced the extent to which German was used in Ada’s class. It appeared that German was used mostly in explicit language instruction rather than for conversation or for the language of classroom management, although this cannot be guaranteed given Ada’s peripheral participation during observed lessons. Helene’s use of French in class appeared not to be moderated for my benefit. She used French for classroom management and for explicit language instruction.

Liddicoat (A. Liddicoat, personal communication, 29 November 2013) warned that this particular CPP project risked swinging the balance too far towards the culture dimension at the expense of the linguistic dimension. In light of that view, much consideration was given to the incorporation of target language use wherever possible, in consultation with the teachers who were aware of the proficiency levels of the individual students. Use of target language websites and texts was recommended to students. This occurred at Greenview because Ada emailed German website URLs directly to her students, and Frith and Sarah (both City) were observed searching German sites. In all three planning sessions the decision was made for the interview questions to be posed in the target language, and in all cases, this resulted in questions being formed first in English and then translated into the target language, with the assistance of Google Translate, the teacher, or both. Those students who conducted their interview in class time (Greenview and Muirside Schools) were most likely to keep to the use of the target language, as they had the teacher’s support available. City School students conducted their interviews in their own time and for most, their interviewees were personally known to them. It is not possible to say the extent of German used by Kirsty’s interview with her German mother, and Marnie’s interview of a German student at school, for example.

In the interests of greater depth of exploration, all teachers advised that they were relaxed about the use of English (or in Helene’s class, use of “Franglais” (HPS248)) if interview responses were not understood. This aligns with Liddicoat’s (2008b) approach to allow use of the native language if needed to ensure engagement with the material and elucidation of ideas. Emails in French from Helene’s contacts proved difficult for the students to translate, despite her request of the senders that they use simple language. Helene spent time sitting alongside each student and helped most with the translation of
the responses, with many resorting to use of *Google Translate*, with mixed results, while waiting for Helene.

From the outset, Ada’s and Craig’s students knew they were required to present the findings of their CPPs in German as their internally assessed speech or conversation. After some initial uncertainty, Helene decided her Year 11 class could incorporate CPP findings in their assessed speech, but she made it optional, and she did not announce this to the students until midway through the CPP work. Most students took up the option, to some extent. Thus, the majority of student participants presented their findings in the target language, as recommended, but not practised, by Abrams et al. (2006), and in contrast with many other CPP studies.

In all classes, the speeches were presented to the teacher but not to the class. This was not as I had expected, given planning session discussions with all three teachers about the value in students sharing their findings with their classmates and the stipulation that presentation of findings was a compulsory step of the CPPs. However, it became clear that presenting speeches to the teacher for assessment was the dominant classroom activity (Sannino, 2008), the established, tried and true routine and as such, overrode the notion of speeches to a larger audience. It was of significant concern that not sharing findings would forego the opportunity to expose all (teachers and students) to alternative viewpoints and encourage the review of assumptions. It would amount to loss of a crucial step in supporting students to take responsibility for their own learning (Lee, 1997; Delett et al., 2001; Schulz, 2007; Su, 2011), a feature of student-centred classrooms (Byram et al., 1991; Dewey, 1910/2005; Guilherme, 2002; Jourdain, 1998; Mantle-Bromley, 1995; Morgan, 1993). As a remedial action, I asked each student to briefly discuss their findings and share the verdict on the validity of the hypothesis at the start of the class discussion in the final lesson.

These subsections have presented the data relating to the everyday operation of the CPPs in the classrooms. At the end of the classwork, feedback was gathered from teachers and students on culture learning and how that had been influenced by their involvement in a CPP. Those responses are considered in the next section.
7.4 Evaluations of CPPs

Students and teachers were asked to evaluate the CPPs at the conclusion of the classwork. Responses were gathered from the teachers in one-on-one interviews, and from the students in a semi-structured class discussion. This thesis has language teachers as its focus, so the students’ perspectives appear only to supplement teachers’ evaluations of the CPPs as a means to teach culture.

Each teacher was interviewed at the end of the CPPs class work, after the class discussions had taken place. The teachers were present at their class’ discussion so were aware of the students’ contributions. The findings discussed in this section are divided into teachers’ responses that reveal their orientation towards culture teaching and their evaluation of the CPPs as a class activity.

7.4.1 Orientation towards culture teaching

The central focus of Phase 2 was to evaluate CPPs as a tool to teach language and culture with an ICLT approach. Determining the teachers’ orientation to culture teaching, and in particular whether their cognitions and practices suggested alignment with ICLT, assists with the interpretation of their evaluations of the CPPs. Their orientation was analysed from three perspectives, as represented by Liddicoat’s (2005) axes: views on the nature of culture (static or dynamic), views on cultural content in the language class (facts/artefacts or practices), and the overall educative approach (cultural or intercultural).

Overt culture topics such as food, festivals, folklore, facts, and fame (Diaz-Greenberg & Nevin, 2004; Jedynak, 2011; Kramsch, 1991; Richards et al., 2010) are the common limits on cultural content in the classroom, often taught as static information, and potentially trivialising the complexities associated with consideration of culture as practices (Diaz-Greenberg & Nevin, 2004). Ada, Craig, and Helene referred to teaching topics that have the potential to be treated as static content based on artefacts, and a selection of these are presented in Table 7.3.
Table 7.3

*Culture References Potentially Representative of Treating Culture as Static*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Language/ School</th>
<th>Topic/activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada, German, Greenview</td>
<td>• Considered history to be of particular importance in German class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advised that <em>Christmas in Germany</em> was a customary theme for the assessed speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kirsty named <em>Christmas in Germany</em> as an example of culture often covered in German class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig, German, City</td>
<td>• Considered history to be of particular importance in German class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Routinely taught food-based lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Correctly predicted food-related hypotheses would be generated in CPPs (chosen by Anya and Kim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggested fashion as a topic that motivates her class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Past classes had studied famous French people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught French history as the value of history to France was “quite different to New Zealand” (HPS476-477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene, French, Muirside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be remembered that there *is* a place in ICLT for factual information, and it assists development of learners’ *savoirs* as general knowledge about the C2 (Byram, 1997). But it alone is not sufficient, and students should not be led to believe it is unchanging or applicable to all members of the cultural group. Culture teaching must be explorative, reflective, and comparative if the other savoirs are to be developed. With that in mind, these potentially static cultural topics were analysed further to see whether they were taught with a cultural or an intercultural orientation.

All three teachers named history as being particularly important to their subject language. Teaching culture as history, geography, and institutions falls within Liddicoat’s...
explanation of an interpretation of culture teaching as area studies (Liddicoat, 2005; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013). However, there is evidence of these teachers treating history not simply as formal facts (Abrams et al., 2006) about overt culture, but with a somewhat deeper understanding and, certainly for Craig, with links between culture and language, the crux of ICLT. Craig considered, “You can’t teach German without teaching some of the history” (CTI60-61) because of the influence of history on the language. He referred to words that cannot be used anymore because of the historical context they are associated with, and he talked about history’s influence on the stereotypes of German people.

Excerpt 2, from Ada’s interview, indicates her cognitions as a native speaker on the role of history in learning German:

*Excerpt 2.*

64. Ada: I mean for me as a German
65. I think one really big thing for me is [for students] to understand a little bit of our history and what that means for the country and for Germans now?
66. Jo: mm
67. Ada: and it starts with little bits and pieces like having flags hanging in the classroom which make me feel
68. quite uncomfortable especially if they have the German eagle on it, that’s just not on, we don’t do that (ATI)

Excerpt 2 demonstrates that Ada understood cultural history to be important in language class because of its role in shaping the people. This suggests that she treated culture as an active verb-like notion (Roberts et al., 2001) or, as Liddicoat (2005) put it, how “a society constructs, represents, enacts and understands itself” (p. 31). Her remarks suggest she is conscious of her position as a native member of the culture—“our history”—and feels some responsibility in ensuring her students gain an awareness that a German perspective exists as a valid alternative (Byon, 2007; Byram, 1997; Ghanem, 2014; Kelly, 2012). Despite the teachers’ reference to the role of history in language learning, there was no evidence that they had reflected on, or explored in class, the relevance of history on New Zealand language and culture. Nevertheless, understanding how cultural history is referenced in the language will assist the development of ICLT competence *savoir apprendre* (Byram, 1997), the ability to recognise cultural references and their connotations.
Analysis of the teachers’ cognitions about history suggested elements of an intercultural perspective. To further exemplify how standard classroom topics commonly taught with traditional approaches (Kramsch, 1991; Richards et al., 2010) were more deeply explored by participants of this study, a summary of the analysis of Helene’s focus on food is presented in Table 7.4. The table lists the instances where she named food as a cultural topic, along with her stated associated classroom practices (potential or actual), and a brief assessment on the approach apparent in terms of the cognitions about culture and its alignment (or not) with ICLT.

Table 7.4
Representative Example of Cognitions of the Cultural Topic of Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Associated classroom practices</th>
<th>My assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helene predicted a hypothesis about</td>
<td>She suggested associated research could include “some really useful language ... if you go to a restaurant” (HPS477-478)</td>
<td>Considers culture as practices: cultural conventions associated with dining out. Integration of language and culture. ICLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested student could share with</td>
<td>Suggested student could share with the class “ten really ...well known French dishes you might want to check out” (HPS480-481)</td>
<td>Considers culture as facts, and fame: well known dishes Non-ICLT But if well known because they are the most popular dishes then it considers values and behaviours. Potential for ICLT if the why is explored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the class “ten really ...well known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French dishes you might want to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check out” (HPS480-481)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested research could include</td>
<td>Suggested research could include other “interesting things, like French love doing proverbs with food” (HPS495-496).</td>
<td>Recognises that culture affects language by considering the relationship between food and proverbs. ICLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other “interesting things, like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French love doing proverbs with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food” (HPS495-496).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Helene’s cognitions outlined above suggest evidence of an alignment with ICLT. Her methods associated with teaching food as a cultural topic could be said to be in line with treating “culture as societal norms” (Liddicoat, 2005, p. 30; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013, p. 19), where culture is accepted as including social conventions (Neff & Rucynski, 2013) and behaviours (Jedynak, 2011). The emphasis she placed on food in her French culture-teaching could relate to her ontogenesis (Cross, 2010; Swain et al., 2011), outlined in her interview, which included family holidays to France based around her father’s love of French food.

It appeared that the cultural content featured in these classes was greatly influenced by what the teachers’ believed would interest the students, be relevant to them, motivate and engage them (all consistent with pragmatism and with SCT), and (from a more political standpoint), attract them to studying the language again the next year. For
example, when considering prompts in case students needed assistance with generating hypotheses, Craig suggested dating, kissing when greeting, and males hugging as being of likely interest to the City School class. This response names cultural aspects that are not artefacts or institutions but are practices imbued with covert cultural values and ripe for exploration, reflection, and comparison. In Ada’s view, cultural conversations got the boys excited and interested. She noted that if a cultural topic is of personal interest to them they are “gonna find out a whole lot more about it” (ATI328-329).

Cultural content that secures students’ interest also means they are likely to engage at a deeper level with the information, resulting in more than just technical knowledge (Dewey, 1916/2008) that might occur in a lesson on tenses, for example. The need to keep students interested and motivated seems to take on greater importance in the language classroom, where there is great awareness among teachers that language learning is an optional subject with low class numbers, as Craig described: “A dreadful maths teacher gets another class the year after, but here [in languages] you’ve got no kids anymore” (CTI155).

It was not clear whether the teachers introduced covert cultural content associated with more value-based, and potentially more controversial, practices such as gender differences, ethnic and racial relationships, social problems, politics, and so on, or whether they touched on negative aspects of the culture. In a discussion arising from Matt’s hypothesis on German beer consumption (mentioned earlier), Ada approached the content in a practical and factual way with no analysis made of rights, wrongs, or problems stemming from alcohol use. It was also not clear whether the teachers expected their culture teaching to make an internal impact, confronting and transforming their students’ identities, beliefs, and worldviews, as would occur in an ICLT orientation (Liddicoat, 2005, 2011; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009).

A teacher’s view on the relationship between language and culture, and more specifically the integration of them in the classroom, is indicative of that teacher’s culture teaching orientation. Ada, Craig, and Helene did not believe language learning was sacrificed if time was spent on culture. Ada said, “I don’t think you can separate the two” (ATI105) and, according to Helene, most topics could lead to learning about the culture. Craig said he would prefer his students to not know a tense so well if they could learn “the cultural bit” (CTI168) because to study a language without the culture would be only
“half a message” (CTI171). These comments reflect the intercultural approach encouraged by the first principle of iCLT (Ministry of Education, 2013; Newton et al., 2010), where language and culture are equally weighted and integrated in the language class.

Another angle from which to gain insight into the teachers’ culture-teaching orientations was examination of the goals they had for their classes. In the teacher interviews I asked first about their teaching goals for their language class and then about their culture-teaching goals. These are summarised in Table 7.5.

Table 7.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Goals (Participant’s own words used)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ada, Greenview   | **Teaching** My main goal is always to broaden their horizon to make sure that they know there’s more to the world than just this little island and that includes the understanding of other cultures or even just being open to learning about other cultures as well as the language...(ATI35-39)  
                   | Oh yeah and they probably should achieve at the end of the year as well but that I always find that that’s not my pedagogical standpoint though (ATI43-45)                                                                 |
|                  | **Culture teaching** To give them an understanding but I think more so the openness... if you’re only involved with your own culture you’re very restricted in your understanding of the world... that’s really my job if they don’t take anything away from German classroom apart from that I’d be happy (ATI78-82) |
| Craig, City      | **Teaching** To have kids speaking by the time they leave and speaking well (CTI55).                                                                                                                                                   |

(continued)
Culture teaching
It has to support the language programme... (CTI72)
There’s a reason why the language is the way that it is, and culture informs the language informs the cultures, I mean the two things are... really interrelated (CTI73-74)

Helene, Muirside
Teaching
To get an appreciation of learning another language, to learn about their own language... (HTI110-112)
Learning the language ... [is] really important but it has to be linked to other benefits... (HTI116-117)
At the same time I want them to get an appreciation of different cultures, why do people think act and um are different to their own and learn about English (HTI118-120)

Culture teaching
For them to um appreciate the fact that we are different, that to, enjoy being different... (HTI167)
For them to see that you know cultures are different and that that’s ok you know that’s a good thing (HTI174-175)

It will be noted that Ada and Helene both mentioned culture teaching in their responses to their teaching goals. The interviewees were not aware there was to be a supplementary question focusing on culture-teaching goals, but knew that my research focus was on culture teaching. Interestingly, Ada’s explanation of her general teaching goals did not initially include the linguistic dimension at all, and even when eventually mentioned, it was downplayed. Her view of language education seemed more holistic, focusing on material that would interest the students in order to foster broad skills and personal values more widely applicable than a language alone. Ada’s goals for teaching culture repeated this philosophy. These comments, along with her conclusion that she had done her job if her students left the class more open-minded, indicated that her cognitions and practices were aligned with pragmatism and student-centred approaches that promote an awareness of the C2 (Byram et al., 1991; Dewey, 1910/2005; Fantini, 2012;
Guilherme, 2002), and in this respect her cognitions reflected ICLT. Absent, though, from these responses and other data gathered from Ada, were references to critical awareness of C1, or to a relationship between C1 and C2 (Barro et al., 1993; Byram, 1997; Jordan, 2002; Kramsch, 1993; Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Wilkinson, 2012; Young & Sachdev, 2011). An intercultural orientation relies on self-understanding as much as appreciation for the new (Bagnall, 2005; Holmes & O’Neill, 2010; Jackson, 2006). It must be emphasised, however, that Ada took a different approach to involvement in the observed CPP classes, choosing to stay mostly on the sideline, seemingly conscious of not wanting to exert influence on my greater research study. This is mentioned again later, and does limit the extent of analysis that can be made of her cognitions and usual practices.

Craig’s teaching goals for his class were expressed succinctly and focused on only the linguistic dimension, and on only one skill – speaking. This appears directly contrary to an ICLT understanding. In a follow up question, though, his response suggested his practices did not support that stated teaching goal, because he sometimes spent more time teaching culture than teaching language “probably to the detriment of the language learning” (CTI60). (Consider also, that the target language was used to a great extent in the observations of Craig’s classes.) So, despite stating that his goal was to focus on speaking, he advised his practice focused on culture. (Mismatches between cognitions and practices are discussed again below). With respect to Craig’s culture-teaching goals, any such tension was less evident. Although it is not clear whether his reference to “the language programme” referred to the greater learning languages curriculum area, the narrower language knowledge strand, or to his school curriculum specifically, these cognitions suggest that he considered language and culture to be equally important, indicative of an ICLT approach. The C1 was not mentioned in his response, though, and triangulation of data from Craig’s class demonstrated minimal recognition of the value of critical self-awareness, suggesting his approach was not comprehensively aligned with ICLT.

In contrast, Helene’s responses demonstrated an understanding of ICLT’s accent on critical reflection, developing awareness and understanding of one’s own culture, and making comparisons. This is as explicitly stated in the Learning Languages area of the curriculum: “Learning a language provides students with the cognitive tools and strategies to learn further languages and to increase their understanding of their own
language(s) and culture(s)” (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 24). Helene also referenced the need to have an appreciation of other cultures and to ask “why?” to achieve a deeper level of exploration, and her response included the idea of developing an acceptance that cultures are not homogeneous.

Raised earlier was the potential for mismatches between the teachers’ cognitions and their practices (Birello, 2012), and this appeared to be evident in responses from Helene and Craig. For example, despite Helene’s awareness of the value of reflection, she had thought back on past class work and realised the potential that had existed for greater involvement of reflection and comparison. Craig’s tensions between his cognitions and practices regarding the balance of language and culture have been noted. In the planning session, Craig had recognised ways in which the CPPs would work with other activities the class was doing and how he could enhance the integration of language and culture in the project. However, there was no evidence of this occurring in observed lessons. For Craig and Helene, their cognitions about culture teaching appeared to be further aligned with ICLT than their classroom practices suggested, as was the case for teachers in other studies (e.g., East, 2012a; Sercu et al., 2005).

It is possible that good intentions were constrained by the situatedness of the classroom context (Richards, 2008), particularly in terms of time and assessment pressures (Agee, 2004; Birello, 2012; Zheng, 2013). Ada believed she could always do more culture teaching, but that was also the case for language teaching as, “It’s always a time factor, everything always is in teaching” (ATI87). Craig reported that he was trying to do more culture teaching, aware of the political move towards a balance and integration of language and culture. Compare this, though, with his comments that he taught more culture than language to the possible detriment of language learning (CTI160), but also the greater extent of target language used in his class. Helene initially said she did not experience hindrances in teaching culture and was doing so to her desired extent. However, in discussing this point she recalled a recent lesson for which she had planned much language and culture integration but where time and class size constraints meant that she had been unable to fully follow that plan. Time, it will be recalled, was the most common restriction on culture teaching for teachers in many published studies (e.g., Sercu et al., 2005; Yeganeh & Raessi, 2015) and in the Phase 1 results of this study.
Alternatively, it could have been the particular context of their involvement in this project that gave rise to the apparent mismatch between cognitions and observed classroom practices. Such an influence could have been positive: Their understanding of ICLT principles was enhanced revealing their potential application; or negative: My presence in the classroom and the unfamiliarity with CPPs were perceived as posing limits on the extent to which they could adapt the project. The latter certainly appeared to be the case in Ada’s class, where she participated only minimally in my presence. This made it difficult to gather and interpret data beyond that associated with her evaluation of the CPPs.

7.4.2 Summary of orientation

Reviewing these cognitions and practices, it is clear that Helene was the most cognisant of intercultural theory. She attributed it to the application requirements of her AFS scholarships to France: “I have to link all my goals with Ellis or Newton” (HTI937). Her response to hearing the Phase 1 findings that New Zealand teachers have low awareness of ICLT was that teachers should be “told off by the Ministry” (HTI928) because the Newton principles were long established. Another instance of Helene’s ICLT knowledge coming to the fore was her questioning the approach of teaching CPP-related language features in other lessons during the week. She was concerned that it did not reflect “the idea of teaching culture embedded in the language... a very strong point” (HPS131-132). This view is indicative of an intercultural orientation to teaching (Liddicoat, 2005, 2011; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009) and directly aligns with iCLT’s first principle (Ministry of Education, 2013; Newton et al., 2010) to integrate language and culture from the beginning. Alleviating her concern somewhat, Helene was interested to hear that participants had subsequently reported that reinforcing CPP-related language in other lessons of the week had provided the language learned with more meaning and context (i.e., was better integrated) than would have been the case for language taught in the more usual teacher-directed class work. This relates to Dewey’s (1897, 1909/2009; 1915/2008) view that it is important to present new knowledge as part of a bigger real-world picture, and not strip content of its meaning, as can occur if grammar lessons are divided from their authentic application in language use. Helene also explicitly referred to the need to find similarities and differences between cultures, and she described having undertaken projects that involved exploration. She was conscious that it was the reflection step that
her lessons lacked and appeared motivated in her intention to redress that aspect in future classes.

Neither Craig nor Ada referred to intercultural pedagogy by name, by scholar, or by singling out ICLT concepts as being part of their practises. Without a doubt they both saw value in teaching culture. In fact, Craig reported spending more time on culture than language and Ada’s teaching goals focused on cultural awareness over language awareness. It is heartening to see culture featuring so strongly in their cognitions and reports, but it must be concluded that the evidence points towards Ada and Craig both taking a chiefly cultural orientation rather than an intercultural one. That said, Craig’s stated awareness of the relationship between language and culture and the associated impact on identity shows potential for the development of a more intercultural perspective. At times, Ada appeared unconvinced of the value of reflection, so her tendency towards an intercultural view was perhaps less robust. This mirrors the findings of Sercu (2007) where teachers favourably disposed to an ICLT approach failed to appreciate the value of expanding students’ awareness of C1. It may, therefore, not be the case that an individual is at one fixed place on the cultural-intercultural continuum. There is evidence to suggest a fluctuating position, where an intercultural approach, or at least something aligned with it, is demonstrated under some circumstances. This notion is expanded upon in the Discussion (chapter 9).

This section has considered the teachers’ cognitions and practices that reveal their approach to the nature of culture, cultural lesson content, and culture teaching. It has shown that all teachers had cognitions that support at least some features of ICLT, even if not consciously so, but they were at different and fluctuating positions on a continuum between an ICLT orientation and a traditional cultural orientation overall. The next section considers the teachers’ evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the CPPs as implemented in their language class, along with suggested improvements to enhance the quality and value of exploration.

### 7.4.3 Strengths and weaknesses of CPPs

This section divides the teachers’ evaluations of the CPPs into the perceived strengths and the perceived weaknesses. All weaknesses are accompanied by suggested improvements.
Strengs

Influenced by findings of other studies (e.g., Abrams et al., 2006) and especially by Liddicoat’s concern about over-balancing in favour of culture (A. Liddicoat, personal communication, 29 November 2013), data were gathered on teachers’ views on whether the cultural content emphasis of the CPPs had detracted from language learning. It is a significant strength of the project that there was much evidence to suggest the CPPs did not restrict the students’ language production. In fact, Ada and Craig reported that the projects had increased target language output, particularly with respect to the assessed speech activity, where these classes presented their CPP findings in German. Ada reported being “really impressed” (ATI286) at the substance of the information the boys included in their speeches. It is acknowledged that Ada did conduct the occasional follow up language-focused session at another point during the week.

Craig’s report was the most positive with respect to language development specifically. He reported that the students were “producing more language” (CTI394-395), no one’s marks had suffered, one or two students had achieved higher marks than usual, and “even the weaker ones have spoken really really nicely” (CTI424-425). The internally assessed output was expected to be two minutes long, but in this class the CPP-based speeches and conversations had been longer; Jacqui and Sinead, for example, spoke for four and a half minutes. Craig’s explanation for this was that the students “had stuff to talk about... it really gave them things to talk about, that they wanted to talk about” (CTI564). He believed they had recognised an information gap and had wanted to fill it, and in this respect, the activity “exactly fulfils the curriculum” (CTI602). In other words, the students demonstrated an appreciation of being able to take the role of expert with respect to content knowledge (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Craig considered the project to have been something of a risk since it was not “formally” (CTI415) teaching language structures, potentially jeopardising students’ achievement in external examinations. But having participated in the CPP, Craig described it as an example of “all this good pedagogy that you’ve heard” (CTI417-418) where learning occurs as students “start to ask you questions [when] they’re ready” (CTI416-417), creating teaching moments.

Helene’s responses did not clarify whether the CPPs had affected the language proficiency of the Muirsie students. She did recommend some amendments relating to enhancing the language dimension of the CPP (detailed in the next section), which could
suggest that she believed there to be room for improvement in that regard. As noted, Helene had taken some time to reach her decision about how her Year 11 class could present their CPP findings, potentially influencing the opportunities for students to generate project-related target language output and the extent of scaffolded support they could have received to do so. It should also be recalled that Helene’s class received significant exposure to genuine usage of French language in the emails sent from Helene’s contacts in France. In this respect, genuine social interaction in the target language (as per Principle 2 of iCLT) was most prevalent in Helene’s class. Taking account of all three responses, it appears that the CPPs have the ability to motivate and increase language output provided that students are scaffolded with respect to the language forms needed for the L2 output stages.

A strength of the CPPs from Craig’s perspective was the provision of time for students to “stick with the topic” (CTI218) and “sit back and reflect on things” (CTI212-213). He considered this to be a positive alternative to the usual obsession of language classes to “get through what the Germans call the stuff,... the programme” (CTI223). It is doubtful that this reference to reflection was pertaining to the ICLT step of self-awareness, but was about the students having the luxury of time to properly process and internalise new information. This is a crucial step for meaningful development according to both pragmatism and SCT.

Helene named “the learning of your own culture” (HTI749) as a particularly valuable aspect of the CPPs. Ada seemed not to see great benefit in those reflective steps at the outset of the project. Asked about whether her involvement in the CPPs had shed light on the value of the reflection elements, Ada said it had allowed the boys to see that there were multiple perspectives within their own culture and that not everyone will think the same or agree with their interpretation. She believed they might not otherwise consider other people’s perspectives because “they’re teenagers so y’know it all revolves around them” (ATI264). Interestingly, the CPP work had led her to come upon such a realisation herself, learning that there were different perspectives within her own culture, as presented in Excerpt 3.
Ada: I found it very interesting I mean I had to hold back a little bit I wasn’t gonna put my opinion on them um because I think sometimes what they found on the Net or even talking to other people might have been slightly different to what I would’ve said? but again that was very interesting for me to see that even other German natives see things completely different (ATI)

In this way, the CPPs had allowed Ada to take the role as co-explorer making discoveries alongside her students (Byrd & Wall, 2009). Ideally, she would have expressed this to her class to model the attitudes of an intercultural speaker of openness, curiosity, and readiness to suspend belief (savoir être) (Byram, 1997) (and she may have done so when I was not present), but perhaps it was only in this moment of contemplation that it had been revealed to her.

Both Ada and Helene also named the students’ ability to choose their topic as a strength of the CPPs. Ada considered it important that the information had come from a mix of sources other than the teacher, supporting Schulz (2007), and Helene thought it beneficial that it had broken up normal classroom routines. Helene also remarked on the opportunities to combine language and culture as she had done in the email task, even if it had come with translation struggles.

Craig named the reflection step as the most interesting or beneficial aspect of the CPPs. He saw value in the students critically thinking about what they had found and relating it to themselves. He had been astonished by how it was only in reflection that students realised “things that I thought would have been apparent but they found really really surprising, like, ‘you didn’t realise that? okay well that’s good’” (CTI341-343). Despite New Zealand having multiple traditions from a variety of contributing cultures, these students were more capable of recognising complexity and multiple elements in the target culture rather than their own. In Craig’s opinion, the reflection elements mitigated this. These findings also suggest that by facilitating their students’ reflection, the teacher can gain a better understanding of their students as individuals, their levels of comprehension, their background knowledge, and the constraints and affordances they experience in language learning, in SCT terms, their ZPDs (Ajayi, 2008; Scott &
Palincsar, 2009). The City School students’ reflections had led to a reflective moment for their teacher, too, as Craig realised the extent to which he might make assumptions about what the students think or already know, especially in relation to their own culture (Sercu & St. John, 2007).

Kirsty (City) offered a particularly poignant comment on her positive experience of the CPP. It will be recalled that she had interviewed her mother, a native German. Kirsty advised that the CPP had been a happy catalyst to conversations with her mother: “I never would’ve talked to my mum about all that stuff so it was nice for us just to—’cause I would never’ve asked all those questions and [it] kind of sparked an opportunity to” (CCD530-534). The CPP had allowed Kirsty to realise that interactions are transactions between people as holders of histories and experiences (Kramsch, 2009; Scarino, 2014), and in doing so, enhanced her development in all of Byram’s (1997) savoirs.

This section has discussed the ways in which teachers saw value in the CPPs as a learning tool. Overall, the responses were positive with respect to language output, motivation, and supporting ICLT practices. The next section presents the aspects of the CPPs that the teachers believed to be unimportant or could be improved upon for better learning outcomes.

Weaknesses
The operationalisation of the CPPs was determined collaboratively with each teacher. As a result, some of the weak points of the project were class-specific. One such example surrounded the use of native speakers. At City School, Craig had recognised value in having native speakers accessible for the class, but in the practice of CPPs this had only been actualised through exposure to the language assistant, Astrid. In his post-CPP interview, Craig expressed the wish that he had involved more native speaker visitors, such as “a 65-year old German chap comes in and says what it was like after the war” (CTI538). This view was corroborated by one of his students who had specified the native speaker interview as the most interesting or valuable aspect of the CPPs suggesting she had enjoyed this ethnographic approach (Roberts et al., 2001; Sobolewski, 2009).

In contrast, Helene involved native speakers extensively, although that brought its own difficulties. The language in the emails from her native French contacts was not as simple as she had hoped and as a consequence, students needed much help with
translation from Helene or by resorting to *Google Translate*. The extent to which she translated was a concern for Helene; she raised this three times in her interview as the area for improvement for her future application of the CPPs. She later thought that perhaps dedicating some time to grammar points, such as question forms, would alleviate the degree to which translation was needed. Use of *Google Translate* was noted in Craig’s class too, as the girls wrote their interview questions first in English and then translated them to German.

Ada’s class was different again. Despite being a native speaker, she was observed contributing her native perspective in relation to only two of the students’ hypotheses: Tom’s on nudity and Matt’s on alcohol consumption. This meant that she was an untapped resource for much of the CPP class work, or at least in the observed lessons. It is possible that she made more extensive contributions during the unobserved language-focus sessions.

The teachers could see scope for improvements to the reflection sheets. Ada thought she might not use them in her future application of CPPs, or at least, would not call them reflection sheets. This could be further evidence of her uncertainty around the value of the reflective steps. She saw the value of the sheets as a means to help students keep track of their research, but she recommended their role in supporting target language use be accentuated. Ada said she would require students to list vocabulary items found and create sentences in German to reveal where they needed assistance so she could “pick up on that and turn it into a teaching lesson” (ATI390). This response was interesting, because it was at Ada’s request in the planning session that I added to the reflection sheet template a section headed German language, which Ada was to develop to suit her needs. No amendment was made and it remained as a stand-alone section with no supporting instruction or comment (see template in Appendix N). Some of the boys occasionally recorded vocabulary items under the heading; on one of Matt’s reflections he noted under *German language*, “It was in English lol” (GRSMt6). I was not aware of Ada treating the reflection sheets as evidence of learning needs. Craig, too, was going to “work something up” (CPS235-236) to incorporate a language aspect into the reflection sheet, but did not do so. Helene considered recording French language on the reflection sheets a “cool idea” (HPS399) but again, it was only used occasionally, and not by all students. In general,
students considered the reflections sheets to be, in the words of Tineke (Muirside), “a pain but they were necessary I think” (MCD627).

The only improvement suggested by Craig was the use of a film (not necessarily in German) about cultural identity to demonstrate the “dislocation cultures that are everywhere, German culture strangely enough” (Craig, CTI378-379). This would be a positive addition in terms of providing information from another source (Schulz, 2007), but to maximise the already limited class time, consideration would need to be given to adaptations such as using the movie to address multiple teaching points, or limiting the number of scenes screened.

Helene had found her preferred approach to work alongside the students to be time-consuming in a large class when all were working on individual projects. This is exactly the issue that Ada and Craig predicted in their suggestion that a larger class would benefit from restrictions at the hypothesis generation stage. Rather than limit the hypotheses, Helene’s suggested improvements were for larger classes to work on the CPPs in pairs to “reflect together” (HTI411) and to involve a native speaker as a teaching assistant to increase the support available.

A final matter raised by Helene was the impact of her indecision about how to present the findings. It was not until part way through the CPP work that she had given the class the option of incorporating their findings in their internally assessed speech. Helene later came to believe that she should have been more explicit with how the findings could be used in the speeches and could have better supported the students in doing that. This is raised again in discussion chapters 8 and 9.

This section has outlined the aspects of the CPPs that were problematic or undesirable. All weak points could be remedied or mitigated through the improvements recommended by the teachers. In the next section, consideration is given to the ability of the CPPs to serve as a professional development tool for teachers.

7.4.4 Teacher education

The CPPs were chosen because of their suitability as an intercultural task but in their operation, it became clear that their step-by-step nature clearly exemplified three core practices of ICLT: explore, reflect, compare. It was an unanticipated by-product of the
CPPs that they could have a role as a teacher education tool to demonstrate the theory in practice—as praxis—to provide a way for teachers to “reorganize their experiential knowledge... [as] a new lens through which to interpret their understandings of themselves and their classroom practices” (Johnson, 2006, p. 240).

This realisation motivated me to ask the teachers if their involvement in the CPPs had clarified or enhanced their understanding of ICLT. Helene said it “absolutely” had (HTI332), and it had inspired her to incorporate a reflective aspect in other projects: “The reflecting on your own culture which I haven’t done at all ... but I will definitely put that in” (HTI333-336). For Craig, being involved in this intercultural activity had made him more comfortable with the idea that he could implement it having gained an assurance that the outcomes can be good (CTI489-492). Ada’s response to whether the CPPs had enhanced her understanding of ICLT was initially non-committal: “Um ... yeah I think” (ATI132). As was the case for Helene, the CPPs had illuminated for Ada the reflective element through the step of researching the hypotheses in terms of one’s own culture. Ada said that aspect had “surprised” her (ATI132); it was not what she would have done herself but she had found it “quite interesting” (ATI139). Unlike with Helene’s response, it was difficult to determine whether this interest was transformative for her and her teaching practices, or just a matter of curiosity. Later, though, at another mention of the possibility of the projects increasing her understanding of ICLT she was more certain, responding, “Yeah absolutely yeah” (ATI170).

All teachers advised they would appreciate more training in ICLT, and they were unanimous in wanting that assistance to be practical. Helene suggested “more exchanges, hearing from other teachers you know what kind of projects they’ve done, how did it work” (HTI942-943). She thought such information should be presented to teachers in person, rather than adding to their emails with notice of a new posting on a website. Craig said he would particularly like “more showcasing of it [ICLT], so more exemplars” (CTI512-513) from the Ministry. He stated that teachers are interested in real examples and case studies to demonstrate “this is what happened here, this is the way this project was run, what [it] would... look like if you ran it for two weeks solid” (CTI515-516). Craig also thought teachers desired information on how intercultural activities can link to assessments. He suggested the Ministry’s Learning Languages website (Ministry of Education, n.d.) as the place for such resources and support but added that he does not...
regularly visit the site so would require notification that new information had been posted. Ada considered the priority to be guidance from the Ministry on what it “wants us to do as teachers” (ATI576). She noted the disparity between the balance of language and culture in the curriculum and the lack of balance in reality: “Everybody focuses on language because it’s the only thing that’s being assessed” (ATI578-579). She expressed concern that teachers’ abilities (and potentially their pay if it becomes performance based) were measured against success in assessments so there was little incentive or support for a change in practices. In Ada’s view, practicable ways to manage this should be presented to teachers in person, not “just put it out there and send an email” (ATI593-594).

These responses indicate that although the teachers might be aware of the political will for the practice of an intercultural approach, or at least a new emphasis on culture, that alone is not sufficient for them to amend their practices (Sercu, 1998, 2006; Timperley, 2011). They desire practical support, evidence of the value of the application of the theory, and opportunities to apply and test examples for themselves with security that it will not negatively impact on student achievements and teacher appraisal (Johnson, 2006; Leeman & Ledoux, 2005; Sannino & Nocon, 2008; Sercu, 1998).

The final section of this chapter presents findings that relate to the possible future application of CPPs, substantiating the students’ and teachers’ views on the overall value of the CPPs as a class activity.

### 7.4.5 Further use of CPPs

It has been seen that the majority of responses to the CPP were positive, and any weaknesses could be addressed with minor improvements. Most indicative of their value as a language/culture learning tool is whether they are likely to be used again. In answer to an explicit question, the 23 student participants were unanimous in recommending that CPPs be part of future language classes.

With respect to the teachers’ perspectives, despite some mixed responses from Ada, it was her *actions* that demonstrated firm commitment to CPPs. Not only did she advise “it would definitely be happening next year” (ATI609) in her Year 12 class, but she was already implementing the project with her Year 13 students and using an adaptation of it for the advanced students in her Year 10 class. In Ada’s opinion, the CPPs had “show[n] a different side” (ATI617) of the boys. The project had allowed students not so proficient
in the language to make a positive contribution to the class. For one student, it had served as “a bit of an in back into the German language” (ATI619) and he had come to feel part of the class again despite his awareness that his language proficiency was lower than that of his classmates. Ada’s appreciation of the reflective component was not clear at the outset, but by the end of the project she seemed to have changed her views somewhat. In reporting that she would continue to implement the CPPs, Ada advised she would keep the steps generally the same, including “the looking at it from your perspective you know doing the native speaker or the native input and then flipping it” (ATI359-360).

Craig was delighted to see that ICLT practices had resulted in good outcomes extending “from the weakest to the strongest, they’ve all benefitted from it and they’ve really benefitted from it and they feel clever” (CTI496-497). He had moved from an initial position of thinking it was a fun idea to appreciating sound gains for the students in terms of learning outcomes and the pleasure taken from it. Craig advised, “I like it, I really like it, I will definitely do it again” (CTI482-484), remarking that it really suited Years 12 and 13. In addition, near the conclusion of his post-CPP interview, Craig committed to setting a similar task for his current Year 9 class, entering it into his teaching plan as we spoke.

When asked if she would use CPPs in other classes Helene responded, “Yes! I’m going to do it next term! Honestly I will” (HTI1001), referring to her Year 10 class. She added that she would try to incorporate it in Year 9, if it could be accommodated around her attendance at school camp, and would also use CPPs in the next year’s Year 11 and 13 classes (the Year 12 class would comprise the students of this study).

This section has provided evidence that teacher participants considered the CPPs to add value to language learning. Ada was already practising them in other class levels, and all teachers expressed a desire to implement them in future classes.

7.5 **Chapter Summary**

In review, this chapter has described the operation of the CPPs as a project that exemplifies ICLT principles. It has demonstrated how it can be implemented in a variety of class sizes and proficiencies, involving diverse student and teacher characteristics. Its strengths have been revealed as a motivating and engaging activity that can lead to enhancement of target language output, knowledge of the target culture, and general
education skills. Its weak points are few and readily remedied. The approaches of all three participant teachers were found to be aligned to some extent with ICLT and the CPPs themselves appeared to enhance their awareness, understanding, and practice of ICLT aligned practices.

In the next chapter, these findings are related directly to the research questions. Following that, in chapter 9, the quantitative results and qualitative findings are united for analysis using SCT to address the overall research concern of supporting New Zealand language teachers in the practice of ICLT.
CHAPTER 8 – DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

8.0 Overview

This chapter discusses the findings from Phase 2 of the study, the in-class intervention of the ICLT-based cultural portfolio projects (CPPs). They are later synthesised with the results from Phase 1 for analysis through the application of SCT to reveal tensions that would benefit from development to assist teachers with the practice of ICLT (chapter 9). The findings are discussed in relation to the following research questions:

1. To what extent do the teachers’ cognitions about the CPPs reveal an ICLT approach?

2. To what extent do the teachers’ and students’ practice of the CPPs reveal an ICLT approach?

3. To what extent do CPPs enhance teachers’ awareness of ICLT as a teaching approach?

In the sections that follow, where each research question serves as a section heading, the findings are interpreted firstly with respect to each teacher, to demonstrate the range of cognitions and practices revealed in this phase, and then collectively in response to the research question.

8.1 RQ1: To what extent do the teachers’ cognitions about the CPP reveal an ICLT approach?

Cognitions held by teacher participants Ada, Craig, and Helene were explored during the one-on-one meetings of the planning sessions and the post-CPP interviews and, to a lesser extent, in their contributions to the CPP lessons. Like their Phase 1 peers, these teachers also demonstrated cognitions that were consistent with an ICLT approach. For Ada and Craig, in particular, it was not evident that those cognitions were held as conscious representations of ICLT, or whether their thoughts and beliefs coincidentally aligned with ICLT principles and methods. Helene’s specific reference to the principles of iCLT made her position clearer.

Presenting the cognitions of each teacher separately illuminates the range of viewpoints present even in this small sample. In each teacher’s subsection, comment is
made on their motivation for participation in the research project because it was an “individualised” feature (Peiser & Jones, 2013, p. 376) of their ontogenesis, which influenced the extent and nature of culture teaching cognitions they revealed.

8.1.1 Ada’s cognitions

It was at times difficult to interpret the cognitions of Ada, the native German teacher of German at Greenview School, because of the limitations she placed on her involvement in the study. Her motivation for participation in the project was to support me in my research, helping by making her class available to work with the CPPs.

The mainstay of ICLT is the relationship between language and culture (Kohler, 2015; Liddicoat, 2011). A teacher’s thoughts and beliefs about that relationship are a strong indication of whether their teaching orientation is aligned with ICLT. Ada did not think language and culture could be separated, believing cultural knowledge to be crucial in reducing misunderstandings in intercultural interactions (Liu & Laohawiriyanon, 2013). She demonstrated a perception of culture as practices, as ways in which people interpret, create, and exchange meaning (Kramsch, 1998a, 2003; Liddicoat, 2005; Scarino, 2014), for instance, her reference to German cultural conventions around celebrating sporting wins. This directly accords with ICLT. Her reported involvement of content based on lived practices, her reference to the role of history in German language, and her ease with the use of English to ensure content was understood, all served as evidence of her intention to integrate language and culture from the beginning, supporting (consciously or not) Principle 1 of iCLT.

Ada specified the ability for students to choose their own research topic as the most valuable features of the CPPs. She believed it made the project interesting, motivating, and relevant to them. This substantiates results of past CPP studies (e.g., Allen, 2004; Byon, 2007) and sits well with the views of pragmatism and ICLT that useful and relevant material is more deeply engaged with and better internalised than technical knowledge gained through passive absorption (Dewey, 1916/2008; Liddicoat, 2002, 2005, 2011; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013; Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006). To avoid stifling this motivation, Ada imposed no limitation on the topics generated by the students, even though Tom’s choice of a hypothesis related to nudity could have become controversial. She knew her students as individuals with a repertoire of background experiences and

Ada’s cognitions were similar to those of the two other teacher participants in many respects. However, it was her thoughts and beliefs about the reflective elements of the CPPs that most distinguished her perspective. Initially, Ada did not show appreciation of the reflection steps of the CPPs. Her desired outcome was successful speeches rather than necessarily enhancing students’ ICC (Feryok & Oranje, 2015). Thus, she initially deemed the reflective steps to be not only unnecessary, but an impediment to achieving the dominant activity (Sannino, 2008), the assessed speech. This view appears contradictory to ICLT, in which reflection is a crucial feature.

With the benefit of time and closer analysis, however, it became apparent that it was not a case of Ada thinking reflection to be not worthwhile. Rather, she expected students would do it automatically—as she reporting doing herself—thereby making reflection-devoted lessons unnecessary. Her ontogenesis, as an immigrant to New Zealand, influenced this point of view, leading her to assume that the students would be as aware of their culture as she was of her own. But as her student, Tom, expressed, it is not until confronted with an alternative that one comes to think “oh we don’t normally do that” (GCD209-211). Ada’s life in New Zealand, married to a New Zealander, was likely to expose her to many such encounters. In contrast, her students were members of the dominant society, so their culture may have been invisible to them (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Kramsch, 1993; Lo Bianco & Crozet, 2003) making it hard to recognise its influence on their interpretations of interactions. (Sagashi was aware of the culture of his Japanese heritage but probably because it was different to that of his classmates.)

The value of reflection, therefore, requires explication for students. Furthermore, it is objective and critical reflection that is necessary for ICLT. Ada’s view of reflection appeared limited to the superficial level of noting “this is different to what I do” (APS844-845), but as recognised by a teacher in Scarino’s (2014) study, ICLT requires “looking beyond comparison” (p. 397) to interrogate one’s own viewpoint with questions about why and how. Ada’s cognitions on reflection are indicative of a cultural, rather than intercultural, orientation, where comparisons are made but with a focus on differences and without critical self-awareness, transformation, or decentring (Byram, 1997; Dewey, 1909/2009; Kramsch, 1993; Liddicoat, 2005, 2011; Phipps, 2003; Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009).
Scarino (2014) reported that education policy documents rarely include explicit promotion of the value of relativising one’s own culture. Learning about one’s own culture is occasionally mentioned in the New Zealand curriculum, but there is no promotion of the need to relativise it or decentre from it, and this might be a reason why it was not at the forefront of Ada’s expressed cognitions.

Ada did expect her students to be transformed through their language class. Her primary goal was for her students to broaden their horizons. She added language skills secondarily, seemingly in recognition that it is an expectation of policy and, probably, the students and other stakeholders. She identified that not all students could achieve high language proficiency, but all could become more open-minded, in which case she would consider she had done her job. This supports the curriculum values that encourage responsible citizenship, contribution to society’s wellbeing, and active participation in the global community (Ministry of Education, 2007a). It is also consistent with pragmatism’s and ICLT’s promotion of democratic and moral ideals for developing students as socially aware global citizens cognisant of alternative perspectives (Byram & Guilherme, 2000; Dewey, 1897; 1909/2009; 1910/2005; Guilherme, 2002; Richards, 2008). Again, though, the corresponding element of considering the influence of one’s own cultural perspective was absent.

Despite Ada’s willingness to be involved in the CPPs, the speech clearly remained the dominant activity (Sannino, 2008) with which the CPP had to fit, rather than the other way around. This could suggest that Ada treated language as the starting point, with consideration of the culture-in-language (Kohler, 2015; Risager, 2012). It must be kept in mind, however, that Ada accommodated the CPPs into her lesson programme at very short notice. Making changes to high-stakes internal assessments in an important year of study for the students would require considered planning and consultation. Ada provided for the introduction of the CPPs with limited notice by working out how best to mould both the CPP and the assessment for minimal disruption.

In summary, in many respects, Ada had cognitions that aligned with ICLT, particularly with respect to the importance she placed on learning culture, considering it inseparable from language. She valued comparison of cultures and appeared comfortable in supporting exploration of the target culture. However, her devaluation of the role of reflection suggests that her approach was cultural, not intercultural, and her priority was
communicative competence, not ICC. This is not a criticism, because in doing so she was following the main thrust of the New Zealand curriculum. It is indicative, however, of the tension in the Ministry’s documents, and possibly of insufficient exposure to ICLT practices and methods. This is considered in greater depth in chapter 9.

8.1.2 Craig’s cognitions
Craig, the only native New Zealand teacher participant in this phase, taught German (and other languages) at City School. He contributed wholeheartedly to the one-on-one sessions and regularly participated in the CPP work with his students. He rarely expressed knowledge of ICLT specifically, but he reported having read about ICLT because it was “where everything is moving” (CTI203). Craig’s motivation for participation in the project was to benefit his students; he regularly commented on how well the CPPs would work for the girls and expected them to find the project enjoyable and constructive.

Craig considered language and culture to be interrelated, with each providing half of the message. He, too, referred to the role of history in German language, and his reference to particular language features being no longer appropriate because of their historical connotations evidenced recognition of the relationship between culture and language. He asserted strongly the importance of culture in language education, believing he favoured the cultural dimension over the linguistic dimension. That said, his expressed teaching goal had a solely language focus: “To have kids speaking by the time they leave and speaking well” (CTI55), suggesting his objective was for communicative competence—as implied by the curriculum’s objective of communication—rather than ICC as promoted in supporting curricular documents. This apparent mismatch in Craig’s responses suggested tension between subsets of his beliefs (Agee, 2004; Birello, 2012; Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009; Kohler, 2015; Sercu, 2006), where his personal perspective placed great value on cultural awareness but his professional perspective emphasised the more traditional language awareness (see Byram, 2012).

From the outset, Craig was excited by the CPPs, expecting them to be engaging and an outlet for those with German experiences to share their encounters. This evidenced recognition that students can contribute to the meaning-making process (Cross, 2010; Scarino, 2104; Swain et al., 2011). Craig was keen for the project to be enjoyable so the students would commit to the work and to secure return students given the non-
compulsory status of language learning in New Zealand. He also seemed to appreciate
that making content interesting and relevant to the students would mean learning would
come more naturally and be within their grasp (Daniels, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). He
considered the CPPs as a culture-based activity into which he could work some language
application, suggestive of a language-in-culture view (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Kohler,
2015; Risager, 2012), where culture is the core (Lange & Paige, 2003), not discrete or
supplementary, and into which language is integrated.

Craig demonstrated much solidarity with the essence of Principle 2 of iCLT, also an
objective of the New Zealand curriculum, to engage learners in genuine social interaction
(Delett et al., 2001; Dewey, 1916/2008; East & Scott, 2011). He believed class activities
needed to be authentic in content and purpose. This represents Dewey’s concern that
teaching a subject’s content as separate from its real-world purpose strips it of meaning
and makes it “barren” and irrelevant to the learner (Dewey, 1915/2008, p. 118). This view
was also revealed in Craig’s recognition that the presentation of the findings step
involved a student-centred task that would legitimise each student, giving them the
opportunity to take the role of expert in presenting their new-found knowledge so others
could learn from the cultural exploration undertaken. Authentic activities are also the crux
of task based language teaching (TBLT), an approach that has been successfully
promoted and disseminated (East, 2012a; East & Scott, 2011). Craig recognised post-CPP
that he should have incorporated more native speaker contact as valuable genuine social
interactions. Perhaps, like the teachers in East’s (2012a) study, in taking a TBLT
approach he did not recognise its potential alliance with ICLT.

In summary, many of Craig’s thoughts and beliefs were consistent with ICLT. He
emphasised the relationship between language and culture, and at times revealed views
that foregrounded culture over the linguistic dimension. He valued exploration and
student-centred activities as opportunities for genuine engagement with material.
However, with the expressed teaching goal that students learn to speak well, it appeared
that his priority was communicative competence, rather than ICC. Again, this may be
indicative of a lack of exposure to ICLT theory and uncertainty of how to put it in to
practice (East & Scott, 2011), but given his propensity to read professional literature, this
is less likely. It seems to have been more a tension between the subsets (Agee, 2004;
Birello, 2012; Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009; Sercu, 2006) of his personal beliefs, which
mostly aligned with ICLT, and his professional beliefs, which sought to comply with his interpretation of the curriculum objective and foster linguistic achievement.

8.1.3 Helene’s cognitions

Helene, the native German teacher of French at Muirside School, was the most demonstrably aware of ICLT. She was familiar with the method of iCLT, volunteering references to Newton’s principles by name and substance. She had attended workshops that had featured ICLT, but considered most workshops had a linguistic focus. In Helene’s view, her ICLT knowledge was enhanced by having to address the curriculum’s language and culture objectives in her applications for language immersion awards. This could well have given Helene cause to notice and internalise features of ICLT in order to understand and appropriate them in her own practices (Cole & Engeström, 2007; Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Vygotsky, 1978; Zuengler & Miller, 2006).

However, Craig also received a language immersion award and the application process did not appear to similarly influence his ICLT awareness. Helene was genuinely engaged in all stages of the project and eagerly contributed to the one-on-one meetings. Her motivation for participation was to help herself; she treated the project as a professional development opportunity.

Helene’s cognitions on the relationship between language and culture were lucid. This was most apparent in her expression of concern that conducting extra language lessons outside the week’s CPP lesson was inconsistent with “the idea of teaching culture embedded in the language ... a very strong point” (HPS131-132). This comment demonstrates not only cognitions that were consistent with iCLT Principle 1 but it suggests conscious awareness of the principle itself, which she had internalised as a central belief (Rokeach, 1968).

Helene’s focus was not assessment. This was evident in her not directing the CPPs towards a particular assessment goal, which could be interpreted as seeing value in the project in itself, as developing students’ ICC. Helene saw culture learning as the starting point of the classwork into which language could be integrated, characteristic of a language-in-culture perspective (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Kohler, 2015; Risager, 2012). Of the three teachers, Helene expressed most support for dynamic assessment, intending
to assess students’ progress as they worked through the project, collaborating with each student and individually scaffolding them to reach their next level of understanding.

Helene’s selection of her Year 11 class to participate in the project was based on the diversity of class, noting in particular that exchange students Malene and Margo would offer alternative perspectives based on their experiences and backgrounds. The class mix was viewed positively by Helene, as all having something unique to contribute, and she saw potential for the CPP to adapt to their different learning needs. These views evidenced cognitions that aligned with iCLT Principle 5, *acknowledge and respond appropriately to diverse learners and learning contexts*. Helene was willing to encourage her students’ exploration of culture, and she did not want to impose restrictions on their hypotheses, despite the larger class and low language proficiency of some. She herself raised the importance of reflection, voicing its role in terms of exploring similarities as well as differences. However, her references to reflection did not include a critical awareness component, and that is perhaps the point at which Helene’s cognitions fell short of a wholly ICLT orientation.

To summarise, the majority of Helene’s cognitions were not only consistent with ICLT, but were knowingly grounded in ICLT theory and iCLT principles. This was most evident in terms of the integration of language and culture, but also in her consideration of the role of reflection in cultural exploration and in comparison to reveal similarities as well as differences. Reference to critical awareness of one’s own culture and its influence on interpretation of other viewpoints was absent, suggesting that Helene’s thoughts and beliefs were well advanced towards ICLT but with scope for further development.

### 8.1.4 Collective summary - RQ1

The cognitions of all three teachers’ represented the curriculum’s objective of communication, as would be expected of teachers operating within the New Zealand curriculum. However, communication is not the same as ICC, which is promoted, but only in the curriculum guide (Ministry of Education, 2013). To differing extents, the teachers demonstrated cognitions that fitted with an ICLT approach. Although cultural awareness was evidently valued, the imbalance between language and culture and, most notably, the absence of reflection and critical cultural awareness, meant the overall
orientation was cultural not intercultural. This characterises a common thread running through this thesis.

Valuing student-centred activities came through as a strong cognition, supporting a pragmatism viewpoint. Student-centred approaches have been promoted in New Zealand schools for some time, with a particular push on task-based teaching (East, 2012a; East & Scott, 2011; Ellis, 2005). In this respect, these teachers represent advancement from the assertion made by some (e.g., Byram, Nichols, & Stevens, 2001; Byrd & Wall, 2009; Sercu et al., 2005) that active approaches to learning are uncommon in language education. Nevertheless, the level of curiosity teachers showed in the CPPs as involving self-induced discovery leading to unique and meaningful contributions suggests that activities of that nature are still infrequent.

The findings are now discussed in relation to the second research question, regarding teachers’ practices.

8.2 RQ2: To what extent did the teachers’ and students’ practice of the CPP reveal an ICLT approach?

The structure of considering teachers first individually and then collectively is used again in this section to demonstrate alignment, or otherwise, of their practices with an intercultural approach. It also allows comparison between an individual teacher’s cognitions and practices.

8.2.1 Ada’s practices

Ada considered language and culture as not able to be separated. However, of the three teachers, she was the only one to conduct additional language-based classes to support the culture knowledge her students had gained in the CPP sessions. Helene had commented that such an approach was contrary to integration, but this was not necessarily a case of Ada separating the inseparable. Instead, it suggests a tension between cognition and practice, where Ada thought of language and culture as inseparable, but considered it necessary to separate them in practice to ensure that students sufficiently understood both to achieve their assessment requirements. Kohler (2015) considered a tendency to separate language and culture to indicate a cultural orientation with an aim for communicative competence. Other responses from Ada do suggest this was true for her,
but another possible explanation is Risager’s (2006) two levels of culture, the generic level, where one cannot be conceived of without the other; and the differential or micro level, where they can be separated in certain respects (see also Kohler, 2015). As was suggested in the discussion of the Phase 1 teacher responses (chapter 6), this also parallels the abstract-concrete cognitions divide raised by Borg (in Birello, 2012) and Mangubhai et al. (2005).

It is likely that Ada was considering language and culture in the generic and abstract sense when responding to interview questions about their relationship, aware of their mutual influence. But with respect to the concrete reality of teaching language and culture, there was an element of division to ensure that students’ exposure to each was sufficient to achieve the assessment task, at which the CPP was directed in Ada’s class. Because the additional language-focused lessons—described by student Matt as “doing the grammar” (GCD293)—were not observed, it cannot be confirmed whether Ada integrated the language information with the cultural knowledge that the students were developing through their CPP work. It is certainly a possibility and, if it did occur in that way, it represents the view of integration as being scalable (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013), where in some respects it is the language that is articulated more (culture-in-language) and in others, the culture (language-in-culture). Language-based lessons were likely to have occurred whether or not the class was working on CPPs. By using the CPP work as the basis for the lessons, it could be argued that language points were more integrated with culture than would occur in typical language lessons. Lastly, directing the CPP classes and the additional language classes towards the speech assessment served to unite the sessions in a way that could be considered as integration. It is also relevant to note that Ada’s decision to stay on the periphery in the observed classes would not have continued into the additional sessions where she was sole facilitator. In those classes she was more likely to make contributions as someone native to the target languageculture.

Despite Ada raising the potential for the reflection sheets to serve as indicators of the students’ development (Dixon-Strauss, 1996; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Vygotsky, 1962/2012), they were not used for that purpose in practice. Interestingly, though, at the conclusion of the CPP, Ada suggested that her future use of the CPPs would include a modified version of reflection sheets to track the boys’ language use to determine where
she needed to offer support on particular language points. There are a number of aspects to remark upon here. Firstly, her cognitions about use of the reflection sheets and her practice with them did not correlate. Although she expressed an interest in providing the students with feedback as they progressed through the project it did not eventuate, again possibly because she remained on the periphery in the CPP classes. Secondly, she saw the most value in the reflection sheets as a mediating tool for language development. This suggests that she did not appreciate their worth in terms of supporting critical thinking, comparison, and reflection for culture development, or that she did not consider those matters to be important. She even intended to rename them to remove reference to reflection. Thirdly, not necessarily knowingly, she saw the potential for the reflection sheets to represent a student’s ZPD, serving as a window on not just his current level of language knowledge but also his potential level that could be achieved with her scaffolding in the form of a pointed language lesson (Wagner & Brock, 1996). Ada could see how elements of the CPPs could work as a “formative and summative assessment” (Schulz, 2007, p. 18) of language development but she seemed less aware of its ability to serve the same purpose for intercultural development.

The sharing findings step of the CPPs was another point at which Ada’s cognitions were not realised in her practice. As already mentioned with concern, initial discussions with Ada (and the other teachers) highlighted the benefits to be gained from the students sharing their findings with the class. In actuality, the speeches were presented in front of Ada only. This was a case of the dominant activity (Sannino, 2008)—speeches in front of the teacher—overriding the non-dominant activity—speeches in front of classmates. As mentioned, changing the usual tried and trusted method of assessment may have been too significant a change for the teachers to feel comfortable making with short notice.

Ada’s class was fortunate to have a native speaker teaching them German, but the target language was used very rarely in observed lessons. It is possible that this was due to the contextual factor of me being present; that was not the impression I got, however (cf. Craig’s class, where it was clearly so). The more likely contributing factor was the boys’ wide range of proficiency levels. Ada had been their teacher for only one full term and their proficiency levels were below her expectations. Individuals working with an intercultural orientation prioritise target language use but they need not exclude the use of the first language if it allows learners to better understand concepts and elucidate ideas.
If usual language use was reduced in Ada’s class, it was probably because Ada devolved most of the responsibility for the CPP sessions to me. She minimised her contribution, and as a consequence the German language input was minimised. Ada’s class also had regular exposure to two other native German speakers (Suse and Astrid) but not necessarily to German speech, given their infrequent use of German in the observed sessions. The potential for target language input from native speakers was not maximised. Given the range of context-based influences, it was not possible to ascertain whether the observed low level of German language use was indicative of any particular approach. Target culture input, however, did feature when Ada shared her personal perspectives of the C2.

Ada’s native German viewpoint was clearly valued by the boys, who considered Ada to embody the language and the culture (Ghanem, 2014; Kelly, 2012) making her contributions more real and relevant than other information sources (Byram et al., 1991; Luk, 2012; Sercu, 2004a; Sercu et al., 2005; Schulz & Ganz, 2010). That said, it was interesting to hear from student Tom that Ada did not often volunteer her cultural knowledge but did share it when asked; this was corroborated by Ada. It was a pity that greater advantage was not taken of Suse’s and Astrid’s presence, too, in terms of providing additional interpretations of a German perspective (Jogan et al., 2001), although Suse did serve as the boys’ native speaker interviewee.

Native speaker interviews were a compulsory step in the CPPs. The intention was that they would expose the students to lived perspectives likely to be different to those they came across in their secondary source research (Schulz, 2007). It was also an opportunity to practice target language output in a genuine social interaction (iCLT Principle 2). Astrid was only present in one observed CPP lesson at Greenview School. This was unfortunate, because her perspective would have provided an interesting contrast to Ada’s and Suse’s, being closer in age to the boys and not being a permanent resident in New Zealand. Nevertheless, the boys did gain an alternative view from the Skype conversation with a former language assistant, since returned to Germany. That conversation was genuine social engagement in the target language, and was a valuable ad hoc development of the CPP project.

Ada’s limited engagement in the project in observed sessions meant that she did not take a role as co-explorer with the students. She did, however, forward relevant German
language websites to the boys, thereby actively encouraging their exploration of the target culture. It cannot be known the extent to which she shared in the students’ research at the extra unobserved sessions.

Summarising Ada’s practices, there were instances where her classroom behaviour revealed a stance consistent with ICLT. She encouraged exploration of culture, the classes were mostly student-centred, and the Skype conversation provided a genuine social interaction in the target language. However, integration of language and culture was rarely observed, reflection was not encouraged, and Ada’s own contributions from a native German perspective were infrequent and not critically analysed. Ada’s cognitions demonstrated greater alignment with ICLT than did her practices, as was the case in many of the international studies and in the Phase 1 results. This section must come with a rider, though: Ada’s practices were clearly moderated in my presence given her participatory stance of making her class available to me for research purposes.

8.2.2 Craig’s practices

Craig was regularly engaged in the CPP sessions. He spent the most time with the two Year 13 students, Frith and Sarah, speaking predominantly in German and commonly sharing experiences of time in Germany. At other times, Craig would work alongside each of the Year 12 students, assisting them with internet searches, their reflection sheets, and translation. He regularly used German when giving class instructions, but individual conversations with the Year 12 students were more likely to be in English. This could have been because I was present, as was made apparent in other situations of target language use in this class. Craig participated keenly in the first session’s general discussions about culture and in the final class discussion session, contributing his own viewpoints and experiences as well as responding to students’ comments. To this extent, Craig was a co-explorer with his students. He certainly encouraged their exploration and would often share his experiences of life in Germany. Those instances were never critically analysed, though, by Craig or the students, and in some cases appeared generalised, for example, Craig’s comment, “It’s a particularly German thing ... to want to not be German” (CCD242-244). The reformulation step was less well supported, even though Craig himself could have served as a resource in providing another New Zealand perspective on the students’ hypotheses.
Craig had seen value in providing regular feedback on the reflection sheets but did not pursue it in practice. He was not at all keen to use the reflection sheets as formal assessment because the students were already “assessed to death” (CPS511) and did not need grades to motivate them. This supports Dewey’s (1915/2008) argument that students will learn best when they are actively invested in relevant and useful content, and that the promise of a good grade (or threat of a poor one) will not alone lead to internalisation of knowledge. Comments made in the planning session suggested Craig also saw value in the sharing of findings so all could learn. He contrasted past speech assessments where all spoke on the same topic (Christmas in Germany) with the meaningful and genuine social interactive nature of CPP-based presentations. But this did not occur in practice. Fortunately, Craig’s use of conversations as an assessment option for some students allowed the sharing component to be realised as an information gap task in which each interlocutor had unique cultural findings to pass on to the other. This was the likely reason for the conversations extending beyond their expected 2-minute duration; both interactants had a story to tell. Compare this with the dead-end—or “dead and barren” (Dewey, 1915/2008, p. 118)—nature of a speech presented only to the teacher.

Native speakers did not feature strongly in Craig’s classroom practices, something he later regretted. Craig regularly spoke in German and shared his experiences of German culture. Astrid was present in three observed classes, but in all three, she sat and talked in German with the two Year 13 girls, and was not observed conversing with the Year 12 students (it is possible she was acting under instruction from Craig). Given that no other native speakers visited the class during the period of the CPPs it was unfortunate that Astrid’s contribution was limited. She did serve as the native speaker interviewee for Jacqui and Sinead, however.

Results of the CPPs showed that Craig’s practices, whether consciously aligned with ICLT or not, allowed his students to develop their ICC. It might have been a function of their age (final year at school), proficiency in German, and/or visits to Germany, but it was Craig’s Year 13 students who made the most apparent advances in their ICC. Although the student’s ICC was not assessed in this study, Frith and Sarah both displayed characteristics of having been transformed through the CPPs. Frith had gained an improved understanding of her own culture’s views on religious diversity, recognising the extent of her misunderstanding about both the target and her own culture (Bryam &
Morgan, 1994; Su, 2011). Sarah had come to realise her hypothesis about German punctuality could not apply to all Germans and, where it was true, she could justify it through cultural values and cultural practices (Abrams, 2002; Seelye, 1993; Su, 2011).

In summary, Craig’s practices revealed alignment with ICLT with respect to supporting exploration of cultures. He also encouraged student-centred genuine social interactions and use of the target language where possible, and supported students to take the role of expert in making unique contributions based on their own experiences (Dewey, 1916/2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Instances of integration of language and culture were evident, but not to the extent expected, given his cognitions that valued integration. Limitations on native speaker input meant limited exposure to alternative cultural perspectives. Although comparison was evident at times, the practice of reflection was occasional at best, and critical objective reflection was even less common. Tensions between his cognitions and practices could have stemmed not from a personal view of the importance of culture, but a professional view that emphasis is still placed on the language dimension (Agee, 2004; Birello, 2012; Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009).

8.2.3 Helene’s practices

Helene was fully engaged in all steps of the project. She even contributed her own hypothesis at the first lesson (French strikes). Although it was not chosen by her students, it was a strong indication of her intention to become a co-explorer and engage with her students in reciprocal meaning-making (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Scarino, 2014). In all observed lessons she acted as a “guide on the side” working alongside each student in their “experiential workspace” (Prawat, 2009, p. 325) assisting with their research and reflection sheets, offering her own experiences, and translating. Helene expressed concern at having done so much translation with the students. This could have been a function of the extent to which students were exposed to the target language in the CPPs, significantly more than the other classes despite being generally the least proficient group. It also could have been due to the unrestrained topic choices generating unfamiliar language items. Helene’s cognitions about the value of free choice of topic were carried out in practice, evidencing genuine commitment to supporting exploration and banking on the benefits of engagement arising from the student-centred topic generation and selection.
Being from Germany, Helene was native to neither the dominant New Zealand culture nor the target French culture, but she used this as an advantage. Her recent return from France meant she was enthusiastic about sharing her encounters, perspectives that were new to her and new to her students. She thereby served as an authentic and current resource (Byram et al., 1991). This democratised the class in a way, meaning Helene was not always in the role of teacher/expert but regularly contributed as a more experienced learner participating in the joint activity of learning French language and culture (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Helene developed the language component concurrently with the respective stages of the project. For example, as part of her extemporaneous task requiring students to generate follow-up questions to the email responses from French speakers, Helene wrote on the board, in French, salutations and introductory sentences appropriate for emails and asked the class to name French question forms. Helene had not earlier expressed the intention of developing the language aspect of the CPPs, but did so in practice, confirming her views on the integration of language and culture, and presenting a language-in-culture perspective (Crozet & Liddicoat, 2000; Kohler, 2015; Risager, 2012).

Helene’s appreciation of dynamic assessment was revealed in her expressed preference to work alongside students one-on-one. That was carried out in her practice, ascertaining each student’s progress and future potential as she scaffolded their development (Dixon-Strauss, 1996; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Vygotsky, 1962/2012), collaborating with them in their research and their language learning (Lantolf, 2000). This approach enabled her to see where changes could be made to assist the students, such as requiring Kelly and Tineke to collaborate—often-absent Tineke contributed research skills and Kelly contributed experience gained from her sustained participation in the CPPs. This legitimised both students as having valued roles to play in the joint activity (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Helene had a passion for involving native speakers in language education. It was part of her teaching routine, and she was keen to maximise it in the CPPs. Her proposed native speaker visits came to only limited fruition (one person at an unobserved lesson serving as the native speaker interviewee) but she made use of her wider community in her impromptu decision to email the students’ interview questions to her personal contacts in France. The responses exposed the students to multiple perspectives on their
hypotheses from a wide range of people socialised within the culture (Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Jogan et al., 2001; Roberts et al., 2001; Schulz, 2007; Sobolewski, 2009). This amounted to a significant enhancement to the CPPs, and demonstrated how interactions are not simply transactions between individuals, but transactions between people with different histories and experiences (Kramsch, 2009; Scarino, 2014). Access to native speakers was again utilised in the reformulation step. The only teacher of the three to place any substantial importance on this step crucial to ICLT, Helene invited her daughter to the class to provide the alternative perspective of a New Zealander of German heritage.

The presentation of the findings step was perhaps the least well executed stage of the CPPs in Helene’s class. Being unsure in the planning session of how best to require the sharing of findings—but cognisant of the value of doing so—Helene delayed her decision until midway through the CPP work when she offered her students the option to use their findings in their assessed 1-minute speeches. This bolstered her student-centred approach, allowing students to make their own decisions about the content they wanted to be assessed on. Once again, the speeches were not presented to the class as a whole, missing the chance for all to share what they had learned.

In summary, Helene displayed a range of practices that were in accordance with ICLT and in most respects, her cognitions—also representative of ICLT—were carried out in practice. There was substantial integration of language and culture, although some of the content of the email messages was outside the students’ ZPDs. She supported her class to explore, and acted as a co-explorer alongside them. However, that exploration did not extend to the students’ (or Helene’s) own cultures in any critical fashion.

8.2.4 Collective summary - RQ2

A range of commonalities across the teachers can be seen. All teachers encouraged self-directed exploration of the culture and student-centred focus applying pragmatism’s “pedagogy of personal experience” (Prawat, 2009, p. 325), where it is the situation and experience that educate the student (Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006). This represents an advance on traditional practices geared around the teacher transmitting packages of information for passive absorption and test by recall. It provides a good foundation upon which an ICLT approach could be developed. Common in its absence, though, was critical reflection on one’s own culture. Students received minimal support to reflect at
all, let alone critically, and teachers did not model it in their involvement in the CPPs. This substantiates the findings of the much larger sample in Phase 1 of this study, and those of the Sercu et al.’s (2005) study, among others.

Using the students’ research discoveries as the content for their speech or conversation assessments integrated the CPPs with the usual language programme, and it did come with some benefits. Students could make a meaningful contribution to the shared knowledge of the class community, knowing that they were the relative expert on a topic (Byrd & Wall, 2009; Cullen et al., 2009; Dewey, e.g., 1910/2005; Lee, 1997; Sercu et al., 2005; Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006). This provided the speech with a genuine purpose (iCLT Principle 2), something that must surely be missing if one knows one’s entire class will be talking on Christmas in Germany, as was formerly the case in some classes. Students’ attendance to, and retention of, the language of the speech is at risk of being superficial if it was perceived as being needed only to achieve a grade—“foreign attractiveness,” according to Dewey (1915/2008, p. 94). In these classes, the output in the assessed speeches and conversations was more extensive than expected, having been generated from a point of genuine interest and the student’s recognition that they can take the role of expert in their research. Even though they knew from the outset that the CPP research work would form the basis of their assessments, the students never lost the joy or motivation of the discovery work along the way, and most revelled in the chance to share their findings; some named it as one of the most enjoyable parts of the CPPs. For these reasons, it was especially disappointing that no teacher saw through the step of sharing findings with the class as a whole. The value of presentations to the class audience was underestimated.

Teachers’ practices were affected by whether their focus was on the presentation of findings as an assessment, or as just another step of the CPPs. Making the speech assessment the focus—as happened in Ada’s and Craig’s classes—had the potential to diminish the value of the CPP as a worthwhile activity in itself. Ada emphasised the speech at every step of the project and this came through in her students’ responses in the class discussion: Matt commented, “I enjoyed the project but I don’t [sic] really enjoy the internal it led to” (GCD442). The CPPs were treated as a means to an end, rather than being valued as an engaging work project that could help track and develop ICC (or even communicative competence, if that was the teacher’s objective). Craig was more balanced
in his appreciation of the project itself as well as being keen to support his students in doing well in their assessments. This was likely to have been influenced by his engagement in and enjoyment of the CPPs, but having a combined level class and allowing either speeches or conversations to present CPP findings may also have been factors. In Helene’s class, the presentation of findings was not settled on until mid-way through the project. This had the positive consequence of the students treating the CPPs as the priority and thus they retained their value.

The discussion now turns to the third and final research question, relating to the role of the CPPs in terms of teachers’ awareness of ICLT.

8.3 RQ3: To what extent do CPPs enhance teachers’ awareness of ICLT as a teaching approach?

It is surprising that CPPs have not appeared before in relation to ICLT given their clear exemplification of core principles of ICLT: the integration of language and culture; the involvement of exploration, reflection, and comparison; the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. The findings revealed that the clear stepwise nature of the CPPs meant that they served as praxis, enacting the theory of ICLT. The teachers saw how the principles of ICLT could be implemented within one activity, and how other activities could be adapted to suit an intercultural approach. In this section, each teacher is once again considered in turn to best reveal how his/her participation in the CPPs had an impact on his/her understanding of ICLT.

8.3.1 Ada’s ICLT development

There were two significant areas in which CPPs assisted Ada to become more aware of ICLT and its benefits for language learners. The first was the role of reflection. Much has been said about Ada’s initial doubts about the need for reflection steps in the CPPs. However, she reviewed her position at the conclusion of the project, in recognition that the students had learnt that there were multiple perspectives within their own culture. This is a step towards them decentring (Barrett, 2007; Kramsch, 1993; Scarino, 2010; Wilkinson, 2012; Witte & Harden, 2011), crucial in ICLT, but something that does not come naturally to teenagers, according to Ada. So, while the reflection had not been undertaken critically, where each boy could have considered the reasoning and cultural influences behind the views he held, it had revealed the multiplicity of perspectives.
within any one cultural group and demonstrated the futility of stereotyping or essentialising people to a culture (Barro et al., 1993).

That value of reflection had been revealed to Ada in exactly the same way. Although Ada would have regularly faced rich points (Agar, 1994) causing her to consider her own cultural viewpoint with respect to the culture in which she was immersed, the CPP research had presented her with alternative perspectives from within her own culture. Being a native speaker does not make someone an authority on, or representative of, a culture (Byram, 2015; Ghanem, 2014; Kramsch, 1998b; Liddicoat, 2008a; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013). Ada advised that her future use of CPPs would follow the same steps, and she particularly stated that would include the reflective reformulation step. That is encouraging, but it remains unclear the depth of value that Ada saw in reflection as mediating the construction of knowledge of target and own cultures and, in turn, mediating the development of ICC.

The second development for Ada was the impact of ICLT, and the CPPs in particular, on the less proficient students in the class. She had seen the project democratise the class and create opportunities for all to make meaningful contributions, regardless of language proficiency. At the planning session she had warned about Tom’s dominance in terms of vocal contributions and being more proficient than his classmates. However, the levelling nature of the research project had allowed all students to make positive contributions. Ada believed it had restored interest in students who she felt were being lost to the subject; one boy had reconsidered his decision to not pursue German at the next level. The CPPs legitimised the participation of students formerly on the periphery by levelling access to resources and resetting the division of labour (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Ada was non-committal about whether or how the CPPs had enhanced her knowledge of ICLT. She eventually responded that the projects had “absolutely” (ATI170) assisted her in that regard, but with the exception of the matters discussed above it was difficult to pin-point how. Taking a lead from Sercu (1998), it might be a case of her needing to secure some of the concepts for herself through her own testing in her own environment, to allow further convincing benefits to be revealed to her. As it was, her views on reflection had changed after seeing the reality of one activity (the CPPs) in action, and she was actively applying the CPPs in other classes. That personal
engagement with the experience might subsequently result in the newly-acquired, theoretically-driven beliefs shifting from a vulnerable periphery position (Rokeach, 1968) to become central beliefs and given more priority in guiding her practices (Birello, 2012; Borg, 2006, 2009; Castro et al., 2004; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 1968; Sercu & St. John, 2007).

In summary, Ada’s participation in the CPPs, limited though it was, allowed her to gain a certain level of appreciation for the reflective elements of ICLT, and awareness of how the approach legitimised all as having something valuable to contribute to the activity. Given time to test CPPs further in her own classroom—a “legitimate site for teacher learning” (Johnson, 2006, p. 244)—it is hoped that Ada’s practice of ICLT will expand. This supports the case for CPPs as providing an easy testing environment for teachers to discover the principles of ICLT in a way that can be incorporated into their existing teaching programme without requiring significant change.

8.3.2 Craig’s ICLT development

At the conclusion of the CPPs, Craig revealed he had initially considered the ICLT-based activity to be risky because it did not “formally” (CTI415) teach language elements that might be required in the examination. It is assumed that he was referring to more traditional, and probably teacher-centred, approaches where a set of pre-ordained material has to be learnt and recalled in assessment (Dewey, 1915/2008). However, he had come to realise that the project had facilitated a series of teaching moments generated by the students as they worked on the project, and which he recognised as evidence of “all this good pedagogy that you’ve heard” (CTI417-418). It is the teachers prepared to take risks and try innovative teaching methods who are most likely to change their beliefs and attitudes in response to their new experiences (Sercu & St. John, 2007). This also represents Timperley’s (2011) description of knowledgeable teachers able to question their teaching practices as “adaptive experts” (p. 6), adapting and updating their views and methods in light of political changes, challenges, and student needs.

Taking the risk paid off in Craig’s class with the students doing well in their internal assessments in terms of quantity—some spoke more than twice as long as was expected—and quality of output. Craig put the development down to the girls’ commitment to the self-selected topics and their desire to talk about what they had learnt.
He also believed the CPPs had been beneficial in legitimising the contributions of those in the class with lower levels of proficiency. It would be interesting to know whether this takes on more significance in a class of combined Year levels where the difference in proficiency between classmates may be greater. All had made new discoveries and the cultural expertise was more evenly divided across the classroom community of practice than was the case for language knowledge.

Craig had received minimal training in ICLT, having attended a single workshop, but had chosen to do his own reading on the approach. It was, therefore, a welcome consequence of his involvement that he gained confidence that he could apply ICLT in the classroom. His participation had given him the chance to test the theory for himself in a concrete situation (Sercu, 1998) and he found the outcomes to be positive. This concurred with the recommendations from all three teacher participants that teachers desire practical information, exemplars, and evidential facts about what was done, what worked, what did not work, and the context. It is the dynamic complexity of the practical concerns that serve to attract and repel teachers in their development of a new approach (Feryok & Oranje, 2015).

Craig considered the reflective elements, including the reflection sheets, to be the most valuable aspect of the CPPs. He had been surprised to discover the extent to which the students had not previously known about their own culture—they had recognised complexity in German culture but not their own. It transpired that the reflective steps were valuable to both student and teacher, giving students time to reflect on their discoveries (rare in language classes, according to Craig), and revealing to the teacher the students’ level of understanding and awareness. The reflective elements had thus served to identify the teachers’ and students’ ZPDs, background knowledge, and individual learning needs (Ajayi, 2008; Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Schulz, 2007; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Swain et al., 2011; Vygotsky, 1962/2012, 1978; Wagner & Brock, 1996), resonating with principles and values of the curriculum. This finding also demonstrates how ICLT has advanced from CLT, with the CPP activity addressing CLT’s shortfall of not considering the influence of the backgrounds and needs of the students on their language learning (Byram, 1997; Jebahi, 2013; Kelly, 2012; Manjarrés, 2009; Ryan, 2012).
To summarise Craig’s position, the development of his awareness of ICLT was greatest with respect to gaining appreciation of some of the benefits of reflection, and in seeing his understanding of the theory represented in practice. This suggests that CPPs are not only educative for students in terms of development their ICC, but also for teachers, in development of their understanding of ICLT.

8.3.3 Helene’s ICLT development

Of the three teachers, it was clear that Helene’s understanding of ICLT was greatest at the outset. However, involvement in the CPPs still served to enhance her awareness of how her practices could be further adapted to align with ICLT. Exploring and comparing were a feature of Helene’s usual teaching approach, and she aimed to integrate language and culture. Reflection was the only one of the core practices of ICLT that was not already foregrounded in Helene’s class, and the CPPs illuminated this shortfall for her.

Although Helene’s cognitions indicated that she valued reflection and cultural self-awareness, the CPPs had reinforced their worth and consequently given her cause to reconsider past lessons. This led to an appreciation of how reflection would have enhanced the students’ development in those class activities. She named “the learning of your own culture” (HT1749) as one of the most valuable steps of the CPPs. In this respect, Helene’s understanding of ICLT was more advanced than the teachers in other studies (e.g., Han & Song, 2011; Jedynak, 2011; Sercu et al., 2005) who had cognitions and practices that aligned with ICLT in some respects but who failed to guide or model cultural self-awareness. Work on the reflective elements in Helene’s class was the most extensive of the three contexts, although it was still often conducted at a superficial level with few instances of interrogation of the students’ (or Helene’s) viewpoints. Student Holly’s findings in relation to the religious significance of Christmas were an exception, as she reflected objectively on her culture’s emphasis on receiving gifts.

Helene’s ontogenesis played particular importance in how the CPPs influenced her understanding of ICLT (Cross, 2010; Peiser & Jones, 2013; Swain et al., 2011). Her motivation to participate in the study was to treat it as a professional development opportunity. She already made good use of professional support available, and she demonstrated the most advanced understanding of ICLT of the three participants, probably as a result. She was the most willing and active in adapting the CPPs throughout
the study to incorporate the target language (Abrams et al., 2006), to mine the social and cultural context (Newton, forthcoming), and accommodate the diversity of her class (Ministry of Education, 2007a, 2013). She therefore characterised the role of “adaptive expert” (Timperley, 2011, p. 6), seeking out opportunities for “cognitive renewal” (Sercu & St. John, 2007, p. 54) by recognising there was always room for development of her cognitions and practices. Her knowledge of the iCLT principles suggested that she was well on the way to internalisation of them as core beliefs to govern her practices (Birello, 2012; Borg, 2006, 2009; Castro et al., 2004; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 1968; Sercu & St. John, 2007).

In summary, for Helene, the CPPs enhanced her experiences of language and culture integration, exploration, and comparison, and they developed her awareness in the only principle that she was not already making prominent, reflection. Also apparent in Helene’s responses was her subsequent application of the principles of ICLT to other activities carried out in her classes, allowing her to adapt the more traditional dominant activities to better align with ICLT. This bodes well for Helene’s continued practice of an intercultural approach beyond the period of this study.

8.3.4 Collective summary - RQ3

The findings are unambiguous in terms of the CPPs enhancement of awareness of the principles of ICLT. Reflection stands out as the area of greatest development. Other studies (including the Phase 1 results) showed reflection to be an undervalued and under-practiced element in teachers whose approach might otherwise be relatively consistent with ICLT (e.g., Han & Song, 2011; Jedynak, 2011; Sercu et al., 2005) but they did not make any suggestions for how the situation could be improved. The cognitions of these three teachers evidenced similar level of understanding overall and, although practices differed among teachers, by the conclusion of the project all three had developed awareness of at least some of the values of reflection, and assisted students in adding cultural self-awareness to their “personal cultural tool kit” (Cole & Gajdamaschko, 2007, p. 208). The other common primary finding is that the CPPs, and therefore ICLT, democratised the classrooms (Dewey, 1910/2005). The projects allowed the teachers to be co-explorers and the students to take the role of experts, and differences in language proficiency were diluted by equality in contributions in terms of cultural understanding. This proved to be a motivating factor for the students. The students in all classes
unanimously agreed the CPPs should be used in future classes. In examining the third research question, then, the CPPs did serve to mediate the teachers’ development of their awareness of ICLT, in particular, the all-important reflective function. Positive outcomes for the students were highly valued by the teacher participants.

8.4 Conclusion

Involvement in the CPPs supported all teachers in renewing their cognitions and their practices to become more in line with the ICLT approach promoted for language teaching in the curriculum guide (Ministry of Education, 2013). This was so, irrespective of the extent to which the individual teacher already practised ICLT. The findings reinforce the suitability of CPPs for teachers at all points on Liddicoat’s (2005) traditional-intercultural continua, to prompt them in ensuring all principles of ICLT (and iCLT) are addressed in equal measure.
CHAPTER 9 – GENERAL DISCUSSION

9.0 Overview

It is clear from the data that a large number of New Zealand teachers have minimal awareness of ICLT. Some 10 years on, these findings reiterate those of Sercu et al. (2005) as well as other more recent studies in New Zealand (e.g., Conway et al., 2010; Richards et al., 2010; Roskvist et al., 2011) and abroad (e.g., Byram & Risager, 1999; Czura, 2013; Han, 2010; Han & Song, 2011). What is missing from those past studies is a systematic explanation of the findings to narrow down the areas where development is required. In this chapter, the results from Phase 1 and the findings from Phase 2 are synthesised and discussed with respect to the overall research concern of supporting New Zealand secondary school teachers’ awareness and practice of ICLT. The value of SCT, as applied in this chapter, is in its ability to reveal the social, cultural, historical, and institutional factors at play when participants are engaged in an activity (Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006; Wertsch, 2007). Many of these factors are beyond constructivism, the theory most often used in the culture teaching literature. Central to this thesis is the SCT notion of mediation, specifically, the tools with which teachers mediate the activity of language and culture teaching. The theoretical construct of legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) is also applied in a role complementary (Engeström, 1991) to SCT’s mediation.

In this chapter, the focus is on how tensions affect the mediation of teaching with an ICLT approach and why they manifest as gaps between the education system’s promotion of ICLT and the teachers’ classroom practices, and between cognitions that align with ICLT and classroom practices that do not. Firstly, an outline is provided of the tools shown by this study to be relevant in the mediation of the activity of teaching languages with an ICLT approach. The sections that follow demonstrate how the mediational value of those tools is constrained by tensions associated with access to the tools, flaws in the tools, or ineffective use of the tools. Thus, the aspects that would most benefit from development to resolve or mitigate hindrances in the practice of ICLT are illuminated. CPPs are then considered again, this time in terms of the CPPs’ ability to resolve or mitigate those tensions and assist teachers in taking an ICLT approach. Finally in this chapter, a new heuristic model is presented. The model pulls together threads from
throughout the study to depict the cognitions, practices, and competencies necessary for an ICLT practitioner.

9.1 Mediating Tools

Mediation is a primary distinction between SCT and other theories of development (Kohler, 2015; Lantolf, 2011; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Sundin & Johannisson, 2005; Wertsch, 1991; Wertsch, et al. 1995). Many tools exist for mediating the practice of teaching with an ICLT approach—more than can be listed here—but those shown to be especially relevant in this study are noted below. It must be remembered that the tools themselves are powerless until accessed by a participant and put to use, and that tools can hinder as well as enable (Lantolf, 2011; Wertsch, 1991; Wertsch et al., 1995). In the context of the New Zealand educational system, the curricular documents are arguably the most important tools, influencing all classroom activity. It is first in the list of the nine tools presented here:

1. *The New Zealand School Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007a). Although the national curriculum is not prescriptive, it has a significant mediatory role in that all school work must be carried out in support of the curriculum objectives. For the Learning Languages learning area, the sole objective is communication.

2. *Supporting resources.* This “tool constellation” (Engeström, 2007, p. 33) includes materials and information to mediate practitioners’ understanding of how to interpret the curriculum (chiefly the curriculum guides and assessment standards) and mediate the practice of teaching language and culture in terms of approach (e.g., the Learning Languages website and professional literature from language teacher associations) and in terms of methods (e.g., class activities, media kits and sample lesson plans). School curricula are also relevant here, having been developed in accordance with the national curriculum and serving to mediate day-to-day practices in the classroom.

3. *Teacher education.* This term includes the initial tertiary level training of pre-service teachers and their practicum work, as well as subsequent ongoing professional development of in-service teachers. It will be recalled that some participants of Phase 1 had no teacher training. This tool not only mediates
teachers’ practice of language and culture teaching, it also significantly influences the ways in which the other tools mediate the activity.

4. **Assessments.** Language and culture education at NCEA level is assessed internally, through school-designed assessments such as portfolios and speeches, and externally in national examinations. This tool plays a significant role in mediating teachers’ choices of content for the classroom, in terms of designing and grading the internal assessments and in preparing students for external assessment.

5. **Languacultures.** The target language and culture (overt and covert), and even those native to them, can function as tools mediating interactions by supporting authentic engagement with the languaculture. In this context, the English language and its cultures are also mediating tools as the medium of instruction, but objectively reflecting on one’s own languaculture shapes understanding of its role in one’s own meaning-making processes. Students and teachers with other language backgrounds have access to additional languaculture tools (e.g., Phase 2 students Malene, Margo, and Sagashi, and teacher Helene).

6. **Classroom resources.** A range of resources are employed in language classes. Teachers in both phases regularly used the internet and other media, such as film, texts, and coursebooks to mediate the activity by providing a range of perspectives on the language and cultures. Computers, pens, and paper are common tools in any classroom to mediate both input and output.

7. **ICLT theory and the iCLT method.** ICLT is recommended by the Ministry. The extent to which a teacher understands the theory of ICLT and the principles of iCLT (Newton et al., 2010) will mediate his/her interpretation of the objective of language and culture teaching and consequently, his/her practices in the classroom.

8. **Time.** Time is a tool that no action can be without. It is included in this list because it was shown to mediate a teacher’s practices in the language classroom in terms of how language and culture was taught as well as what content was taught (Sercu et al., 2005). Time also influences the mediational value of other tools.

9. Unique to Phase 2 of this project were the **tools associated with the CPPs.** This tool constellation included the mediating reflection sheets, the native speaker interview
format, the hypothesis reformulation format, the portfolio to gather findings, a
means of presenting findings, and the contributions based on the ontogeneses of the
community members. In chapter 8, these tools were shown to mediate teachers’
understanding of ICLT and their practices, particularly in terms of enabling
reflection.

Effective use of relevant tools is fundamental for the success of a joint activity
(Lave & Wenger, 1991). With respect to the tools listed above, participants were unaware
of some tools (e.g., iCLT methods), chose not to use some (e.g., own languaculture), used
some inappropriately (e.g., consider the curricular aim to be communicative competence),
were restricted in their access to some (e.g., professional development in ICLT), or the
tools themselves were inappropriate (e.g., original teacher training that excluded ICLT).
If a participant is impeded in their use of tools to effectively mediate their participation
they will be kept on the periphery, unable to develop or contribute to the success of the
activity, ultimately worsening the outcome for the community of practice (Lave &
Wenger, 1991). In the current case, mediation that is ineffective due to tools being
inaccessible, irrelevant, or inappropriately used will restrict the development of a
teacher’s practice of ICLT. With appropriate use of tools, the process, the knowledge, and
the individuals are actively transformed (Corsaro & Johannesen, 2007; Wertsch et al.,
1995); in this case, teachers will become ICLT practitioners. The following section
examines tensions that this study has shown to impede teachers’ ability to use the tools to
effectively mediate their practice of an ICLT approach.

9.2 The Tensions

The results and findings of this study revealed a range of contextual factors influencing
teachers’ cognitions and practices. This section discusses tensions within and between the
contextual factors that influenced the value of the tools in mediating the specific activity
of teaching with an ICLT approach. The SCT notion of mediation can be unwieldy
because mediation occurs at every point of every activity. The following discussion
restricts consideration of mediation to the tools for mediating teachers’ practice of an
ICLT approach. It considers which tools were used, whether the tools mediated by
enabling or hindering the activity, and why the tools mediated the activity in that way.
The tensions reflect themes that have recurred throughout this thesis, namely:
9.2.1 Consistency in cognitions and between cognitions and practices

All teacher participants were working towards the development of their students’ ability to communicate in the target language, as required by the Learning Languages sole objective of communication (Ministry of Education, 2007a). There is, however, an immediate tension in that the curriculum (the tool) mediated participation differently across teachers. Those with sound understanding of ICLT treated the objective to mean developing intercultural communicative competence (ICC). The others—the majority—were not consciously working with an intercultural approach and were shown to be treating the objective to mean developing communicative competence. The ramifications of this interpretation are examined in the next section relating to the curricular documents.

Not only were there tensions across teachers but there were at least two sources of tension within individual teachers associated with the effectiveness of mediational tools. Firstly, teachers’ cognitions were at times ambivalent; that is, they demonstrated strong feelings for seemingly contrasting views (Luk, 2012). The data supported the research evidence for mismatches between a single teacher’s personal beliefs and his/her professional beliefs (Agee, 2004; Birello, 2012; Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009; Sercu, 2006), and between a teacher’s central beliefs and peripheral beliefs (Birello, 2012; Borg, 2006, 2009; Castro et al., 2004; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 1968; Sercu & St. John, 2007). Across Phases 1 and 2 of this study, professional and central beliefs—both often representing dominant activities (Sannino, 2008) such as assessment having a language focus—competed against personal or peripheral culture teaching views—often associated with non-dominant activities, such as the value of culture, exploration, and reflection. This was underlined by responses from Ada and Craig showing personal...
beliefs in the superiority of the cultural dimension as competing with their professional beliefs that the language dimension must be emphasised to meet the requirements of the education system (viz, assessments). This is evidence of mediational tools hindering teachers’ practice of ICLT due to (i) flaws in the tools themselves, that is, ambiguity across curricular documents and assessment, and (ii) impeded access to the tools, due to inadequate teacher education in ICLT and insufficient time (time being perceived by teachers as necessary to implement ICLT).

Secondly, there were tensions between teachers’ cognitions and their practices. This was also the case in teacher studies conducted by Díaz (2013), Larzén-Östermark (2008), Sercu et al. (2005), and Young and Sachdev (2011), where cognitions appeared not to be borne out in practice. The literature presented two views on this matter: (1) a teacher’s practices can be explained by his/her cognitions (e.g., Birello, 2012; Borg, 2009; Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Daly, 2008/9; Dewey, 1910/2005; Pajares, 1992), and (2) teachers have ICLT-aligned cognitions but do not demonstrate ICLT-aligned practices (e.g., East & Scott, 2011; Richards et al., 2010; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Sercu et al., 2005; Young & Sachdev, 2011).

The findings of this study unite the two views. The cognitions of the teacher participants revealed greater alignment with ICLT than their practices indicated, corroborating the findings of Sercu et al. (2005) and others. Overall, the teachers’ cognitions suggested they were “favourably disposed” (Sercu, 2005, p. 10) towards ICLT but they did not practice ICLT methods to an equivalent extent in reality (Díaz, 2013; Sercu et al., 2005). Other studies have postulated reasons for this, as discussed in response to the hypotheses (chapter 6) but, heeding Borg’s warning (in Birello, 2012) against a simplistic expectation that an individual’s belief system will be consistent or will consistently control their practices, all contextual factors were considered through the wide lens of SCT. The primary influences are the subjects of the tensions in the following sections, but it is worthwhile to note here two further factors that influenced alignment between teachers’ cognitions and practices.

Firstly, the subject teachers had a range of prior experiences as individuals and as teachers, students, language learners, immigrants (e.g., Ada and Helene, and the Phase 1 native teachers of international languages), and emigrants (e.g., Craig and the Phase 1 teachers who had spent considerable time abroad). The teachers’ ontogeneses affected
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access to tools and the effectiveness of the tools to mediate their practice. For instance, different levels of familiarity with ICLT affected access to some tools (e.g., the principles of iCLT), and the extent to which others were employed effectively (e.g., using all cultures present in the classroom). Secondly, the dynamic reality of the research context (Feryok, 2010; Feryok & Oranje, 2015) could have influenced the choice of tools. Phase 1 involved teachers’ unconfirmed reports of cognitions and practices in a questionnaire with the associated potential for bias (e.g., reporting greater use of some tools than actually occurred). In Phase 2, teachers were involved in a research project with the researcher present (e.g., so avoided use of the target language). Influences unique to a phase (such as the Phase 2 teachers’ motivations to participate in the project) were examined earlier in the discussions of the hypotheses (chapter 6) and of the research questions (chapter 8).

Both views are supported by this study: cognitions were an indicator of practices, but not all cognitions could be put into practice. The best laid plans (i.e., cognitions) are only as good as the reality the contextual experience allows; sometimes classroom life gets in the way. Those contextual factors result in the tools failing to effectively mediate the activity, as is discussed in depth in the coming sections. Teachers’ practices are grounded in their cognitions but because, as Borg remarked, beliefs appear “internally inconsistent” (Birello, 2012, p. 91) the impression of dissonance is created. However, it is more a case of competition between beliefs—the ongoing interplay between personal or abstract or peripheral views against professional or concrete or central views—arising as a consequence of the other tensions presented here, none more so than the consistency of the curriculum and its supporting documents.

9.2.2 Consistency across curricular documents

In New Zealand, academic researchers review and generate best practice recommendations for language education. In turn, the Ministry considers whether and how to promote those recommendations. For instance, in recent times, researchers recommended task based language teaching, which the Ministry subsequently promoted strongly and successfully (East, 2012a; East & Scott, 2011; Ellis, 2005). Currently, researchers recommend ICLT (e.g., Newton, 2014, forthcoming; Newton et al., 2010; Conway et al., 2010; Scarino, 2005) and although the Ministry is promoting ICLT, it is not doing so effectively. The tools of the curriculum, its supporting resources, and
professional development are not successfully mediating teachers’ practice of ICLT, either because those tools cannot be accessed, they are flawed, or they are being only partially used. This is evidenced by the two-thirds of practising language teachers who were unfamiliar with how to implement ICLT.

All teachers worked towards the curriculum’s objective for students of languages: communication. However, as noted, they were operating under different interpretations of that objective. Those positioned on the traditional side of the balance of any one of Liddicoat’s (2005) axes, treating culture as facts, taught through artefacts and information, or taking a cultural orientation (as the majority was shown to do), will have interpreted the objective as communicative competence (Kohler, 2015). The curriculum document itself could be said to support this approach in its emphasis on communication. Those at the intercultural ends of the axes, treating culture as processes, taught through practices, and taking an intercultural orientation will have considered the objective to relate to ICC. This gives rise to two particular concerns. Firstly, communicative competence tends to be construed as relating to fluency of oral performance and ignores the more covert meaning-making elements of interactions (Forsman, 2012; Stapleton, 2000) and the relationship between culture and language (Liddicoat, 2011). Secondly, aiming for communicative competence does not emphasise the influences of the backgrounds and individual needs of the students (Byram, 1997; Byram & Zarate, 1996, 1997; Jebahi, 2013; Kelly, 2012; Manjarrés, 2009; Ryan, 2012).

Ascertaining the intended interpretation of the objective is further complicated by the appearance of ambiguity in the Ministry’s view on ICLT. The curriculum itself (Ministry of Education, 2007a)—a highly accessible document—talks of communication, and by inference, communicative competence. However, the somewhat sprawling online curriculum guide for the Learning Languages learning area (402 pages when downloaded as a document) refers to ICC in the leading paragraph on the landing page and encourages iCLT as the teaching method (Ministry of Education, 2013, 2014, June 3). In explaining what became “new or different” with the curriculum review, the guide describes the “effective intercultural communicator” as the new aim over native-like accuracy (Ministry of Education, 2012, August 28, section 5). ICLT is not uniformly promoted across curricular documents (Johnson, 2006), jeopardising the value of those documents to effectively mediate the activity of ICLT.
Unfortunately, Sercu’s (2006, 2007) assertion that, globally, schools have replaced the curricular objective of communicative competence with one of ICC does not apply to New Zealand’s curriculum. Rather, educational policy is in a state of limbo or transition. The consequence of this ambiguity is seen in responses from this study’s teachers, who have not yet reached in their own mind a single position about the value of culture skills in relation to language skills. Phase 1 teachers’ cognitions aligned with ICLT in many respects, but their reported practices represented both traditional methods and ICLT. The Phase 2 teachers described the importance of culture but their practices did not always match their assertions. Many participants seemed to be operating under a hybrid approach (Mangubhai et al., 2005), whether by chance or design, but there was a pervading perception that the elevation of culture in the curriculum required only greater incorporation of culture into lessons. That is, they believed a cultural orientation, rather than an intercultural one (Liddicoat, 2005), was expected and the inconsistency across curricular documents neither supported nor opposed that interpretation.

The ambiguity of the Ministry’s view is compounded by a second tension within the curricular documents. The curriculum asserts the equivalence of language and culture and their joint role in communication. However, the supporting materials—the online guides, the online communities, research reports, the assessment standards—do little to guide teachers in the practice of the cultural dimension (Castro et al., 2004; Luk, 2012; Scarino, 2014). The change to the curriculum to emphasise the role of culture appears to have taken place without sufficient concomitant resources to ensure that all teachers were supported in its implementation in the classroom and understood the importance, and means of assessment, of cultural knowledge. Adding to the vagueness is the curriculum’s instruction that language knowledge and cultural knowledge must be “only assessed indirectly” (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 25) through their contribution to communication, but the external assessments developed under the auspices of the Ministry take a language knowledge focus. A similar situation in Hong Kong was described by Luk (2012) as creating the impression that cultural knowledge and ICC were not taken seriously by the education authorities.

In New Zealand, cultural assessment is left to the teachers themselves. The effects of this tension were borne out in the data. Phase 1 teachers reported not teaching culture because they lacked knowledge of how to do so, and used the same reason for not testing
cultural knowledge. They believed cultural understanding was not rewarded by NCEA, or was not required to be assessed, and most tellingly, two-thirds were not at all familiar with ICLT. It was also evident in Phase 2, where Craig wanted to focus on culture, but had a teaching goal that focused on language, and Ada wanted to know what the Ministry “wants us to do as teachers” (ATI576). These findings reinforce the uncertainty experienced by the teachers in other studies (Díaz, 2011, 2013; East & Scott, 2011; Kohler, 2015; Luk, 2012; Stapleton, 2000). The existence of ambiguity, uncertainty, and low awareness of ICLT means the tools were not used to successfully mediate the activity of teaching with an ICLT approach. In many ways, those impediments could be remedied through teacher education. But, as is discussed next, teacher education and professional support around culture teaching and ICLT carry their own tensions.

9.2.3 Effectiveness of teacher education and professional support

The data show that ICLT does not form a part, at least not gainfully so, of original teacher training. This is a significant obstacle to teachers’ access to ICLT-related tools to mediate their teaching. Other studies have explained the limited practice of ICLT in the classroom by its absence in initial teacher training (Bryd et al., 2011; Kelly, 2012; Peiser & Jones, 2013; Schulz & Ganz, 2010; Woodgate-Jones, 2009). All participants of this study were reliant on professional development to bring (or keep) them up to date with the theory and practice of ICLT. Across phases, many participants reported attending professional development events, and more reported reading professional literature, but the data and past research (especially Conway et al., 2010) suggest that those avenues were not focused on culture teaching, let alone ICLT (or iCLT). The end result is that teachers were not sufficiently trained in ICLT theory and practices and were, therefore, restricted in their ability to fully employ ICLT-related tools to mediate their teaching, if they are able to access those tools at all.

Notwithstanding the Ministry’s role to keep teachers informed, the teachers are also responsible for keeping themselves up to date with the information accessible to them. Many teachers in this study were members of professional organisations, read professional literature, and attended professional development opportunities. To do so they may have been reliant on support from schools, in terms of time, funding, and teaching relief; and professional bodies and the Ministry, in terms of the provision of reachable opportunities and publication of comprehensible research. If teaching
requirements are updated to incorporate new information (as occurred in the curriculum review) teachers are responsible for accommodating changes in their practices, but they can only be expected to do so satisfactorily if they have been provided with clear explanations, examples, and ongoing professional learning opportunities (Sercu & St. John, 2007; Scarino, 2005). At present, it is not clear whether ICLT is a recommendation or a requirement, which has resulted in vagueness as to the extent to which teachers should attempt to understand it, analyse it, and practise it.

In Phase 1, reading professional literature correlated positively with scores on the ICLT Practices and Activities scales but did not have a significant correlation with the ICLT Cognitions scale. This lack of a relationship suggests that professional literature alone might not be sufficient to alter cognitions to accord with ICLT; an alternative interpretation is that ICLT might be insufficiently covered in the literature. Membership of professional organisations, though, was correlated in a positive direction with all ICLT scales, suggesting that organisational meetings, seminars, and workshops, which tend to have a practical focus, could be effective in changing beliefs as well as behaviours (Scarino, 2005). This supports pragmatism’s approach to learning through experience with knowledge gained in and through action (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Hjørland, 1997). It also concurs with Sercu’s (1998, 2006; Sercu & St. John, 2007) assertion that teachers need to critically test activities before a change is reflected in their beliefs. Crucially, it also substantiates the Phase 2 teachers’ recommendations that ICLT training be of an applied nature.

It will be recalled that Helene, from Phase 2, thought teachers should be “told off” (HTI928) by the Ministry if they were not familiar with the principles of iCLT. This corroborated the Phase 1 findings from teachers aware of ICLT who asserted that there was no reason for not understanding the approach with professional development available. The fact remains, however, that two-thirds of teachers did not know the approach, so the current means of teacher education are not satisfactory, not consistent, and/or not accessed, and therefore do not serve to successfully mediate teachers’ practices. Although ICLT is promoted by the Ministry, it is not a standardised part of teacher training and is not well catered for in professional development.
9.2.4 Access to languacultures

The nature and extent of a teacher’s access to the target language and cultures will influence their lesson content and their attitudes towards culture teaching (Czura, 2013). Concerns about a lack of familiarity with covert culture, inadequate access to native speakers, and use of outdated resources were raised in the discussions of the hypotheses (chapter 6) and research questions (chapter 8). A teacher with an intercultural orientation would consider knowledge of covert cultural aspects crucial for ICC, representing culture as more than artefacts and information, but as lived practices. Participants whose access to the tool of covert culture was hindered (by self-imposed or externally imposed constraints) means covert culture could not be used to mediate the activity, compromising an intercultural approach.

Although nearly half of the Phase 1 teachers did not teach the ability to explore cultures—a fundamental practice in ICLT—all three Phase 2 teachers were shown to support or encourage cultural exploration in their usual teaching methods and in the CPP work. Exploration of culture is one way an individual can become more familiar with the covert aspects of culture (target and own) and their role in meaning-making in social interactions. A teacher who possesses the ability to critically analyse his/her own cultural viewpoint is more likely to see value in self-awareness and consequently foster the skill in his/her students (Kohler, 2015). Critical reflection is discussed separately next, as this study has revealed its absence as being a—if not the—shortfall in New Zealand language teachers’ views and practices in ICLT.

9.2.5 Reflection

Modelling and teaching critical reflection is vital in ICLT. One widespread finding from this project cannot be ignored. Common across phases, and across cognitions and practices, was the lack of emphasis of the role of critical reflection in language learning. Although the “borders between self and other” were often explored, they were rarely “problematised and redrawn” (Liddicoat, 2005, p. 33) or “interrogated” from the perspectives of other cultures (Bagnall, 2005, p. 107). That is the level of critical self-awareness expected for ICC, necessary to influence learners’ knowledge (savoirs), attitudes (especially savoir être), and skills (especially savoir s’engager) (Byram, 1997), and the extent to which they undergo personal transformations (savoir se transformer) (Houghton, 2010, 2013).
This study’s participants were generally “favourably disposed” towards teaching methods that aligned with ICLT (Sercu, 2005, p. 10; see also Han & Song, 2011) but with the major exception of seeing little or no value in practising critical analysis of their own culture, or encouraging their students to do so. Without reflection, the target culture remains external to the learner, as a feature of the other, and the emphasis tends towards differences between the C1 and C2. Differences do need to be considered, and valued (Barraja-Rohan, 2000), but it is in making connections that boundaries are softened (Duff, 2004; Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Rowsell, Sztainbok, & Blaney, 2007). Without explicitly teaching and modelling objective and critical reflective practices, the teacher is operating with a cultural, not intercultural, orientation. The lack of awareness of the role of reflection in language learning could be explained by the absence of explicit promotion of reflection and relativisation of one’s own culture in education policy, curricula, and training programmes (Castro et al., 2004; Scarino, 2014).

This systematic examination of the key tensions, universal across phases, has clarified the matters which need attention if teachers are to be supported in awareness and practice of ICLT. It has also revealed the ways in which the CPPs activity assisted in easing those tensions, as discussed next.

9.3 Using CPPs to ease the tensions

Interpreting the findings through SCT revealed two noteworthy ways in which CPPs served as a tool to effectively mediate the teachers’ practice of ICLT: (1) they provided an additional constellation of mediating tools, all of which were easily accessible; and (2) they improved access to existing tools by addressing some of the existing impediments. In this section, the discussion returns to the CPPs and considers how their application in Phase 2 mediated language and culture teaching to the extent that all of the tensions raised above were avoided or mitigated to some degree, thus enhancing the practice of ICLT.

With respect to alleviating the tensions within cognitions and between cognitions and practices the CPPs demonstrated how the theory of ICLT can be applied in the classroom. This mediated their practice of ICLT through development of their understanding of the approach by allowing them to see that it was not risky and achieved desirable learning outcomes while complying with the curriculum. In a clear
substantiation of pragmatism and SCT, the study had given Ada, Craig, and Helene the opportunity to experience the ICLT notions they had heard about, in the legitimate learning environment of their classrooms (Guskey, 1986; Hjørland, 1997; Johnson, 2006; Sercu, 1998; Sercu & St. John, 2007). Craig described the situation as having given him confidence that he could put his ICLT-aligned cognitions into practice without compromising his professional beliefs or his students’ achievement. All teachers expressed the intention (already acted upon by Ada) of using the ICLT principles to guide their future teaching (Borg, 2006, 2009; Castro et al., 2004; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 1968; Sercu & St. John, 2007). In other words, CPPs caused personal/abstract/peripheral beliefs to dovetail with professional/concrete/central beliefs, removing barriers to the practice of ICLT-aligned beliefs and also removing any suggestion of inconsistency.

The CPPs eased tensions between the *curriculum and supporting documents* by generating learning outcomes that complied with the curriculum’s objective of communication while following the Ministry’s recommendations for use of ICLT, iCLT, and TBLT. The outcomes of the CPPs provided evidence that ICLT can be enacted without comprising either their personal or their professional beliefs. The release of these tensions assisted in uniting teachers’ cognitions and practices. The CPPs successfully worked across all curricular resources, bridging recommendations that could appear disparate. This improved access to, and removed flaws from, the tools of curriculum and supporting resources so they could be wholeheartedly used to mediate teaching with an ICLT approach. There remains scope to work further on the matter of assessment, however. Although the benefits of CPPs for assessment were not made clear in this study, primarily due to teachers’ unwillingness to amend their usual assessment methods, CPPs lend themselves to dynamic assessment of the development of ICC. The regular submission of reflection sheets would support ongoing feedback and, coupled with the assessment of the content (not just the language) of students’ presentations of their findings, development of the savoirs (Byram, 1997) could be assessed.

It was a positive finding of significance that the CPPs served as praxis, where ICLT theory was demonstrated in practice without generating conflict between teachers’ subsets of beliefs, and therefore obviating inconsistency between cognitions and practices. Not all teachers make use of the tool of professional development, and not all professional
development opportunities have ICLT as a focus. It transpired that the step-by-step nature of the CPPs served as a form of in-house teacher education, making clear ICLT’s fundamental practices of explore, reflect, and compare. Participating in the CPPs informed teachers on the practicalities of the implementation of the projects, the ways in which language and culture could be integrated, and the ease with which it could be accommodated within the limited timeframes of a school programme. This newfound or advanced knowledge enabled the teachers to see ways in which their usual class activities could be adapted to an intercultural approach and all expressed the intention of doing just that. In these ways, the CPPs improved the ability for the tools of ICLT theory and iCLT method to be used to mediate the teachers’ practices.

The CPPs enhanced access to and use of the languacultures of the class to mediate language teaching. The reflective and comparative steps, in particular, meant that many had more mediating tools at their disposal. Not only were the students exposed to elements of the target language and culture that they might not otherwise have dealt with (acknowledged by all classes), but they were starting to gain an understanding of their own language and culture and the influence of same on their interpretation of the L2/C2. The exploratory steps gave participants longer and deeper exposure to cultural aspects. In some cases, those aspects were unlike the usual overt culture topics of coursebooks, such as Frith’s (City) research on religious tolerance, Tom’s (Greenview) study on the acceptance of nudity, and Caitlyn’s (Muirside) consideration of the role of formality in language. Using primary and secondary information sources for the students’ research provided an enhanced range of resources and points of view (Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Jogan et al., 2001; Schulz, 2007), and the focus on native speaker input provided authentic engagement to obtain current perspectives (Ministry of Education, 2007a).

Given the low levels of awareness of the role of reflection in language learning and because, as Bagnall (2005) asserted, “existing school and organisation structures inhibit reflection” (p. 107), reflection was given a prominent role in the CPPs in the reflection sheets and in the reformulation of the hypothesis step. By making these tools of reflection available and accessible, teacher and student participants’ attention was directed towards the place of reflection in language learning. All three teachers specified the development of reflective abilities (in themselves and/or in their students) to have been a valuable outcome of the CPPs.
In addition to relieving existing tensions, the CPPs tools enhanced the language teaching and learning experience in the following ways:

1. Students’ background knowledge and experiences were treated as valuable to the class community, as endorsed by pragmatism, SCT, and ICLT (Ajayi, 2008; Cross, 2010; Dewey, 1927/1998; Jebahi, 2013; Kelly, 2012; Manjarrés, 2009; Morgan, 1993; Oranje, 2012; Oranje & Feryok, 2013; Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Ryan, 2012; Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Scarino, 2014; Swain et al., 2011; Vygotsky, 1978). This legitimised all learners as having something worthwhile to contribute, which had a marked influence. Students with lower language proficiency had felt legitimised to participate in the joint practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Previously, students aware of their deficiencies in relation to their peers had minimised their involvement and one of Ada’s students had decided not to study German again. Post-CPPs, feeling validated and “clever” (Craig, CTI497), those students had increased their participation, improved their production of the target language, and Ada’s student had decided to continue with German.

2. The research nature of the CPPs directly facilitated an exploration approach in the classroom (Byram, 1997; Byram & Zarate, 1997; Dewey, 1915/2008, 1916/2008; Liddicoat, 2011; Scarino, 2010). This operationalised the fundamental ICLT practice of exploration and supported key competencies and values of the curriculum to “explore different world views” (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 17). Exploration was not common in Phase 1 teacher reports.

3. The reflective elements of the CPPs directly operationalised the second of the fundamental ICLT practices, reflection (Byram, 1997; Dewey, 1916/2008; Jackson, 2011; Kramsch, 1993; Liddicoat, 2011; Moeller & Osborn, 2014; Oranje, 2012; Scarino, 2014). Values, key competencies, and principles of the curriculum promote reflective understanding of “one’s own personal world” (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 24) encouraging students to “learn about their own values” (p. 10). It was a significant finding of this project that, across the phases, teaching and modelling reflection was absent in the majority of teachers. It is therefore another significant finding that CPPs serve to address that absence.
4. The reflection sheets required regular consideration of how the target viewpoint and
the student’s own were the same or different, operationalising the third of the ICLT
practices, comparison (Abrams, et al., 2006; Byram, 1997; Newton et al., 2010;
Roberts et al., 2001; Kramsch, 1993; Liddicoat, 2011; Oranje, 2012; Wilkinson,
2012; Witte & Harden, 2011; Young & Sachdev, 2011). This supported the
curriculum’s value of “discussing disagreements that arise from differences”
(Ministry of Education, 2007a, p. 10) in seeking “shared cultural understandings”
(p. 14) and developing students’ ability to “view their world from new
perspectives” (p. 20). Across phases, comparisons had focused on differences, not
similarities, and without reflection any discoveries would remain external to the

5. The CPPs allowed students to develop the savoirs of ICC (Byram, 1997), such as
knowledge of the target culture and their own culture (savoirs), and attitudes of
curiosity and willingness to engage with culture, and suspend and reconsider their
beliefs (savoir être). Students had begun to develop skills in identifying
ethnocentric perspectives (savoir comprendre) and in discovering and applying
cultural references (savoir apprendre). Students were motivated, engaged, and
valued, all of which are necessary starting points for the development of critical
cultural awareness (savoir s’engager)—“the most educationally significant of the
savoirs” (Byram, 2015, p. 51)—for identity development (savoir se transformer)
(Houghton, 2010), and for an educative experience (Dewey, 1915/2008; 1938).

The CPPs, or at least this implementation of them, did not solve all problems, however. Awareness and practice of reflection were increased across teachers, but for
Ada and Craig reflection appeared to hold interest, rather than value, and in all threecontexts it was rarely critical reflection. In addition, although the steps of the CPPs were
repeated across all contexts for consistency, there were differences in how it was treated
in the classes, which affected the extent to which it benefited the teachers and students. In
Ada’s and Craig’s classes, the CPPs were treated as a means to an end—the end being the
speech assessment—rather than being valued as an engaging work project that could help
develop ICC (or even communicative competence, if that was the teacher’s aim). In
contrast, in Helene’s class, not settling on the method of presenting findings until mid-
way through the project had the positive consequence of the students treating the CPPs as
the priority, and thus they retained their value. The CPPs were a practical application of ICLT that emphasised key components of the practice but they did not instruct in the theory. For this reason, they did not manage the contrasting interpretations of the communication objective as relating to communicative competence or ICC.

9.4 Summary

Examination of the tools, and the participants’ use of them, showed the tools were often inaccessible, insufficient, or ambiguous and were, therefore, not successfully mediating teachers’ practice of ICLT. Teachers were at different and fluctuating positions in terms of their view on the nature of culture, what content to teach, and their orientation in doing so (Liddicoat, 2005). Each approach drew on different tools, and/or applied tools differently.

Access to teacher education—original training and in-service professional development—is crucial to learn new ways of thinking and gain ongoing support in testing new-found knowledge. This will allow theoretical periphery beliefs to be reviewed and committed to as concrete core beliefs. As elucidated by Bastos and Araújo e Sá (2014), “teachers cannot teach what they do not know, do not own, or do not believe in” (p. 2). Once teachers have an understanding of ICLT theory and practices, the tensions associated with the tools, especially surrounding ambiguity across curricular documents, will dissolve and teachers will collectively interpret the objective as intercultural communicative competence, thus mediating effective practice of ICLT.

The Phase 2 intervention demonstrated that CPPs encouraged practices that were in greater accordance with New Zealand’s education policy and international research than currently occurs in typical New Zealand language classes. The step-by-step nature of the projects served as praxis for the teachers, making clear the necessary elements of intercultural practice: explore, reflect, and compare to develop knowledge, attitudes, and skills. In this way, the CPPs clarified some of the ambiguities existing in the curricular documentation. They produced sound results for the students, and they facilitated a balance between language and culture. Rather than leave teachers to discover those tools for themselves—or attempt to interpret the ambiguity within them—the CPP work essentially put those tools directly in the hands of the teachers. CPPs acted as a consciousness-raising measure in the teachers who had yet to internalise ICLT theory and
practices, and removed conflict in teachers’ subsets of beliefs by unifying personal, abstract, or peripheral beliefs with professional, concrete, or core beliefs.

Arguably, the most important finding of this study was the limited value teachers placed on reflection in language education. Results from across phases suggested that teachers had many cognitions and practices that aligned with ICLT and the absence of reflection was, for many, the one step keeping them from an unmitigated ICLT approach. A significant impact of the CPPs was, then, the revelation of the role of reflection to teachers not familiar with ICLT and as a refresher to those generally familiar with the practices and principles.

This brings to a close the interpretation of the results and findings through application of SCT. It revealed the tensions and opportunities for transformation. Positive results from the use of the CPPs suggest that change can be achieved without significant upheaval. There was no evidence that teachers were against ICLT, but there is evidence that it is a theory without practical support (Sercu, 1998). At present, New Zealand teachers are hindered in their access to, or successful use of, tools to enable their practice of an ICLT approach. The CPPs have been shown to avoid or remedy most of those impediments so the tools are more accessible, less flawed, and can be applied more fully by teachers. The chapter concludes with the presentation of a heuristic model developed to illustrate the elements fundamental for a practitioner of an ICLT approach to make clear the areas where that support would be best directed.

9.5 Intercultural Communicative Language Teacher Model

The findings of this study, and the areas for development brought to light above, motivated the conceptualisation of a heuristic model of the intercultural communicative language teacher. The model features each element of an ICLT approach so it can be singled out as a focus for evaluation and development. With all elements fully developed, an individual can be said to be an intercultural communicative language teacher.

The framework of this conceptual device incorporates three cognitive elements, three primary practices, and three competencies, which together comprise an ICLT approach. The structure of the model was derived from:
Liddicoat’s (2005) three axes characterising cognitions of culture in language teaching: the nature of culture, cultural content, and teaching orientation;

The three fundamental practices of ICLT summarised as explore, reflect, and compare (Newton, 2012; Oranje, 2012); and,

The three groups of competencies of Byram’s (1997) savoirs model of ICC: knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

As outlined in section 2.5 of chapter 2, the first of Liddicoat’s (2005) axes represents teachers’ views on the nature of culture, ranging from treating culture as a static body of facts and information about a society (traditional) to treating it as the dynamic processes “through which a society constructs, represents, enacts and understands itself” (Liddicoat, 2005, p. 31), aligned with ICLT. The second axis represents teachers’ cognitions about appropriate culture content to teach as ranging from artefacts and institutions or “the things produced by a society” (traditional) to practices or “the things done by members of the society” (Liddicoat, 2005, p. 32) (ICLT). The third axis represents a teacher’s overall orientation to language and culture teaching, that is, whether their “intended educative impact of culture learning” (Liddicoat, 2005, p. 32) includes confrontation and transformation of the learner’s identity and beliefs (the intercultural pole), or whether it comprises imparted knowledge that remains external to the learner (the cultural pole).

In this study, the three axes have been combined to create the cognitive dimension of the model (see Figure 9.1). The non-ICLT poles of the axes intersect at the nucleus, the point at which the teaching approach is furthest from ICLT, but from where development of the intercultural language teacher can commence. The teacher can be represented as progressing along the respective axes from the traditional nucleus towards the outer reaches of each axis as their cognitions about language and culture teaching develop towards an ICLT approach.
The second dimension of the model incorporates the three fundamental practices of an intercultural approach: exploration, reflection, and comparison (Oranje, 2012; Oranje & Feryok, 2013) (see also revised Principle 3 in Newton (forthcoming)). In the model, each of the elements occupies a space between the intersecting axes, as shown in Figure 9.2. There is no particular relationship between any one of the practices and the cognitions on either side of it because all cognitions influence all practices. For example, progress along any one of the three cognitions axes will affect the extent to which a teacher models and fosters exploration of culture. Those who view culture as facts, for instance, are unlikely to facilitate exploration with the expectation of making new discoveries; whereas, viewing culture as dynamic practices opens the way for learners to explore cultures and, through reflection and comparison, analyse their experiences of them to find similarities and differences.
At the nucleus, where culture is considered as facts, taught through reference to artefacts and institutions, with an educative emphasis on the cultural, there are few opportunities to explore, reflect, and compare; that is, the approach is not intercultural. With classroom practices involving greater degrees of exploration, reflection, and comparison, a teacher progresses out towards the outer ranges of the axes. In other words, undertaking those three practices assists in recognition of culture as processes, best taught through reference to practices, and involving an educative emphasis on the intercultural.

The third dimension, represented by the outer ring of the model, comprises the three groups of competencies of an intercultural speaker (Byram, 1997), knowledge (savoirs), attitudes (savoir être) and skills (savoir comprendre, savoir apprendre, and savoir s’engager). These are shown in the full model, presented in Figure 9.3. Locating the competencies on the perimeter of the model characterises their development as a result of progression through the cognitions and practices. The outer circle is where the approach to teaching language and culture is fully representative of an intercultural communicative language teacher.

*Figure 9.2. Development of the model to include the three practices of ICLT: explore, reflect, and compare.*
The axes of this model are treated as continua to accommodate fluctuations in cognitions, because development from the nucleus to the intercultural edge might not always be linear in one direction. The data from this study revealed a range of matters that influence a teacher’s position on the axes in any given situation. These included conflicting “subsets of beliefs” (Birello, 2012, p. 91), contextual factors associated with classroom reality (Feryok, 2010; Feryok & Oranje, 2015), exposure to new theories and opportunities to test them (Sercu & St. John, 2007), and responses to specific activities and their differing “points of articulation between culture and language in communication” (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013, p. 26). The practices of exploration, reflection, and comparison, too, will fluctuate, where a teacher’s use of one practice might bloom forth in one activity, but lie dormant at the nucleus in others (as was demonstrated in Helene’s practice of reflection, for instance). It must be remembered that it is not the case that there is no place for facts, artefacts, and institutions in an intercultural language class (East, 2012a). What is important is how the facts and artefacts are treated. If they are presented as unchanging, or applicable to all members of the culture, or are assessed by recall, then the approach is contrary to ICLT. In an ICLT approach, those same facts should be explored, reflected upon, and compared against other cultural viewpoints.

![Diagram of intercultural language teacher model](image)

**Figure 9.3.** Example of a teacher in development on the complete model of the intercultural language teacher.
The model does not divide cognitive and practice elements. They together influence an individual’s approach to culture teaching and the development of the competencies in their students (and themselves in the co-constructive meaning-making process). The model visually demonstrates the interconnectivity of beliefs and practices necessary in an ICLT approach. Figure 9.3 presents an indicative example of a teacher practising significant exploration, little reflection, and moderate comparison (representative of the overall majority of participants in this study), and consequently remaining some distance from the outer ring, the realm of a fully intercultural communicative language teacher.

9.5.1 Application of the model

The model has been designed to be applied by the individual to herself/himself, be they teacher or teacher educator. This notion was grounded in the study’s theoretical paradigm of pragmatism and SCT. It is by considering one’s own position with respect to the cognitions, the practices, and the competencies, that one is compelled to reflect on the extent to which one could be considered an ICLT practitioner. As endorsed in pragmatism, this self-induced discovery through personal experience with the model will make the outcome more meaningful to the individual and more likely to be internalised and alter future practices than if s/he was analysed, and informed of the results, by another (Dewey, 1909/2009, 1915/2008, 1916/2008, 1938). Furthermore, no one other than the individual herself/himself can provide a personalised and veracious assessment of their cognitions and their aims for teaching. With respect to SCT, the model serves as a tool to mediate the individual’s practise of ICLT by establishing the extent to which they think, know, and behave in accordance with ICLT, and by revealing the cognitions, practices, and competencies that require further development to accord with an ICLT approach.

The intention of the model is that a practitioner can consider her/his positioning on the model and review the extent to which her/his cognitions and practices demonstrate an intercultural approach. Working around the individual elements of the model the individual can ask herself/himself, To what extent am I considering culture as processes? Am I teaching through practices? Can I create more opportunities for exploring and for teaching the skill of exploration? Am I modelling and developing the attitudes of an intercultural speaker? Some might wish to chart their perspectives (as in Figure 9.3) to reveal the elements that require more concentrated development. A teacher developing
towards ICLT from a more traditional starting point could be represented by a series of ever-changing models depicting their cognitions and practices fluctuating under different contexts and circumstances. This is the first presentation of the model and it will benefit from further work to fine-tune it and test its application in practice.

9.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter has used SCT to systematically analyse the quantitative results and the qualitative findings. It has found that New Zealand teachers demonstrate many cognitions and practices that are in accordance with ICLT principles. However, the element of critical reflection, crucial to ICLT, was lacking in practice and not highly valued in cognitions. This stems from New Zealand teachers having low awareness of ICLT due to inadequate coverage of the theory and practices in original and ongoing training, and uncertainty about how to implement ICLT in the classroom (and assessment) environment. This results in tensions affecting teachers’ access to and efficient use of language education tools. The CPPs were shown to be a mediational means of reducing some of those tensions, serving as praxis to direct teachers’ awareness and practices towards ICLT. In particular, they brought the importance of reflection to teachers’ attention. Finally, it has presented a model that brings together all areas of this thesis in one heuristic device against which teaching practitioners can assess their own development on the path to becoming a more competent intercultural communicative language teacher.
CHAPTER 10 – CONCLUSION

10.0 Overview

This chapter concludes the thesis. It commences by recalling the aims of the project and summarising the primary contributions made by the study to the field of ICLT research. Secondly, implications of the study’s findings are raised and associated recommendations are made with respect to the overall research concern of supporting New Zealand language teachers in the practice of ICLT. Thirdly, limitations of the study are acknowledged in terms of both concept and methodology. Finally, future research directions are suggested.

10.1 Primary contributions

As stated in the Introduction (chapter 1), this thesis had two aims: (1) to ascertain New Zealand language teachers’ current understanding and practice of ICLT, and (2) to develop, implement, and evaluate CPPs as an activity to support teachers in the practice of ICLT. Both aims were successfully achieved as is shown in the preceding chapters and as is summarised in the following presentation of the primary contributions made by this study.

10.1.1 Aim 1: Ascertain current understanding

Data gathered by questionnaire from 76 practising language teachers from across the South Island, from a range of schools in terms of size, locality, and extent of language education, depicted the status quo of language teachers’ understanding of ICLT. The results from this part of the study have provided a fresh understanding of the place of ICLT in New Zealand in terms of teachers’ awareness of ICLT, their practice of the approach, and uniquely, explanations for low levels of awareness and practice. Furthermore, this new information allowed comparisons to be made with past studies. Results demonstrated that New Zealand language teachers’ understanding and practice of ICLT have not developed significantly from the earlier New Zealand-based reports from Harvey et al. (2010) (and its derivatives), Roskvist et al. (2011), and East (2012a), but are marginally greater than revealed by teachers in similar international studies by Byram and Risager (1999), Czura (2013), Han (2010), Han and Song (2011), and Sercu et al. (2005).
This current understanding is expected to be of interest to the Ministry, ICLT scholars, teacher educators, and practising teachers.

10.1.2 Tools to mediate the practice of ICLT

This study has made a unique contribution to the research field, important to New Zealand research in particular, by revealing reasons for low levels of practice of ICLT. Teachers’ practice of ICLT was hindered by mediational tools being inaccessible, flawed, or used ineffectively.

(i) Inaccessible tools

Teacher education (original training and ongoing professional development) can provide tools to enable the practice of ICLT. This thesis asserts that teachers could not access those tools. Original teacher training has little, if any, gainful reference to ICLT and subsequent professional development opportunities have a language teaching focus and lack information on the application of ICLT. Furthermore, not all teachers attend such events. Few resources are readily available to assist teachers to apply ICLT in their classroom, and those that do exist are not regularly accessed.

(ii) Flawed tools

The role of ICLT in language education is ambiguous as a consequence of inconsistency across curricular documents. The curriculum itself does not refer to ICLT. It does contain values, competencies, and principles that could be interpreted as referring to ICLT, but only by those who have awareness of the approach. The sole objective of the curriculum is communication, which implies communicative competence is the goal of language teaching rather than ICC. The curriculum guide (Ministry of Education, 2013), however, does relate to ICLT. The guide promotes Newton et al.’s (2010) method of iCLT, offers examples of application of the method, and refers to the notion of the intercultural speaker. However, teachers are not familiar with this guide, evident in the finding that the majority of teachers are not familiar with ICLT. Assessments set by the Ministry retain a language focus; whereas, culture knowledge assessment is left to teachers to assess indirectly through its contribution to communication (Ministry of Education, 2007a), and without much in the way of support in how to do so.
(iii) **Ineffective use of tools**

The inadequacies and inconsistencies described above manifest in teachers being uncertain about how to apply ICLT in the classroom and, as a consequence, tools that are accessible are not used effectively. The curriculum guide’s promotion of iCLT (Ministry of Education, 2013) appears not well utilised; the various languacultures in the classroom are not commonly drawn upon; and most significantly in this study, the tool of reflection is seldom used or used uncritically, rarely effective in assisting the development of ICC.

**10.1.3 Consistency of cognitions and practices**

The study replicated findings of existing research in terms of an apparent mismatch between teachers’ cognitions and their practices, with teachers expressing thoughts and beliefs that aligned with ICLT but reporting practices that did not. This study has contributed to this area in two unique ways by applying SCT to consider a broad range of contextual factors that influence a teacher’s thoughts, knowledge, beliefs, and practices. Firstly, reasons for cognitions not being borne out in the reality of the classroom were brought to light. These included teachers being concerned that they lacked time, knowledge of the target culture, knowledge of how to teach culture, and supporting resources. The majority of teachers did not have an intercultural orientation, either as a result of, or in accordance with, their interpretation of the curriculum as having the goal of communicative competence. Secondly, this study closely examined those reasons and revealed that they could not be accurately described as mismatches or inconsistencies between cognitions and practices. Rather, they resulted from an individual’s competing sets of beliefs, whether abstract-concrete, personal-professional, or core-peripheral. This competition was exacerbated by the inadequacies, inconsistencies, and uncertainties outlined above. This thesis has argued that those deficiencies can be rectified with increased understanding of ICLT theory and practices so the tensions between beliefs are reduced to allow greater alignment between thoughts and behaviours.

**10.1.4 Aim 2: CPPs to support ICLT**

The second aim sought to develop, implement, and evaluate the CPPs as an activity to support teachers in their practice of ICLT. In all three situations, the CPPs were successfully developed and adapted, in collaboration with the teacher, to suit the specific contextual factors of the class, including proficiency levels and class diversity. The CPPs were implemented with ease, even given the limited planning time, and enhanced
students’ understanding of the target culture and their own culture. In addition, students became aware of their tendencies to stereotype and generalise. The projects democratised the classroom, re-motivating some in their language study, and allowing all students to take the role of expert and share the knowledge of their research areas. Teachers and students alike evaluated the CPPs positively. All student participants recommended CPPs be used in future classes; all teachers expressed the intention to do so (Ada was already doing so). Not only was the CPP developed to be in accordance with ICLT, but it transpired that it served as a teaching tool given the explicitness with which it lead the teacher and the class through the fundamental practices of ICLT of explore, reflect, and compare. Thus, the teachers’ understanding of ICLT was enhanced, and the CPPs had given them the opportunity to test the theory in the reality of the classroom to discover the benefits for themselves, boding well for future changes in practices (Guskey, 1986; Sercu & St. John, 2007).

A significant contribution of this thesis related to the practice of reflection in language education.

10.1.5 Reflection
Failure to recognize the value of reflection on one’s own culture to assist language learning was common across both phases of this study. It was rare for teachers to model it and rare for teachers to foster in their students the skill of reflection. This thesis has argued that it is the absence of reflection that is most accountable for keeping teachers from thinking and acting with an intercultural orientation. This is addressed further in the implications of the study (section 10.2).

10.1.6 Model
An outcome of this study was the development of a heuristic model for teachers and teacher educators to assess the extent to which they think and behave as an intercultural language teacher. The value of the model is in its ability to highlight the aspects that require further development, be they cognitions (e.g., treating culture as facts or processes), practices (i.e., exploring, reflecting, and comparing), or competencies (i.e., knowledge, attitudes, and skills). The model serves as a tool to mediate teachers’ practice of ICLT by raising consciousness of their own thoughts and practices so they can develop them towards an intercultural approach.
10.1.7 Summary of achievement of aims

Both aims were accomplished successfully. A renewed understanding of teachers’ cognitions and practices is now available, which can serve as a guide to improve systems and processes to develop teachers further in their practice of ICLT. The CPPs were evaluated favourably by students and teachers and were shown to be an effective tool to positively mediate the practice of ICLT. The intercultural language teacher model, generated from the thesis as a whole, directly serves to support language teachers to think and act in accordance with ICLT.

10.2 Implications and Recommendations

This section presents some of the implications arising from this study’s findings, and where relevant, makes associated recommendations.

Despite ambiguity, ICLT is promoted by the Ministry, a position reached with considerable commitment and, presumably, cost. The absence of ICLT from original teacher training neglects future teachers by failing to support them in working within the Ministry’s requirements and guidelines. It also neglects the Ministry itself, by paying no heed to the scholarly and practical work it commissioned and promotes. The introduction of ICLT (and specifically, iCLT) was a significant development for New Zealand language teachers and should be wholeheartedly followed through, with support to ensure that they keep abreast with their international peers. The question then arises of how best to address this need to educate teachers on the value of ICLT and on the importance of critical reflection, specifically.

Nearly two-thirds of all Phase 1 teachers were members of professional organisations, and most accessed professional literature; all three Phase 2 teachers engaged with these means of professional support. The results of the quantitative analysis indicated that those who had affiliations with professional organisations achieved the higher scores on the ICLT Cognitions, Practices, and Activities scales. This suggests that more could be made of support provided through professional organisations.

Of the Phase 1 teachers aware of ICLT, half reported learning about the approach through in-service professional development workshops, as had all three Phase 2 teachers. The length, nature, and quality of those events varied. Ensuring that professional
organisations’ publications, meetings, and events include content on culture teaching and ICLT, and are made accessible to all, will expose more to the theory, principles, and exemplars of an ICLT approach. This would improve access to the mediational benefits of tools associated with professional affiliation.

ICLT needs to be actively brought to the attention of a large portion of the teaching population. Leaving teachers to their own devices has not worked. Not only was there a large number wholly unaware of ICLT, but a further large group had heard of the concept and taken no further steps to inform themselves of it. The curriculum guide is, in theory, easily accessible (although somewhat sprawling). More could be made of that site, particularly in terms of providing exemplars (as suggested by Craig), but first teachers must be aware that it exists.

The Phase 2 teacher participants endorsed recommendations of past studies (e.g., Edwards, 2008; Díaz, 2013; Guskey, 1986; Moeller & Osborn, 2014; Rainio, 2008; Scarino, 2014; Sercu, 1998; Sercu & St. John, 2007) in their desire for concrete examples. Helene believed that these are best presented in person at workshop-style meetings. The CPP activity lends itself to development into a format for sharing at workshops and online, with a range of levels of detail so teachers could directly apply the CPPs, or adapt and apply them, in their teaching programmes.

Teachers not currently members of professional organisations or not accessing the materials should be encouraged to do so to increase the possibility of exposure to ICLT theory and methods. Teachers’ access to the tools would thereby be enhanced and understanding among teachers would be more uniform. This is particularly important for teachers of EAL and te reo Māori, given that their responses in this study indicated that they were among the least qualified in teaching and language acquisition, least likely to be members of professional associations, and least likely to demonstrate cognitions and practices representative of ICLT.

A review of teacher training programmes would be beneficial to ensure that future teachers of languages are exposed to ICLT and made aware of how to implement it in the classroom. Any subsequent review of the curriculum should consider making the presence of ICLT more explicit in relation to the Learning Languages learning area. In fact, the principles of intercultural teaching can be applied more widely than just language
classes; general education would benefit from the curriculum’s promotion of intercultural methods, particularly given the cultural diversity of New Zealand school classrooms.

10.3 Limitations

A number of limitations to this study are acknowledged. Firstly, although every effort was made to make the questionnaire design and data analysis processes robust, limitations remained. Most of these were raised in the methodology (chapter 4) and in the results and discussion of the questionnaire data (chapters 5 and 6). They included the wording of items that could have proved confusing for teachers of New Zealand’s languages, and the use of specific words (e.g., modal verbs should and must) which could have unexpectedly influenced responses. The potential for a social desirability bias was high. Elements of the questionnaire clearly indicated that teaching culture was valued in the research field, so participants might have selected responses that favoured culture and ICLT because they perceived they were the more “prestigious” (Brown & Rodgers, 2002, p. 144) or most desirable responses (Dörnyei, 2007), reflecting the “human tendency” to present oneself “in a good light” (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 8). The potential danger of this was revealed in the number of responses from long-serving teacher participants claiming ICLT featured in their original training, when clearly it could not have.

It is also accepted that the participant sample could have shared characteristics that were not common with all teachers nationwide, let alone internationally. Although surveying South Island teachers was considered a positive feature of this study because they are an under-researched group, those teachers could have had unique characteristics that limit the generalisability of the results. Similarly, those teachers who received the questionnaire but did not complete it could have had perspectives highly relevant to the research concern but their views were not represented.

With respect to the CPP intervention, it is acknowledged that all three teachers volunteered to participate in the project, and did so when attending an event of a professional language teacher organisation. They might, therefore, not characterise the average New Zealand language teacher and their positive results and experiences might not transfer to teachers less engaged in professional support. In a related point, the teachers’ rationales for participation in the study had an impact on the extent to which the CPPs influenced their practice of ICLT. They did not all get involved for the express
purpose of reviewing their own teaching approaches, and this was a limitation in terms of assessing the extent to which the CPP work changed their perspectives.

It is recognised that the extent of my participation in the design, adaptation, and implementation of the CPPs is a limitation of the study. I took to each class my familiarity with ICLT, awareness of past CPP research, and intimate acquaintance with the details and expectations of the CPP itself. Future use of the CPPs will be managed by teachers without the CPP designer and researcher alongside, which may influence how the projects are carried out and their results.

It could be argued that there are inherent limitations in teacher cognition research, due to it involving psychological constructs that cannot ever be confirmed as true by a researcher. This study endeavoured to mitigate that concern by triangulating across data collection techniques, methods of analysis, and by using participants’ own words when reporting their perspectives.

10.4 Future Research Directions

A number of areas for future research arose throughout the project. Of particular relevance to New Zealand research would be further study on teachers of te reo Māori. The low levels with which te reo teachers’ cognition and practices aligned with ICLT were surprising given that Māori language lessons are popularly considered as integrating culture and language. This was certainly my own experience as a learner of te reo and was corroborated by a representative of local Māori (T. Rewi, personal communication, 5 July 2013, in consultation with Māori for ethics approval). Such integration is reflected in the New Zealand curriculum where there are frequent collocations in sections relating to te reo of the words language and culture, and of the Māori equivalents, te reo Māori and tikanga Māori. Teachers of te reo had a high rate of having no teaching qualification, and a low rate of membership of professional language teacher associations. Research of te reo teaching is warranted in at least two directions: (1) to analyse whether increasing te reo teachers’ exposure to ICLT theory and practice and the provision of ongoing support enhances their practice of ICLT; and, an especially interesting avenue, (2) whether teaching approaches that are uniquely Māori also serve to develop students’ ICC, and if so, whether they can be generalised to non-Māori students.
Given the noted limitation of the CPP activity being affected by my presence, it would be worthwhile to implement the CPPs with a broader base of teachers and without direct assistance. Such a study would be more representative of the real-world application of the CPPs if they are made available as a teaching tool. There would also be value in conducting the project over a longer period, perhaps a full year, to analyse greater use of the CPPs as a form of dynamic assessment of the students’ ICC. This research did not assess the development of students’ ICC, per se, and that, too, would be a worthwhile study to provide further evidence for teachers on the benefits of CPPs and ICLT in the language classroom.

This thesis has theorised a set of tensions as presently impeding a teacher’s practice of ICLT, related to curricular documents, teacher education, and ongoing support, in particular. These tensions were revealed by inductive interpretation of the data gathered across the two phases of the study. Each tension would benefit from more concentrated exploratory and confirmatory research with a view to developing meaningful and coordinated resolution strategies.

Further research is required into the regularity, availability, and uptake of ICLT professional development opportunities for teachers New Zealand-wide. It is possible that the focus on South Island teachers of this study has revealed an imbalance in access opportunities between the greater and more condensed population of the North Island and the smaller and more geographically widespread South Island population.

It was a significant finding of this study that reflection is the broken thread that keeps teachers’ cognitions and practices from close alignment with ICLT. The low cognisance of the value of critical reflection justifies further research. This would be best achieved with intervention studies in collaboration with teachers (as recommended by Scarino, 2014) to generate evidence that the teachers can see and test for themselves in their own context (Sercu & St. John, 2007).

Lastly, the development of the intercultural language teacher model was grounded in this research and has not been tested. Researching teachers’ use of the model is necessary, and could be achieved in a collaborative study of the kind mentioned above. This would allow analysis of the model’s practical application, and its value in mediating
a teacher’s practice of ICLT by clarifying his/her position on the trajectory to becoming a wholly intercultural language teacher.

10.5 Concluding Summary

It is asserted that, of the prerequisites for change in views and practices, the most crucial is the ability for teachers to test for themselves the theory in practice, in their initial training and in subsequent professional development. In this study, with CPPs as praxis, ICLT was illuminated through the stepwise application of the elements of exploration, reflection, and comparison, and the teachers were involved in the development of the research (Díaz, 2013; Scarino, 2014). The “grey ballast of theory” (Sercu, 1998, p. 255) was made more buoyant by the experiential-derived approach taken (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Dewey, 1929; Prawat, 2009; Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000), providing the experience of change after which beliefs could be reconsidered (Guskey, 1986; Pajares, 1992).

Advances are being made in the practice of ICLT elsewhere in the world, most notably Europe, where the level of sophistication is such that the focus is now moving beyond intercultural speakers to critical intercultural citizens, global citizenship, and the transcultural, where more emphasis is on the theoretical nuances of intercultural teaching (Byram, 2008b, 2014; Crozet, 2015; Guilherme, 2002, 2015; Jackson, 2011, 2014; Risager, 2007). New Zealand teachers must be better supported in the practice of ICLT; otherwise, they will be forever playing catch up.
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Appendix A – Permissions granted

19/11/2016

RE: Request for permission to use your questionnaire
1 message

Lies Sercu <Lies.Sercu@arts.kuleuven.be>       Thu, Jan 10, 2013 at 7:45 AM
To: "joranje72@gmail.com" <joranje72@gmail.com>

Dear student,

You are welcome to use parts of the questionnaire. Please quote the 2005 book.

Your research sounds really interesting. I would be most interested in assessing your PhD thesis, once it is ready.

In the meantime, please to not hesitate to contact me again should you deem my assistance essential.

Best wishes,

Lies Sercu

Prof. dr. Lies Sercu
KU Leuven - University of Leuven
Faculty of Arts, Blütsch-Inkomstraat 21, POBOX 3308, 3000 Leuven, Belgium
www.kuleuven.be/cv/u0010757e.htm

Van: joranje72@gmail.com [joranje72@gmail.com]
Verzonden: woensdag 9 januari 2013 0:47
To: Lies Sercu
Onderwerp: Re: Request for permission to use your questionnaire

Dear Assoc Prof Sercu

Happy New Year to you!

I am following up on the email message I sent to you last month (shown below).

I wonder if you have had an opportunity to read my message and consider whether you are willing to grant me permission to use elements of the questionnaire you and your coresearchers developed for your investigation of intercultural competence of foreign language teachers.

I appreciate that it is a busy time of year and I’m sure you have a lot of correspondence to deal with. I am very passionate about my project and keen to construct my questionnaire but I do not want to incorporate your question lines without your consent.

You are welcome to contact my supervisors if you wish to discuss my request. They are:

Dr Anne Faryok, Linguistics Programme Coordinator, University of Otago
anne.faryok@otago.ac.nz

Prof Lisa Smith, Dean of College of Education, University of Otago
lisa.smith@otago.ac.nz

I hope to hear from you soon,

With best wishes
From: joranje72@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2012 9:23 AM
To: lis.sercu@arts.kuleuven.be
Subject: Request for permission to use your questionnaire

Dear Assoc Prof Sercu,

I am a PhD student of Linguistics at the University of Otago in Dunedin, New Zealand (NZ).

My research is associated with intercultural communicative language teaching (as was my recently completed Master of Arts degree) and my doctoral project comprises two parts. One involves the use of cultural portfolio projects as an activity for NZ secondary school language learners (in classes for English as a second language and other languages as foreign languages). Briefly, students will undertake individual research projects testing whether a selection of their preconceptions of the target culture hold true. They will also relate the preconceptions to their own culture to determine their relevance there, and present their overall findings to their class. If the projects are found to enhance intercultural competence they will provide language teachers with a practical activity to help address their concerns that they suffer from a lack of resources/ideas/practices/knowledge to teach culture.

The second part involves a questionnaire for NZ secondary school language teachers asking about their cognitions of culture teaching. The NZ Ministry of Education has published documents that recommend intercultural communicative language teaching, but the NZ teacher training courses do not include instruction in the approach. NZ studies show there to be a lack of culture teaching in mainstream school language courses.

I have come across the book written by you, and other members of CULTNET, 'Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence' (2005, published by Multilingual Matters Ltd). I am contacting you to request permission to use elements of your questionnaire (included in the book as Appendix 1) as a foundation of the questionnaire that I intend to develop for NZ teachers. If you agree, I would like to use some questions verbatim and others to inspire my own line of questioning. Please do advise if there is any other party that I should also approach regarding this permission.

I look forward to hearing from you,

With best wishes

Jo Oranje

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=0733f04ef&view=pt&ch=q&cat=PH%20Permissions&search=cat6hvp13q2f1sdfs67266&sml=13c20a1ad667266
Dear Jo (and Mike),

Yes, of course, I am happy to know that it is still useful. Please feel free to contact me if you have questions or comments.

Good luck with the PhD research!

Best wishes,

Karen

Karen Risager, Professor Emerita, Department of Culture and Identity, Roskilde University, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark, tel. +45 25 74 52 23.

---

Fra: BYRAM M. [mailto:m.s.byram@durham.ac.uk]
Sendt: 1. februar 2013 07:59
Tit: joranje72@gmail.com
Cc: Karen Risager
Emne: RE: Permission to use questionnaire

Dear Jo

I am sure Karen will be delighted as I am that you find the book interesting and are happy to give permission. All you need to do is acknowledge the source and give a reference.

You may like to know that it was also the basis for a survey by Serce et al 2005 Foreign language teachers and intercultural competence. Multilingual matters. Second, one of my PhD students from China used it as a basis for her work


the snow has left us and we are in the rain and wind now - but 'bracing'

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ui=2&ik=9d30b04f&view=p&at=R41%2CBb%23Permissions&search=cat&hl=13c951e4f0452606&sid=13c951e4f045269
362

362

13/11/2015

Best wishes

Mike

Michael Byram
Professor Emeritus
University of Durham
School of Education
Durham DH1 1TA
Email: m.s.byram@dur.ac.uk

Published 14 September 2012:
Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning (2nd edn.) Edited M. Byram and A. Hu

From: joranje72@gmail.com [joranje72@gmail.com]
Sent: 01 February 2013 03:21
To: BYRAM M.
Subject: Permission to use questionnaire

Dear Prof Byram

Firstly, thank you for recently accepting me as a new member of the CultNet group. I am very excited to be within reach of so many of the people whose names appear on various works scattered across my desk!

This time, I am contacting you with respect to your book, 'Language Teachers, Politics and Cultures', co-authored with Karen Roager in 1999, in which you discussed your research of language teachers in England and Denmark.

The book includes, as Appendix 1, the questionnaire administered to the teachers in England. Stage 1 of my PhD research in New Zealand involves surveying secondary school language teachers about their understanding and practice of intercultural communicative language teaching. Many of the items you posed in the questionnaire appear pertinent to my objectives, so I write to seek your permission to use some of those items verbatim and others to inspire my own line of questioning. Please advise if there is anyone else I should contact regarding consent to use the document.

I trust you are keeping warm despite the chilly, snowy weather we hear the UK is experiencing (while we benefit from the warmth blowing across from the very high temps in Australia!)

With kind regards

Jo Oranje

(University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand)

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=10df66e46f&view=pt&at=pth%3DPermissions&search=cat%88t%3D315e4045368&sigm=13c951e4045d260
Dear Jo,

Certainly you are allowed to quote verbatim the questions I used. Your project seems very interesting. It's a pity teachers in NE do not have any training on intercultural competence development.

Since POland is a member of the European Union our language education is under a great influence of the EU recommendations. So nowadays student teachers have a compulsory training in this field. BUT all the teachers who graduated from colleges or universities even 3 years ago have no idea what IC is. So what they really teach is culture.

If you are ready with your findings please send it over to me. I would love to share your results with our staff.

Best wishes

Malgorzata Jedynak

---

Malgorzata Jedynak, PhD
English Studies Department, office 213
Wrocław University
Kołłątaja 22
50-137 Wrocław
POLAND
http://www.ifa.uni.wroc.pl/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=63&Itemid=40
Dear Jo,

I am happy for you to include the figures in your thesis as long as they are appropriately attributed.

best wishes

Tony

---

From: joranje72@gmail.com <joranje72@gmail.com> on behalf of Jo Oranje <harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz>

Sent: Sunday, 28 June 2015 3:44 PM

To: Tony Liddicoat

Subject: Permission to include figures in PhD thesis

Dear Professor Liddicoat,

I am writing to seek permission to reproduce the axes graphics that you used in a 2005 publication to represent language teachers' perceptions of culture, cultural content, and culture teaching orientation.

I am a PhD Candidate in Applied Linguistics and Education at the University of Otago, New Zealand. My topic is New Zealand secondary school language teachers’ awareness and practice of Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching. Perhaps you remember attending my presentation at the 2013 ALAA-ALANZ-ALTAANZ conference in Wellington, where you made some very helpful comments which enhanced the quality of my subsequent research involving cultural portfolio projects. (I will be presenting the results at the Adelaide conference in Nov/Dec.)

Given your prevalence in the field, I refer often to a range of your works. I would be very grateful if you would allow me to reproduce in my thesis the axes graphics labelled “Approaches to culture in language teaching,” depicted as Figures 1 and 2 on pages 31 and 32 respectively of this article: Liddicoat, A. J. (2005). Culture for language learning in Australian language-in-education policy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 28-43.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=0c3d6d4e6&view=pt&attachmentid=ao1e14e3d07409e3a0f1&attbid=14e3d07409e3a0f1
I would, of course, include an attribution to you in the figures' titles.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request.

With kindest regards
Jo Oranje

Email: harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz
RE: Including Conversity Card images in thesis
1 message

Jenny Magee <jenny@jennyMagee.com>  
To: Jo Oranje <joranje72@gmail.com>  

Tue, Jun 23, 2015 at 11:17 AM

Hello Jo,

How lovely to hear that you’re finding the Conversity cards useful! And thank you for the attribution.

I’d be very happy for you to use the images. If you let me know which ones you want to use, perhaps I can send a high res copy of the photos?

Warm regards,

Jenny

From: Jo Oranje [mailto:joranje72@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 23 June 2015 11:11 a.m.
To: Jenny Magee
Subject: Including Conversity Card images in thesis

Dear Jenny,

Some time ago I purchased a set of Conversity cards from you. I have found them to be incredibly helpful, and popular, in the research work I'm conducting for my PhD at the University of Otago in the practice of Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching in NZ secondary school language classes.

I used them as a cultural warm-up lesson ahead of a term-long intercultural project in high school French and German classes, and in the students' evaluations at the end of the term they named the conversity card discussion as one of their favourite parts of the project! I showed them at a Language and Intercultural Communication conference in Portugal last year, and will be doing the same at the combined NZ and Australian applied linguistics conference in Adelaide later this year. I always include your website address in my presentations, and let my teacher participants know where to get their own set.

I'm writing to you now, to ask for your permission to include scanned images of one or two of the cards in the appendix of my PhD thesis, since I have mentioned their application as a warm up task in my research project. Your website already appears in my list of references, but I think the examiners of my thesis will be interested to see an example or two of the cards. They will be fully attributed to you. Please let me know what you think.

Best wishes for your continued good work,
Appendix B – Questionnaire

TEACHING CULTURE IN THE LANGUAGE CLASS

We know you are a very busy teacher! Please, detach the tea-bag, brew a refreshing cup of tea, and sit down with these simple questions that we hope will ultimately help you and your colleagues with the practical business of language and culture teaching. The questionnaire has four sections and uses a variety of response styles across 52 questions. Please read the instructions for each question before answering.

SECTION A – The languages you teach and your affiliations with other cultures

A1  What associations do you have with cultures other than your own? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ I have family members from another culture (including association through marriage, adoption, fostering, whangai)
☐ I have holidayed outside New Zealand
☐ I have lived outside of New Zealand
☐ I have close friends from another culture
☐ I have acquaintances who are from another culture
☐ I have learned a second (or additional) language and my learning included cultural knowledge
☐ I am interested in other cultures
☐ I actively seek to learn about other cultures
☐ I have taught classes in which there were children from other cultures

A2  (i) What language(s) do you teach (including ESOI)? (Please specify)

(ii) If you teach more than one language, which one do you spend the most time teaching? NOTE: If your time is spent equally across languages, please choose one and respond to all questions with that language in mind (Please specify)

(iii) Is the language you teach your native language (mother tongue)? (Please circle one)

YES  NO

A3  How do you keep in touch with the culture associated with the language you teach? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ I am a native of the culture
☐ I am immersed in the culture as an ESOI teacher from a non-English speaking country
☐ Media generated in the language (e.g., film, television, printed material, Internet)
☐ Media generated in English about the culture (e.g., film, television, printed material, Internet)
☐ Contacts with native speakers who live in New Zealand
☐ Contacts with native speakers who live outside New Zealand
☐ I visit places where the language is spoken every: (Please tick one)

☐ 1 year  ☐ 2 years  ☐ 3-5 years  ☐ 6-10 years  ☐ 11+ years

☐ Other ways (please specify) ...

A4  How familiar are you with the following cultural aspects associated with the language you teach? For every item, please respond by assigning a score on a scale of 1 (not at all familiar) to 4 (very familiar)

☐ History
☐ Geography
☐ Ethnic and social groups, ethnic relations
Scale = 1 ('not at all familiar') to 4 ('very familiar')

- Racism toward this culture
- Daily life and routines, such as shopping, food, and drink
- Youth culture (e.g., fashion, music, etc.)
- School and education
- Political system
- The Arts, such as film, theatre, art, literature
- Social and living conditions
- Festivities and associated holidays, customs, and traditions
- Tourism and travel
- Gender roles and relationships
- Working life and unemployment
- Religious traditions
- Stereotypes associated with this culture
- The country's relationship with and/or significance for New Zealand
- Environmental issues

A5 How often do you read professional literature about teaching language and culture? (Please tick one box)

☐ Less than once a year
☐ Between once and six times a year
☐ Monthly
☐ Weekly
☐ Daily

SECTION B - Your views about teaching culture as part of language education

Question B1 relates to the relative importance of different facets of language education. Question B2 relates to what you think about culture in language teaching whereas Question B3 relates to what you do with respect to culture in your language teaching.

B1 How important are the following curricular areas in your language course? Please rate every item, using a scale of 1 ('not at all important') to 4 ('very important').

- Vocabulary
- Speaking
- Culture
- Writing
- Listening
- Reading
- Grammar

B2 Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements relating to what you think about the place of culture in language teaching. Please rate every item using a scale of 1 ('do not agree at all') to 4 ('strongly agree').

- Language and culture are intertwined
- Intercultural misunderstandings are mostly due to language differences and not cultural differences
- In teaching, my focus is on linguistic competence
- My school's focus is on linguistic competence
- The New Zealand language curriculum's focus is on linguistic competence
- Culture is a fifth skill, to be introduced once reading, writing, speaking, and listening are acquired
- The students' own cultures should be incorporated in their language lessons
- A language teacher should present only a positive image of the culture and society
- Knowledge about other cultures builds tolerance towards members of those cultures
- Discussing controversial cultural topics is beneficial in the language classroom
- It is not possible to teach language and culture in an integrated way; the two have to be separated
- Language education includes development of reflective understanding of one's own culture
- It is important to prepare students for future intercultural encounters
Scale = 1 ('do not agree at all') to 4 ('strongly agree').

Introducing the cultural knowledge strand into the National Curriculum was important
Culture knowledge is primarily gained through transmission from the teacher
Students ought to be assessed on the cultural dimension in their language course
Language teachers must present a realistic, sometimes negative, image of the target culture
Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations
Personal contact with people from the relevant culture creates tolerance
If the time pressure is great, the cultural dimension ought to give way to the linguistic
Culture knowledge is primarily gained through addressing it as it arises incidentally

Teaching culture means lost opportunities for teaching language
Language teaching ought to contribute to students' understanding of their own identities
It is important to deepen students' knowledge about their own cultures while learning about a new culture
Language education includes skills to accommodate cultural differences
The most important outcome of language education is intercultural competence
To learn a new culture you need to consider how it is similar to, or different from, your own
Culture should be taught from the beginning of language education
Comparing languages and cultures draws students' attention to the influence of invisible culture in their lives

83 Using the same scale of 1 ('do not agree at all') to 4 ('strongly agree'), please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements relating to what you do with respect to teaching culture in language class.

When I have limited teaching time, culture teaching has to give way to language teaching.
I feel restricted from implementing my own cultural ideas/ideals.
I am motivated to teach culture.
I consider the cultural knowledge strand of the New Zealand curriculum when I plan my lessons.
I am aware of my own culture when I am teaching.
I provide opportunities for students to make links between culture and language.
My school requires that I implement intercultural communicative language teaching methods.
I purposefully plan to talk about my own experiences of the culture that I teach.
If using texts for linguistic skills (reading, speaking, etc.) I also critically discuss the text's meaning with students.
I provide opportunities for students to make connections with their own cultural backgrounds and experiences.
I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own culture(s) through the eyes of others.
I teach culture as it crops up.
I critically analyse my own culture in class activities.
I assign projects based on culture.
I aim to teach the ability to mediate between cultures.
I teach culture as a distinct subject area.
I provide opportunities for students to interact with native speakers of the language.
I teach the ability to explore culture to find out more.
I teach culture to support curriculum topics, e.g., a unit on food allows discussion on food and eating habits.
I aim to assimilate the students in the target culture.

84 This item covers the same topics as Item 44. This time, please respond in terms of whether these topics should be introduced to students in their language lessons. Please rate every item using a scale of 1 ('not at all important') to 4 ('very important'). In addition, if you currently practice the topic in your language lessons please tick the box alongside your rating.

Rating 1-4
Practice? Topic
□ History
□ Geography
□ Ethnic and social groups, ethnic relations
□ Racism toward this culture
Scale = 1 ('not at all important') to 4 ('very important')

- Daily life and routines, such as shopping, food, and drink
- Youth culture (e.g., fashion, music, etc.)
- School and education
- Political system
- The Arts, such as film, theatre, art, literature
- Social and living conditions
- Festivities and associated holidays, customs, and traditions
- Tourism and travel
- Gender roles and relationships
- Working life and unemployment
- Religious traditions
- Stereotypes associated with this culture
- The country's relationship with and/or significance for New Zealand
- Environmental issues

B5 How is your teaching time distributed over 'language teaching' and 'culture teaching'? (Please tick one)

- 100% language – 0% culture
- 80% language – 20% culture
- 60% language – 40% culture
- 40% language – 60% culture

- 20% language – 80% culture
- 0% language – 100% culture
- 100% integration language–culture

B6 If, in B5 above, you ticked culture teaching as occupying greater than 50% of time, please go to Section C. If you ticked less than 50% of teaching time for culture, please indicate the extent to which each of the following reasons prevent you from teaching culture more often, using a scale of 1 ('not at all') to 4 ('a great deal').

- I am constrained by a curriculum that is more linguistically oriented.
- There is a lack of information to support me in teaching culture.
- There is a lack of time to teach more culture.
- I don't have access to enough activities suitable for teaching culture.
- I would prefer more knowledge of the target culture in order to teach it.
- I would prefer more knowledge of how to teach culture.
- Because culture is not assessed, it need not be taught.
- Other (please specify):

SECTION C – Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching

C1 Have you heard of intercultural language teaching as a teaching approach? (Please tick one)

- No, I have not heard of it. Please skip to Question C5.
- Yes, I have heard of it, but I'm not familiar with what the main principles are.
- Yes, I have heard of it, I understand its main principles, but I do not practice it.
- Yes, I have heard of it, I understand its main principles, and I practice it.

C2 (i) Have you participated in any training in intercultural communicative language teaching? (Please circle one)

YES

NO
(ii) If you answered YES, you have participated in training in intercultural communicative language teaching, what form has that training taken? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ It was part of my initial/original teacher training.
☐ I have studied it in my own time.
☐ I attended a professional development course or workshop while in service.

C3 (i) In your experience, is the practice of intercultural communicative language teaching encouraged in New Zealand (for example, by the Ministry of Education, professional bodies, professional literature, etc.)? (Please circle one)

YES  NO

(ii) Please comment or expand on your answer. If you wish
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

C4 Which, if any, of the following resources do you make use of with regard to intercultural communicative language teaching? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ Ministry of education published or endorsed information for teacher training about the principles of intercultural language teaching, including websites (e.g., NZ Curriculum Online, TIKI’s Learning Languages Community, TIKI’s ESOL Online, Teacher Professional Development Languages (TPDL))

☐ Ministry of education published or endorsed activity ideas or materials for use as in intercultural language lessons.

☐ Other resources developed for teacher training about intercultural language teaching (e.g., created by your school or colleagues, obtained from websites not affiliated with the Ministry of Education, or from professional literature)

☐ Other resources for activity ideas or materials to use as intercultural language lessons (e.g., those shared by colleagues, developed by you, obtained from websites, or from professional literature)

C5 What resources, if any, do you use when teaching culture? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ Coursebooks and textbooks

☐ School-owned cultural materials such as books, artefacts, music, film, etc.

☐ Visits from native speakers

☐ Items you bring from home (associated with your own culture, the target culture, and/or New Zealand cultures)

☐ Items the students bring from home (associated with either the students’ own culture or the target culture)

☐ Class trips (Please specify where)
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

☐ Other (please specify)
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

C6 (i) Listed below are a number of activities that could be used to teach culture. Please rate every activity using the following scale: 1 = I never use this activity, 2 = I rarely use this activity, 3 = I sometimes use this activity, 4 = I frequently use this activity.

1. I ask my students to think about the image that media promotes of the culture
2. I tell my students what I have heard or read about the culture
3. I tell my students why I find something fascinating or strange about the culture
4. I ask my students to independently explore an aspect of the culture
5. I use videos, DVDs, audio recordings, and/or the Internet to illustrate aspects of the culture
6. I ask my students to think about what it would be like to live in the culture
7. I talk to my students about my own experiences in the culture
8. I ask my students about their experiences in the culture
(ii) Are there any other activities that you practice in teaching about culture? (Please specify)

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

C7 (i) Are there cultural topics you avoid? (Please circle one)

YES NO

(ii) If you answered YES to Question C7(i), please specify the topics, and, if you feel comfortable doing so, please comment on why you avoid them.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

C8 (i) Do you test culture acquisition? (Please circle one)

YES NO

(ii) If you answered YES to Question C8(i), how do you test for culture acquisition?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

(iii) If you answered NO to Question C8(i), why do you not test for culture acquisition? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ The curriculum does not require the testing of culture acquisition
☐ I don't have enough expertise to assess culture acquisition
☐ I don't teach enough culture to warrant testing
☐ Testing is important for language acquisition but not important for culture acquisition
☐ I don't have time to assess culture acquisition.
☐ Other (please specify) ___________________________________________
D3 Which ethnic group do you belong to? (Please tick all that apply)
- New Zealand European
- Māori
- Samoan
- Cook Island Māori
- Tongan
- Niuean
- Chinese
- Indian
- Other (please specify)

D4 What languages can you speak? For each of the languages you can speak please specify how you learned them (e.g., native tongue, subject at school (compulsory or optional), immersion, adult education, self-taught, etc.), whether the learning included culture education, and whether you maintain your proficiency in the language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>How did you learn it?</th>
<th>Culture learning included? Y/N</th>
<th>Maintain proficiency? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D5 What, if any, teaching qualification(s) do you hold?

D6 For how many years have you been teaching language(s) (irrespective of whether full- or part-time):

D7 (i) Are you a member of any professional language association (e.g., NZAFLA, TESOLANZ)? (Please circle one)

- YES
- NO

(ii) If you answered YES, please list those associations:

D8 What is the total number of students at your school?

D9 What is the total number of students studying the language you teach? exactly/approximately (Please circle one)

D10 How many hours per week, on average, do students attend your language class?

- Junior level: 
- Senior level: 

D11 What other languages are taught at your school (including ESOL):

D12 How much flexibility do you have over the lesson content and teaching methods used in your language class? (Please tick one)

- High flexibility – I have total, or near total, control so I can design and conduct the lessons in any way I see fit.
- Some flexibility – I am bound to some curricular and/or school programmes, but within those parameters I have control over what and how I teach.
- Low flexibility – I am entirely bound to curricular and/or school programmes (e.g., coursebook, repeated lesson plans, etc.) and have little or no control over content and teaching methods.

D13 Do you have any comments, explanations or thoughts you wish to add about the topic of teaching culture in language education?

373
Thank you! We appreciate you taking time out of your busy teaching life to answer these questions. We hope that the results will benefit you and your colleagues. If you would like to be kept informed of the results of the study please clearly write your email address below. Again, we are very conscious of protecting your anonymity so your email contact information will be stored apart from your responses. If recording your email address here concerns you but you are interested in the results, please email your contact details directly to the researcher, Ms Jo Oranje: harja159@student.otago.ac.nz. Please place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and deliver to your office administrator to return on your behalf, or post directly to:

Jo Oranje
Department of English & Linguistics
University of Otago
PO Box 56
Dunedin 9054

Your email address, for use only to provide information about the results obtained from the full survey:

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C – Cover Letters

August 2013

Dear Principal

I am a PhD candidate at the University of Otago, working within the fields of Applied Linguistics and Education. My particular research focus is the teaching of culture as part of language education.

As Phase 1 of my study I wish to consult language teachers of all secondary schools in the Ministry of Education’s Southern region, to learn about their perspectives and practices regarding teaching culture in their language classes. My aim is to determine how the realities of language education relate to the theoretical approaches of culture teaching. South Island based teachers are rarely represented as a group in studies of this kind.

To gather this data I have designed a questionnaire which I hope will be completed by all Southern region teachers of Māori, foreign languages (such as Japanese, French, Samoan, etc), and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL). All phases of the project, including the questionnaire and its administration, have been approved by the University of Otago’s Human Ethics Committee (Ref: 13076).

I have enclosed a number of copies of the questionnaire so that one can be given to each of the language teachers at your school. The quantity included is based on the number of languages mentioned on your website as being taught at your school, but please contact me if you require more so all teachers can be given the opportunity to participate. I have attached a teabag to each as a small incentive for the teacher to take a few moments from their many other commitments and record their much-valued views and experiences, in the hope of making a difference for language teachers nationwide.

I would be very grateful if the questionnaires could be completed within one week.

I suggest that the school’s office administrator be responsible for distribution of the surveys to your language teachers to make use of their standard procedures for circulation of documents to staff. Also, to reduce the demands on the teachers and to streamline the return process, I ask that teachers seal their completed questionnaires in the individual envelopes attached and return them to the office administrator, who can then post them all to me in the large, stamped and self-addressed envelope provided. These instructions are included on the questionnaire documents.

If you have any questions regarding the project, or its administration, or if you require additional copies of the questionnaire, please email me at harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz.

You may also contact my research supervisors if you wish to discuss anything with them:

Dr Anne Feryok, Linguistics Programme Coordinator, Department of English & Linguistics anne.feryok@otago.ac.nz, ph 03 479 8637; or

Prof Lisa Smith, Dean of University of Otago College of Education lisa.smith@otago.ac.nz, ph 03 479 9014.

I thank you for considering my request, and hope you agree to support the project, the results of which I expect to be of interest to the field and of benefit to New Zealand’s language teachers.

Yours sincerely

Jo Oranje, BA, GDipSLT, MA
Student Researcher
Dear language teacher

I am a PhD candidate at the University of Otago working within the fields of Linguistics and Education. My particular research focus is the teaching of culture as part of language education.

I am contacting language teachers of all secondary school in the Southern region, to find out about their perspectives and practices regarding teaching culture in their language classes. South Island based teachers are rarely represented as a group in studies of this kind. I am approaching teachers of Te Reo Māori, foreign languages (such as Japanese, Samoan, etc), and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL).

The results of the study will clarify the reality of language teaching, which can be considered alongside current theories of culture teaching. Data will be gathered by questionnaire and results reported only in aggregate form, so your responses will not be individually identifiable. Data will be securely stored in line with the University of Otago’s research protocols. The study has received approval from the university’s Human Ethics Committee (Ref: 13/076).

International studies suggest that teachers consider culture to be a valuable part of language education but many, for a range of reasons, feel restricted in their teaching of it. This study will help determine whether there are ways in which New Zealand language teachers can be better supported in teaching culture in line with the Ministry of Education’s Language Learning framework. While your participation is entirely voluntary, your views are valuable and may contribute to making a difference for you and your colleagues. Your contribution will assist in presenting Southern teachers’ perspectives, and provide substance to any claims for future governmental support.

I know a lot of demands are made on your time. I have attached a teabag to your questionnaire in the hope of encouraging you to take a few moments to consider the questions over a refreshing cup of tea. I expect that it will take you about 20-30 minutes to complete. When finished, please seal the questionnaire in the enclosed plain envelope and deliver it to your school’s office administrator, who will return the questionnaires completed by you and your colleagues. I would be very grateful if you could complete and return the questionnaire within one week.

The questionnaire design protects your anonymity as much as possible. The identifier on the top relates to the school only, to allow me to track where responses are from. You are asked to record your email address if you wish to receive a report on the findings. The address will be stored separately and will not be reported on or published. Completion of this questionnaire serves as your written consent to your involvement in the study.

If you have any questions regarding the project, please email me: harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz. You may also contact my supervisors: Dr Anne Feryok, Linguistics Programme Coordinator, anne.feryok@otago.ac.nz, ph 03 479 8637; or Prof Lisa Smith, College of Education Dean, lisa.smith@otago.ac.nz, ph 03 479 9014.

I am hopeful that you will contribute, so I thank you in advance for your support and participation in this study.

Yours sincerely

Jo Oranje, BA, GDipSLT, MA
Student Researcher
Dear Principal (and language teachers)

I recently posted you a set of questionnaires about language teachers’ perspectives on teaching culture and asked if your school would consider participating in my PhD research. If you have already returned completed questionnaires, then I sincerely thank you. If you have not yet decided whether to participate, then please accept this friendly encouragement to be involved in a study that I hope will be of practical use to language teachers. If you are happy for your school to be involved, I would be very grateful if this message and its attachment could be forwarded to the language teachers so they can decide if they want to participate.

I received feedback that an electronic version would have been preferable, so I have attached an electronic copy of the questionnaire. If you, the language teacher, are more inclined to complete it electronically then please open the attached Word document, and when finished, return it by email to: harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz. It would be useful if you rename the document and include your school as part of the document name, but this is not compulsory.

I also received feedback that this time of year is especially busy, and Term 4 would be better. If you would rather consider it in Term 4, please send your email address (or alternative contact details) by return email (harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz) and I will be in touch later in the year, at which time you can consider whether to participate. Paper versions of the questionnaire will still be gladly received, at any time. I am happy to send additional stamped self-addressed envelopes, if needed.

*I have also had positive feedback, from teachers who have appreciated the opportunity to reflect on their practices and have found the content interesting.

Please, feel free to contact me about any aspect of this project, at harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz. I’m still learning! And please note the return timeframe, for any format, is now open-ended.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request.

With best wishes

Jo Oranje
# Appendix D – SPSS Codebook (sample page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full variable name</th>
<th>SPSS variable</th>
<th>Coding Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have family from another culture</td>
<td>A1family</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have holidayed outside New Zealand</td>
<td>A1holiday</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived outside New Zealand</td>
<td>A1lived</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have friends from another culture</td>
<td>A1friends</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have acquaintances from another culture</td>
<td>A1acquaint</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned a second language with culture</td>
<td>A1learned</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in other cultures</td>
<td>A1interest</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek to learn about other cultures</td>
<td>A1seek</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have taught classes with children from other cultures</td>
<td>A1classes</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What language do you teach?</td>
<td>A2language</td>
<td>STRING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which language do you spend most time teaching?</td>
<td>A2which</td>
<td>1 = ESOL 2 = Māori 3 = French 4 = Spanish 5 = German 6 = Japanese 7 = Mandarin (Chinese) 9 = Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the language you teach your mother tongue?</td>
<td>A2mother</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a native of the culture</td>
<td>A3native</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am immersed as an ESOL teacher</td>
<td>A3immersed</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in the language</td>
<td>A3mediang</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media generated in English about the language</td>
<td>A3mediEng</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with native speakers outside NZ</td>
<td>A3contoutNZ</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit places where the language is spoken</td>
<td>A3visit</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity of visits in years</td>
<td>A3visityears</td>
<td>1 = 1 year 2 = 2 years 3 = 3-5 years 4 = 6-10 years 5 = 11+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ways to keep in touch with culture</td>
<td>A3Other</td>
<td>0 = No 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>A4history</td>
<td>1 = Not at all familiar 2 = Minimally familiar 3 = Somewhat familiar 4 = Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>A4geog</td>
<td>1 = Not at all familiar 2 = Minimally familiar 3 = Somewhat familiar 4 = Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and social groups, ethnic relations</td>
<td>A4ethnic</td>
<td>1 = Not at all familiar 2 = Minimally familiar 3 = Somewhat familiar 4 = Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism toward this culture</td>
<td>A4racism</td>
<td>1 = Not at all familiar 2 = Minimally familiar 3 = Somewhat familiar 4 = Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life and routines</td>
<td>A4daily</td>
<td>1 = Not at all familiar 2 = Minimally familiar 3 = Somewhat familiar 4 = Very familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth culture</td>
<td>A4youth</td>
<td>1 = Not at all familiar 2 = Minimally familiar 3 = Somewhat familiar 4 = Very familiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E – Transcription Conventions, Sample Transcription, Document Management Macro Code Legend

Transcription Conventions

?  high rising tone, questioning tone

!  exclamation; sound made with excitement, particularly lively etc

[  signifies point at which overlap commences

]  signifies end of section of overlapped speech

(  )  non verbal information that forms part of the turn

.  a short untimed lull in speech.

....  longer lull in speech where each . represents approximately 1 second

-  utterance broken off

CAPS  word was stressed

xxx  inaudible utterance

Note. Where other participants or schools were mentioned in utterances the names were replaced with the relevant pseudonym
ADA (GREENFIELD) INTERVIEW: 28 JULY 2014

1. A: So I've got some pretty standard questions, some are about you
2. A: yeah
3. A: not too many I'll race through them
4. A: (laughs) It's OK
5. A: They'll be short answer [most of them]
6. A: yes
7. A: The first ones are the boring kind like: [pause]
8. A: yes
9. A: so stuff about you your associations with German language and culture? so you're a native
10. A: I am a native German speaker, lived there for 26 years
11. A: and how long have you been in New Zealand?
12. A: 15... and don't do the maths, (laughs) ha
13. A: (laughs) I am going to ask you the age band year you fell into, 30s 30s 30s (or 50s)
14. A: (laughs) 30s (or 50s)
15. A: (laughs) ah so you teach German do you teach any other languages
16. A: no
17. A: have you ever taught English as a second language
18. A: in a real sense, no, I taught drama through arts and drama
19. A: it's quite different.
20. A: it has oh it certainly has
21. A: teaching qualifications?
22. A: I'm a fully qualified teacher
23. A: (laughs)
24. A: whatever that means, registered teacher
25. A: and did you do your training in New Zealand or somewhere in Germany (some here
26. A: I did some of it in Germany um but I did the one year diploma in New Zealand
27. J: yes
28. A: so I did the final year bit in New Zealand
29. J: and your length of teaching experience? and type of schools
30. A: umm double 10 girls' school and double 10 boys' school and it's been about 7 years I think and a half years
31. J: and so they're both in New Zealand
32. A: yes
33. J: ok so that's the facts and figures out the way, now here's a really broad one to start with, what are your
34. goals for your language class
35. A: well, um... okay. I think my main goal is always to to broaden their horizon and make sure that they
36. know there's more to the world than just this little island
37. J: no
38. A: um and that includes the um, understanding of other cultures or the, even just being open to learning
39. about other cultures as well as the language and because I think it... you learn a whole lot of culture through
40. language to start with and um you also um if you do go overseas if you do get a chance, you know you get
41. a different access to the culture if you know the language
42. J: mm
43. A: um yeah oh yeah and they probably should achieve at the end of the year as well but that (laughs)
44. J: (laughs)
45. A: as well I always find that that's not my pedagogical standpoint though? I mean you we have to do that and
46. it's part of it and we do do that and we do that well um but I think if you do the other stuff well and you and
47. you get them excited you get them interested and there's a positive environment then that happens more or
48. less (automatically)
49. J: (naturally) yes
50. A: yes
51. J: do you think there is a need to teach culture in language classes
52. A: yes, absolutely you can't have another language without culture um, and as I said before you have you
53. know some culture that's embedded in the language and the other way around
54. J: mm mm
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56. A: some stuff that's really simple some stuff that's not so simple um, um and I think it actually keeps the 
56. students interested
57. J: mm
58. J: (laughs)
59. A: really. It's just something that's different it's something that's not constant, that doesn't necessarily hinge on 
60. their how well do I understand the grammar but it gives you a different access to a student it gives them a 
61. different access to, um, the language, and yeah so 
62. J: yeah
63. A: short answer yes long answer what you said before (laughs)
64. J: (laughs) so what are your goals for teaching culture
65. A: ... to give them an understanding but I think more more so the the un openness I mean for me as a German 
66. I think one one really big thing for me is to understand a little bit of our history and what that means for the 
67. country and for German now?
68. J: mm
69. A: um and it starts with little bits and pieces like um having flags hanging in the classroom which make me feel 
70. quite uncomfortable especially if they have the German eagle on it that's just not on we don't do that 
71. J: oh
72. A: um yes um but the boys don't really understand it I mean just recently about the soccer world cup for 
73. Example, Germans celebrating winning the soccer world cup
74. J: mm
75. A: there's a certain way we are allowed to celebrate and there's a whole lot of ways we are not allowed to 
76. celebrate and it's you know it was an amazing opportunity to just come out and talk about these kinds of 
77. things [ but I think 
78. J: yeah yeah yeah
79. A: um, if you're only you're involved with your own culture you're very restricted in your understanding of the 
80. world
81. J: yeah vs definitely
82. A: um and that's really my job if they don't take anything away from German classroom apart from that I'd be 
83. happy
84. J: fantastic, do you experience any difficulties or hindrances in teaching culture at the moment? Like do 
85. you teach as much culture as you would want to?
86. J: mm
87. A: um, I think you can always do more but that goes for language and for culture
88. J: mm
89. A: um it's always a time factor everything always is in teaching
90. J: mm
91. A: but I think I do I do enough 
92. J: yeip
93. A: and I think basically because there's certain kind of main points that I have built into my programme but a 
94. lot of things just came up 
95. J: right
96. A: and we just have a discussion about it or the students come in with a question and we talk about it so it 
97. happens quite regularly that they come in with a question and then we turn it into a cultural 
98. J: yeah
99. A: session some how um, because they get that that's important as well 
100. J: yeah
101. A: um yeah the only hindrance would be, the time really to do more about that 
102. J: mm
103. A: and I'd love to work with other subjects to do a little bit more but yeah that's it
104. J: mm very good
105. A: future planning
106. J: um are you concerned that learning about culture detracts from learning the language
107. A: not really so because I don't think you can separate the two um I don't think you can and I mean at the 
108. end of the day um it's quite interesting because the amount of language that you teach that you can teach is 
109. quite limited in the time frame that we've got at school
110. J: yeah
111. A: but the amount of culture is not? Like um because what happens is that if you give them 
112. a little bit of I know a little bit of information they will run off and do, their own stuff
311. A: yeah
312. A: with 47? And come back and you know it kind of turns into this, self motivated learning I suppose
313. A: yeah
314. A: or independent learning what was the question? [laughs]
315. A: yeah well, you know that teaching culture detracts from learning language
316. A: oh right, isn't it, don't think so because a lot of it I think a lot of it what happens it's more getting them to
317. think a lot of those thinking processes happen outside the classroom as well and then they come back with a
318. result or something new
319. A: mm yeah I've noticed that actually with the boys especially
320. A: yeah
321. A: if you sort of feel at the time oh is anything actually, have we learned anything, absorbed anything but next
322. time oh we have [we've got reflections completed or something
323. A: yeah yeah yeah]
324. A: something's processed mm
325. A: yeah
326. A: um have you had any training in intercultural language teaching
327. A: nope [laughs]
328. A: so do you think doing this project the intercultural cultural sh portfolio project gave you any
329. understanding of intercultural? Did it um did it enhance your understanding of it?
330. A: um
331. A: of intercultural language teaching? Did it clarify 47? Did it
332. A: yeah I think I think the one thing that surprised me though I probably wouldn't have done it like that was
333. the the the flipping it
334. A: yeah
335. A: you know the putting it back on ok, cow you're really get to look at it we're going talk about you're going
336. to talk to somebody from your own culture who might have a different different perspective like that was a
337. that was a step that I wouldn't have taken?
338. A: yeah
339. A: and I find that quite interesting um, um, and I think that and the other thing was watching watching the
340. boys actually going through it, um and especially the outcome
341. A: yeah
342. A: I'd like right through the programme I didn't really oh we'll see where they end up but they actually learnt
343. a lot?
344. A: kahool
345. A: and I think for me like, if I were to do it again which I probably will um I would do it slightly differently?
346. A: yeah
347. A: I would do it kind of more because if you do it as a term-long project which you can easily do, but you
348. can incorporate more language along the way?
349. A: kahool
350. A: so kind of make it more pointed, um which is what I only did with the boys towards the end?
351. A: yes
352. A: so I probably would've, threat that through through the term a little bit more um, but apart from that
353. A: I've got Year 13s doing it now? two three of them?
354. J: oh brilliant
355. A: um I've got two of my year 10s who are doing a project like that? They're not going to do it with language
356. though
357. J: yeah
358. A: but they're going to do a purely cultural thing, um and my this year's Year 12 probably doing it next year I
359. think
360. J: purely cultural or intercultural as well
361. A: purely intercultural yeah sorry but no language input
362. J: yeah yeah
363. A: that's what I mean um no intercultural yeah
364. J: right so it does sound like the project itself has um given you a demonstration of intercultural language
365. teaching
366. A: yeah
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167. It so you’ve sort of learnt a little bit about the approach by

168. A: yeah

169. Is seeing a project that’s formed within it

170. A: yeah absolutely yeah

171. Is cool um… was the project practically applicable in the classroom? Do you think it fitted in with your

172. Existing programme

173. A: yeah I mean kind of put most of my programme on hold

174. It really

175. A: um but I think um, I don’t think there was anything anything wrong with it. I don’t think we missed

176. Anything?

177. It really

178. A: um but it actually gave us an opportunity to to recap um a lot of the language which we needed to

179. Do anyway?

180. It’s good

181. A: um and that’s what I mean I think in that way it’s really easy to incorporate it into your teaching you

182. Say ok this is, you know we’re going to combine it with um grammar revision or

183. It’s yeah

184. A: recap of language and just do it in a different context and doing you know different vocab

185. It’s right

186. A: which again would be individualised for whatever they’re doing

187. It’s yeah

188. A: and that’s really what makes it exciting for the students

189. It’s the fact that you had to individualise it, that could be a problem if you had a large class

190. A: it could be but then you could turn it into a bit more like what I would probably do is restrict the topics a

191. Little bit more?

192. It’s right

193. A: so just say right we’re gonna do um a big topic um, about food for example

194. It’s yeah

195. A: but they choose their individual aspects on the food?

196. It’s right

197. A: but then I can teach to that

198. It’s yeah

199. A: um and I like or y’know you’re gonna do sports and you can do a lot of vocal input around the sports and

200. but they each choose different aspects

201. It’s yeah

202. A: so it could still be an individual and they choose what group they go into they could even choose the

203. broad topic that we’re doing which I probably would do

204. It’s yeah

205. A: um, but it couldn’t become individualised as it was for the

206. It’s yeah yeah

207. A: small group yeah but there’s ways around that

208. It’s so it didn’t compromise your usual teaching programme it just required a little bit of adaptation or and

209. Flexibility

210. A: I think teaching does that anyway

211. It’s yeah I’m just thinking we’ve um I think other teachers were to use this programme could they argue, um

212. I’m not gonna be able to fit that in with what I’m doing sort of thing so

213. A: well course they can but that just means they’re very inflexible in what they’re doing I’m mean it really

214. depends what kind of teacher you are and how you’re teaching I suppose

215. It’s yeah

216. A: are you are you one of those teachers who who has a set programme and follow them and most

217. Comfortable with that

218. It’s yeah

219. A: and that has its own validity and it works and that’s fine or are you a teacher who just sees what the

220. Students are interested in what’s actually currently happening around the world y’know you pick them

221. up on that and you’re quite flexible and confident to to adapt things

222. It’s right
223. A: but I think it really depends on the teacher and his teaching style
224. A: mm mm mm ok
225. A: that arg--you will always get that argument though
226. A: mm
227. A: no matter what (laughs)
228. A: (laughs) do you think it's adaptable for different learner needs and levels of proficiency
229. A: absolutely
230. A: yeah cos you're already doing a bit of that if you've got Year 13 looking at them and Year 10 oh Year 11 you
231. said
232. A: No Year 10 two Year 10 boys
233. A: So Year 12 and 13 at the moment
234. A: yeah I mean for our Year 10 boys it's an extension
235. A: right
236. A: because they're so good
237. A: mm
238. A: and they just need something else and because I can't give them you know if I advance them too much in
239. the language they're gonna be miles ahead and I will never, you know
240. A: mm
241. A: that kind of creates an atmosphere in the classroom that you don't want, so you wanna give them
242. breadth really
243. A: mm
244. A: and the cultural knowledge is one of those ways of doing that
245. A: mm
246. A: and they can feed information back to the other students which means everybody learns something
247. A: mm I like that idea
248. A: um, which is really important that they don't feel like they're you know racing miles ahead and
249. leaving everybody else in the dust (uhhh) yeah I think it's um um if you look at it like for Year 11 again
250. because the language is so limited you would probably have to restrict it a little bit more Year 12 you can um
251. let them loose quite individually!
252. A: mm
253. A: and Year 13 definitely they can basic-
254. A: yeah
255. A: because they're quite that but that point they should be quite able to find their own things
256. A: yeah
257. A: you know find their own vocals make their own decisions
258. A: right
259. A: because they have enough grammar enough language to be able to put it together at the end so yeah
260. A: every good um, so did you think learning about their own culture was valuable, that was the bit that was
261. new to you thinking about, how they turned it around and studying their own culture do you think that was
262. valuable to them?
263. A: I think so I think they were quite surprised what other people might have thought I mean (laughs) it
264. might sound a bit y'know but they're teenagers so y'know it all revolves around them?
265. A: yeah
266. A: so they might not take into consideration what other people necessarily think and that they might have a
267. completely different view?
268. A: yeah
269. A: um... but I mean like for example you know when Tom was talking about the nudity and he was saying
270. you know that that rugby game on but he couldn't go because his grandparents were there
271. A: yeah
272. A: I don't think prior to that he would have really thought about that even asking them
273. A: yeah
274. A: um... and I think it's really important to them to realise that yes we are living in one culture but we still
275. perceive things differently
276. A: yeah yeah pool
277. A: and that not everybody has the same opinions and sees things
278. A: yeah
279. A: you know sees the world the same way
280. B: no I hope they did pick up on that coz that was yeah one of the underlying principles
281. A: right
282. B: um um um do you think they found it interesting? and engaging? the boys?
283. A: yeah
284. B: is that did?
285. A: it's hard to get that particular group of boys engaged in something especially long term and I mean I was
286. really impressed with what they came out with y'know just any information that actually came out of
287. the speeches at the end was quite substantial [which I was quite impressed about]
288. B: oh yeah coz being boys they don't sort of tend to be too effusive and excited and end over praise
289. A: noo
290. B: [laughs]
291. A: nooo um I think you have to um... really judge it by what they came up with at the end and
292. B: hmm
293. A: what what they did was for for boys that age quite deep in some cases
294. B: [laughs] I was interested when we talked with them that they were sort of just oh yeah yeah it was alright
295. like that throughout.
296. A: right
297. B: and then we got to the end should next year's class do it oh yeah?
298. A: yeah yeah
299. B: oh ok [laughs]
300. A: yeah [laughs]
301. B: just being boys weren't you up to that point [laughs]
302. A: [laughs] yeah yeah yeah
303. B: um
304. A: unless you give them food oh well
305. B: [laughs]
306. A: do you want more food? say something nice
315. As but that they had a, they had a mix of um you know I can find facts on the internet or so-called facts on
316. the internet um and then I can go off and speak to somebody who's been there who's experienced that um
317. or even a couple of people you know and see what they say so how that that personal, perspective as well as
318. the more removed I suppose
319. It yeah yeah
320. A: I think was really important and I mean for for language teachers it's amazing because I don't think I
321. would've thought about doing such a lengthy project otherwise?
322. It mm
323. A: um but now I'm thinking ok Year year 12 next year I think Year 11 would probably be the year where
324. I would do it
325. It yeah
326. A: and just programme it a little bit differently um... but, I'm pretty sure I'm gonna do it again next year and
327. see what they do
328. It mm
329. A: yeah
330. Is that's exciting
331. A: I'll invite you along for the presentation
332. It yeah I'd love to see the yeah ok this is um, I cobbled it together from various other similar projects that
333. are mostly done at tertiary level
334. A: mm
335. Is so tried to create one that could be applied at secondary level so I'd be really interested to see now
336. having seen you go through this um, sort of an activity one to how you develop it next year
337. A: mm I think that the individual stops would probably stay the same
338. It yeah
339. A: I think the looking at it from your perspective you know doing the the native speaker or the native input:
340. and then flipping it to think those three main stops
341. It yeah
342. A: um... I probably won't do them have them do reflections (laughs)
391. unnecessary really in there
392. At right
393. At I think I would, follow the yeah I think I would follow the s-same steps really
394. At so nothing was a problem you don't there was nothing that
395. At apart from the boys being boys? no (laughs)
396. At yeah (laughs)
397. At um yeah no
398. At coz those reflections you might remember back in the beginning when we planned I had intended that
399. they would be submitted even two or three weeks (for us to
400. At yeah)
401. It: check over and provide some feedback but it didn't really work like that because they weren't (all at
402. the same point)
403. At yeah
404. It and it was the (same with the other class too
405. At yeah)
406. It: at City no one was ever really at a nice (right point)
407. At: yeah yeah;
408. It: that they had something to hand in so um I don't know whether that could be better managed
409. At: yeah
410. It: so there is a point at which you can sit with them over it: or even just do it remotely to give them some
411. feedback.
412. At: yeah mm
413. It: um ... so you've sort of covered it I've said have you got any suggested improvements regarding any aspect
414. of the project so you've talked about better incorporation of the language
415. At: mm
416. It: throughout
417. At: mm
418. It: reflections that may not be so long and detailed and more just about condensing ... the knowledge
419. they've gained from that session
420. At yeah
421. It: anything else that you think could improve it?
422. At I don't think so I quite liked the way it worked and it worked for the boys so
423. It: yeah
424. At um
425. It: do you think um coz I said in the class discussion it dawned on me that it wasn't until the very end that
426. they heard what each other was learning about
427. At mm
428. It: so maybe there's some way earlier on to incorporate then sharing a bit more information so they start to
429. learn a bit more about the other views
430. At yeah you could do that I mean if I'm kind of looking at ok if I have a big class that would take up
431. a whole lot of time?
432. At yeah true
433. At: um but I mean you could do something I mean one, one thing of doing it so that they kind of create like
434. an online poster or something where they just put some information on so that if the others are interested
435. they can just put it in a centralised point
436. It: yeah
437. At: and they can all see it and it also means you know that kind of where they put their summarising
438. sentences for the session or something
439. At: yeah yeah
440. It: so that might work quite well so it's right there for everybody to access if they want to
441. It: yeah
442. At: but I probably wouldn't facilitate that in the classroom in the sense that now you have to give your initial
443. findings
444. At right
445. At whatever I probably wouldn't do that
446. At mm
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447. A: maybe do a quick thing like you know do you have anything exciting that you want to share with us
448. like
449. J: yeah
450. A: six minutes at the beginning of a lesson
451. J: yeah
452. A: but um I don't think I would do another leg presentation somewhere
453. J: right
454. A: in the middle
455. J: right oh that's interesting to hear um I mean do you think doing the project reduced the extent of
456. language that they would've learned if we didn't do the project?
457. A: reduced?
458. J: yeah
459. A: um (ahem) so not really I mean vocabulary-wise maybe
460. J: mm
461. A: um because we would've done topics? Otherwise?
462. J: yep
463. A: um but because we did a whole lot of grammar um a real intense grammar like real intense three week
464. grammar block
465. J: yeah
466. A: that they then incorporated into their speech (ahem)
467. J: right
468. A: I don't think that was that was um so I don't think they missed out on anything I think that but it again it
469. really depends on the class though?
470. J: mm
471. A: and this class really needed the grammar revision anyway?
472. J: yep
473. A: so for them it worked really well?
474. J: so you wouldn't ever consider doing a project like this in a condensed form that every class that in a raw is
475. done on it because you needed those gaps in between to focus on your grammar
476. A: so it depends on what kind of class you have like because my Year 13 that I have this year um if they
477. go on into Year 12 I know where they're at I know what grammar they have also if I have at the beginning of
478. the year so ok this is the project that I wanna do here I would prepare them grammar-wise to a point
479. where at the end we really just have to do vocab
480. J: right
481. A: um which is probably the ideal scenario then I would probably do it as a two week project
482. J: right
483. A: got it done
484. J: yeah
485. A: kind of thing
486. J: so there's so again it's another way it could be adaptable then
487. A: mm
488. J: in some classes I might suit better to have it as a condensed
489. A: mm mm
490. J: ok
491. A: with that class (yep) I would probably do it as a condensed thing I wouldn't
492. J: mm mm
493. A: because they won't need the grammar revision
494. J: mm oh that's interesting um do you think they learnt any other skills doing it just general skills research
495. or
496. A: I think researching a little bit because I think some of them came across the websites that weren't
497. really giving them much information or were giving them contradicting information
498. J: mm
499. A: just really looking at what kind of websites am I looking at?
500. J: yeah
501. A: I think that's something that came to them but lots of them are actually quite good at that um I don't
502. know if they learned anything else I'm not sure
303. J: mm, I noticed a difference between the boys here and the girls that the girls didn’t necessarily know the
304. best way of searching doing Google searches didn’t really have so many um search techniques up
305. their sleeve
306. A: mm
307. J: but the boys knew a little bit more about that and were quite quite quicker at picking up on search
308. techniques
309. A: yeah
310. J: I just sort of imagined them being young and being on the computers all the time they’d be good at it but
311. they’re not necessarily doing focused searches are they
312. A: so it’s also mean the one thing that the boys are struggling with is just what what kind of search
313. terms
314. J: yeah
315. A: you know and to really filtering it down to what’s the actual thing that I’m looking for
316. J: yeah yeah yeah yeah
317. A: um and I think that that’s something that’s really important for them to learn
318. J: yeah yeah
319. A: that they’re not you know because if you put meat in them [and German and meat
320. J: yeah it’s just yeah
321. A: well what do you get you know?
322. J: yeah yeah
323. A: um but yeah I mean most of them are quite quite good at it
324. J: yeah yeah
325. A: but they all need a little bit of help to just say ok na (sex) focusing what it is that you’re you know
326. constantly keep going back to your hypothesis what if it actually that you’re looking for because it’s very easy
327. to go off on a tangent
328. J: oh yeah definitely (laughs) we all do that
329. A: (laughs) so yeah
330. J: do you think they enjoyed being independent doing their own research and choosing their own topic and
331. being sort of autonomous in some way?
332. A: I think they did well from the fact when I kept nagging them (laughs)
333. J: (laughs) yeah I suppose they have to get a bit of that then
334. A: so I think that they really did and I mean it it frightened me sometimes um like in the middle of it
335. thinking you’ve got nothing
336. J: mm
337. A: because what they’d actually written down was next to nothing but um, goes to show um at the end of it
338. they’ve a whole lot of information and they managed to put it into beautiful speeches so, um I think what
339. boys are really bad at is organising themselves to sort of make their own lives easier? As in I’m going to
340. write down what what website I used I’ll write down what kind of information you know I’m just going to
341. take those bullet points?
342. J: yeah
343. A: and I think that gets them into trouble with teachers sometimes because I need to see it that they’ve got
344. E?
345. J: yeah yeah something that you—
346. A: and they might know it but they haven’t written it down?
347. J: yeah
348. A: um because that’s obviously what happened, really for a lot of them
349. J: yeah
350. A: so I have no idea and they really enjoyed putting their own opinion in there I can tell you that
351. J: oh that’s
352. A: (laughs)
353. J: (laughs) that’s a good point actually so yeah they get to talk about themselves as well as whatever the
354. topic is
355. J: yeah
356. A: and they don’t get to do that much
357. A: oh they do but not not not about topics like that
358. J: yeah
359. A: you know usually it's about my family or where do you live it's quite boring stuff
360. J: yeah
361. A: whereas here they can they can really put their thinking hat on yeah
362. J: yes they've got a valid point of view
363. A: mm
364. J: oh I like that too
365. A: (laughs)
366. J: um has doing the project encouraged you to extend your knowledge and practice of intercultural of the
367. intercultural approach?
368. A: absolutely
369. J: mm
370. A: absolutely cuz I mean as I said before I can't probably unknowingly incorporate it into my teaching um
371. but I think this is something that really something that can that can work as a kind of constant in my teaching
372. programme
373. J: ok good, would you like further training in intercultural communicative language teaching?
374. A: uh I'll train the others (laughs)
375. J: (laughs)
376. A: no I actually would I would actually quite like to see what um the ministry wants us to do as teachers
377. because they're you know if you you look at the curriculum you've got two big strands one is language
378. one is curriculum (asked in error) and everybody focuses on language because it's the only thing that's being
379. assessed um and we need to you know gravitate to what's being assessed because that's what we're
380. measured against especially if we're going into performance pay and things like that um but it's like well if
381. they're equally strengths, where is it
382. J: yeah yeah that's right and you only see it buried in long documents that the ministry's commissioned that
383. no teachers got time to sit down and read
384. A: no no and I mean you're doing a whole lot of training on you know around language learn language
385. learning around assessments all of that but (shen) I've never been to anything to do with culture that
386. wasn't led by a teacher who just comes up with something exciting themselves
315. see because I don't know the boys that well. Um I've only had them for well a term before we started this
316. J: yeah
317. A: um and it it shows a different side of them I'm just looking at one them out the window um, and it's been
318. really interesting because especially that one boy that's been struggling with the language quite a bit I think
319. for him it was a bit of an fill back into the German language
320. J: oh nice
321. A: like he did he did quite a bit of outside work as well we did a bit of outside work with him as well but-
322. think that was kind of just something I can do I'm part of this class again even though my language might not
323. beat the live!
324. J: oh I like that
325. A: as everybody else's so I think um yeah hopefully that means for him that um he will continue, and I think
326. that's the other thing because cultural knowledge gives students who might not be so good at language
327. another in into the classroom into the class community
328. J: mm [that's a really good point
329. A: um, cuz otherwise you always have the same strong people
330. J: yeah and then it makes the language a little bit less abstract or meaningless if you're not learning the
331. language this allows you to make more sense of it and you'll yeah
332. A: mm yeah
333. J: oh that's a lovely note to finish on
334. A: [laughs]
335. J: we're bringing in even those we thought we were losing
336. A: yeah
337. J: alright thank you
338. A: you're welcome
339. J: I'll turn this off
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenview</th>
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<th>Muirside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Matt</td>
<td>Sa Sarah</td>
<td>H Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Tom</td>
<td>F Frith</td>
<td>Tk Tineke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Marc</td>
<td>M Marnie</td>
<td>K Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Sagashi</td>
<td>K Kirsty</td>
<td>An Anya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Cameron</td>
<td>Si Sinead</td>
<td>Mi Malene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Richie</td>
<td>J Jacqui</td>
<td>Mg Margo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ad Adrian</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ta Talia</td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Caitlyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N Nadine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g., GRSMt1 = Greenview, Reflection Sheet, from Matt, Section 1
Appendix F – MaxQDA Coding System

MaxQDA

Code System [1057]
QUOTE [43]
Setting description [71]
Question setting [95]

Explanation or justification of the question about to be asked; includes fillers between questions

NZ context [7]
NZ system [4]

Exposure to target culture [17]
Individual has been exposed to the target culture

Exposure to other cultures [5]
Culture general [16]
Comments made about culture generally, i.e., not specifically NZ or the target, but about alternatives generally

Intertwined [6]
Reference to language and culture being intertwined, inseparable

Coexplorer [4]
Teacher behaved as coexplorer in the project - the teacher learned too

ICLT insight through project [12]
The project provided knowledge or insight into ICLT

Development of ICC [2]
Continue [23]
Will continue with the project in future classes

Culture detracts Lang Vs Cult [20]
Reference to culture detracting from learning the language

Other skills [10]
Students learned other skills

Target culture [6]
Reference made to element of the target culture

Ss respond to target [3]
Students make a response to a feature of the target culture

Compare approaches [19]
Comparison made between ICLT project and what would have happened in class

Practice [37]
Project in practice - information relating to how the project actually worked in the classroom

NZ culture [5]
Reference made to an element of NZ culture

\*\*\*
Students make a response/reflection about their own culture

**Action ICLT [88]**
ICLT in action

**Instruction [15]**
*General format of CPPs [5]*
General remarks on various steps or features of CPPs

**Hypothesis statement [23]**
students stating their hypothesis.

**Hypothesis validity [25]**

**Reflection [56]**
Evidence of students reflecting

**Compare [34]**
Evidence of students comparing cultures

**Explore [43]**
Evidence of students exploring the new cultures

**Easy to implement [5]**
Comment that the CPPs are not difficult to incorporate into existing schedule

**Stereotypes [13]**
Comments made about stereotyping good or bad

**Heterogeneous statement [10]**
Comments made that reflects recognition of heterogeneous nature of culture

**Misstep [47]**
An aspect of the project in practice was not understood, not followed or otherwise not to plan

**Addressing misstep [30]**

**Improvements [34]**
Things teacher would (or thinks should be done to) improve upon or change in future applications of the project

**Praise [76]**
Praise for the project

**smiling [13]**

**Democratises [6]**
Reference to culture learning as democratising the class, leveling across the class

**access to a student [5]**

**Teacher responds to non-native culture [4]**
The teacher responds to a culture not their own.
ICLT training [11]
Intercultural language teaching

Application of ICLT [7]
Desire for practical information for application of ICLT

Accessing ICLT resources [4]
Comments made in relation to making resources available

Restrictions on ideals [7]
Reference to restrictions or hindrances to teaching ideals

Time [6]
Time mentioned as a limitation

Teaching moment / opportunity [8]
Reference to a teaching moment or opportunity

other culture activities [6]
Teacher mentions other culture related activities they do in the class

Do's and Don't's [3]
Reference to something acceptable or not acceptable in the culture

Affect [5]
Teacher refers to their personal feelings

History [3]
Comment on importance of learning History

Motivation [18]
Relates to students being motivated engaged

Assessment - [1]
Assessment mentioned but downplayed

Assessment + [1]
Promotes assessment as important

Teaching goals [5]
Overall teaching goal (not specifically culture)

Biodata [9]
Teacher's background information

Association [1]
Teacher's association with the culture of the language they teach

**Lang accesses culture accesses lang [6]**
Statement reflects language as accessing culture or culture as accessing language

**Openminded [4]**
Statement reflects value in openmindedness

**Culture teaching goal [9]**
For statements that reflect the teacher's goals for teaching culture

**Broaden Horizons [5]**
For when comment relates to culture as broadening students' horizons

**Sets [304]**
- **RQ3 Do students see value in CPPs [0]**
- **RQ2 Do teachers see value in CPPs [139]**
- **Compare approaches [19]**
Comparison made between ICLT project and what would have happened in class

**Practice\Praise\access to a student [5]**
**Practice\Praise\Democratises [6]**
Reference to culture learning as democratizing the class, leveling across the class

**Practice\Praise [76]**
Praise for the project

**ICLT insight through project\Development of ICC\Continue [23]**
Will continue with the project in future classes

**Other skills [10]**
Students learned other skills

- **RQ1 Do CPPs facilitate ICLT [34]**
- **ICLT training\Application of ICLT [7]**
Desire for practical information for application of ICLT

**ICLT training\Accessing ICLT resources [4]**
Comments made in relation to making resources available

**ICLT insight through project [12]**
The project provided knowledge or insight into ICLT

**ICLT training [11]**
Intercultural language teaching

**Teaching style, approach or experiences [46]**
**Teaching goals [5]**
Overall teaching goal (not specifically culture)
Assessment + [1]
Promotes assessment as important

Assessment - [1]
Assessment mentioned but downplayed

Motivation [18]
Relates to students being motivated engaged

Teaching moment / opportunity [6]
Reference to a teaching moment or opportunity

Restrictions on ideals / Time [6]
Time mentioned as a limitation

Restrictions on ideals [7]
Reference to restrictions or hindrances to teaching ideals

Teacher cognitions re culture teaching [85]
Broaden Horizons [5]
For when comment relates to culture as broadening students' horizons

Culture teaching goal [9]
For statements that reflect the teacher's goals for teaching culture

Lang accesses culture accesses lang [6]
Statement reflects language as accessing culture or culture as accessing language

Do's and Don’t's [3]
Reference to something be acceptable or not acceptable in the culture

Affect [5]
Teacher refers to their personal feelings

History [3]
Comment on importance of learning History

Culture detracts Lang Vs Cult [20]
Reference to culture detracting from learning the language

Practice / Improvements [24]
Things teacher would (or thinks should be done to) improve upon or change in future applications of the project

Reflects ICLT principles, explore, reflect, compare [0]
Appendix G – Sample Field Note

1. Observation of Muirside – Week 4 – Thurs 21 August, 9.00am
2. Present: With the exception of Tineke, all students present, Teacher Helene
3. Weather was windy and raining/sleeting.
4. Malene and Margo had attended a cultural quiz night at the university last night.
5. Today was Nadine’s 16th birthday. She was last to arrive to class and when she entered
6. the class sang her happy birthday in French. Then, Helene called for volunteers to help
7. carry out a German birthday tradition – no one volunteered so Helene asked Margo and
8. Malene to help. Only Malene was familiar with the tradition. Nadine sat on a chair and
9. Helene, Malene and Margo lifted the chair (and Nadine) slightly off the ground once for
10. every year of age, and as they did so the whole class counted in French. Nadine had been
11. given an iPhone for her birthday. She was a little distracted today.
12. Helene had emailed the class’s questions to a range of French native speakers with whom
13. she has contact. Each student received answers (printed out by Helene and collected in a
14. clear plastic folder for each student) from at least 4 respondents. All responses were in
15. French. Respondents were:
16. Nicolas, male, 50
17. Sylvie, female, 50, professeur
18. Mina, female, 52
19. Charlene, female, based in Dunedin
20. Sylvie, female, 30, based in Dunedin
21. Therese, female, 96 (mother of Nicolas; Nicolas interviewed Therese and emailed
22. response on her behalf)
23. The class time was spent reading, digesting and writing a reflection on the responses.
24. Most had trouble reading the responses even though the respondents had been asked to
25. use simple French. Some were putting phrases into Google Translate. Caitlyn found that
26. it did not give her the cultural information needed, as her respondent was making the
27. point that he did not bother to greet everyone individually, as was usually expected, but
28. made a grand entrance announcing and greeting the group as he entered.
29. The final aim of the class was for each student to develop a follow up question to expand
30. upon the information provided by one of the respondents. Helene provided formulaic
31. email starter sentences on the board.
32. Helene sat with each student to go over their responses. When she was talking with Kelly I
33. overheard a specific conversation about tenses – the first grammatical point I have heard
34. being taught when I am present.
35. I had a discussion with Adrian about why he attends Muirside for French rather than his
36. own school. He advised that it was because the school scheduled Music and French
37. together and that only two boys had signed up to do both. The other had dropped
38. French. Adrian wanted to pursue French so he was accommodated at Muirside.
39. No class next week because it is school exams week.
NAME:  {Frith}

DATE: Tuesday 10th June

This reflection is about my hypothesis: ‘That Germans are more respectful of religion than New Zealanders”

1  The information source:

Describe the information source that you used for this search, including where and how you found the source or materials (include enough information to allow someone else to be able to find the same source).

How reliable was the resource?

This week I had a primary source, a native German speaker. She is the language assistant teacher at school, here for 6 months. She has very recent knowledge of German culture, and although only able to speak from one perspective and privilege was able to provide a reliable source for information. I intend to interview another source to gain a wider perspective.

2  Cultural information

What cultural information did you discover from this resource?

I discovered that although there is tolerance for other religions in Germany, there is a large ignorance towards other religions for example not celebrating or recognising holidays and religious days of religions that are not Christian.

3  Support or challenge hypothesis?

Does this information support or go against your hypothesis? What are the circumstances of this support or challenge – that is, when does it apply, to whom, and why? (For example, it might only apply to people of a particular age, or from a certain region, or on a particular day of the year.)

This challenges my hypothesis. Germans appear to be ignorant towards other religions with a marked difference between respect/toleration and celebration.

4  Similarities and differences

In what ways does this information demonstrate similarities or differences between the German culture and your own culture?

This highlights differences between our cultures, there is no celebration for Chinese New Year and things like it in Germany.
5 Impact on hypothesis

*How has this information affected your view on the accuracy of your hypothesis?*

I think my hypothesis is proving less accurate the more I research the topic, in different ways. Some ideas remain true e.g. Germans being respectful of religion, but I think New Zealanders are much more open to the idea of celebrating other cultures as we are such a mix of Maori, Chinese, pacific island etc.

6 German language

*Getauft* - baptised
Appendix I – Class Discussion Schedule

This cultural portfolio project was intended to give you an opportunity to learn about culture.

1 Do you think it’s important to learn about culture when learning a language?

Your hypotheses:

2 Other than reading your reflections, I haven’t yet heard about what you have learned about your cultural hypotheses. One at a time, can you state your hypothesis, and then tell us what you discovered about it. Say whether you found it to be true for German culture, and if so, in what situations/contexts; and was it true for New Zealand culture? Similarities and differences.

The Intercultural approach – exploring the new culture, reflecting on your own, comparing to find similarities and differences

3 Did the project (which means your own research, and what you heard about the others’ findings) allow you to learn about German culture?

4 Do you think that knowledge is different to what you would have learned if your class hadn’t done the project? How?

5 Do you think that comparing German and New Zealand/Japanese cultures was useful/beneficial/valuable?

6 Has the project made you more aware of your own culture? And how it influences you, your language choices, your behaviour?

7 Has the project made you think more about stereotyping or over-generalising about cultures?

8 Has the project inspired you to learn more about German culture?

9 Do you think learning about culture came at the sacrifice of learning the language? If so, what it the nature of the project, or more so because I was there and wouldn’t have understood it if you used German?

10 Is learning culture more important, less important, or equally important as learning language?

The workings of the project:

11 Had you done research work of this kind before, in any subject? Do you think the project has given you skills in research work?

12 Did you like choosing your own topic to research and use for your speech? Or would you have preferred to be given a topic, as happened in the past?

13 Did you enjoy being independent in your research, being free to search whatever websites you liked, talk to your own German contacts etc? Or would you have preferred being given more directed instructions, told where to search, given set questions to answer etc?

14 What is your opinion on the use of reflections in the project? Did they allow you to consolidate the information you had gathered? Were they useful for your speech preparation? Or were they a burden or a waste of time?
15 Overall, did you enjoy the project?

16 Do you have any comments about the project – what you liked, didn’t like, could be improved?
Appendix J – Teacher Interview Schedule

Teacher interview:

- **Biodata:**
  (i) what is your association with German language and culture – native, long term visit, when, how long?
  (ii) Age Band, 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s
  (iii) Languages you teach/have taught
  (iv) Teaching qualifications
  (v) length of teaching experience, number of schools, Countries?

*General questions about your teaching approach*

- What are your goals for your language classes?
- Do you think there is a need to teach culture in language classes?
- What are your goals for teaching culture?
- Do you experience any difficulties/hindrances in teaching culture at present? Do you teach as much culture as you would like? If not, why not?
- Are you concerned that learning about culture detracts from learning language?

*Thinking about the cultural portfolio projects and the intercultural approach now:*

- Have you had any training in intercultural language teaching? If yes, of what nature?
- Did the cultural project clarify/enhance/extend the value/meaning of ‘intercultural’ for you?
- *If you don’t teach as much culture as you would like,* did the project circumvent any of the issues? Add to them? Address them?
- Was the project practically applicable in the classroom? – did it fit within existing programme? - did it compromise your usual teaching programme?
- Is it adaptable for different learner needs? --- different proficiency levels?
- Do you think learning about one’s own culture is valuable?
- If yes, did this project go some way towards achieving that?
- Did students find it interesting/engaging, do you think?
- Did **you** find the project interesting/engaging?
- What did you think were valuable, interesting, elements of this project in terms of teaching culture?
- What did you think was unimportant, difficult, unnecessary, problematic in this project?
• Do you have any suggested improvements regarding any aspect of the project?

• Did this project reduce the extent of language learning that would have otherwise taken place in class?

• Did it teach any other general skills? Eg, general exploration of culture, as well as research skills, presentation skills

• Do you think the students were ready to be, and enjoyed being, autonomous/independent learners?

_Influence on your future practice_

• Has it encouraged you to practice (or extend your practice of) an intercultural approach?

• Would you like further training in ICLT to assist you in implementing (or consider adapting to, or improve your practice in) ICLT methods?

• If there was a place to store ICLT based resources, such as a detailed outline for the CPP project, would you access it?

• Are you likely to use this project (or an adapted form of it) again in other classes (either other levels, or future Y12/13 classes?)
Appendix K – Consent Forms and Participant Information Sheets

March 2014

{School address}

Dear {Principal}

TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

I am writing to seek your permission for {school} staff member {teacher}, and one of his language classes, to participate in a university research project in Term 2, 2014.

I am a PhD student at the University of Otago, studying in the fields of Applied Linguistics and Education. My research topic is teaching culture in secondary school language classes, with specific emphasis on intercultural language teaching. Although the approach is favoured, and promoted, by the Ministry of Education, it is not widely understood or practiced by New Zealand language teachers. I have a Graduate Diploma in Second Language Teaching and a Master of Arts in Linguistics (Culture in the primary school FSL classroom).

{Teacher} became aware of my project when he attended my presentation at the New Zealand Association of Language Teachers’ Language in November 2013. I mentioned that I was hoping to conduct some in-class research in secondary school language classes. {Teacher} expressed an interest in being involved, subject to your approval.

I prepared a one-page outline of the project for your information. {Teacher} might have already passed this on to you, but I have attached it to this letter, along with the information sheets for teacher participants, student participants, and parents/guardians of student participants. If you agree to allow me to work with {teacher} and his class, I will require written consent from all of these groups. The project has approval from the University’s Human Ethics Committee (Ref: 13/076), conditional on gaining your permission.

Please contact me if you have any questions about the project or your school’s involvement in it. You may also contact either of my PhD supervisors if you wish:

Dr Anne Feryok
Dept of English & Linguistics (Linguistics Coordinator)
Ph: 479 8637
Email: anne.feryok@otago.ac.nz

Prof Lisa Smith
College of Education (Dean)
Ph: 479 9014
Email: lisa.smith@otago.ac.nz

If you agree to allow {teacher’s} participation, I would be very grateful if you could sign the attached consent form.

Yours sincerely

Jo Oranje

Email: harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz Ph: 021 257 2923
Brief outline of participation in Cultural Portfolio Projects for School

My name is Jo Oranje. I am a PhD student at the University of Otago in the fields of Applied Linguistics and Education. I am researching Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching (ICTT), a teaching approach that involves integrating culture into language lessons so learners can gain intercultural competence as well as linguistic competence in the target language. ICTT is recommended by the Ministry of Education but is not widely understood or practiced in New Zealand.

As part of my research I would like to work with [teacher] and his Year 12/13 German class to practice and evaluate a class assignment that embodies the principles of ICTT. If evaluated positively by the students and [teacher], and if students’ intercultural competence is enhanced, then the assignment will be made available as a teaching resource to assist teachers in the understanding and the practice of ICTT.

The assignment is called ‘Cultural Portfolio Projects’ (CPPs). It involves four steps:

1. Students generate instances of their current understanding about German culture. This might include factual knowledge, or misconceptions, or even stereotypes. By way of example, in a research study on CPPs involving American learners of Korean, students generated ideas such as ‘Koreans are health-conscious people’ and ‘Koreans love expensive brands’. Only statements confirmed as appropriate will be used.

2. Each student will select two items of cultural knowledge and treat them as hypotheses, testing their validity using primary and secondary sources (eg, interview native speakers, Internet, film, books), to determine whether they are, in fact, representative of German culture.

3. Students relate those same statements back to their own culture (eg, Are New Zealanders health-conscious people? Do Māori love expensive brands?) and similarly test their validity.

4. Students report their findings to the class. This gives everyone an opportunity to adjust their own understanding, appreciate alternative views of culture, and accept that culture is dynamic and not homogeneous. Use of German language will be encouraged at all steps, where proficiency levels allow.

All details of the project will be worked through with [teacher] so that the assignment is tailored for the proficiency level of his class, and so the research involvement does not hinder his own teaching goals. My aims are:

1. To observe and audio-record the class when students are working on the assignment. This will be no more than one period a week throughout Term 2.

2. To ask students to make regular annotations/reflections for each source they use, which will form entries in their portfolio. The portfolios will be submitted regularly for feedback from me and from [teacher]. This will allow their learning processes and development to be tracked. These reflections, a class discussion and a brief questionnaire will allow students to evaluate the project in terms of what they learned, what they found challenging, and what they liked or did not like about the activity.

3. To interview [teacher] (audio-recorded) to seek his opinion on the value of the assignment in terms of enhancing intercultural competence and its practical application in the classroom.

4. Analyse the data gathered from the portfolio entries, observations, questionnaire, and interview using qualitative methods as part of my thesis.

The portfolio itself will not be graded. However, [teacher] would like students to present their findings as the speech that is required for their NCEA assessment.

All participants and the school will be given pseudonyms and anonymity will be a priority. Publications may result from my thesis, but again, no identification will be used.

Written consent is required from you, [teacher], students, and students’ parents/guardians. Should a student not provide her consent or not provide the consent of her guardians, she may still work on the assignment but no data will be gathered or analysed with respect to her contribution. This is as specified in the University’s Human Ethics Committee approval. Please feel free to contact me about any aspect of this proposal: joranje72@gmail.com

Thank you for your time.
TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

CONSENT FORM FOR PRINCIPALS

I have read the outline and range of Information Sheets concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. My school’s participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw my school’s involvement from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. Personal identifying information, including audio-tape recordings and transcriptions, will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;

4. The teacher interview element of the project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning relates to teacher participants’ views on the value and practicality of cultural portfolio projects for teaching culture in language classes. The precise nature of the questions asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. In the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable the teacher may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.

5. I understand the impact of the project on my school with respect to the teaching programme and I am aware that teacher and student participants will receive a small incidental non-monetary gift as a token of thanks for their involvement in the study.

6. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve anonymity of the school and the individual participants.

I agree to the involvement of my school in this project.

.........................................................  ........................................
(Signature of participant)  (Date)

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

INFORMATION SHEET FOR TEACHER PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the aim of the project?

This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) research thesis in the fields of applied linguistics and education. The aim of the project is to engage language learners in an activity that embodies the principles of the Intercultural Communicative approach to language teaching and learning. The activity involves the students undertaking small-scale research projects called ‘Cultural Portfolio Projects’ (outlined below) in which they will test the validity of a selection of their own preconceptions about the culture(s) associated with the language they are learning. They will also research their own culture’s approach to those same topics and then report their overall findings to their class. The activity is designed in accordance with Ministry of Education’s framework for learning languages.

The value of the activity with respect to its ability to enhance students’ intercultural communicative competence will be measured from the perspective of the students, through journal entries they will write throughout the project, and of their teacher, through a short interview conducted at the conclusion of the project. If the activity is evaluated positively, then it will be considered for promotion to New Zealand secondary school language teachers as a classroom resource that supports the intercultural communicative language teaching approach. Globally, teachers have reported a need for such resources.

What type of participants are being sought?

You are being asked to participate because of your position as a teacher of a secondary school language class (ESOL, Māori, and foreign languages such as French, German, Japanese, etc.). The students of your class will also be asked to participate. Your involvement in the project is subject to the agreement of your principal.

If you participate you will receive a small incidental non-monetary gift as a token of thanks for participating in the study. It is anticipated that you will not be unduly inconvenienced by the study and there will be no costs to you that will require reimbursement. The researcher will work closely with you throughout all stages of the project to minimise the impact on your usual programme.

In fact, it is hoped that you will benefit from the study, by virtue of experience with an activity that may be of practical use in your language teaching and may support you in meeting the requirements and recommendations of the New Zealand school curriculum. In addition, there is an opportunity to engage
in a sharing of perspectives with the researcher regarding current research and the reality of language teaching to bridge the gap between academia and the classroom. Beyond any personal benefits, your contribution will assist your language teacher colleagues, some of whom have expressed concern about the lack of resources and support with the practicalities of teaching culture in the language classroom.

**What will you be asked to do?**

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to allow the researcher to work with you in setting an exploratory assignment for your students to undertake as a small part of their coursework. The project time frame is will take no longer than 6 weeks and will occupy between 30 minutes and 1 hour of class time per week. These time frames are flexible and negotiable and will be confirmed in discussion with you as part of designing the project to suit you and your class. Details of the assignment are given below. During times that the students are working on the project in class the researcher may be present to observe how the activity is developing in practice. In addition, a part of the project will require students to make weekly entries in a journal, recording their research and learning progress for analysis by the researcher. Journal entries will be made as part of the lesson period. The period over which the project will be completed, and the times and dates of the observed lessons will be determined in consultation with you and any other relevant school staff.

Once the students have completed the project, you will be asked to participate in a short, semi-structured, discussion-style interview seeking your views on the value and practical application of the project. While there will be particular lines of questioning (discussed further below), the style of the interview will allow free discussion about your opinions and experiences of the activity with respect to its suitability for teaching culture in your language class. The interview will be carried out on a one-on-one basis between you and the researcher. The interview will be at a time confirmed in consultation with you and it will take place at school in a quiet space for no more than 30 minutes.

Implementing the activity in class will require some adjustment to your usual teaching programme. However, it is hoped that you will see value in the activity and be willing to incorporate it into your lesson plans for the (at most) 6 week period. If you wish, and to reduce the degree of inconvenience to you, the researcher is willing to: a) create lesson outlines to guide you in instructing the class in the task; b) co-teach the class with you during the periods in which they are working on the tasks; c) be the primary instructor during the periods in which they are working on the tasks; or d) any combination of these over the course of the project period. These matters will all be determined in consultation with you.

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in any aspect of the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**The students’ project**

The activity for the students to undertake is called a ‘cultural portfolio project’. It is a research assignment in which students test their own theories about the culture(s) associated with the language they are learning. In the introduction to the task the students will be encouraged to generate a number of assumptions and preconceptions they hold about the target culture. By way of example, responses in other studies have included, ‘Koreans love expensive brands’, ‘Koreans are health-conscious people’, and ‘Afternoon tea is very important in England’. Students will then research the validity of those preconceptions through primary (eg, native speakers) and secondary (eg, Internet, books, film) sources. They will then be asked to consider and research those same concepts from the perspective of their own culture (eg, are New Zealanders health-conscious people?). Finally, they will present their findings to the class. Use of the target language will be promoted where achievable.

It is hoped that the project will impart the following skills: 1) knowledge about the new culture; 2) revision of inaccurate preconceptions; 3) acceptance that multiple perspectives exist within a culture,
and between cultures, and tolerance and empathy for alternative viewpoints; 4) deeper understanding of their own culture bringing an associated awareness of where cultural differences might lie in future intercultural interactions; and 5) ability to take an exploratory approach in learning that will benefit students beyond the classroom. These skills are associated with the Ministry of Education’s framework for language learning.

What data or information will be collected and what use will be made of it?

Pseudonyms will be used for all participants, and the participating schools, to help preserve your anonymity in the resulting published report.

Audio recordings will be made for the length of each observed lesson to capture all verbal interactions associated with activity on the project. The researcher may also make notes throughout the lesson to provide relevant additional detail on the non-verbal elements of the interactions and describe the physical environment. The recorded data that relates directly to the class activity will be subsequently transcribed for analysis. Interactions that do not relate to the project will not be transcribed or analysed in any way. The interview will also be audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. The journal entries made by the students will be collected as raw data. Sections from transcribed data and the journals may be used in the research report but will not appear in any form that might allow identification of the parties involved.

Personal information gained from you at the time of the interview will be restricted to gender, native language and culture, languages spoken, age (in 10-year age bands), and some details about your teaching service. You will be asked to give your professional opinions on the value of the project. The biographical data that you provide may provide some context for your opinions.

The data collected will be securely stored in a way that only those mentioned below will be able to gain access to it. Data obtained as a result of the research will be retained for at least 5 years in secure storage. Any personal information held on the participants (including audio tapes after they have been transcribed) may be destroyed at the completion of the research even though the data derived from the research will, in most cases, be kept for much longer or possibly indefinitely. All transcription and administration (copying, typing etc) will be carried out by the researcher. There will be no commercial use of the data.

Any participant may, at any point, request a copy of the data as it pertains directly to them, where this can be shared without revealing the identities of other participants who otherwise remain unidentified. Once the period of data collection has concluded (ending with the interview) participants will have one further week within which they may amend the data. Any participant can withdraw from the study at any point, at which time the researcher must ascertain whether the participant will allow the use of any data already obtained from that participant.

The results of the research may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity. If requested, you will be provided with necessary search information to allow you to find a copy of the thesis once available at the university library.

This research involves an open-questioning interview technique. The general line of questioning will be restricted to your views on the value and practicality of the cultural portfolio project for teaching culture in the language class. Semi-structuring will ensure all interviewees are asked to evaluate the same aspects of the project, such as the content and format, the time period required, the ability to assess its effect on intercultural competence, its effect on students' motivation and engagement, and the like. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago
Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used. If the line of questioning develops in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable, you have the right to decline to answer any particular question(s), or withdraw from the project.

**Can participants change their mind and withdraw from the project?**

You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**What if participants have any questions?**

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

**Researcher:**
Jo Oranje
Department of English and Linguistics
Email: harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz

**Primary thesis supervisor**
Dr Anne Feryok
Department of English and Linguistics
University telephone: 479 8637
Email: anne.feryok@otago.ac.nz

**Secondary thesis supervisor**
Prof Lisa Smith
College of Education (Dean)
University telephone: 479 9014
Email: lisa.smith@otago.ac.nz

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHER PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. Personal identifying information, including audio-tape recordings and transcriptions, will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;

4. This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning relates to my views on the value and practicality of cultural portfolio projects for teaching culture in language classes. The precise nature of the questions asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. In the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.

5. I understand the impact of the project on me with respect to my teaching programme and I am aware that I will receive a small incidental non-monetary gift as a token of thanks for participating in the study.

6. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity should I choose to remain anonymous.

I agree to take part in this project.

(Signature of participant) ........................................ (Date) ........................................

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

INFORMATION SHEET FOR STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for thinking about taking part in our project. Here is some information that you need to read carefully so you can decide whether or not you want to join in. If you decide not to take part, that's fine.

Why are we doing the project?

This project is part of a university student's work for her PhD degree. The student's name is Jo Oparaje and she is learning about how people teach and learn new languages. Jo is interested in how people learn about the cultures associated with the language they are learning so she wants to work with students and language teachers at your school.

Why are we asking you to be involved?

Jo would like you to help her because you are learning a language at school. Your parents or guardians will need to know about it too, and they can ask for you not to participate if they don't want you to. The university needs to know that you have agreed to be involved.

We hope that the project will help language teachers and language learners understand the cultures associated with a language being learned, as well as how it relates to the learner's own culture. We think this will help your communication in the new language to be more successful.

What will you have to do?

Jo has a project for you and your classmates to do in your language classes. It is a research project that you will work on for 30 minutes to one hour each week for a period of about two months. It might also form part of your usual homework allocation, but will not increase your workload beyond your usual level. Once a week, as you progress through the project, you will be asked to write a short statement explaining what you have learned so far. These will be read by Jo. At the end you will be asked to fill in a questionnaire about what you liked and did not like about the project.

Jo also wants to visit your language class to watch you and your classmates working on the projects. She will watch and listen without getting in your way. You don't have to do anything special or different.

Jo will give you a small non-monetary gift as a token of thanks for participating in the study.

If you don't want to take part, that's fine.

What information do we want and what will it be used for?

When Jo visits the class she might record the lessons with a Dictaphone audio-recorder so she can remember what was said and listen to it again later. She will transcribe, or type up, what she hears on the tape but only what is said about the project work, not your personal conversations. While she's in
the classroom, Jo might also write some notes about what she can see. You might be asked to tell Jo how old you are, what country you come from and what languages you speak.

The paper, audio and computer files that include your work or your information will be seen only by Jo and the people she is working with. They will keep whatever you say private. She will write up the results from this study for her university work. The results may also be published in academic journals and talked about at conferences. Your name will not be on anything Jo writes about this study.

Can I change my mind and stop being part of the project?

Participation in this study is voluntary, which means that you do not have to take part if you don’t want to and nothing will happen to you. Anytime you want to stop, that’s okay and you don’t have to give a reason.

What if I have any questions?

If you have any questions about the project, either now or later, you can talk to Jo when you see her at school, or email her. You can also talk to your teacher about it if you want to. Your parents can talk to Jo too, or to the people working with Jo. Here are their contact details:

The researcher:  
Jo Oranje  
Department of English and Linguistics  
University of Otago  
Email: harjo159@student.otago.ac.nz

Primary research supervisor:  
Dr Anne Feryok  
Department of English and Linguistics  
University of Otago  
Telephone number: 03 479 8637  
Email: anne.feryok@otago.ac.nz

Secondary research supervisor:  
Prof Lisa Smith  
Dean of College of Education  
University of Otago  
Telephone number: 03 479 9014  
Email: lisa.smith@otago.ac.nz
TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

CONSENT FORM FOR STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

I have been told about this study and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered in a way that makes sense.

I know that:

1. Participation in this study is voluntary, which means that I do not have to take part if I don’t want to and nothing will happen to me.

2. Anytime I want to stop, that’s okay and I don’t have to give a reason.

3. The researcher, Jo Oranje, will audiotape my lesson so that she can remember what I say, but the recording will be erased after the study has ended and my name will not be recorded.

4. I will be asked to write about the project while I am working on it and Jo Oranje will be able to read what I have written. She might use the information in her project but she will not identify me in any way.

5. If I have any worries or if I have any other questions, then I can talk about these with Jo Oranje, or ask my teacher to talk to her on my behalf.

6. The paper, audio and computer files with my work or information about me will only be seen by Jo Oranje and the people she is working with. They will keep whatever I say private.

7. I will receive a small incidental non-monetary gift as a token of thanks for participating in the study.

8. Jo Oranje will write up the results from this study for her university work. The results may also be written up in academic journals and talked about at conferences. My name will not be on anything Jo or her workmates write about this study.

I agree to take part in the study.

........................................................................................................................................
Name

........................................................................................................................................
Signature                      Date
TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARENTS/GUARDIANS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to allow your child to participate. If you decide to allow your child to participate, we thank you. If you decide that they will not take part there will be no disadvantage of any kind to you or your child and we thank you for considering our request.

If you are not a native English speaker and you experience difficulties understanding any written or spoken element of this project then you may ask the researcher to seek translation assistance for your preferred language. Alternatively, you may involve someone you know who can act as a translator or your language support person.

What is the aim of the project?

This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) research thesis in the field of applied linguistics. The aim of the project is to engage language learners in an activity that embodies the principles of the Intercultural Communicative approach to language teaching and learning. The activity involves the students undertaking small scale research projects called ‘Cultural Portfolio Projects’ (outlined below) in which they will test the validity of a selection of their own preconceptions about the culture(s) associated with the language they are learning. They will also research their own culture’s approach to those same topics and then report their overall findings to their class. The activity is designed in accordance with Ministry of Education’s framework for learning languages.

The value of the activity with respect to its ability to enhance students’ intercultural communicative competence will be measured from the perspective of the students, through their portfolio entries made throughout the project and a brief questionnaire, and of their teacher, through a short interview conducted at the conclusion of the project. If the activity is evaluated positively, then it will be considered for promotion to New Zealand secondary school language teachers as a classroom resource that supports the intercultural communicative language teaching approach. Globally, teachers have reported a need for such resources.

What types of participants are being sought?

Your child is being asked to participate because s/he is a student of a secondary school language class (ESOL, Māori, or foreign languages such as French, German, Japanese). The teacher of the class will also be asked to participate.

We hope that the project will help language teachers and language learners to better understand a new culture and how it relates to their own culture. We think this will help language learners to communicate in the new language more successfully.

Participants will receive a small incidental non-monetary gift as a token of thanks for participating in the study. It is anticipated that your child will not be unduly inconvenienced by the study and there will be no costs to her/him that will require reimbursement. The work will be conducted as part of
their usual language class. If the project entails homework it will form part of their usual homework allocation for the subject and will not be in addition to their usual workload.

**What are the parents/guardians asked to do?**

You are asked to allow your child to participate in a class activity that the researcher will set the class to undertake as a small part of their classwork. Details of the assignment are given below. The project time frame is likely to last approximately 8 weeks and will occupy between 30 minutes and 1 hour of class time per week, as negotiated with the class teacher. During times that the students are working on the project in class the researcher may be present to observe how the activity is developing in practice. The observations will take place throughout the length of the project during Term 2 of 2014. In addition, a part of the project will require students to make weekly entries in a portfolio, recording their research and learning progress for analysis by the researcher. Portfolio entries will be made as part of the lesson period.

Please be aware that you may decide not to permit your child to take part without any disadvantage of any kind to yourself or your child.

**The students’ project**

The activity for the students to undertake is called a ‘cultural portfolio project’. It is a research assignment in which students test their own theories about the culture(s) associated with the language they are learning. In the introduction to the task the students will be encouraged to generate a number of assumptions and preconceptions they hold about the target culture. By way of example, responses in other studies have included, ‘Koreans love expensive brands’, ‘Koreans are health-conscious people’, and ‘Afternoon tea is very important in England’. Students will then research the validity of those preconceptions through primary (eg, native speakers) and secondary (eg, Internet, books, film) sources. They will then be asked to consider and research those same concepts from the perspective of their own culture, eg, are New Zealanders health-conscious people? Finally, they will present their findings to the class, in the target language where achievable.

It is hoped that the project will impart the following skills: 1) knowledge about the new culture; 2) revision of inaccurate preconceptions; 3) acceptance that multiple perspectives exist within a culture, and between cultures, and tolerance and empathy for alternative viewpoints; 4) deeper understanding of their own culture bringing an associated awareness of where cultural differences might lie in future intercultural interactions; and 5) ability to take an exploratory approach in learning that will benefit students beyond the classroom. These skills are associated with the Ministry of Education’s framework for language learning.

**What data or information will be collected and what use will be made of it?**

Pseudonyms will be used for all participants, and the participating schools, to help preserve anonymity in the resulting published report. No participant’s name will be recorded (in raw data or completed research). The name of the school will not be recorded. It is therefore unlikely that any participant will be able to be identified from the research.

In all classes observed by the researcher, a small audio-recorder will be used to record all verbal interactions for the period spent on the class activity. Because of the project’s focus on the references to the cultural portfolio projects, only those interactions that directly or indirectly relate to the projects will be transcribed for further analysis. The researcher will take hand written notes while in the classroom, noting relevant non-verbal activity that relates to the projects. If you choose not to allow your child to participate, recordings of interactions involving your child will not be transcribed or analysed.

The portfolio entries will be collected by the researcher for analysis. Any other personal information gained from your child will be restricted to gender, age, native language and other languages spoken.
The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned below will be able to gain access to it. Data obtained as a result of the research will be retained for at least 5 years in secure storage. Any personal information held on the participants (including audio tapes after they have been transcribed) may be destroyed at the completion of the research even though the data derived from the research will, in most cases, be kept for much longer or possibly indefinitely. All transcription and administration (copying, typing etc) will be carried out by the researcher. There will be no commercial use of the data.

The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve anonymity of your child. No external agencies will have access to the raw data. The research is not externally funded. No commercial use will be made of the data.

You or your child may, at any point, request a copy of the data as it pertains directly to your child, where this can be shared without revealing the identities of other participants who would otherwise remain unidentified. Once the period of data collection has concluded (projects completed) participants will have one further week within which they may amend the data. Any participant can withdraw from the study at any point, at which time the researcher must ascertain whether the participant will allow the use of their data.

If requested, you or your child will be provided with necessary search information to allow them to find a copy of the thesis once available at the university library.

**Can participants change their mind and withdraw from the project?**

You may withdraw your child from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage of any kind to you or your child.

**What if participants have any questions?**

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

The researcher:  
Jo Oranje  
Department of English and Linguistics  
University of Otago  
Email: hurjo159@student.otago.ac.nz

Primary research supervisor:  
Dr Anne Feryok  
Department of English and Linguistics  
University of Otago  
Telephone number: 03 479 8637  
Email: aunc.feryok@otago.ac.nz

Secondary research supervisor:  
Prof Lisa Smith, Dean  
College of Education, University of Otago  
Telephone number: 03 479 9014  
Email: lisa.smith@otago.ac.nz

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
TEACHING CULTURE IN LANGUAGE CLASSES - CULTURAL PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS/GUARDIANS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. If I had questions they have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. My child’s participation in the project is entirely voluntary;
2. I am free to withdraw my child from the project at any time without any disadvantage;
3. Personal identifying information on audio-tape and associated transcriptions will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;
4. My child will not be subject to any discomfort or risk;
5. My child will not be exposed to inconvenience or cost, but will receive a small incidental non-monetary gift as a token of thanks for participating in the study;
6. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my child’s anonymity.

I agree for my child to take part in this project.

..........................................................................................
(Name of child)

..........................................................................................  ..................................................
(Signature of parent/guardian)  (Date)

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix L – Research Consultation with Māori

Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation Committee
Te Komiti Rakahau ki Kai Tahu

Tuesday, 26 February 2013.

Dr Anne Feryok,
Department of English · Linguistics,
DUNEDIN.

Tēnā Koe Dr Anne Feryok

Teaching culture in language classes at New Zealand secondary schools: Use of cultural portfolio projects as an intercultural communicative activity.

The Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation Committee (The Committee) met on Tuesday, 26 February 2013 to discuss your research proposition.

By way of introduction, this response from The Committee is provided as part of the Memorandum of Understanding between Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and the University. In the statement of principles of the memorandum it states “Ngāi Tahu acknowledges that the consultation process outlined in this policy provides no power of veto by Ngāi Tahu to research undertaken at the University of Otago”. As such, this response is not “approval” or “mandate” for the research, rather it is a mandated response from a Ngāi Tahu appointed committee. This process is part of a number of requirements for researchers to undertake and does not cover other issues relating to ethics, including methodology they are separate requirements with other committees, for example the Human Ethics Committee, etc.

Within the context of the Policy for Research Consultation with Māori, the Committee bases its consultation on that defined by Justice McGechan:

“Consultation does not mean negotiation or agreement. It means: setting out a proposal not fully decided upon; adequately informing a party about relevant information upon which the proposal is based; listening to what the others have to say with an open mind (in that there is room to be persuaded against the proposal); undertaking that task in a genuine and non cosmetic manner. Reaching a decision that may or may not alter the original proposal.”

The Committee considers the research to be of interest and importance.

As this study involves human participants, the Committee strongly encourage that ethnicity data be collected as part of the research project. That is the questions on self-identified ethnicity and descent, these questions are contained in the 2006 census.

Because this research is being done in Dunedin, the Committee suggests contacting Tangiwai Rewi at Te Tumu.

The Committee suggests dissemination of the research findings to relevant National Māori Education organizations and Toitu te Iwi at Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu regarding this study.

We wish you every success in your research and the Committee also requests a copy of the research findings.

This letter of suggestion, recommendation and advice is current for an 18 month period from Tuesday, 26 February 2013 to 15 August 2014.
Nâhaku nea, nā

Mark Brunton
Kaiwhakahaere Rangahau Māori
Research Manager Māori
Research Division
Te Whare Wānanga o Otago
Ph: +64 3 479 8738
Email: mark.brunton@otago.ac.nz
Web: www.otago.ac.nz
Appendix M – Correlation tables

Table M1

Correlations Between Cognitions Statements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge about culture builds tolerance</td>
<td>Discussing controversial topics is beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture are integrated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural misunderstandings are language difference</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school's focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU language curriculum's focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is a fifth skill</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's own culture should be incorporated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should present only positive image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about culture builds tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing controversial topics is beneficial</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture must be separated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language education includes reflective understanding</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to prepare for intercultural encounters</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| It is important to prepare for intercultural encounters | Pearson Correlation | .214 | .214 | .214 | .214 | N |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .214 | .214 | .214 | .214 | N |

| Introducing cultural values into the curriculum | Pearson Correlation | .320 | .320 | .320 | .320 | N |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .320 | .320 | .320 | .320 | N |

| Language and culture are integrated | Pearson Correlation | .320 | .320 | .320 | .320 | N |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .320 | .320 | .320 | .320 | N |
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and culture are interrelated</th>
<th>Teachers must possess realistic image</th>
<th>Personal contact with the cultures matters</th>
<th>With low pressure culture should give way to linguistic competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture are interrelated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural misunderstandings are language differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and culture are interrelated</th>
<th>Culture knowledge is mostly gained from intercultural encounters</th>
<th>Teaching culture means lost opportunities for learning</th>
<th>Language teaching should stand as an example as well as be new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture are interrelated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural misunderstandings are language differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture is a fifth skill</th>
<th>Students' own cultures should be incorporated</th>
<th>Teacher should present only positive image</th>
<th>Knowledge about culture builds tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39.96</td>
<td>0.39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discouraging colonialistic thinking is beneficial</th>
<th>Knowledge about culture builds tolerance</th>
<th>Teacher should present only positive image</th>
<th>Culture is a fifth skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.39.96</td>
<td>0.39.96</td>
<td>0.39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and culture must be separated</th>
<th>Language must be separated</th>
<th>Language education includes reflective understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.39.96</td>
<td>0.39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>76.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to prepare for intercultural encounters</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (r)</th>
<th>0.39.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and culture are interrelated</th>
<th>Language teaching should induce skills to accommodate differences</th>
<th>Most important outcomes is intercultural competence</th>
<th>To learn a new culture consider how it is similar and different to own</th>
<th>Culture should be taught from the beginning of primary education</th>
<th>Comparing results influence of visible culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture are interrelated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .223</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural misunderstandings are language differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school’s focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ language curriculum’s focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is a fifth skill</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ own cultures should be incorporated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should present only positive image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about culture builds tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing controversial topics is beneficial</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture must be separated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language education includes reflective understanding</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to prepare for intercultural encounters</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and culture are interrelated</th>
<th>Language teaching should induce skills to accommodate differences</th>
<th>Most important outcomes is intercultural competence</th>
<th>To learn a new culture consider how it is similar and different to own</th>
<th>Culture should be taught from the beginning of primary education</th>
<th>Comparing results influence of visible culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture are interrelated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .223</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural misunderstandings are language differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school’s focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ language curriculum’s focus is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is a fifth skill</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ own cultures should be incorporated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should present only positive image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about culture builds tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing controversial topics is beneficial</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture must be separated</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language education includes reflective understanding</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to prepare for intercultural encounters</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .050</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and culture are intertwined</td>
<td>Interpersonal misunderstandings and language differences</td>
<td>My house is on linguistic competence</td>
<td>My schools house is on linguistic competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing cultural strand into curriculum was important</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge is mostly gained through transmission</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ought to be assessed on cultural dimension</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers must present realistic image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with the culture creates tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With time pressure culture should give way to linguistic</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture knowledge is mostly gained as it arises incidentally</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.353</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means lost opportunities for teaching language</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should contribute to understanding of own identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should include knowledge of own culture as well as new</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should include skills to accommodate differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important outcome is intercultural competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge about culture, cultural norms</th>
<th>Discussing controversial topics, etc.</th>
<th>Language and culture must be separated</th>
<th>Language education includes reflective understanding</th>
<th>It is important to prepare for intercultural encounters</th>
<th>Introducing cultural values into curriculum is not as important</th>
<th>Cultural knowledge is mostly gained through transmission</th>
<th>Students ought to be assessed on cultural dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introducing cultural strand into curriculum was important</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>-.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>.30</strong></td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge is mostly gained through transmission</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>-.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ought to be assessed on cultural dimension</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>-.62</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>.44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage interpersonal situations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>-.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with the culture creates tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>-.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to understand the culture's way of life</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>-.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should contribute to understanding of own identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>-.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Teachers must present realistic image</th>
<th>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations</th>
<th>Personal contact with the culture creates tolerance</th>
<th>With time pressure culture should give way to linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introducing cultural strand into curriculum was impr</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge is mostly gained through transmission</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ought to be assessed on cultural dimension</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers must present realistic image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with the culture creates tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With time pressure culture should give way to linguistics</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture knowledge is mostly gained as it arises incidently</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means that opportunities for teaching language</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should contribute to understanding of own identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should help learners develop knowledge of new culture as well as new</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should include skills to accommodate differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important outcome in intercultural competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Culture knowledge is mostly gained as it arises incidently</th>
<th>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations</th>
<th>Language teaching should contribute to understanding of own identity</th>
<th>Language teaching should help learners develop knowledge of new culture as well as new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introducing cultural strand into curriculum was impr</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge is mostly gained through transmission</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ought to be assessed on cultural dimension</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers must present realistic image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with the culture creates tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With time pressure culture should give way to linguistics</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture knowledge is mostly gained as it arises incidently</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means that opportunities for teaching language</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should contribute to understanding of own identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should help learners develop knowledge of new culture as well as new</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should include skills to accommodate differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important outcome in intercultural competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (t-test)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td>Language teaching should include skills to accommodate differences</td>
<td>Most important outcome in intercultural competence</td>
<td>To learn a new culture consider how it is similar and different to our own</td>
<td>Culture should be taught from the beginning of language education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing cultural stand into curriculum was impr</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.652</td>
<td>N 78</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge is mostly gained through transmission</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.579</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ought to be assessed on cultural dimension</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.554</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers must present realistic image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.527</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.549</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with the culture makes tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.503</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With time pressure culture should give way to linguistic</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.467</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture knowledge is mostly gained as it arises naturally</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.454</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means test opportunities for teaching</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.492</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should contribute to understanding of own identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.464</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should achieve knowledge of own culture as well as new</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.467</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should include skills to accommodate differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.467</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 75</td>
<td>N 76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Comparing means influence of intercultural competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introducing cultural stand into curriculum was impr</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge is mostly gained through transmission</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ought to be assessed on cultural dimension</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers must present realistic image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means teaching skills to manage intercultural situations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with the culture makes tolerance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With time pressure culture should give way to linguistic</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture knowledge is mostly gained as it arises naturally</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching culture means test opportunities for teaching</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should contribute to understanding of own identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should achieve knowledge of own culture as well as new</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching should include skills to accommodate differences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important outcome in intercultural competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (Sample 2) 0.503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and culture are integrated</th>
<th>Interpersonal and cultural differences</th>
<th>My focus is on linguistic competence</th>
<th>My school's focus is on linguistic competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To learn a new culture</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Significant</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider how it is similar and different to own</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider how it is different to own</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture should be taught</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Significant</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the beginning of language education</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To learn a new culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider how it is similar</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and different to own</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture should be taught</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the beginning of</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language education</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing relative influence</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of invisible culture</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

|                                | Pearson Correlation | Sig (2-tailed) | N |
|                                |                    |                |   |
| To learn a new culture         |                    |                |   |
| consider how it is similar     |                    |                |   |
| and different to own           | 0.21                | 0.19           | 70|
|                                |                      |                |   |
| Culture should be taught       | 0.21                | 0.19           | 70|
| from the beginning of           | 0.21                | 0.19           | 70|
| language education             | 0.21                | 0.19           | 70|
|                                |                      |                |   |
| Comparing relative influence   | 0.16                | 0.09           | 70|
| of invisible culture           | 0.25                | 0.05           | 70|

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
### Correlations Between Practices Statements

**Correlations**

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With limited teaching time culture gives way to language</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel restricted from implementing my ideas</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the cultural stand</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of my own culture when teaching</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make links between culture and language</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school requires Native CLT</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to talk about my own experiences</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically discuss the text's meaning with students</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make connections</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for reflection through other's eyes</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as 'time' vs.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically analyze my own culture in activities</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I design projects based on culture</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With limited teaching time culture gives way to language</th>
<th>I feel restricted from implementing my ideas</th>
<th>I am motivated to teach culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sgr. (failed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel restricted from implementing my ideas</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sgr. (failed)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sgr. (failed)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the cultural stand</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sgr. (failed)</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of my own culture when teaching</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sgr. (failed)</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make links between culture and language</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sgr. (failed)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school requires that I implement CLT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sgr. (failed)</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I consider the cultural strand</th>
<th>I am aware of my own culture when teaching</th>
<th>I provide opportunities to make links between culture and language</th>
<th>My school requires that I implement ICT</th>
<th>My school requires that I implement ICT</th>
<th>I am able to talk about my own experiences</th>
<th>I am able to talk about my own experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With limited teaching time culture gives way to language</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel restricted from implementing my ideas</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the cultural strand</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of my own culture when teaching</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make links between culture and language</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school requires that I implement ICT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I teach as a distinct subject area</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for interaction with same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach the ability to read across cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have limited teaching time</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture (language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel restricted from implementing my ideas</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.667</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the cultural strand</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of my own culture when teaching</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make links between</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture and language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school requires that I implement CLT</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture to support curriculum topic</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I aim to assimilate students into the target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With limited teaching time</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture (language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel restricted from implementing my ideas</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.667</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the cultural strand</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of my own culture when teaching</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make links between</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture and language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school requires that I implement CLT</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td>I felt restricted from implementing my ideals</td>
<td>I am motivated to teach culture</td>
<td>With limited teaching time</td>
<td>culture gives way to language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as it crops up</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically analyze my own culture in activities</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I design projects based on culture</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I aim to teach the ability to meditate</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as a distinct subject area</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for interaction with native speakers</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach the ability to explore culture</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture to support curriculum topics</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>438.0</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Correlations

![](Correlations)

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My school requires that I implement V.G.</th>
<th>I plan to talk about my own experiences</th>
<th>I culturally discuss the text's meaning with students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I plan to talk about my own experiences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.168</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically discuss the text's meaning with students</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.445</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for reflection through others' eyes</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.671</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as it crops up</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.359</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically analyze my own culture in activities</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.227</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assign projects based on culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.493</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I aim to teach the ability to mediate</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.328</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as a distinct subject area</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.202</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for interaction with native speakers</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.108</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach the ability to explore culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.348</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture to support curriculum topics</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.438</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>I provide opportunities to make connections</th>
<th>I culturally discuss the text's meaning with students</th>
<th>Teach culture as it crops up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I plan to talk about my own experiences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.161</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically discuss the text's meaning with students</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.445</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for reflection through others' eyes</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.671</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as it crops up</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.359</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically analyze my own culture in activities</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.227</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assign projects based on culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.493</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I aim to teach the ability to mediate</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.328</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as a distinct subject area</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.202</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for interaction with native speakers</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.108</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach the ability to explore culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.348</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture to support curriculum topics</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>r = 0.438</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I critically analyze my own culture in activities</th>
<th>I assign projects focused on culture</th>
<th>I aim to teach the ability to mediate</th>
<th>I teach culture as a distinct subject area</th>
<th>I provide opportunities for interaction with native speakers</th>
<th>I teach the ability to explore culture</th>
<th>I teach culture to support curriculum topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I plan to talk about my own experiences</td>
<td><strong>0.245</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.692</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.163</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically discuss the texts receiving with students</td>
<td><strong>0.362</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.101</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.159</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make connections</td>
<td><strong>0.292</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.224</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.452</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for reflection through others' eyes</td>
<td><strong>0.588</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.113</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.456</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as it crops up</td>
<td><strong>0.322</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.175</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.204</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically analyze my own culture in activities</td>
<td><strong>0.253</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.600</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.350</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assign projects based on culture</td>
<td><strong>0.168</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.196</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.300</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I aim to teach the ability to mediate</td>
<td><strong>0.459</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.320</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.380</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as a distinct subject area</td>
<td><strong>0.065</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.158</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.094</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for interaction with native speakers</td>
<td><strong>0.536</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.307</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.352</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach the ability to explore culture</td>
<td><strong>0.357</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.551</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.470</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture to support curriculum topics</td>
<td><strong>0.169</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.209</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.320</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I teach culture to support curriculum topics</th>
<th>I am to assimilate students into the target culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I plan to talk about my own experiences</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically discuss the text</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities to make connections</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for reflection</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as it crops up</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I critically analyze my own culture's</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assign projects based on culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I aim to teach the ability to</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiate</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture as a distinct subject area</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide opportunities for interaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with native speakers</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach the ability to explore</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach culture to support curriculum topics</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I aim to assimilate students into the target culture</th>
<th>With limited teaching time gives way to language</th>
<th>I feel resistance from implementing my ideas</th>
<th>I am motivated to teach culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I aim to assimilate students into the target culture</th>
<th>I consider the cultural strand</th>
<th>I am aware of my own culture when teaching</th>
<th>I provide opportunities to make links between culture and language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I aim to assimilate students into the target culture</th>
<th>My school requires that I implement ELD</th>
<th>I plan to talk about my own experiences</th>
<th>I critically discuss the text's meaning with students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I aim to assimilate students into the target culture</th>
<th>I provide opportunities to make links with connections</th>
<th>I provide opportunities for reflection through others' eyes</th>
<th>Teach culture as it crops up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>I change my study habits to fit the class</th>
<th>I change my study habits to fit individual classes</th>
<th>I change my study habits to fit my ideas of how I learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECISIONS TO MAKE WITH CRAIG REGARDING APPLICATION OF CPPS IN YR 12 GERMAN, TERM 2, 2014

1 Timetable

Discuss, amend and confirm DONE – copy emailed to Craig

- Covers regularity with which the CPP is involved in the Term’s programme
- Covers Jo’s attendance/involvement
- Covers potential assessment, or at least feedback

2 Jo’s involvement

(i) Jo is away for two week period near end (Tues 10 June – Sun 22 June = ie, Weeks 6 and 7). Students could be working on own-culture testing in that time? As class work or home work.

CRAIG INFORMED: YES NO

(ii) Jo happy to facilitate entire first session of discussion about culture generally, generation of cultural knowledge, formulation of hypotheses to test. If agreed, Jo will provide full lesson plan in days before first lesson.

JO TO TAKE 1st LESSON: YES NO Shared or Other

(iii) Jo happy to facilitate class discussion (Week 8?)

- Because speech is only 1min, and must be in German, the extent to which information is shared could be limited by time, nerves and proficiency. Relaxed discussion allows students to share knowledge gained – allows fuller appreciation of their development. Students offer informal summary (in English) of their findings.

JO TO TAKE DISCUSSION: YES NO Shared or Other

(iv) Confirm periods for Jo to attend. Any time Mondays, otherwise mornings or 1-2pm periods if possible. Can arrange occasional afternoon if needed.

JO TO ATTEND: Session will be Tuesday 8.50 – 9.50am (Period 1) where possible. Jo to attend most weeks (except when away).

(v) Confirm extent of Jo’s involvement in class. All CPP related work done by Jo? Share from week to week? Craig to do most of research-based work Weeks 2-7?

DIVISION OF LABOUR: Craig will do much of the day to day instruction because he will include his own language related aspects. Jo to be present and will facilitate as and when appropriate; to be decided lesson by lesson.
3  **Week 1 Hypothesis Generation**

(i) Start with general discussion about culture, New Zealand culture and German culture?  
**YES  NO**

(ii) Preferred way to generate cultural knowledge statements?  
- Each person names first three things that come to mind about German culture  
- Each person names three things important to tell others about German culture  
- Each person writes three things they know about German culture and they are submitted anonymously (when are they assessed for appropriateness and made available for choosing)  
- General areas named by teacher (eg, greetings, politeness, timekeeping, meal times, recreation, clothing, etc) and students asked how Germans do it (takes a stereotypical approach though)

**GENERATION METHOD:** Brainstorm as class. No need for anonymity. Might need some encouragement to generate ideas.

(iii) Select hypotheses in first lesson?  
**YES  NO**

(iv) One or two hypotheses? Two allows for backup if one isn’t fruitful or is boring, and can settle on one further into process; or pick one in beginning for focus?  
**ONE  TWO**

4  **Annotations/Reflections Format**

This is the work carried out throughout, that is added to the portfolio, and assessed dynamically for development. Consider,  
- Provide standardised form (as per example). Same structure used each time. (easier to track development)  
- Or, alternative ways of reflecting for each source, ie, use different genres (letter, free paragraph, news report) (harder to track development but offers different skills)  
- Use of target language and English. Form in German, so regularly see the language. Response in either English or German (don’t want to restrict the provision of evidence of their development through lack of vocab, but want to provide as many opportunities to use target language)

**REFLECTION/ANNOTATION FORMAT:** Standardised form, possibly with framework in German. Jo to create draft and Craig to consider and possible translate to expose to some German terminology.

5  **Interview**

(i) Will all students have access to a native speaker who they can interview?  
**YES  NO**  One student’s mother is German, lived away for 30 years. All have access to the Language Assistant.
(ii) What are the steps of the interview that can be included in portfolio and/or evaluated? Eg, Prepare questions and include in portfolio, carry out interview (how will responses be recorded), transcription or summary?

INTERVIEW STEPS: Potentially all.

6 Speech

(i) What week is the speech conducted in?

SPEECH DATE: Last week – Week 9

(ii) Is the speech to form part of the project (otherwise, the discussion can be relied upon)? If so, some form of translation required. Eg,

(a) Classmates make a short written summary of each speech – tests their understanding of the speech and the speaker’s clarity of presentation. These go into the portfolios of the classmates.

(b) Speaker provides an English translation of the speech for the portfolio.

SPEECH IN PROJECT: YES NO Both options are possible – to be confirmed later

7 Questionnaire

Jo wants to get students to complete very short questionnaire asking students their opinion on the value of the projects. Will there be a few moments in last week to do this? Alternatives – take home questionnaire, or do first week of Term 3.

QUESTIONNAIRE TIME: Final week

8 Assessment

(i) Submission of portfolio at regular intervals provides chance for students to get feedback on their work, dynamic assessment of development at stages throughout project. OK to do?

PORTFOLIO SUBMITTED AT REGULAR INTERVALS: YES NO To be submitted electronically

(ii) Who to provide that feedback?

JO ONLY JO & CRAIG CRAIG ONLY

(ii) Elements, if any, of the CPP (other than speech) to be used as formal assessment?

ELEMENTS FOR ASSESSMENT: Only speech for formally graded assessment. The portfolio will provide the motivation for the speech. Feedback offered throughout.

(iii) Consider example – will require expansion to include change in attitude and awareness.

JO TO DO FURTHER WORK ON EVALUATION: YES NO No mark allocated for -portfolio
9  Homework

What aspects, if any, could be done as homework rather than class work? Eg, will all researching be done in class time? Will interview be done in class time? Will speech preparation be done in class time?

HOMEWORK/CLASSWORK DIVISION: To be decided lesson by lesson.

10  Consents

(i)  When to give consent forms to students (own and guardians)?

CONSENT FORMS TO STUDENTS: This week. Craig has taken them to hand out.

(ii) Principal’s consent – has Craig spoken to {Principal} before Jo meets her?

YES  NO  Craig to give her a heads up, and Jo to follow up with phone call/meeting.

11  Timetable

IS THE TIMETABLE CONFIRMED?  YES  NO  Content to remain flexible throughout the term
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Week 1 Beg. 5 May</th>
<th>Week 2 Beg. 12 May</th>
<th>Week 3 Beg. 19 May</th>
<th>Week 4 Beg. 26 May</th>
<th>Week 5 Beg. 2 June</th>
<th>Week 6 Beg. 9 June</th>
<th>Week 7 Beg. 16 June</th>
<th>Week 8 Beg. 23 June</th>
<th>Week 9 Beg. 30 June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task</strong></td>
<td>Discuss culture generally; Generate cultural knowledge; Develop hypotheses</td>
<td>Research/test hypotheses</td>
<td>Research/ testing</td>
<td>Research/ testing</td>
<td>Interview native speaker – preparation of questions, interview and some form of transcription or analysis</td>
<td>Research/ testing in own culture</td>
<td>Class discussion about their findings</td>
<td>Speech (based on project)</td>
<td>Quick questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
<td>Lang Asst present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time allotted</strong></td>
<td>1 Period TUES 8.50am</td>
<td>1 period TUES 8.50am</td>
<td>1 period TUES 8.50am</td>
<td>1 period TUES 8.50am</td>
<td>1 period TUES 8.50am</td>
<td>1 period TUES 8.50am</td>
<td>1 Period TUES 8.50am</td>
<td>1 period for speech Part of 1 period for questionnaire.</td>
<td>Which periods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jo’s attendance</strong></td>
<td>Jo to facilitate</td>
<td>Jo to attend</td>
<td>Jo to attend</td>
<td>Jo to attend</td>
<td>Jo to attend</td>
<td>Jo to attend</td>
<td>Jo away</td>
<td>Jo to facilitate</td>
<td>Jo to attend speeches? Jo to attend for q’naire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission for assessment/evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Week 3, Submit portfolios (electronically) for initial feedback</td>
<td>Week 5, Submit portfolios (electronically) for assessment/ feedback on testing of target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Week 9, Submit full portfolios (for assessment (needs to include some written response on speech – own or others’))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflection

NAME:

DATE:

This reflection is about my hypothesis:

“That ____________________________________________”

1 The information source:

Describe the information source that you used for this search, including where and how you found the source or materials (include enough information to allow someone else to be able to find the same source).

How reliable was the resource?

2 Cultural information

What cultural information did you discover from this resource?

3 Support or challenge hypothesis?

Does this information support or go against your hypothesis?

What are the circumstances of this support or challenge – that is, when does it apply, to whom, and why? (For example, it might only apply to people of a particular age, or from a certain region, or on a particular day of the year.)
4 Similarities and differences

*In what ways does this information demonstrate similarities or differences between the German culture and your own culture?*

5 Impact on hypothesis

*How has this information affected your view on the accuracy of your hypothesis?*

6 German language
Appendix O – Sample Conversity Across Cultures Cards

Who gets served first at dinner?

What rituals start and end meals?

Looking someone straight in the eye is...

I show respect by...
Handshakes, hugs, bows and hellos

How do you greet older people?

How do you wait in line?

Etiquette in crowded places
Does kindness matter more than honesty?

People should always be honest